

ipcc

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON climate change

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE IPCC
Berlin, Germany, 7-12 April 2014

IPCC-XXXIX/INF. 1
(27.II.2014)
Agenda Item: 6
ENGLISH ONLY

FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

IPCC Secretariat

c/o WMO • 7bis, Avenue de la Paix • C.P. 2300 • 1211 Geneva 2 • Switzerland
telephone : +41 (0) 22 730 8208 / 54 / 84 • fax : +41 (0) 22 730 8025 / 13 • email : IPCC-Sec@wmo.int • www.ipcc.ch



FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments

On 9 December 2013 Governments were invited to provide comments on the future work of the IPCC, using a questionnaire form structured around the three objectives agreed by the Panel at its 37th Session. The following submissions were received by Governments. Comments are by alphabetical order:

Governments

- Argentina
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Belgium
- Brazil
- Canada
- China
- Denmark
- Egypt
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Japan
- Kenya
- Kyrgyzstan
- Latvia
- Madagascar
- Maldives
- Mali
- Mexico
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Saudi Arabia
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Thailand
- United Kingdom
- United Republic of Tanzania
- United States of America

Observer Organization

- European Union



*Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable*

Argentina's views on topics and questions that should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

First, the periodicity of 7 years for the ARS is excessive according to spiraling political and economic changes that require such information. The same applies to scientific inputs that feed climate change negotiations.

Another challenge relates to the simultaneity of the reports. Since the Groups II and III are based largely on information from Group I, as all of three reports are performed at the same time, that implies constraints for the other two groups (especially for Group II) relative to the timeline they count with for finishing their reports. *It also adds pressure to governments for the review process.* This could be solved if the reports were held separately with a frequency of about one year (at least) between each other, and taking into account timeline requirements and decisions of the UNFCCC process.

Regarding Special Reports, it could be important to move forward to cross-cutting approaches among different Working Groups. There is, as well, a number of emerging issues that should be addressed such as *shale/ tight* gas; migrations and analysis and deployment of conventional energies. It should also be approached the issue of short-lived gases and black carbon.

Considering IPCC Special Reports, regional issues, should be prioritized those regions or sub regions where the conditions of their countries require information that cannot be generated by those countries. In addition, an interesting option could be to approach to a specific issue at a regional level, from special reports.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In this sense, we consider appropriate to evaluate the following option: Group I address the issue of scientific basis, specifically climatic aspects; Group II work address impacts and vulnerability and finally, Group III evaluates adaptation strategies and mitigation, enabling, at the same time, analysis of synergies.



Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable

Regarding leading authors, there should be considered the possibility of setting incentives to the Coordinating Lead Authors of the reports based on the workload and responsibility they have.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

Regarding the TSU, it is proposed that a larger number of developing countries should have a more active role in these units, since they are mostly led by developed countries.

Workshops in developing countries (pre and post Assessments Reports or Special Reports) would facilitate engagement of developing countries scientists and experts. This could be done in a sub regional basis.

COUNTRY: AUSTRIA

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

AUSTRIA SEES THE NEED FOR SOME CHANGES COMPARED TO THE PRACTICE SO FAR. FOR AUSTRIA IT WOULD BE A HIGH PRIORITY FOR THE IPCC TO PRODUCE FAST TRACK PRODUCTS TO RESPOND TO URGENT NEEDS AT THE POLICY LEVEL WITHOUT UNDERMINING THE HIGH QUALITY OF THE IPCC PRODUCTS.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

Austria sees some merits in streamlining the structure of the IPCC by reducing the number of IPCC WGs to two. Some current tasks of WG II should be moved to WG I (assessment of climate change impacts) and the responses to the climate change risks, including adaptation and mitigation, should be addressed by the second Working Group. This would help to avoid duplication of effort and would make it easier to have coherence in the ARs and simplify coordination.

Austria would prefer to reduce the size of the IPCC bureau accordingly.

Austria sees also room to improve the internal co-operation within the bodies of the IPCC, e.g. the secretariat in Geneva and the TSUs. More detailed internal rules for co-operation, describing in more detail the responsibilities, might be helpful. The goal is to have a more robust and efficient management (see suggestions under C). In this context Austria sees an important task of the secretariat in archiving all material that informed IPCC reports. The TSUs should definitely hand over all that material before they terminate their task as TSU. It is of great importance of the IPCC to have access to any information that informed its products.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

For Austria it is a priority to enhance the capacity of the IPCC in order to meet the information needs of Parties in a more timely manner. One of the bottle-necks in the past was the limited capacity of the TSUs. Austria believes that one option to enhance that capacity would be that a TSU is hosted in more than one country. In this context a broader involvement of and support by institutions in developing countries, which are in a position to do so, would be useful.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

Austria notes the increasing role of social media. The IPCC should consider to engage a broader community in preparing its reports. This could be made possible by more and better use modern IT. However, such activity should be informed by a scoping study so that the plenary has a good understanding about the scope, the goal, the resource implications of such activity. This study might build on the experience of other, similar bodies.

COUNTRY: AZERBAIJAN

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

We think that in order to provide more comprehensive analysis and more deep understanding of trends optimal length of an assessment period must be no less than 10 years.

IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national GHG inventories, but the work must be focused mostly on key source categories and trends. For example, for oil and natural gas activities there are lack of methodologies concern fugitive emissions (especially no higher tier methodology for gas system releases of CH₄, better quantitative evaluation is needed to validate the current emissions from gas production and transportation in the former USSR emissions estimates.) There are serious need in revision of Emission Factors for Former USSR countries and strong needs in new investigations.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

The best way to cover cross-cutting matters is to enhance cooperation between WG members, TSU and national focal points. For this purpose the existing experience of Ozone Secretariat could be used. There are need for creation of IPCC national focal points network, in-country network of national scientists and experts could also be created in order to provide comments to new IPCC products.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

To enhance transparency and experience exchange at least one expert of each developing countries and countries with economy in transition should participate in annual Annex I GHG inventory reports review activities.

In order to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts whole Assessment reports, Special reports, Reference manuals of IPCC Guidelines on GHG inventory, containing most important information on higher tier methodologies should be translated to all Official languages of the United Nations.

Some financial support for young researcher, scholarship programmes and etc. could be provided to scientists and experts from developing countries and countries with economy in transition. Secretariat should propose list of topics of interest for research and developed process for researchers selection, the relevant information should be distributed through national focal points.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

COUNTRY: BELGIUM

Submission by Belgium related to the Future of the IPCC

Thank you Chair for giving us the opportunity to make a second submission in the context of the work of the Task Group on the future work of the IPCC

We discussed this issue within the Coordination Committee for International Environmental Policy, the International Co-operation Commission (environmental research) and with scientists that actively participated in the IPCC processes as well as stakeholders (including members from the Federal Council for Sustainable Development). We would like to reiterate our previous submission that we slightly completed and updated.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

The IPCC is unique and is and has been successful in reaching its main goals as awareness building and providing the objective scientific and technical information as sound scientific basis for the climate negotiations. The IPCC is without doubt of a highly policy relevance and will remain very important for the international climate agenda in the coming years.

It is important that the IPCC keeps providing the most valuable outputs and learns from its experience, in particular its strengths as well as the evolution of the society and scientific knowledge. Belgium will at this stage not yet focus on specific products, lengths of assessment cycles etc. The discussion needs to take place taking into account the good aspects of the IPCC, the (positive) lessons learned as well as the projections we have of the future society and the context we are working in. We are happy to synthesise a few of these considerations.

The IPCC products should support the IPCC objectives. Key objectives include assessment of all substantial issues regarding current climate, its change and the understanding of this change, with a view to

- Providing information that is useful for the policy processes and underpinning policy development without being policy prescriptive,
- Inform the society as a whole on the topic of climate change, their impacts and the links with human societies and the environment.
-

IPCC products should continue to be of a high quality through

- The continued thorough application of severe 'quality control' review procedures, comprehensive use of scientific analyses available in the peer reviewed literature etc.
- The independency of the scientists preparing the reports with regards to the policy making process as well as with regards to any other type of interest that may be connected with the matter.
- Ensuring the participation of a scientific community as large and diverse as possible as well as relevant, with a particular attention to the "federating" role that the IPCC acquired over the years, together with large research organisations and - programmes.
- Acting in a (more) dynamic way by at the same time keeping the high quality and robustness.

Furthermore the IPCC faces a number of challenges:

- flexibility with respect to (short term) demands, the evolving scientific communities, research funding, evolving societies,...
- increasing efficiency and effectiveness due to budget and time constraints and for decreasing the workload on authors and other experts involved;
- increasing transparency (e.g. stakeholder engagement, public web consultation,...);
- strong demands for assessments by the policy makers within short delays;

- the need to reduce the time lag between the production of scientific outcome and the development of policy;
- the challenge of how to be more policy-relevant without being policy prescriptive;
- the evolving nature of scientific practice (systemic approach', the connectivity) and its relationship to society;
- the increasing science outcome with science evolving very fast in some areas and more slow in other;
- the fact that climate change is not only an environmental problem but one linked to equity, security and economy; emphasis on economic aspects in the assessment might have an important impact on the policymakers, more than the ecological aspects. The emphasis in the AR5 of connecting CC to SD is an evolution in the good direction and this could be developed further emphasising economic, equity and security aspects.
- the fact that other organisations provide quick assessments in the area of expertise of the IPCC but without similar in depth review processes;
- the need for a still more integrated, crosscutting, multidisciplinary approach (experts from different WGS working better together);
- the need for a more integrated regional approach so that information is also more useful on the regional and local level;
- the many different aspects of CC: physical science and ethical, social, technological, economic, environmental and security aspects;
- the ever-lasting sceptics and the 'disinformation' on climate change issues;
- the fact that people will probably also more use different communication tools: mobile phone, I-pad,...and read less and less big reports;
- the fact that possibilities for better graphics increase;
- the fact that IPCC should continue to attract the best scientists;
- the advances in IT;
- the need for (additional) products that are more easily accessible and more easy to understand by the user and public at large including more educational, possibly to be provided by other organisations but with the help of the IPCC.

The IPCC might have to consider a modification in the assessment cycle, the type of products useful for policymakers, and for informing the society as a whole, their periodicity, content, presentation and dissemination and consequently the organisation and structure of the in the light of these objectives, challenges and new opportunities.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

Depending on the outcome of the discussions regarding the products, the assessment cycle, structure and organisation of the IPCC will have to be adapted.

Belgium is in favour of keeping a kind of comprehensive nature of the Working Group reports also because it is very important to preserve their function as the best “encyclopaedia” of current knowledge on climate change while the scope of each WGs may change, their comprehensive coverage should remain.

The publication of the comprehensive report had always a big impact on the media, policymakers and the public at large. It creates momentum for political decisions.

At the other hand it is important to strike the right balance between the comprehensive reports every 6 to 7 (or more) years and regular updated information with respect to the needs of the policy community and taking account of short-term trends.

Several options are possible - see annex.

Issues of organisation that we regard as useful to consider in this framework include:

- The mandate of the IPCC: this could involve
 - o the description of the mandate of the Bureau members in particular of the IPCC-Vice Chairs as well as the WG-Vice-Chairs. In the past, two IPCC Vice-Chairs were suggested by the IPCC chair instead of three. Those would be provided with tasks and responsibilities that would enhance the effectiveness of the IPCC underpin the chair's work. A further clarification and elaborated mandate (ToR, including possibly support needs) would be most welcome;
 - o the number of working groups and their mandate - changes that could facilitate the collaboration and exchange of information between the working groups
 - o renewed attention to the role of the IPCC regarding the synthesis of information regarding socio-economic and emission scenarios, and the related coordination and exchange of information between the working groups

Depending on the outcome of the discussions regarding the assessment cycle, also methods and processes will have to be adapted. Anyhow lessons can be drawn from the AR5 assessments in order to enhance processes and procedures for the next assessment.

New and continuous challenges are

- Increasing flexibility, efficiency, effectiveness
- Increasing independency
- Procedures for the production of 'fast track' assessments on very specific issues of interest to policymakers while keeping the high quality »
- Increased connectivity, inter-disciplinarity, crosscutting issues
- Need for a further development of the regional approach as a function of the increasing regional knowledge development; this approach is far more policy-relevant and of interest to the public at large.
- Increase the range of views, expertise, gender and geographical representation in particular involvement scientists from developing countries (in the report as well as in the structure e.g. : Technical Support Unit, Bureau)
- Global versus regional/local: focus on regional aspects is more policy-relevant, more interesting to users, public at large
- Better linking adaptation and mitigation
- Interaction between scientific communities and users of the IPCC products
- Continuation of strengthening the drafting and reviewing process
- Develop a climate friendly approach to reduce IPCCs carbon footprint (continue to search for possibilities for reducing the number of face to face meeting, minimising C emissions, C neutralising/compensating activities, optimal selection of meeting place given the country of residence of the participants to minimise travel distance and therefore pollution and CO₂ emissions. ...)
- Organise broad consultation for scoping next assessment, involving stakeholders
- In view of an increasing demand on the TSUs,/ and or for a better geographical balance, one could consider more than one TSU for one WG, depending on the products to be developed. This is of course if budget is available It could be for each WG one TSU for the longer term assessment and another one for special reports.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

There are several issues related to the better involvement of developing countries in the IPCC activities. One is capacity building. While capacity building is not in the mandate of the IPCC, the IPCC could be a catalyser by informing adequate organisations e.g. START,...on the needs.

Also scientific outcome regarding developing countries should increase. This could be via specific focus on developing countries issues in e.g. 'Future Earth' by the Belmont Forum.

Another issue is the identification of the right scientist in the developing countries. Often the Focal Point (FP) in a developing country is a meteorological office, not always having the right or sufficient connections with the other scientific communities or Ministries in charge of environment, research and education. Maybe a training of the FP could help so that the FP has the skills to involve more and well suited experts from their country.

D. Other matters

Communication

Communication is a fundamental process within the IPCC requiring continuous attention and adaptation to needs, challenges and technical evolution. In the organisation of science (for example 'Future Earth', the involvement of stakeholders from the initiation of the research is now very important. This should also be the case for the IPCC. In the reflection about the next assessment, it seems logic and useful to involve stakeholder.

The technological revolution since IPCC was created should be reflected in the balance of its products. More people are searching for information on the internet than reading large printed books in the library. Reports and assessment procedures should be also extended to include, where appropriate, interactive graphics, animations, and simple models and formulae. On the internet there is no limit on space, so it is possible to cover a much greater depth of information and range of combinations of scenarios than can ever be included in paper reports, without wasting time on arguments about prioritisation of space.

Within the Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) – Climate (an initiative promoting research alignment within Europe), Norway took the initiative to set up a study on “Knowledge transfer: usability and framing of scientific climate information”. The study will use the IPCC AR5 reports as a case to identify drivers and barriers for appropriate science-policy interactions leading and explore the mechanisms by which the AR5 information informs and influences decision making in different European countries and how to increase capacity of research organisations to operate on the science-policy nexus. The outcome of this activity could provide maybe a useful input to the work of the IPCC.

Discussions with stakeholders informed us on the need for ‘easy’ / 'accessible' information. Maybe that is not exactly the role of the IPCC but the IPCC could act as a 'catalyser' in identifying ‘easy, accessible products’ and providers of those.

Funding of the IPCC and the link between the funding and the organisation:

For the good functioning of the IPCC there is a need for stability in the funding. With the global crisis, IPCC runs the risk that governments will not continue to pay the voluntary contribution, since it is not binding but voluntary. A solution for structural funding should be evaluated.

For the sake of independence it could be good to make funding independent from the location of the TSU, so as to enhance geographical balance and increase the involvement of developing countries.

Zorita, E. (Independent agency needed, Nature Vol 463/11Februari2010) states that the IPCC should be made stronger and independent and makes a plea for an international climate agency with full time scientists, independent from government, industry and academia.

On the very long term this might be an option for the IPCC.

In view of improving the participation of developing countries in the IPCC process, we suggest that the UN evaluates the possibility of funding a TSU or TSU satellite in a developing country.

Process and timeline to discuss future IPCC work

Belgium is pleased a Task Group has been set up.

Based on the previous submissions and /or these submitted by February 21st, it is suggested that the secretariat makes a first analysis to identify convergences, divergences, discussion items and priorities, including an indicative roadmap.

Some actions require a decision before the next Bureau elections and should be handled soon. The type of products, the assessment cycle and the resulting changes in the structure of the IPCC will have to be decided as soon as possible and before the next Bureau elections. We doubt if the Task group meetings back to back to the planned IPCC plenaries will be sufficient to come to conclusions and we suggest to consider an additional meeting e.g. September 2014 (between the WG3 and SYR meetings, if the budget allows to do so.

Other items are to be handled before the next assessment, not before the election of the new Bureau, such as lessons learned from the AR5 and the resulting changes in methods and procedures. This should be done before the start of the next assessment.

A third category of items require a continuous attention such as enhancing and innovating communication and processes, methods and procedures.

A fourth category of items are to be handled on the longer term such as the structural funding of the IPCC and the IPCC as an independent UN structure.

* * *

Preliminary suggestions for further discussion regarding the number and mandate of the working groups, and timing of the assessment reports

We would like to consider several options for a possible re-organisation of the working groups and the timing of the reports:

a) A re-organization of the 3 current working groups (keeping the TFI as it is) in 2 new groups:

Group 1 - *Mechanisms: climate and impacts*

- physical climate change
- impacts on ecosystems and human activities

Group 2 - *Solutions: Mitigation, adaptation and vulnerability*

- Scenarios, role of socio-economic drivers in shaping emissions, mitigation potential, adaptation potential, and vulnerability
- Technical potential
- Costs
- Transition, links with sustainable development

This could have advantages and drawbacks that require further analysis: for example, the second group may facilitate an integrated discussion of mitigation and adaptation in their context, but the issues of impacts might appear unnecessarily separated in two parts, as the analysis of impacts requires information on vulnerability.

In this configuration, we would suggest a “rolling” publication of reports, with a report from one of the groups followed by a report from the other group 2 to 3 years later.

An updated synthesis report would be prepared after each of those publications, thus providing better integration and more frequent input to the policy making process. Another advantage would be that interdisciplinary exchange and contribution might be facilitated by the fact that scientists more involved in one group would be available to review and provide input to the other group during the preparation of its report.

b) An alternative suggestion, also preliminary, is keep most of the existing practice while adding a new type of “short update” reports, without necessarily re-organizing the working groups (though not precluding such changes):

The concept would be to keep the preparation of a comprehensive report once every ~7 years, “synchronised” with the UNFCCC review agenda, but to add smaller “update” documents every ~2 years, resulting in 2 updates per cycle.

The updates would contain 1 chapter from each Working Group, with sections on every topic on which substantial new scientific information is available.

A full update of the SPM of the Synthesis Report would also be produced, building solely from the “update” document and the previous full Assessment Report (AR).

Updates would follow the same thorough review process as ARs, but with adapted deadlines (as content would be much shorter).

The motivation is to satisfy the demand for more frequent updates, but a possible drawback that would need to be addressed is the increasing work for some of the scientists

* * *

COUNTRY: BRAZIL

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

The IPCC Assessment Reports have established a reputation for consolidating the available knowledge and being representative of the scientific consensus around climate change. For the next decade, however, emphasis should be placed on shorter and more frequent reports, focused on specific issues, based on the demand from countries. Comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR) should continue to be undertaken over a 5-year assessment period, to allow for a periodical evaluation of climate change trends.

In addition to AR and shorter reports, IPCC should be prepared to meet the demands of countries and groups of countries for methodological development, in particular to respond to the needs arising from the implementation of the post-2020 agreement under the Convention. Focus should be placed on "fast track" products, such as methodological and technical guidance, expert meetings and task forces, with a view to provide countries with the necessary inputs and tools for gathering data and further developing and implementing their policies and actions to fight climate change.

The Panel should, therefore, be responsive to such demands, whether the request comes from the UNFCCC or from proposals submitted by countries to the IPCC Plenary. There may be a need to amend the current procedures and structure of the working groups to consider proposals to the Panel made directly by countries or groups of countries for specific products.

In some cases, such products could, as appropriate, have a regional perspective rather than a global one. These could consist a new "fast track product" from the IPCC: assessments of issues of particular interest to a region, upon request from countries, based on the scientific literature produces (or related to) that region. Assessments from a regional perspective could be helpful to address the

challenge of the dramatic increase in literature, along with the need to increase participation from developing countries in IPCC and address the underrepresentation of non-english literature in IPCC reports. Given the potential increase in obligations related to transparency under the UNFCCC, the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports on national greenhouse inventories, as well as consider other methodological issues such as on how to assess national contributions to the global temperature increase.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

IPCC working group structure and procedures should be adjusted to provide the expedite development of smaller and specific reports, as well as to be prepared to respond to countries' requests for methodological work, as suggested on part A.

Considering the need to enhance participation of developing countries in IPCC reports, the structure of the bureau and of TSUs should not only have regional balance but also work with other UN bodies (including the UNFCCC) to provide feedback of the activities of Bureau and TSU members. TSU structure should be adjusted to include participation of developing countries' institutions, working in network with the host institutions, with a view to increasing opportunities for enhancing capacities in developing countries (see, for instance, the "center and network" structure of the CTCN).

Please refer to the answer on part A for a suggestion to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

IPCC must address the issue of enhancing the participation and contribution of developing countries, in particular with regards to the selection of authors and articles, and the underrepresentation of non-english literature in IPCC documents. The selection of articles and authors should be guided by some aspects, such as:

- different scientific, technical and socioeconomic points of view;
- geographical representation to ensure a balanced participation of experts from developed and developing countries;
- a mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPCC;
- gender balance.

Please refer also to previous answers on regional products as a suggestion to facilitate engagement of developing countries and address non-english literature. Expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme is welcome, but should be considered in tandem with adjusting the TSU structure to allow participation of developing countries' institutions working in network with host institutions.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

An emphasis on shorter and more frequent "fast track documents", focused on specific issues would be helpful as well to address matters related to communication. Please refer also to previous answers on cooperation with UN bodies.

COUNTRY: CANADA

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/>. As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group. The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- **What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period**
- **Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)**
- **Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period**
- **Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period**
- **What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports**
- **Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures**
- **Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories**
- **Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics.**

Canada believes that the mandate of the IPCC to produce high quality, policy relevant and policy neutral scientific assessments on climate change remains the most important and appropriate role for this organization. The unique value of the IPCC as a scientific assessment body is its comprehensiveness, thoroughness and credibility. Other agencies and institutions also provide scientific reports on narrower aspects of climate change (e.g., United Nations Environment Programme [UNEP], Arctic Council, etc.) and sometimes driven by more specific policy interests. The IPCC process remains unique amongst these organizations because of its scientifically robust assessment process and because its scope is defined in the context of understanding climate change and its implications over time rather than a snapshot of science around a specific policy question

Canada notes that the primary driver for any decisions about changes to the nature or timing of IPCC reports should be the needs of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as well as the direction provided to the IPCC by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and UNEP. To date, the UNFCCC has expressed a desire for the IPCC to provide information that would support a future UNFCCC review of long-term global climate mitigation goals. Canada encourages the Task Group and/or Secretariat to consult with the UNFCCC early in these deliberations about what and when IPCC products will be most relevant so that all delegates have a clear and common understanding of UNFCCC needs. Similarly, we encourage that consultations be undertaken with the WMO and the recently established Intergovernmental Board on Climate Services to consider the relevance of the IPCC's future work with respect to climate services.

In general, Canada believes that a long assessment period, such as the current period of approximately six to seven years, serves as a useful planning cycle for the IPCC. This timeframe also aligns with the anticipated timing of the proposed second UNFCCC review of long-term global climate mitigation goals. Canada recommends maintaining a similarly long timeframe for the overall planning period for the IPCC's work moving forward.

Regarding the future assessment products of the IPCC, Canada continues to be supportive of comprehensive Assessment Reports prepared by IPCC Working Groups (WGs) as the main assessment product of the IPCC. These comprehensive Assessment Reports serve both the policy and scientific communities by providing a robust and objective understanding of the state of knowledge on climate change and options for adaptation and mitigation, including what aspects are well-established, where and how evidence is changing, and new and emerging issues and gaps. These reports provide a common information platform upon which adaptation and mitigation decisions and actions can occur.

In Canada's view, the main concern associated with the current assessment model is not with the underlying assessment process, but rather with the usefulness and relevance of the components of the reports that are specifically targeted to policymakers, namely the Summaries for Policymakers (SPMs) and Synthesis Report. Canada suggests that changes to IPCC Assessment Reports for the sixth assessment period focus largely on making changes to these products so that they can better serve policymakers. The following paragraphs offer specific recommendations to achieve this.

While Canada acknowledges that the efforts made to engage governments in identifying policy-relevant questions prior to the scoping of the AR5 helped to shape the report outlines, we note that this consultation process did not lead to fundamental changes in how material was ultimately communicated to policymakers. Therefore, Canada recommends that the scoping process for future Assessment Reports be revised to enable a more iterative consultative process between the science and policy communities. Specifically, Canada envisions a two-stage approach involving: first, consultations on scoping the content of IPCC assessments; and, second, revising how key results are communicated to policymakers.

First, the consultations on scoping the content of IPCC assessments would engage both the science and policy communities in the following ways:

1. The IPCC would conduct scoping directly with policymakers in order to obtain guidance on what questions and issues are most relevant for the IPCC to consider in this assessment cycle. This guidance would directly inform the development of outlines for the cross-WG Synthesis Report, as well as the outlines of SPMs of each of the WG Assessment Reports.
2. Similar to the scoping practice used for the AR4 and AR5, the IPCC would conduct scoping primarily with the scientific community (including socio-economic experts) to prepare detailed chapter outlines for the WG Assessment Reports. These chapter outlines would continue to focus on providing objective and comprehensive scientific assessments of climate change.

Second, Canada recommends that the SPMs of WG Assessment Reports and the cross-WG Synthesis Report be transformed into top-down documents focused primarily on answering/addressing the questions and issues identified by policymakers during the scoping process. In this model, the SPM and Synthesis Report outlines would be developed based on the questions and issues identified through the scoping with the policy makers, and would be prepared by pulling and synthesizing relevant information from the WG reports. To improve relevance and accessibility of the SPMs and SYRs, Canada suggests that a mechanism be considered whereby IPCC engages experts in science communication to facilitate communicating key results. We believe that this would yield more useful and targeted documents than the primarily bottom-up approach of the AR4 in which the SPMs and Synthesis Report were created by drawing together all of the main findings from each WG report. We also suggest considering whether the SPMs and Synthesis Reports should also focus on articulating

the potential impact of the findings rather than the findings themselves. For example, the IPCC could help in explaining the impact of increased confidence in a finding or an emerging or first-time finding with a lower level of confidence.

These processes mentioned above could be designed in such a way to be iterative and mutually reinforcing. For example, the scientific community may need to provide information on whether policy questions are well posed from a scientific perspective and whether they will be able to provide informative responses. Similarly, the scoping process will need to have flexibility built into it in order to ensure that policy questions posed remain relevant as the assessment period progresses.

Canada also continues to support the use of Special Reports to supplement comprehensive Assessment Reports where appropriate. Special Reports should focus more heavily on cross-WG issues of high interest to policymakers where scientific literature pertaining to the issue has rapidly evolved since the last comprehensive assessment. These Special Reports should continue to be subject to the IPCC's rigorous review process.

In regards to the timing of Assessment Reports and Special Reports, Canada suggests that greater staggering between reports would be beneficial for two reasons: it would allow the IPCC to provide a more continuous flow of carefully assessed information to governments; and, it would further encourage reports to build on each other. In particular, the earlier production of reports by WG I continues to be important, as their assessment of projected future climate serves as the basis for both other WGs. Greater spacing in IPCC reports may also help to facilitate more effective participation by experts and governments during the review process as they will not be overburdened by reviewing multiple reports simultaneously.

Canada recommends caution at the use of "fast track" assessment products, as the core strength and credibility of the IPCC lies in the thoroughness of its assessment process. In Canada's view, Special Reports remain the most appropriate tool for the IPCC to assess emerging and cross-WG issues, as these reports adhere to the IPCC's rigorous review process. Organizations other than IPCC may be better positioned to respond to demands for rapid information on emerging scientific literature than has not yet undergone a full assessment. Canada also notes that the IPCC does have the "Technical Paper" mechanism available to it, in which Technical Papers can be prepared on crosscutting topics of interest based on information already assessed in IPCC reports. Technical Papers can be significantly shorter than Assessment Reports and Special Reports and can be prepared much more rapidly because they are based on material that has already been assessed by the IPCC and therefore not subject to the full suite of procedures for preparing IPCC reports. Although Technical Papers are not a suitable mechanism for addressing questions related to rapidly emerging literature, they do provide a way for the IPCC to quickly address targeted questions or topics based on the IPCC's carefully assessed materials. The production of Technical Papers, or a similar product, would be especially valuable at the beginning of the sixth assessment period as the AR5 will have been recently published.

Canada continues to find the work of the IPCC to prepare Methodological Reports for national GHG inventories highly relevant and well aligned with the needs of the UNFCCC. We are supportive of continuing this work, based primarily on requests made to the IPCC by the UNFCCC. Canada does not currently foresee a need for Methodology Reports on topics other than national GHG inventories during the sixth assessment period. Canada's view is that decisions to undertake methodology reports related to others areas should be primarily driven by requests directly from the UNFCCC to the IPCC where the UNFCCC has identified a gap in

methodological guidance and where it would be consistent with the IPCC's role to develop such methodological guidance.

Canada would be supportive of reviewing the Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers in order to ensure it meets the IPCC decision making needs for prioritizing various assessment products.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- **Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups**
- **Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs**
- **Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters**
- **Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions**
- **Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi**
- **Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature**
- **Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)**
- **Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs**
- **Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices**
- **Other governance and administrative matters**

Canada considers that the current IPCC structure based on three WGs dealing with (1) the physical science basis, (2) impacts, adaptation and vulnerability, and (3) mitigation has served the IPCC well. This is a logical structure in which the body of knowledge in each WG builds on that of the previous WGs. This structure has existed throughout the IPCC's history and is deeply ingrained as part of the IPCC "brand". Maintaining this structure allows for continuity in the IPCC even as the specific assessment products change and evolve. However, Canada is open to exploring suggestions for other WG structures that were raised at the 37th Session of the IPCC, such as a structure oriented towards articulating the "challenge" and "solutions" to climate change. Canada sees merit in this type of structure, but currently we suggest it could be best applied to the outline of the Synthesis Report, rather than replacing the current WG structure.

Canada also notes that a main weakness in any WG structure is that the division of work can lead to operational divisions between WGs. Therefore, Canada is supportive of developing and/or improving mechanisms for better cross-WG collaboration and integration. An example of effective cross-WG collaboration was through the IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risk of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX). By focusing on a cross-cutting issue and establishing two WGs as co-leads for this report, there was overall greater cooperation between the WGs than has typically been seen from separate WG reports. It would be useful to understand from the WG Co-Chairs and Technical Support Units (TSUs) how the cooperation worked in practice and what lessons can be learned from this experience. Canada also notes that for the AR5, the IPCC has already taken some important steps to improve cross-WG coordination and the preparation of the Synthesis Report. These include: identifying cross-cutting issues and chapters between WGs early in the process, initiating early development of the Synthesis Report outline, establishing an author team cross-appointed from the WG reports, and establishing a dedicated TSU to support the development of the Synthesis Report. Canada recommends that these practices continue for the sixth assessment period. Canada also recommends that Bureau members could also play a greater role in facilitating cross-WG collaboration, for example through cross appointments or exchanges.

Canada's overarching objective with respect to potential changes to the IPCC Principles and Procedures is to preserve and enhance the relevance, scientific rigor and integrity of the IPCC's assessment work. During these deliberations about the future work of the sixth assessment period, changes to the IPCC's Principles and Procedures will need to flow from overarching decisions about the IPCC's assessment products. However, we would like to take note of three issues for the Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports that we consider to be priorities for ensuring the success of the sixth assessment period:

- Scoping process: As outlined in Canada's response to Question A above, we recommend that the scoping process for the sixth assessment period adopt an iterative scoping approach focused on (a) scoping, with the policy community, the questions and issues that are most useful and relevant for the IPCC to consider in this assessment cycle and using this guidance to develop a robust, policy driven outline for SPMs and Synthesis Reports; and (b) scoping, with the scientific community, the chapter outlines for comprehensive and objective Assessment Reports by the IPCC WGs.
- Preparation of the SPM and Synthesis Report: Also consistent with Canada's response to Question A, we recommend that procedures be considered to adopt a mechanism whereby IPCC engages experts in science communication to facilitate communicating key results in SPMs and Synthesis Reports.
- Procedures for government approval of IPCC reports: Canada recommends that the procedures could better communicate that the role of governments in approving a report is to ensure clarity and relevance of the scientific information presented in the SPM. Greater elaboration of the role of governments in this area will provide greater support to the Co-Chairs in chairing the approval session and the Lead Authors in their role in ensuring the scientific accuracy of the SPM. Canada also recommends that the Procedures more strongly encourage the submission of written comments on the draft SPM during the final government review phase in order to facilitate more efficient approval sessions.

Although some changes to the IPCC Bureau, Executive Committee, Secretariat and TSUs may be necessary depending on the decisions the IPCC takes with regards to its products and structure, in general Canada believes that the roles and composition of these bodies remain appropriate for the sixth assessment cycle. As the AR5 draws to a close, Canada would encourage these bodies to report to the Panel on ways in which they can be improved. Canada would also invite governments that have hosted TSUs to provide advice in this regard. However, Canada would note that one particular area where the Bureau could play a greater role is in supporting the nominating process for the next IPCC Bureau. For example, outgoing Bureau members who are not seeking re-election could be asked to play a role in helping to ensure that there are a sufficient number of well-qualified scientific and socio-economic experts from all regions submitted for nomination in advance of the nomination deadline. This would help the Panel to avoid the need for nominations from the floor during the election, which are less transparent and pose difficulties to the IPCC's Conflict of Interest Policy.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- **Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)**
- **Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)**
- **Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions**
- **Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play**
- **Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English**
- **Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts**
- **Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English**
- **Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data**
- **Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity**
- **Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme**

The level of participation of developing country scientists in the work of the IPCC is an important issue for the sixth assessment period. While the IPCC continues to make progress in increasing the participation of developing country scientists, full representation and participation is necessary for the IPCC to produce assessments that are balanced in their presentation of regional issues and are relevant to and utilized by all members of the IPCC and the global community. However, it is important to note that the IPCC's mandate is not to support capacity building. There are other organizations, such as the WMO and UNEP and other international environment and/or development organizations, that are better equipped to support and encourage the investment in scientific capacity and infrastructure necessary to overcome some of the barriers to participation of developing country scientists in the work of the IPCC. It is also important for the IPCC to be separate from the process of funding scientific research in all countries in order to maintain its credibility as a neutral organization in the production of scientific knowledge.

To help in addressing underlying issues that impede the full participation of developing country scientists, Canada is supportive of the recommendation made by the InterAcademy Council for the IPCC to forge stronger relationships with multilateral and international organizations with relevant mandates for international development in order to provide them with information on the scientific capacity building areas that could lead to more effective participation by developing country scientists in the IPCC. These organizations may also be able to provide direct support to developing country scientists selected as Lead Authors in order to maximize their involvement in the IPCC process.

Regarding changes in the IPCC process itself to promote greater and more effective participation by developing country scientists, Canada suggests that the IPCC could make impactful, near terms changes in the areas of: (i) supporting access to literature and facilitation

of assessment of literature in languages other than English; and (ii) supporting partnerships and exchanges between developed and developing country Lead Authors during the preparation of assessment chapters.

During the deliberations of the Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC, Canada will also look forward to learning from developing countries members on the most effective ways in which the IPCC can promote full participation of their scientists.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- **Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations**
- **Matters related to communication**
- **Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports**
- **Any other matters**

Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations

Canada recognizes value in the IPCC maintaining relationships with other relevant UN bodies and international organizations; however, such cooperation should always be careful to ensure that the IPCC's neutrality in the science and policy process is not compromised. The main focus of this cooperation should be to exchange information and ensure that all organizations are fully aware of the landscape of assessment activities, including the work of the IPCC.

As mentioned in responses to other questions above, Canada is supportive of continuing to evolve and nurture the relationships with UNFCCC, WMO and UNEP. We also see particular opportunities for the IPCC to improve cooperation with the following types of organizations:

- **International environment and/or development organizations:** As mentioned in our response under Question C, improved or new relationships with international environment and/or development organizations that have a mandate for capacity building could allow the IPCC to provide information on the scientific capacity building needs of IPCC members, which has the potential to improve the participation of developing country scientists in the IPCC over the long term.
- **Other international organizations that conduct scientific assessments relevant to climate change:** It is important that the IPCC have close relationships with other organizations that conduct scientific assessments relevant to climate change in order to coordinate on various products. In particular, Canada encourages the IPCC to pursue close cooperation with the Intergovernmental Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) in order to collaborate on assessment work related to biodiversity and climate change and avoid duplication of effort.
- **International climate services initiatives:** The IPCC could consider pursuing participation in the Partner Committee of the Intergovernmental Board on Climate Services in order to exchange information on the IPCC's work.

Matters related to communications

Canada notes that improvements have been made to IPCC communications following the development of the 2012 IPCC Communications Strategy. Since the development of this Strategy, the IPCC has been more successful in reacting to media issues that arose during the development of the AR5 and very successfully launched the WGI report amid significant media attention. Although the IPCC is still learning and making adjustments to its communications process, Canada believes that the principles set out in the IPCC Communications Strategy remain relevant to the ongoing communications approach of the IPCC.

Canada suggests that improvements can continue to be made to the relevance of the scientific information provided in IPCC communications; however, this needs to be driven by

improvements to the SPMs and Synthesis Report, as outlined in our suggestions in response to Question A.

Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports

Canada continues to be supportive of a government driven process for making decisions about the future of the IPCC. However, we also recognize that the IPCC's work is fulfilled by the many hundreds of scientists and experts who lead the development of IPCC reports and that there are many organizations, most significantly the UNFCCC, WMO and UNEP, that both drive and rely on the work of the IPCC to inform decisions. In regards to consultations and engagement with these stakeholders, Canada would support focused and targeted outreach to key user and partner organizations like the UNFCCC, WMO, UNEP, World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) and Programme of Research on Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA). With respect to broader engagement, Canada suggests that governments can play a role in consulting directly with national contributors and stakeholders relevant to the IPCC and bringing these perspectives into the decision making process.

Any other matters

Canada remains committed to the IPCC and its work to prepare scientific assessments on climate change. We look forward to continued discussions on the sixth assessment period of the IPCC during future Task Group and plenary meetings.

COUNTRY: CHINA

Comments by the Chinese Government on the Future of IPCC

21 February 2014

The Chinese government appreciates the Bureau, Executive Committee (EC) and Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) for their preparations for the discussion on the future of IPCC, and wishes to take this opportunity to make comments on this issue of importance to its evolution.

I. Future products of the IPCC

The Chinese government is of the view that the previous assessment reports published by IPCC since its establishment were, overall, a success, and IPCC may pursue the assessment according to the current cycle and the working group structure in the future.

In terms of Special Report, the Chinese government is of the view that IPCC boasts the valid procedures on the launch of a special report and the robust organization for its preparation. However, IPCC is supposed to pay more attention to regional and hot issues in its future assessment. Even a fast track product should be also governed by the same procedures and organizational processes for a special product.

The Chinese government believes that the methodological report on greenhouse gas inventory and other methodological reports constitute a useful support to the preparation of inventories at national level, which should be carried on in response to the advancing science and realistic needs.

II. IPCC's structure including rules, procedures and mechanisms

The Chinese government is of the view that in response to the review by the Inter-Academy Council (IAC), IPCC has made quite a few improvements of its assessment processes and governance including the establishment of Executive Committee, and redefinition of the mandates

of the Bureau and IPCC Secretariat. These improvements, which have noticeably contributed to the preparation of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and will further consolidate the groundwork for its future assessment initiatives, should be maintained.

In terms of IPCC's improved assessment processes, the Chinese government is of the view that the Working Group contributions are published between too short intervals, which hinder the correspondence of these reports. If the framework of three WG contributions plus one synthesis report will remain unchanged in the future, it is suggested to extend or prolong the intervals appropriately between which the contributions of WG II and WG III are released.

In terms of citation, it is necessary to increase that of non-English literature, national assessment reports and other assessment products. The WG TSUs are encouraged to develop a literature library in all UN official languages to increase the citation of non-English literature in IPCC reports. Sound rules on the citation of grey literature should be made to take documents like national climate change assessment reports and climate change bulletins into consideration in the IPCC assessment process.

So far as the terms of reference of the Bureau, Secretariat and TSU are concerned, the Chinese government is of the view that there is no need to make special arrangements on tasks by Bureau members at this stage, but it is necessary to further clarify the mandates of the Secretariat and TSU, that is, the provision of secretarial and technical support to the scientific assessment, to ensure the leading role of authors throughout the process. At the same time, there should be a stronger TSU support to Co-chairs from developing countries and a greater number of TSU members that are recruited therefrom as well.

III. Participation by developing countries

The Chinese government is of the view that IPCC should enable co-chairs, bureau members and authors from developing countries to play a better role. As networked by their inside counterparts, scientists from developing countries are more strongly motivated to get involved in

IPCC's scientific assessment. It is advisable to locate lead author meetings, expert meetings and workshops in developing countries more than before on the ground that they will not lead to additional economic burden on the hosts in order to increase the visibility of IPCC in these countries while attracting more young scientists.

IPCC should render better support to Co-chairs from developing countries. The missions of TSU should be preferred to be undertaken by developing countries on the ground that no additional economic burden would be incurred for these countries.

When devising an assessment report outreach campaign, IPCC may consider how to maximize the role of lead authors and national focal points. Training events can be offered to young scientists from developing countries to share information on latest IPCC assessment.

No stone is left unturned to expand the IPCC scholarship program, through which a stronger support can be rendered to young scientists from developing countries.

IV. Other matters

The Chinese government is of the view that the future IPCC should capitalize on its experience and strength in scientific assessment by introducing more tailored products to distinguish itself from and complement the assessments by other organizations.

IPCC should better serve the UNFCCC negotiation process from the scientific angle of climate change, keeping in mind the needs of stakeholders for the assessment of selected regional aspects or specific climate change science related issues.

IPCC should put in place an information feedback mechanism, through which the reaction to, comments and suggestions on the Fifth Assessment Report by the international community can be kept informed, noted and reviewed in a timely fashion to facilitate the readiness of preparing a higher quality and impact assessment report in the future.

COUNTRY: DENMARK

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

THE IPCC HAS ESTABLISHED ITSELF AS A GLOBALLY RECOGNIZED INSTITUTION OF HIGH CREDIBILITY AND INTEGRITY, AND AS THE REFERENCE POINT FOR SCIENTIFIC AND POLITICAL DEBATE. THE IPCC BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL IN DELIVERING REPORTS OF VERY HIGH QUALITY AND CREDIBILITY, DUE TO THE SUPPORT FROM THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND THE RIGOROUS REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THESE QUALITIES ARE ALSO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF FUTURE IPCC PRODUCTS.

WHILE POLICYMAKERS SEE A NEED FOR FAST TRACK PRODUCTS FROM THE IPCC ON FOCUSED ISSUES, SUCH PRODUCTS ARE ONLY A VIABLE OPTION IF THEY HAVE SAME HIGH QUALITY STANDARD AND CREDIBILITY AS CURRENT PRODUCTS.

THE IPCC SHOULD CONSIDER THE TIMING OF FUTURE METHODOLOGY REPORTS ON NATIONAL GHG INVENTORIES. THE EXPERIENCE HAVE BEEN THAT THE 2006 GUIDELINES CANNOT BE USED BEFORE 2015; A SIMILAR SITUATION WHERE 2017/2018 GUIDELINES ARE PREPARED, BUT CANNOT BE USED BEFORE 2023, SHOULD BE AVOIDED. IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING SUCH FUTURE MRS, IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED THAT NOT ALL CHAPTERS MAY NEED UPDATING.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

The Executive Committee has been a very successful invention and has added a valuable increase in transparency.

In the process of author nomination and selection, it is vital to ensure that authors understand the task and are up to the task and able to play a full role in report preparation.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

Communication has much improved, and the IPCC should continue to have a strong focus on this, further strengthening the communication.

The IPCC should commission a Technical Paper using the outputs of the three AR5 WGs to address the topic of food security, agriculture and climate before the UNFCCC COP 21 in Paris in 2015. Furthermore there should be a Special Report on this topic as it is one that embraces the three WGs and a topic high on the political agenda as it is very likely that food systems will soon be affected by climate change.

The IPCC should get official input from the annual meetings of UNFCCC inventory Lead Reviewers.

COUNTRY: EGYPT

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

1- THE CURRENT PERIOD OF THE IPCC AR AND ASSESSMENT IS MOSTLY OPTIMUM FOR COMPILING AND STUDYING THE DIFFERENT AND VARIOUS REPORTS AND STUDIES FROM ALL OVER THE GLOBE AND MIXING IT TO PRODUCE COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED PRODUCTS THAT GIVING CLEAR VISION OF ALL WORLDS REGIONS.

2- THE PREPARATION OF METHODOLOGY REPORTS SHOULD CONTINUE FOR THE NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES WITH HELP OF THE EXPERTS OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, ALSO ANOTHER METHODOLOGY REPORTS NEEDED FOR THE MRV TO UNIFY THE VISION AT LEAST ON SOME BASIC GROUND FOR THE NEEDS OF DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

1- THE STRUCTURE AND MANDATES OF THE IPCC WORKING GROUPS NAD BUREAU SHOLD BE MODIFIED TO GIVE WIDER OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO BE REPRESINTED WITH ALL OTHER RELEVANTS MODIFICATIONS ON THE TORS OR MANDATES.

2- AT THE MEAN TIME IT TAKES MORE TIME FOR THE REVSIONS OF THE REPORTS BY THE EXPERTS FROM THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES MORE THE TIME THAT GIVEN BY THE IPCC WHICH LEAD TO ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT REAL OPENION.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

1- DISCUSSING THE POSSIBILITY TO HOST TSU IN NORTH AFRICA OR MIDDLE EAST PROBABLY IN EGYPT TO BE FINANCED BY THE IPCC TRUST FUND, AND AT OTHER REGIONAL DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

2- IPCC BOARD MEMBERS AND BUREAU SHOULD BE 50% FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, AND TO BE VERY WELL REPRESENTING REGIONS VULNERABILITIES AND NEEDS.

3-SUPPORTING THE SCIENTISTS AND EXPERTS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WITH ALL MEANS (FINANCIALLY AND ACADEMICALLY).

4- ACTIVATING THE IPCC TRANSLATION UNIT TO TRANSLATE THE ACADEMIC REPORTS, STUDIES AND OFFICIAL GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES AND REPORTS

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

THERE IS A NEED TO COOPERATE WITH ALL INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS, ENTITIES AND ACADEMIA.

COUNTRY: FINLAND

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

IPCC IS AN IMPORTANT SCIENCE-POLICY BOUNDARY ORGANIZATION. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE INFORMATION IPCC PROVIDES FOR THE BASIS OF DECISION MAKING WILL MAINTAIN ITS HIGH SCIENTIFIC QUALITY.

THE ABILITY OF THE IPCC TO CONTINUE TO ATTRACT TOP SCIENTISTS AS AUTHORS IS CRUCIAL. CURRENT AND PREVIOUS IPCC AUTHORS SHOULD BE ACTIVELY CONSULTED IN THE IPCC FUTURE -PROCESS. THEIR VIEWS AND IDEAS SHOULD BE BENEFICIAL IN PLANNING THE FUTURE ASSESSMENT CYCLES, FOR EXAMPLE, REGARDING POSSIBILITIES TO EASE THE DEMANDING WORK LOADS. WAYS TO STRENGTHEN THE SUPPORT FOR LEAD AUTHORS TO STUDY INCREASING AMOUNT OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE SHOULD BE EXPLORED.

THE ASSESSMENTS ARE THE BACKBONE OF THE IPCC WORK. RELIABILITY IS THE KEY, AND MAKING THE PROCESS CONSIDERABLY FASTER MAY NOT WORK WITHOUT COMPROMISING CREDIBILITY. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS, USE OF MORE SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT PERSONNEL ETC. MAY BE USEFUL IN SPEEDING UP THE ACTUAL WORK.

IN THE PAST ASSESSMENT CYCLES, BY THE TIME OF A NEW ASSESSMENT, IT HAS BEEN OBVIOUS THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE SCIENTIFIC UPDATE. ALTHOUGH MANY KEY DECISIONS IN INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE POLICY ARE STILL TO COME, THERE IS A LOT OF MATERIAL FOR POLICY ANALYSIS DURING A 6-7 YEAR ASSESSMENT CYCLE.

IT DEPENDS ON THE TOPIC, HOW MUCH NEW INFORMATION BECOMES AVAILABLE DURING ONE ASSESSMENT CYCLE. MINIMIZING REPETITION AND

FOCUSING IN NEW KNOWLEDGE CAN BE ONE WAY TO STREAMLINE THE ASSESSMENTS.

THE IPCC SHOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE UNFCCC IN DEVELOPING METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS FOR ESTIMATING EMISSIONS/REMOVALS IN NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES. AT PRESENT THERE IS VERY LIMITED EXPERIENCE IN THE USE OF THE 2006 IPCC GLS FOR NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES AND ITS SUPPLEMENTS (WETLANDS, KYOTO PROTOCOL LULUCF REPORTING), THEREFORE, PLANS TO START DEVELOPING NEW "2017 IPCC GLS" ARE PREMATURE. NEW WORK ON METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS SHOULD START AT THE EARLIEST IN 2017, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE EXPERIENCE GAINED BY PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC IN USING THE 2006 IPCC GLS AND ITS SUPPLEMENTS. ANY COMPREHENSIVE METHODOLOGICAL WORK SHOULD ALSO BE BASED ON AN INVITATION FROM THE SBSTA.

IN 2014 TO 2017, THE TFI COULD ORGANISE EXPERT MEETINGS LOOKING AT AREAS OF THE 2006 IPCC GLS WHICH MAY NEED FURTHER CLARIFICATION AND WHERE UNCERTAINTIES ARE STILL LARGE (E.G. REPORTING OF EMISSION/REMOVALS FROM COASTAL WETLANDS). THE UNFCCC LEAD REVIEWER MEETINGS COULD ALSO BE ASKED TO IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE SUCH CLARIFICATIONS WOULD BE NEEDED. IN ADDITION, THE TFI COULD SUPPORT ESPECIALLY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BY DEVELOPING SOFTWARE AND OTHER TOOLS/PRODUCTS TO FACILITATE THE USE OF THE GLS.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THERE WILL BE A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF NEW BUREAU MEMBERS, AUTHORS, ETC. HOWEVER, CONTINUITY AND USE OF GAINED EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE NEED TO BE GUARANTEED BY HAVING ALSO EXPERTS WHO HAVE PREVIOUSLY PARTICIPATED IN THE IPCC WORK.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAS PROVED TO BE ABLE TO ENHANCE THE OPERATION OF IPCC. IT HAS ALSO INCREASED TRANSPARENCY AS WELL AS TIMELINESS AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.

IN ORDER TO DIVIDE THE WORK LOAD THERE COULD ALSO BE TSU DESIGNATED TO SPECIAL REPORTS WORKING IN COLLABORATION WITH THE WG TSU. BOTH SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR THE AUTHORS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED.

INFORMATION ON OBSERVED CLIMATE CHANGES ARE ROUTINELY UPDATED BY RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION OF THESE UPDATES IS ENHANCED BY WMO. IPCC COULD CONSIDER WAYS TO CO-OPERATE IN THIS PROCESS. FOR EXAMPLE BY ASSIGNING SPECIFIC AUTHOR TEAMS TO PARTICIPATE OR BY DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT MATERIAL ANNUALLY OR BI-ANNUALLY UTILISING SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE AND ROUTINELY PRODUCED ANALYSES . SIMILARLY UNDP HAS ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE CLOSE LINKAGES AND HIGH-RELEVANCY FOR THE ASSESMENT WORK.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

CO-OPERATION WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRY CO-CHAIR AND TSU:S COULD BE DEVELOPED. FOR EXAMPLE, TSU:S COULD CONSIDER EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS FROM THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

POSSIBLE SUPPORT FROM THE UN AND OTHER ORGANISATIONS TO FACILITATE PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' SCIENTISTS SHOULD BE EXPLORED.

IPCC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME AND ALIKE ARE IMPORTANT PART OF CAPACITY BUILDING. IN THE LONG-RUN THEY HAVE POTENTIAL TO ENHANCE THE PARTICIPATION OF SCIENTISTS FROM THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE IPCC WORK.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

IPCC HAS IN THE PAST ALSO RAISED RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED TO ADVANCE OUR UNDERSTANDING ON CLIMATE CHANGE. SUCH AN ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH PRIORITIES COULD BE TIMELY AND USEFUL TO MANY ORGANIZATIONS AND GOVERNMENTS. IT COULD BE USED IN PLANNING OF RESEARCH AND POLICY IN INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXT. SUITABLE TIMING FOR THIS KIND OF ASSESMENT WOULD BE IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE AR5 PROCESS. THE ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH PRIORITIES NEEDS TO BE DONE IN COLLABORATION OF ALL WGS AND WITH OTHER RELEVANT RESEARCH ORGANISATIONS AND STAKEHOLDERS. IPCC COULD INITIATE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY SHOULD PREPARE ITS OWN GUIDELINES ON HOW TO COMMAND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ORDER TO PROVIDE RESEARCH BASED SUPPORT FOR DECISION MAKING.

TAKING AN EXAMPLE FROM WG1 TOPICS, THE GLOBAL CLIMATE OBSERVING SYSTEM STILL HAS SEVERE DEFICIENCIES. THERE ARE PROCESSES THAT ARE INSUFFICIENTLY OBSERVED, ALTHOUGH ADVANCE IN UNDERSTANDING OF THOSE PROCESSES ARE CRUCIAL FOR DEVELOPING CAPACITY TO ESTIMATE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CLIMATE. SIMILARLY THERE ARE REGIONS WHERE OBSERVATION NETWORK IS WEAK AND UNDER-RESOURCED. DEFECTS IN OBSERVATION NETWORKS HINDER RISK MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND ADPATATION. ALSO WORRYING IS THE CONTINUITY OF SOME OF THE KEY OBSERVATIONAL PROGRAMS. COMBINED EXPERTISE OF IPCC, WMO, GCOS AND OTHERS COULD BE USED TO PROVIDE ASSESMENT PRODUCT OF RELEVANCE TO RESEARCH, POLICY MAKING, UNFCCC AND OTHER PROCESSES.

THE ABOVE EXAMPLE IS RELATED TO CLIMATE SYSTEM OBSERVATIONS BUT SIMILAR PROBLEMS RELATE OTHER FIELDS OF CLIMATE CHANGE KNOWLEDGE. ADVANCE COULD BE ACHIVED THROUGH ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH NEEDS IN ALL IPCC SECTORS (IMPACTS, VULNERABILITY, ADAPTATION, MITIGATION) .

COUNTRY: FRANCE

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

SINCE ITS CREATION, THE IPCC HAS VERY SATISFACTORILY FULFILLED ITS MISSION. IT HAS BEEN A PIONEER AND REMAINS TODAY A LEADER AND A MODEL FOR GLOBAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS.

ABUNDANT SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION REGARDING THE CLIMATE HAS BEEN DELIVERED ALONG THE 25 LAST YEARS, BY THE IPCC. THE FACT THAT THE CLIMATE NEGOTIATION OPENED IN 1992 HAS NOT YET REACHED ITS SPECIFIC GOALS CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED TO THE LACK OF SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS ; THE IPCC, IN PARTICULAR, HAS DELIVERED THE EXPECTED HIGH-QUALITY INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS.

THUS, THE CORE OF THE IPCC ACTIVITY MUST BE PRESERVED. EVOLUTIONS SHOULD BE ONLY MARGINAL. HOWEVER, THIS LEAVES ROOM FOR INNOVATIONS.

BECAUSE OF THE TIME NEEDED TO PRODUCE RESULTS FROM A NEW GENERATION OF MODELS AND TO PROVIDE RELEVANT ANALYSES AND ASSESSMENT, THE PERIOD FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF FUTURE CLIMATE SCENARIOS WILL HAVE TO REMAIN 6 TO 8 YEARS. THIS RELATES IN PARTICULAR TO THE CONTENT OF WHAT IS KNOWN TODAY AS THE VOLUME 1.

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS ARE HEAVY. THE PREPARATION OF SOME CHAPTERS MAY BE FRUSTRATING BECAUSE THERE IS NO BREAKTHROUGH OR BECAUSE A DIFFICULT QUESTION IS MET ; THERE IS THE NEED OF SOME FLEXIBILITY IN THE CONTENT E.G. TO ALLOW NEW RESEARCH TO BE MORE PRESENTED.

SOME FLEXIBILITY WHICH WOULD REDUCE THE TASK AND THE BURDEN OF THE 6TH ASSESSMENT REPORT SHOULD BE SOUGHT. NO SPECIFIC PROPOSAL IS MADE HERE ; BUT THE PRESENT SUBMISSION EXPRESSES AN OPENNESS TO SOME CHANGES IN THE 6TH ASSESSMENT CYCLE IN THIS RESPECT.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO LEAVE THE ROOM TO THEMATIC ASSESSMENTS OR SPECIAL REPORTS, IN PARALLEL TO ASSESSMENT REPORTS, IN ORDER TO REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC BREAKTHROUGHS.

INTERMEDIATE REPORTS MAY BE NEEDED TO COVER SOME ISSUES THAT WERE NOT FULLY COVERED DURING THE LARGER ASSESSMENT : FOR INSTANCE , SOME ASSESSMENT MIGHT RELATE TO THE ROLE OF AEROSOLS WITHIN A DECADE.

THE TIMING OF SPECIFIC REPORTS (E.G METHODOLOGY REPORTS) SHOULD BE CLOSELY LINKED TO THE UNFCCC'S NEGOTIATIONS DEVELOPMENT.

PLANNING AT THE BEGINNING OF AN ASSESSMENT REPORT PERIOD FOR SPECIFIC TARGETED PUBLICATIONS IS DIFFICULT DUE TO BOTH SCIENTIFIC ADVANCES AND POLITICAL NEEDS AND REQUESTS.

THE TIMING OF THE SUCCESSIVE DELIVERY OF THE THREE WG REPORTS DOES NOT FULLY SATISFY THE IDEAL SET OF CRITERIA BUT NO OTHER OPTIMIZATION IS STRAIGHTFORWARD. IT MUST BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THREE WGS WORKING ALMOST IN PARALLEL OR THREE WGS WORKING SUCCESSIVELY DELIVER DIFFERENT SERVICES, EACH SHOWING ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS ; THE PRESENT SITUATION IS ACCEPTABLE ; NO OTHER IS PROPOSED.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

THE CROSS-CUTTING WORK HAS MADE PROGRESS DURING THE 5TH ASSESSMENT PERIOD. IT SHOULD STILL BE ENHANCED.

THE CHALLENGE OF DRAMATIC INCREASE IN LITERATURE IS RECOGNIZED, PARTICULARLY FOR THE WG2 REPORT AND THE REGIONAL PARTS. SOME STUDY COULD BE UNDERTAKEN ON THE WAYS TO ASSIST THE LEAD-AUTHORS IN THEIR TASKS WITH USE OF THE MOST RECENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ; PERHAPS SOME TRANSFER OF THE WORK TO THE AUTHORS OF PAPERS THEMSELVES COULD BE CONSIDERED, WHERE THESE AUTHORS WOULD SUBMIT THEIR ARTICLES TO THE IPCC WITH A STANDARDIZED FORM AND SUMMARY, INSTEAD OF THE IPCC AUTHORS HAVING TO DO BY THEMSELVES THE COLLECTION OF AN EVER-INCREASING NUMBER OF PAPERS.

MORE TIME SHOULD BE GIVEN FOR THE PRODUCTION OF CMIP ANALYSES.

A HIGHER COORDINATION OF THE TSUS COULD RESULT FROM A GROUPING OF THE THREE TSUS WITH - OR CLOSE TO - THE IPCC SECRETARIAT IN GENEVA. HOWEVER, THIS MAY RESULT IN ANOTHER CHALLENGE/REQUIREMENT, OF FINANCIAL NATURE, IN CASE THE BUDGET OF THE THREE TSUS WOULD ALSO BE INCLUDED IN THE CENTRAL BUDGET OF THE IPCC : THE RESULTING DOUBLING OF THE CENTRAL BUDGET OF THE IPCC SEEMS DIFFICULT TO ENVISAGE IN THE COMING YEARS ; SOME COUNTRIES SHOULD THEN TAKE THE BURDEN OF THE THREE TSUS BUDGETS EVEN IF THE TSUS ARE BASED IN GENEVA.

LANGUAGE COULD BE A BARRIER TO PUBLICATION. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT NON ENGLISH SCIENTISTS COULD SEE THEIR VIEWS AND FUNDINGS REFLECTED IN IPCC REPORTS. A WAY TO ACHIEVE THIS COULD BE TO ENSURE TO HAVE A REVIEW OF ARABIC, CHINESE, FRENCH, RUSSIAN AND SPANISH LITERATURE DONE FOR THE AR, BY A NUMBER OF SPECIFICALLY TARGETED AUTHORS.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

A PART OF THE STAFF OF THE TSUS SHOULD ORIGINATE FROM THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

LANGUAGE COULD BE A BARRIER TO PUBLICATION. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT NON ENGLISH SCIENTISTS COULD SEE THEIR VIEWS AND FINDINGS REFLECTED IN IPCC REPORTS. A WAY TO ACHIEVE THIS COULD BE TO ENSURE TO HAVE A REVIEW OF ARABIC, CHINESE, FRENCH, RUSSIAN AND SPANISH LITERATURE DONE FOR THE AR, BY A NUMBER OF SPECIFICALLY TARGETED AUTHORS.

IN ORDER TO DISSEMINATE IPCC RESULTS AND TO BUILD CAPACITY IN DEVELOPPING COUNTRIES, THE IPCC COULD ENHANCE THE DISSEMINATION OF REPORTS (PAPERS), USING THE NETWORK OF NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS AND NATIONAL SCIENCE ACADEMIES.

IPCC MAY ALSO DEVELOPP WEBINARS AND INTERACTIVE TOOLS TO BE DISSEMINATED IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, IN SEVERAL LANGUAGES.

BASED ON THE METHODOLOGY THE IPCC HAS DEVELOPED SINCE ITS CREATION, THE IPCC COULD PRODUCE METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS HELPING THE PRODUCTION OF REGIONAL ASSESSMENTS OF E.G. IMPACTS, VULNERABILITIES AND ADAPTATION OR OTHER REGIONAL ASSESSMENTS.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

THE METHODOLOGY DEVELOPED BY THE IPCC SINCE ITS CREATION CAN BE USEFUL TO OTHER AGENCIES WISHING TO MAKE ASSESSMENTS RELATED E.G. TO CLIMATE IMPACTS, VULNERABILITIES, AND ADAPTATION TO CC IN SPECIFIC DOMAINS, OR ASSESSMENTS IN OTHER SCIENTIFIC DOMAINS.

THE PRODUCTION OF THE LARGE ASSESSMENT REPORTS BY THE IPCC IS A VERY HEAVY TASK. IT IS PROBABLY NOT POSSIBLE TO INCREASE THE COMPLEXITY OF THIS PROCESS AS WOULD BE THE CASE IF SOME OTHER U.N. BODIES WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PRODUCTION OF A PART OF AN IPCC REPORT.

THE COOPERATION WITH OTHER U.N. BODIES CAN ONLY BE CONSIDERED IN THE FRAMEWORK OF SPECIFIC ACTIONS

COUNTRY: GERMANY

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/>.

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

Reliable and objective assessments of climate research are needed as a basis for climate policy. IPCC reports provide such policy relevant information without being policy prescriptive, and the IPCC should continue to deliver such products in the future. Some modifications are needed to meet future needs and to ensure that the efforts of those involved in the drafting of the products remain manageable. We have some suggestions for modifications below.

Comprehensive assessments

- **IPCC assessment reports (ARs) and Special Reports (SRs) should become more concise** with an increased focus on policy relevant topics. This would increase their usefulness for policy makers and reduce the workload for authors.
- We suggest the ARs should be rather structured according to policy needs and less according to scientific disciplines. The number of Working Group reports contributing to an AR should be reduced and their scope more focused, also with increased coherence and consistency within the overall report. This modified **report structure** would also decrease the workload for the authors. We would suggest splitting the current Working Group 2 (WG2). The new WG1 could focus on the physical science basis and impacts, the new WG2 could focus on adaptation and mitigation strategies.
- **The Synthesis Report** containing concise, cross-cutting syntheses dedicated to overarching policy questions addressed in the ARs and the SRs should be retained.
- The **frequency of publication of assessment reports**, i.e. the length of assessment cycle, of several years should be kept to allow for the thorough multi-step review process and to maintain the high political impact of the IPCC ARs. The assessment cycle should be short enough to enable the WGs to assess the same level of knowledge, but at the same time be long enough for production and application of

consistent scenarios to be analysed by all Working Groups. In particular, the needs of the UNFCCC as the main client of the IPCC reports should be taken into account when determining the length of the cycle.

Flexible products in response to policy needs

- The IPCC reports could be supplemented by **regular updates of relevant new information on facts and figures**. This would enhance the current relevance of the reports. The supplementary information could be purely factual and not require a scientific assessment. Clear rules of procedure and definitions of the supplementary material would be needed in order to protect the integrity and credibility of the IPCC products.
- **Technical Papers (TP)** as complements to ARs and SRs should have a bigger role in enhancing the flexibility and the responsiveness of the IPCC to policy needs, in particular of the Parties to the UNFCCC. Therefore, the decision process and the establishment of TPs should be accelerated. TPs contain extended analyses based on the information and literature cited in ARs and SRs.

Methodology Reports

- **Methodology Reports (MR)** on national greenhouse gas inventories (TFI) remain necessary, but they should respond more precisely and in a more flexible manner to the requests and needs of the UNFCCC.

An **additional IPCC methodology report** could be introduced that provides guidelines for assessment making. This report should summarize and formulize the comprehensive processes and practices for assessment-making the IPCC has developed and applied during the past 25 years. This would allow other scientific bodies to establish their own high quality assessment reports, for example on specific regional or sector-specific aspects. This methodology report could be established by a dedicated IPCC Task Group. Such activity would in the long run avoid a further increase of the IPCC's workload and improve the availability of regional and sector-specific knowledge.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

Operation of Working Groups

- The **structure of the WGs** should correspond to the needs for generating the products. We suggest consideration of the advantages and the feasibility of a new WG structure in accordance with our proposal of two WG reports, see above.
- **Coordination and cooperation across WGs** should be fostered in order to improve the applicability of reports, e.g. through the use of consistent scenarios, language, definitions, and risk assessment approaches. Ways to enhance cross-WG-consistency should be discussed, e.g. through dedicated individuals in the author teams or by enhancing the cooperation of the TSUs.
- The **responsibilities and authorities** of the WG Co-Chairs, CLAs and authors should be further clarified to guarantee the scientific excellence and quality of the products. Terms of Reference of the IPCC Vice Chairs should be established, e.g. defining responsibilities for cross-cutting issues and cooperation.

Optimisation of Operation

- **Working conditions for authors** should remain attractive for the world's best scientists in order to maintain the scientific excellence of products.

The workload for authors should be decreased especially through increased focus of the reports. One way to achieve this could be a modified scoping process (e.g., consideration of scoping of the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) instead of the full report, so that the full report would only focus on issues that are covered by the SPM).

In addition, enhanced technical support given by the TSU or individual support like assisting chapter scientists would be helpful.

Incentives for scientists should be enhanced, e.g. by formally acknowledging the contribution to an IPCC report as a scientific publication.

- **Institutionalize cooperation across the TSU and between the TSUs and the Secretariat** with the objective of professionalizing the support of the scientific assessment process, increasing efficiency and effectiveness, and exploiting synergies. Improved coordination with the Secretariat would also improve the organizational memory of the IPCC, since the TSUs are associated with the establishment of certain products, while the Secretariat is permanent. Improvements could be achieved for example through a dedicated person at the Secretariat responsible for cross-TSU coordination (who would perform overarching tasks like, for example, foster the use of shared tools and organizational frameworks, and support the TSUs' administrative work to reduce their workload).
- **Cooperation with other bodies** is essential to enable the IPCC to focus on its core mandate. For example, since its establishment, the IPCC has also provided a platform that facilitates the integration of climate research across scientific disciplines as a precondition for its assessment process. These activities as well as the requirements in support of the future work of the IPCC should be identified for consideration by other bodies.

In addition, assessments on specific topics or regional assessments could be established by others, using the methodologies of IPCC for assessment making (see above proposal).

Transparency

- **The transparency of IPCC processes** needs to be enhanced. Official drafts of IPCC reports in the final stages of the review, including anonymized review documents, should be made available online for read only access after each review step. The preliminary status of these documents should be clearly communicated.
- We strongly suggest a consideration of measures to maintain public trust in the IPCC process and the integrity of the interaction between governments and scientists. This could be achieved for example through further opening of selected IPCC plenary meetings to accredited media.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

- The assessments of the IPCC are based on the engagement of excellent scientists and on the findings from high quality climate change research from all regions of the world. The IPCC reports have identified a **lack of knowledge on climate change in DCs**. In addition, past experience in the IPCC indicates the **need for additional scientific experts** from these regions, who could engage in the IPCC process.
- Capacity building by the IPCC itself is limited to activities of the IPCC Scholarship Programme. IPCC could, however, **communicate the advantage of a stock taking** of the needs for research in DC and the requirements enabling enhanced participation and contribution of DC experts in the work of the IPCC.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

- The **communication** of the IPCC has much improved since 2010, but current activities should be evaluated and potential improvements explored, including through external professional support and cooperation with other (UN) organizations.
- The work of the IPCC as a whole depends strongly on the scientific excellence of its Bureau members. An active role of members of the IPCC leadership (IPCC Chair, Vice Chairs, Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs, and other members of the IPCC Bureau) in official government functions might affect the scientific integrity of the IPCC since it could be perceived as a **conflict of interest**. This issue should therefore be properly reflected in the IPCC's Conflict of Interest Policy.
- For further strengthening and professionalization of the IPCC and to meet future challenges, a **secure and sustainable funding framework** should be considered. Additional countries, in a position to do so, should be encouraged to increase their level of contributions to the IPCC Trust Funds or to make a contribution to the IPCC Trust fund or provide in-kind contributions where they have not yet done so. Currently, the IPCC is funded by regular contributions from its parent organizations WMO and UNEP, the UNFCCC, and voluntary contributions by some member countries. In addition, WMO and UNEP support the IPCC Secretariat. Additional in-kind contributions from some countries fund the TSUs, data centres, and IPCC-meetings.
- The **Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC** at its first meeting in April 2014 in Berlin should agree on a **work plan** to fulfil its mandate from IPCC37 up to IPCC41 in the first half of 2015. This work plan should include a time plan and a definition of work-strands based on the main topics addressed by countries in their submissions. Sufficient time will be needed for the work of the Task Group. Therefore, we suggest further Task Group meetings in summer 2014 and back to back with the approval session of the AR5 Synthesis Report in Copenhagen in October. The Panel session IPCC39 should adopt the work plan of the Task Group up to IPCC41 and finalize the budget of the Trust Fund for 2014 accordingly.

Overall goals of Germany

The IPCC has been the most important reference for climate policy worldwide, providing comprehensive and reliable scientific information on global climate change for the last 25 years. The IPCC should continue to serve decision making in climate policy by providing high quality products that are of political relevance but not policy prescriptive. The end of the current assessment cycle provides an excellent opportunity to reflect on the lessons

learnt and to improve the IPCC's structure and functioning so that it can maintain this role in the future.

The German Government regards the following as overarching objectives to preserve the strengths of the IPCC while modernising it in a sustainable way:

- guarantee the scientific excellence and high quality of products
- improve user friendliness and political relevance of IPCC products
- reduce the workload for the IPCC authors
- improve efficiency of the work processes
- increase coherence and consistency across IPCC products
- continue to provide a communication platform that facilitates the integration of climate research across scientific disciplines
- ensure the participation of experts from developing countries and enhance the scientific knowledge base about climate change in such countries
- enhance the transparency of the IPCC working procedures

For the compilation of this submission by the German government, experts who contributed to the AR5 and to the recent work of the TFI as well as policy makers and other users of IPCC products were consulted.

COUNTRY: JAPAN

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

(Future products and the process of IPCC)

1. As stated in the last submission, Japan considers that the ARs would continue to be the main IPCC products in the future as they were in the past.

2. Japan considers that the most efficient schedule of preparation of reports should be set up after discussing the roles of each WG’s contribution and the Synthesis Report of AR, and interconnection between them so as to facilitate implementation of the climate change-related policies. It is also important to develop further cross-WG collaboration and mutual comprehension, and enhance integrity among three WG’s reports. Japan believes that we should set up the schedule enabling such tasks to be promoted. In order to set up the WGI’s schedule, coordination with the scientific community is important in view of the necessity of enormous computational resources. Further, given an increased production pace of literatures on climate change, we need to examine the most efficient timing to compile accumulated scientific knowledge.

3. The current schedule under which governments are required to review all of reports within only one or two years does not necessarily provide sufficient time to examine. In order to review with deeper comprehension, longer intervals between publications of each report are desirable.

4. As overall tasks for the future, it is required to prepare reports focusing on practical and applicable mitigation and adaptation measures in each region or sector, taking the post-2020 international regime on climate change into consideration. Those reports should contribute especially to increasing knowledge of mitigation and adaptation measures applicable to developing

countries. In addition, it is important to enhance knowledge in order to contribute to actual action of a wider range of stakeholders. Furthermore, normative studies as well as empirical knowledge become important in relation to issues such as an assessment of geo-engineering. Therefore, Japan considers that it is important for IPCC to assess recent trend of normative studies in addition to the empirical approach.

Regarding the future tasks of each WG, Japan considers as follows:

Climate change observations and projections, analysis on climate change mechanism, attribution, and carbon cycle in WGI are foundation for international and domestic policy-making on climate change, and thus solid scientific assessment must be continuously implemented. It is also important to rapidly assess observation data, which contributes to the risk assessment on the climate change policies, and to make them widely available to the public.

In addition, the relatively new areas with high international needs (e.g. study on hiatus, high-resolution models, near future projections) are important as well. (Necessity of preparation of SRs should be considered.)

As for WGII, reconsidering the approaches to assessment of the climate change impact on each region and regional adaptation measures is of further importance.

In WGIII, improvement of practical knowledge towards construction of a low carbon society is becoming important. It is necessary to consider/analyze feasibility to develop renewable energy sources in developing countries, possibility to introduce CCS and other geo-engineering, and improvement in energy efficiency of conventional power plants. It is expected that cooperation and collaboration between WGI and WGIII become of increasing importance especially for analyzing and setting emission pathways until the temperature peaks and reaches equilibrium in other scenarios than RCP2.6.

In WGII and WGIII, further analyses are necessary on cost/benefits, synergies and trade-offs of integration of mitigation measures and adaptation measures.

5. Accordingly, in the next assessment period, outstanding issues in AR5 which could be addressed in a shorter time period should be firstly examined and be published as SR. Japan considers that the whole AR process should be longer to secure more time to review and work on the report than the current process. SYR is necessary to pursue collaboration between WGs under existing condition. Furthermore, the current interval for the AR (6-7 years) is not always appropriate to sufficiently assess the changes in situation such as the cost of the renewable energy and new technologies, which should be addressed by production and publication of reports like SR as appropriate.

6. Given the necessity to avoid overburdening authors, preparation of additional fast track products needs to be considered prudently. Even if production of such a new type of report is decided, production of SRs and/or MRs should have priorities.

However, case-by-case consideration may be required in urgent cases. For instance, with regard to issues with high expectations of rapid changes and risks which should be addressed before detection of changes, more frequent reporting

on observation data should be considered in order to avoid delay in taking necessary actions.

7. Regarding the question “whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories”, please refer to paragraph 10.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

(System of WGs)

8. Overall, there are no critical issues on the current system of WGs. However, the system of WGII should be enhanced to consider further on regional issues through such as establishing TSU nodes. Adaptation needs to be considered on a regional basis; nevertheless information in Asia and Africa is typically lacking. Thus, it is necessary to establish a supporting mechanism to study climate change impacts and develop adaptation policies in these regions.

(Cross-cutting matters)

9. Regarding cross cutting issues, exchanging information among WGs and TFI is effective through such as establishing Inter-WG/TFI meeting. Also, it is recommended that cross cutting issues are dealt with in SR, if necessary.

Specifically, there are needs to enhance synergy between mitigation and adaptation, inter-relation between mitigation and inventory, coordination on cost analysis between WGII and WGIII, and scenario building.

RCP scenarios do not specify socio-economic conditions, different from SRES scenarios, which make it difficult for policy makers to consider how to build societies to follow RCPs or similar concentration pathways. As explained in "TOWARDS NEW SCENARIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE, IMPACTS, AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES", IPCC Expert Meeting Report (2007), development of SSP should be further promoted in order to provide comprehensive information on climate change and socio-economy as well as enable to evaluate impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Then, the results should be compiled into a special report as a supplementary material to AR5 at the early stage of the next process. Scenario building

is not just a research, but has impacts on policies. Thus, it will be effective to take a process which enables to reflect inputs from policy makers, with securing sufficient latitude for scientists in their work. In addition, when there are fundamental modifications of scenario making, as is the case in switching from SRES to SSP, explanations on the changes in concepts should be provided in reports, which would be useful for policy makers to make decisions.

(TFI)

10. Regarding the inventory guidelines, one of the main outcomes from TFI, Japan assumes that new guidelines would be required for use under the new regime after 2020 in UNFCCC negotiations. Japan believes comprehensive review and improvement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines are also necessary.

While the need for developing REDD+ MRV guidelines is widely recognized, it is also necessary to prepare other methodological guidelines as follows;

- (1) Providing new methodologies such as;
 - a. Methodology on CCS monitoring,
 - b. Supplements for emission factor guidance on new emission sources (exploration and production of shale gas/oil)
- (2) Providing technical information on mitigation policy effectiveness;
 - a. Developing and disseminating methodology on estimating results of sectorial/regional mitigation policies, methodologies on supporting low carbon or zero emission society,
 - b. Developing and disseminating methodologies to use remote sensing on land use and forest including those relating to REDD+,
 - c. Developing and disseminating methodologies which could be applied to National Communications, Biennial Update Reports (BUR) and MRV (national, regional and project level) for developing countries.

Regarding (2) b. above, considering the extensive progress in remote sensing technologies with earth monitoring satellite, utilization of accumulated knowledge and data from international efforts such as Global Forest Observations Initiative (GFOI) of the Group on Earth Observations (GEO) is effective.

Adding “disseminating methodologies through active participation in relevant events held by other organizations” to the TFI mandate is required. It is also worth considering whether implementation of training on developing inventory can be added in its TOR.

As aforementioned, Japan believes that there will be further needs on TFI activities. Japan is ready to continue providing supports for TFI activities upon its continuity for the next phase, as it has been doing to date.

11. Japan considers that TFI should also collect regional data and needs by establishing regional nodes in order to accumulate necessary knowledge in Asia, Africa, and so on.

(Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature)

12. Japan thinks it is important to establish a systematic literature data base based on international cooperation in order to address increasing number of literatures. Burden on authors should be reduced through an international literature data base.

(Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices)

13. Regarding the Appendix A to Principles Governing IPCC Work, it seems necessary to establish a different procedure for TFI products. Currently, Overview Chapter in MRs is considered as a parallel to SPM. SPM of ARs and SRs is compiling the most important messages based on accumulated scientific knowledge, and is the widest circulation among policy in practice makers as well as the public. On the other hand, main readers of MRs are government officials and experts who utilize methodologies. Therefore, each methodology in underlying report is more important for them rather than Overview Chapter.

14. Ideally, there should be a review process for MRs in which final products could reflect real methodological experience after providing opportunities for each country to apply methodologies in practice. There might be defects or areas for improvements which could be realized only through actual experience. Therefore, an amendment to the Appendix A should be considered to make the governmental review period longer or to add an additional process to allow revision of the accepted report after a trial period for governments to use it.

15. The “final” draft of ARs for discussion at panel is shared on the day of session to approve/adopt/accept it. It is difficult for non-native English speakers to handle them in such a short time. It is desirable that this “final” draft would be shared at least approximately one month prior to sessions.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

16. Regarding strengthened support for Co-chairs and Bureau members from developing countries, Japan thinks that we need further discussion in order to reach conclusion with which all of countries can approve.

17. To promote studies in areas which is currently insufficient, Japan would like to recall that the Future Earth initiative (a new 10-year international research plan that promotes “researches for sustainability” by re-formulating a network of researchers/scientists including those conducting research activities which are subject to the IPCC assessment) strengthens coordination and collaboration between the scientific community and other stakeholders such as ODA communities and businesses, to conduct researches. Given such an initiative, cooperation between IPCC and the Future Earth Secretariat should be suitably facilitated.

18. Japan considers that we should utilize existing networks to assist developing countries such as the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN) in order to promote research activities in developing countries.

APN is a network aiming to promote global change research in the Asia-Pacific region, increase developing country involvement in that research, and strengthen interactions between the science community and policy makers. It was established in 1996 and currently 22 country governments in the Asia-Pacific region joins the network. Donor

countries are Japan, the United States, New Zealand and South Korea. It focuses on not only mitigation but adaptation.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

19. Cooperation with international networks such as Global Adaptation Network (GAN)(*1) and Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN)(*2) as well as international academic institutes such as International Council for Science (ICSU) is important. Cooperation with IPBES and CBD should also be promoted taking into account climate change impacts on biodiversity and impact evaluation of CDR technologies on biodiversity. However, it is necessary to consider how to secure political neutrality of IPCC especially when cooperating with other international organizations which have their own political objectives.

*1 GAN: <http://ganadapt.org/>

*2 APAN: <http://www.asiapacificadapt.net/>

20. It is important to precisely deliver scientific knowledge to the public. Primary responsibilities for outreach belong to governments, however, involvement of authors in outreach activities is now more important for disseminating message of reports. From this perspective, Japan invited Prof. Thomas Stocker, WGI Co-chair, and organized a seminar on WGI report last December. Such cooperation is expected to continue among governments, authors and IPCC Secretariat within their capacities. Additionally, supplementary guidance or online tools which summarize basic environmental science would be helpful for the people who are not familiar with climate change science to comprehend AR5 better.

21. As for inputs from user group, consideration should be given in order to collect opinions from a wide variety of stakeholders. It is also necessary to reconsider inputs from governments. WGII report, due to its strong interference with society, would not be very useful for policy making if the current result of studies and researches were simply assessed, compiled, and summarized only from a scientific point of view. Therefore, a process that each government can input their needs is favorable.

22. Discussion, based on the review of reports, on the future vision of IPCC is meaningful. In requesting inputs from observer organization, authors and general public, it would be desirable if one of the questions addresses impacts of the past IPCC reports on policy decision making process and public's knowledge of science.

COUNTRY: KENYA

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

THE WORLD IS DYNAMIC WITH RECENT ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY TO ADDRESS EMERGING ISSUES INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE. FUTURE IPCC PRODUCTS SHOULD THEREFORE TAKE THESE INTO CONSIDERATION FOR THEM TO BE RELEVANT TO THIS DYNAMIC SOCIETY. THE CYCLE OF THE IPCC MAIN ASSESSMENT REPORTS SHOULD THEREFORE BE MAINTAINED BUT SUPPLEMENTED WITH RELEVANT TECHNICAL REPORTS/SYNTHESIS REPORTS ADDRESSING ANY EMERGING ISSUES SUCH AS METHODOLOGIES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES AS WELL AS DETAILED REPORTING ON ANY ISSUE THAT HAS EMERGED WITHIN THE CYCLE. EMPHASIS ALSO NEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO REGIONAL ANALYSIS AND REPORTING. THIS IS BECAUSE IN MANY CASES, READERS OF THE REPORTS OFTEN WONDER WHY EXAMPLES FROM DEVELOPED WORLD DOMINATE THE REPORT WHILE FEW OR NONE ARE PROVIDED FROM THE DEVELOPING WORLD DESPITE ADVANCES IN SATELLITE TECHNOLOGY CAPABLE OF PROVIDING ADEQUATE DATA IN INSTRUMENTAL/MANUAL DATA SCARCER AREAS PARTICULARLY IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

BALANCED REGIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THOSE CONTRIBUTING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRODUCTS AS WELL AS CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SCIENTISTS FROM DEVELOPING WORLD BY WAY OF SECONDMENT TO TSU

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

SEEK ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM PROSPECTIVE DONORS SO AS TO BE ABLE TO SUPPORT INTERESTED SCIENTISTS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDERTAKE IPCC ACTIVITIES

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

THE TASK GROUP ON THE FUTURE WORK OF IPCC SHOULD PREPARE REGULAR REPORTS ON THEIR PROPOSALS WHICH SHOULD BE CIRCULATED TO GOVERNMENTS FOR COMMENTS AND /OR ADVISE BEFORE ASKING IPCC TO IMPLEMENT

COUNTRY: KYRGYZSTAN

Dear Renate Christ,

The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz Republic expresses its gratitude for your cooperation and your letter (Ref. 5283-13/IPCC/GEN). Having considered it, hereby we would like to give the following proposals:

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC ?

The total duration of the current evaluation period is quite satisfactory. The publication scheme of general assessment reports with periodic additions in the form of ad hoc reports is successful in case of a reasonable choice of topics of ad hoc reports. The publication of relatively small volume additional reports on the most relevant topics can be very helpful for countries. Perhaps in some cases identification of topics of ad hoc reports may be made not necessarily at the beginning, but upon receipt of requests and suggestions.

There are no specific proposals for optimal timing of reporting within the evaluation period. The main purpose of the summary reports is compilation of the latest scientific advances in the field of climate change. As noted above, there is a necessity in operational tools to respond to requests of experts or to meet the needs of policy makers in developing countries. These tools can be less bulky than the current ad hoc reports, and more aimed at highlighting specific problems.

It is necessary that IPCC continues Methodological Reports on national greenhouse gas inventories, and includes all countries and all sectors.

It is also necessary that IPCC continues to prepare Methodological reports on other topics identifying countries.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

The structure and function of the IPCC is to a large extent an internal affair of the IPCC. It would be beneficial from IPCC product users' point of views that IPCC would also arrange an opportunity to get answers for individual requests of the Parties to the UNFCCC engaged in main activities of the IPCC on complex scientific and methodical issues. This would be a kind of operational service in dealing with current issues, which in other structures of the UNFCCC is missing or if there is, it can not cope with the function because of lack of capacity. Since the IPCC is an organization that consolidates enormous scientific potential, there is no doubt that it will cope with this task. On the other hand, availability of the operational functions of help/advice will be a kind of feedback that will allow the IPCC to identify the main focus of its activities and to contribute to the improvement of its activities.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC.

It is clear that co-chairs' support from the developing countries as well as support of coordinating lead authors, review editors will promote the strengthening of the contribution of developing countries. However, significant strengthening of contribution can only be achieved if the work is organized in other languages at all stages of the IPCC process.

We hope for further cooperation.

--

**Best regards,
Department of International Cooperation.
State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz
Republic.**

COUNTRY: LATVIA

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

IT WOULD BE OPTIMAL TO HAVE AN ASSESSMENT EVERY 4 YEARS.
IT WOULD ALSO BE OF GREAT USE IF FOCUSED THEMATIC ASSESSMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS WOULD BE PLANNED AT THE BEGINNING OF AN ASSESSMENT PERIOD AND THE PLANS WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE.
ADDITIONAL FAST TRACK PRODUCTS ARE NEEDED TO RESPOND TO EMERGING SCIENCE, ESPECIALLY WHEN THERE ARE NEW TRENDS TO OBSERVE. IPCC SHOULD CONTINUE TO PREPARE METHODOLOGY REPORTS ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGE OF DRAMATIC INCREASE IN LITERATURE IT WOULD BE OF GREAT USE FOR COUNTRIES TO HAVE MORE INFORMATION COMPILATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE POLICYMAKERS IN A SUMMARY TYPE OF REPORTS.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

WE ARE IN SUPPORT TO ENHANCE THE PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

WE FIND IT IMPORTANT TO WORK MORE ON OUTREACH ACTIVITIES TO RAISE THE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND VALUABLE ATTITUDES TO IPCC REPORTS.

COUNTRY: MADAGASCAR

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

I) LENGTH OF ASSESSMENT CYCLE: THE FUTUR PROGRESS IN SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS AND IN PUBLISHED LITERATURES RELATED TO CLIMATE CHANGES ISSUES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN DEFINING THE APPROPRIATE LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD. IN OUR POINT OF VIEW, THE CURRENT TIME PERIOD SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED. THE ASSESSMENT REPORTS SHOULD REFLECT AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE THE PROGRESS IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING SINCE THE PREVIOUS REPORT.

II) SYNTHESIS REPORT: THE CURRENT SCOPE AND ROLE ARE CONVENIENT. REGARDING THE TIMING, IT SHOULD BE PUBLISHED NOT LATER THAN 1-2 MONTHS AFTER THE APPROVAL OF THE WGIII CONTRIBUTION IF THE CURRENT TIMING OF THE 3 CONTRIBUTIONS IS MAINTAINED.

III) IPCC FUTUR PRODUCTS:

- ARS, SRS, TPS, MRS ON GHG INVENTORIES SHOULD CONTINUE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DECISION FRAMEWORK ON SRS, TPS, MRS
- MRS ON OTHER TOPICS SUCH AS V&A STUDIES, USE OF SCENARIOS/CLIMATE PROJECTIONS..., WOULD BE WELCOME FOR SPECIFIC USERS SUCH AS UNIVERSITY, NATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE EXPERTS...
- FAST TRACK PRODUCTS WHENEVER NEEDED TO RESPOND TO POLICY MAKERS NEEDS OR EMERGING CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE
- SRS ON REGIONAL ISSUES FROM THE AR5

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

Madagascar thinks the current IPCC structure and modus operandi should work although we recognize the need to improve cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs .Reducing the number of WGs could be a solution in this direction.. WGI could be Observed and Projected Physical trends, and Impacts , WGII Vulnerability, Adaptation and Mitigation . The timing of preparation of the reports (WGI,WGII, SYRs) could be improved in that case. This would imply adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure ,terms of references.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

i)TSU: co-hosting the TSU is the best figure if the developing country 's institution can provide the financial support. Otherwise the TSU could continue to be hosted in developed country but the staff composition should reflect a balance between developed and developing country experts number.Staff from the developing country could stay at their home country , work via internet exchanges and could be financially supported by the IPCC Trust Fund whenever needed upon co-chairs request

ii) Bureau members and authors from developing country:

Currently no special financial support is received from the national institution for IPCC activity. It is supported by the existing budget. When existing resources are deficient (internet link for example), they are obliged to deploy their own means.

Specific tasks at regional level for a bureau position should be defined and financial support from the IPCC provided accordingly

iii)Improvement of the engagement of developing country scientist and experts

-IPCC should give more information on the IPCC and its procedures, on the roles of authors (CLA, LA, CA, RE) , on the assessment task and review process, on the benefit to get involved in the work of the IPCC.

-What about volunteering? Should we think about granting a stipend? IPCC should seek what could be done on that.

-Language could be a barrier for non english speaking scientists since currently all the comments must be in english (expert and government review).Many think , it takes too much time to work on the document.

- IPCC could organization a regional or sub-regional forum (for developing and LDCs countries) before an assement cycle to sensitize potential authors and reviewers, to share information on climate change research achievement and available published literature. Experts review process could be performed through a regional or sub-regional forum or workshop.

- IPCC could design a regional and/or sub regional climate change portal. Government, universities,individual scientists, NGOs,international institutions (WB, UNDP, UNICEF, WWF) .. are invited to upload all national publications and reports on climate change (whatever the language) which could be considered in futur assessment reports.

iv)Capacity building:

- Capacity building in the use of available international climate data bank for climate change research, to overcome gaps in national in situ observation data.

- Capacity building in the use of scenarios and downscaled climate projections

- Expansion of the IPCC scholarship but with a strong commitment of the fellows to go back to their home country after the achievement of their studies .Follow up of their research activities at national level and sensitization for an engagement in IPCC work such as LA as soon as possible.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

COUNTRY: MALDIVES

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

WITH THE EMERGING ISSUES OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE INCREASING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND LITERATURE, IPCC HAVE MAINTAINED ITS PORTFOLIO TO PROVIDE THESE INFORMATION IN ONE COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENT AS THE ASSESSMENT REPORTS. BE IT THE SYNTHESIS REPORTS, REPORTS FOR POLICY MAKERS OR FULL ASSESSMENT REPORTS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AS KEY DOCUMENTS ESPECIALLY AMONG THE LEAST DEVELOPED AND SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES, WHO EITHER HAS DIFFICULTY OR LACKS THE KNOWLEDGE TO DETERMINE EVEN THEIR DEGREE OF VULNERABILITY TO CLIMATE CHANGE.

THE CURRENT OVERALL ASSESSMENT PERIOD OF 5 YEARS SEEMS TO BE REASONABLE. GIVEN THE FACT THAT THERE IS AN INCREASING AND ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND LITERATURE, THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY OR THE AUTHORS HAVE A HUGE TASK AHEAD OF THEM IN COMPILING THE FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT, AND THE FACT THAT THEY ARE WORKING ON A PURELY VOLUNTARY BASIS, 5 YEARS WOULD PROVIDE AMPLE TIME FOR THEM TO COMPILER THE REPORTS. IF THE CYCLE IS LONGER THAN 5 YEARS, THEN THE PUBLIC COMMUNITY MIGHT LOSE INTEREST. IPCC BEING THE SCIENTIFIC ARM FOR THE UNFCCC AND DUE TO THE CURRENT TRENDS OF CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS, WE FEEL THAT IT IS CRUCIAL TO KEEP THIS 5 YEAR CYCLE FOR THE INFORMED DECISION MAKING BY THE GOVERNMENTS.

THE CURRENT PRACTICE OF REPORTING IMPLEMENTED AND FOLLOWED BY THE IPCC IS ADEQUATE. THE REPORTS BY THE RESPECTIVE WORKING GROUPS, SPECIAL REPORTS, SUMMARY FOR POLICY MAKERS COMPOSES THE ESSENTIAL BUILDING BLOCKS FOR THE FINAL SYNTHESIS REPORT FOR THE POLICY MAKERS. THE SYNTHESIS REPORT WHICH IS NON-TECHNICAL IN NATURE IS SUITABLE FOR THE POLICY MAKERS TO ADDRESS THE BROAD

RANGE OF POLICY RELEVANT AND POLICY NEUTRAL ISSUES. THE SPECIAL REPORTS HAVE BEEN A KEY TOOL TO KEEP THE GOVERNMENTS UPDATED ON THE LATEST CRITICAL ISSUES AND HELPED IN THE INFORMED DECISION MAKING PROCES. THEREFORE HOLISTICALLY, THIS MIXED NATURE OF ASSESSMENT REPORTS HAVE BEEN BENEFICAL.

IT IS ALSO VITAL TO IDENTIFY AND DEFINE THE TIMING OF THESE REPORTS. IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO DEFINE THE TIMING AND AGREE ON THE SCOPE BY THE GOVERNMENTS AT THE VERY BEGINNING OF THE ASSESSMENT CYCLE. THIS WILL ALLOW SPACE TO INCLUDE THE NEW AND IMMERRING ISSUE IN THE REPORTING.

WE DO NOT FORSEE THAT ANY ADDITIONAL FASTTRACK PRODUCTS OR REPORTS COULD BE ACCOMODATED WITHIN SHORT 5 YEAR CYCLE. GIVEN THE IMMENSE TASK ALREADY TO THE AUTHOURS, THE CURRENT PROCEDURE OF REPORTING THROUGH SPECIAL REPORTS CAN ACCOMMODATE AND RESPOND TO THE EMERGING SCIENCE AND POLICYMAKERS DEMANDS.

IPCC METHODOLOGY REPORTS ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES NEEDS TO BE CONTINUED. THIS GUIDLINE HAS BEEN THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES WITHIN THE UNFCCC ON REPORTING THE GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES OF THE PARTIES. WE FEEL THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO PREPARE THESE METHODOLOGY REPORTS AND KEEPS REVISING THE GUIDELINES SO THAT THE GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES ARE REPORTED UNDER AN AGREED COHERENT SET OF GUIDELINES.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

THROUGHOUT THE HISTORY OF CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE IPCC, THE CURRENT FORMATION OF THE WORKING GROUPS, TASK FORCE GROUPS AND THE TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNITS SEEMS TO BE A STABLE, EFFECTIVE AND AN MOST CONSTRUCTIVE WAY OF CONDUCTING THE WORK OF IPCC. THE TIMELY FASHION OF DELIVERY OF THE REPORTS AND OUTCOMES ENROUTE FOR THE AR5 ARE CLEAR INDICATIONS THAT THIS IS AN EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT WORKING STRUCTURE. WE SUPPORT TO MAINTAIN THIS STRUCTURE IN THE FUTURE.

THE WG 1, 2 AND 3 HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN DELIVERING THEIR RESPECTIVE MANDATES ON PHYSICAL SCIENCES, VULNERABILITY ASSESMENTS WITH THE ADAPTIVE AND THE MITIGATION OPTIONS. THE CURRENT WORKING STRUCTURE HAS MADE THEM TO INTEGRATE AND WORKOUT THE INTER-LINKAGES THE CROSS CUTTING ISSUES OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE VARIOUS SECTORS.

THE TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES (TFI) HAS PLAYED A PIVOTAL ROLE AS AN INTERNATIONAL BODY IN FORMULATING THE NECESSARY METHODOLOGIES WITH INTERNATIONALLY AGREED STANDARDS FOR THE REPORTING OF NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. THESE PROCEDURES HAS BEEN WIDELY USED BY ALL PARTIES OF THE UNFCCC IN REPORTING THEIR GHG EMISSIONS. SINCE WE ARE ON THE BRINK OF GETTING INTO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL AMENDMENTS, THE ROLE WHICH COULD BE PLAYED BY THE TFI WOULD BE INVALUABLE. THUS IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE MANDATE OF THE TFI BE CONTINUED.

IT IS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED TO MAINTAIN THE CURRENT SIZE OF THE BUREAU. CONTRARY TO THE PREVIOUS BUREAUS, A CLEAR ROLE AND MANDATE HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE CURRENT BUREAU WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RECENT RULES OF PROCEDURES OF THE IPCC. WITH THE DECISION OF PARTICIPATION OF GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES ALONG WITH THE BUREAU MEMBERS AT ITS MEETINGS, INCREASED THE TRANSPARENCY AND OPENED FURTHER AVENUES FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENTS IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES OF THE IPCC. THEREFORE IT IS NOW ACCEPTED THE BUREAU WOULD FUNCTION IN A MORE COHERENT AND TRANSPARENT MANNER.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

IT IS A COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT A NUMBER OF SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES REMAIN MOST VULNERABLE AND THUS THE WORST AFFECTED GROUPS TO THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE. IT IS ALSO KNOWN THAT THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW LACK FAR BEHIND THE DEVELOPING NATIONS, LET ALONE DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. WHILE WE RECOGNIZE AND APPLAUD THE MEASURES IPCC HAS ALREADY TAKEN TO REMEDY THIS DEFICIENCY, WE BELIEVE THAT IPCC SHOULD MAXIMIZE ALL WAYS AND MEANS POSSIBLE TO DEVELOP THEIR NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CAPABILITY IN ORDER TO BRING THEM ABOARD THE PANEL TO MAKE IT MORE INCLUSIVE. THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS WITHOUT THIS CAPABILITY BUILT IN, THEY SIMPLY CANNOT EVEN DETERMINE CLEARLY THE EXTENT OR THE DEGREE OF VULNERABILITY NOR MEANS TO ADDRESS THEM. WE BELIEVE URGENT AND CONCRETE ACTIONS ARE REQUIRED TO MAXIMIZE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.

IN THIS RESPECT, WE BELIEVE THAT SETTING TSUS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND HAVING THE ADEQUATE BALANCE OF SCIENTIEST FROM THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND SMALL ISLAND STATES ARE CRUCIAL IN BUILDING THE TRUST, RECOGNIZING THE THAT THERE ARE WELL ESTABLISHED AND WORLD RENOWNED RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AND UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND SMALL ISLAND STATES. IT IS VITAL TO GIVE AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR THESE INSTITUTIONS.

CURRENTLY IN SELECTING CLAS AND LAS, MOST OF THEM ARE FROM THE DEVELOPED COUNTRIES OR SCIENTISTS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WHO ARE RESIDING IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. AGAIN THIS CREATES AN AMBIGUITY WHEN IT COMES TO THE SELECTION OF THE CORE WRITING TEAM MEMBERS FOR THE SYNTHESIS REPORT. TO AVOID THIS WE NEED TO SELECT CLAS, LAS FROM DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND SMALL ISLAND STATES IN A MORE BALANCED MANNER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT, REGIONAL, GENDER, YOUNG SCIENTISTS. THIS WOULD HELP IPCC TO BRING IN WEALTH OF LITERATURE AND EXPERIENCE INTO THE REPORTS FROM THE FIRST HAND OF THE DEVELOPING AND SMALL ISLAND STATES.

THERE ARE SEVERAL INCOUNTRY PROGRAMS SUCH AS VULNERABILITY ASSESMENT WHERE EXPERT ASSISTNACE ARE HIGHLY NEEDED IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND SMALL ISLAND STATES AS THEY DON'T HAVE THE IN-HOUSE CAPACITY. IN SUCH CASES IPCC SECRETATIAT COULD PROVIDE THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OF SENDING EXPERTS TO THESE COUNTRIES.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

WE DO NOT AGREE TO HAVE A PARALLEL PROCESS PLAYING THE ROLE OF IPCC AS THIS WILL DUPLICATE THE EFFORT AND WOULD BE A WASTE OF SCARECE RESOURCES AND TIME IN OUR ENDEAVOUR TO ADAPT AND MITIGATE THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE. IN ADDITION, THIS WILL LEAD TO FRAGMENTATION AND LOSING THE COHERANCE AND CREDIBILITY OF SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS. WE ARE CONFIDENT WITH THE CALIBER AND CAPACITY OF THE IPCC AS THE LEADING SCIENTIFIC BODY PROVIDING EVIDENCE AND GUIDANCE IN THE CLIMATE CHANGE ARENA.

COUNTRY: MALI

Mali proposals for future IPCC

The various IPCC reports show more the relevance of the IPCC to improve knowledge on climate, its impact on the socio-economic development and identify appropriate control measures.

Therefore the Mali offers for future IPCC :

- Establish a working group to assess gaps and areas not covered during the 25 years past of the IPCC, especially during the fifth assessment report.
- Continue and maintain the IPCC as an intergovernmental organization
- Keep the working groups of the IPCC and the TSU . However, it would be rational to combine the three working groups in two thematic groups (Climate Change and its impacts group and mitigation and adaptation group). Both groups will have to meet the requirements of the Convention.
- Continue development of IPCC reports at intervals of 7 years ;
- Develop the sixth report of the IPCC in 2020 to strengthen the implementation of the new agreement under the Convention in 2020;
- Strengthen communication strategy , including the level of developing countries;
- Support and develop more specific models for regions to strengthen simulations and data availability ;
- Promote and strengthen the involvement of scientists from developing countries and industrial and users in the IPCC process ;
- Strengthen adaptation and vulnerability measures, especially for developing countries.

Propositions du Mali pour le futur du GIEC

Les différents rapports du GIEC montrent de plus en plus la pertinence des activités du GIEC pour améliorer la connaissance sur le climat, ses impacts sur le développement socio-économique et identifier les mesures de lutte appropriées.

Par conséquent le Mali propose pour le futur du GIEC de :

- Mettre en place un groupe de travail afin d'évaluer les lacunes et les aspects non couverts cours des 25 ans du GIEC, notamment pendant le 5^{ème} rapport d'évaluation.
- Poursuivre et de maintenir le GIEC en tant que organisation intergouvernementale
- Maintenir les différents groupes de travail du GIEC ainsi que les TSU. Cependant, il serait rationnel de regrouper les trois groupes de travail en deux groupes thématiques (le groupe Evolution du climat et ses impacts et le groupe atténuation et adaptation). Ces deux groupes vont devoir répondre aux besoins de la Convention.
- Poursuivre l'élaboration des rapports du GIEC avec une périodicité de 7ans ;
- Elaborer le 6^{ème} rapport du GIEC pour 2020 afin de renforcer la mise en œuvre du nouvel accord prévu par la convention en 2020 ;
- Renforcer la stratégie de communication, notamment au niveau des pays en développement ;
- Appuyer et développer des modelés plus spécifiques pour les régions afin de renforcer les simulations et la disponibilité des données ;
- Favoriser et renforcer l'implication des scientifiques des pays en développement, des industriels et des usagers dans le processus du GIEC ;
- Renforcer les actions d'adaptation et de vulnérabilité, notamment pour les pays en développement.

Birama DIARRA
Directeur des Applications Météorologiques et Climatologiques
Point focal IPCC
Mali

COUNTRY: MEXICO

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/>.

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

- Emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

- Enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Propose more effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Propose ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature, but keep grey literature as a valuable source of information, especially to address research in developing countries.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

D. Other matters

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations, such as CBD, UNCCD, WSFS

COUNTRY: NETHERLANDS

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

THE NETHERLANDS IS PLEASED TO PRESENT ITS VIEWS ON THE FUTURE OF THE IPCC. BEFORE GOING INTO PRODUCTS, STRUCTURE AND MODUS OPERANDI, IMPROVING PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND OTHER MATTERS, WE LIKE TO REFLECT ON THE MERITS OF THE IPCC THAT REMAIN ROBUST, CHANGES IN THE USER COMMUNITY OF IPCC PRODUCTS AND THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT MAY ARISE FROM THESE CHANGES.

THE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES THAT THE IPCC WILL DECIDE TO PROVIDE IN THE FUTURE NEED TO DETERMINE ITS ORGANISATION AND MODUS OPERANDI. WE FEEL IT WOULD BE UNPRODUCTIVE TO DISCUSS THE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE BUREAU, AND ARE CONFORTABLE WITH NOT CHANGING IT AS WE BELIEVE IT MAY SUPPORT THE CREATION OF THE FULL RANGE OF PRODUCTS AND SERVICES THAT IPCC MAY PROVIDE.

THE IPCC ASSESSMENT MODEL IS SEEN AS IN ESSENCE A GOOD MODEL FOR WHAT IT WAS SET UP TO DO AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL. THIS IS ALSO WHY OTHER ORGANISATIONS, SUCH AS IPBES, CLOSELY STUDY THIS MODEL WHEN SETTING UP THEIR OWN ASSESSMENT PROCESSES. PRINCIPALLY, IPCC PRODUCTS ARE USED TO UNDERPIN GLOBAL CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS AND IN THIS RESPECT THE IPCC IS GENERALLY REGARDED AS A GREAT SUCCESS. IPCC REPORTS STILL COMMAND RESPECT GLOBALLY AND HAVE UNIVERSAL BUY IN, STANDING AS THEY DO FOR A COMPREHENSIVE, TRANSPARENT AND OPEN APPROACH. THERE IS AN GREAT VALUE IN IPCC REPORTS, BOTH THE COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS AND THE SPECIAL REPORTS. DIFFERENT AUDIENCES MAKE USE OF IPCC REPORTS, EITHER THE SUMMARIES FOR POLICYMAKERS OR INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS, BUT EACH AUDIENCE DOES SO IN ITS OWN UNIQUE WAY.

INFORMING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ABOUT THE SCALE OF THE PROBLEM AND THE AVAILABILITY OF SOLUTIONS AND PROVIDING LEGITIMACY FOR NATIONAL CLIMATE POLICIES REMAIN CRUCIAL FUNCTIONS IN THE FUTURE AND THESE MUST NOT BE DISCONTINUED. HOWEVER, DEMANDS ON THE IPCC TO PROVIDE MORE TRANSPARENT, FOCUSED AND UP-TO-DATE ASSESSMENTS WILL ONLY INCREASE OVER TIME, AS THE TECHNICAL ABILITIES OF AUDIENCES TO OBTAIN INFORMATION WILL GROW, AND THE NEED TO INCLUDE KNOWLEDGE ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS MANAGEMENT IN LOCAL DECISION MAKING BECOMES MORE URGENT. PEOPLE WILL WANT TO ACCESS IPCC PRODUCTS IN A VARIETY OF WAYS, NOT ONLY THROUGH DIFFERENT ELECTRONIC MODALITIES, SUCH AS THROUGH MOBILE PHONE APPLICATIONS AND INTERACTIVE INTERNET, BUT ALSO THROUGH DIFFERENT PRESENTATIONS OF THE SAME DATA, SUCH AS DATA FILES, TEXT FILES, STATIC FIGURES, TABLES, INFOGRAPHICS AND CINEMATIGRAPHIC MATERIAL.

THERE IS A GROWING DEMAND FOR INFORMATION THAT CAN SUPPORT LOCAL DECISIONS. CLIMATE IS USUALLY NOT THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO CONSIDER FOR NATIONAL AND LOCAL DECISION MAKERS. GIVEN THAT THEY OFTEN DO NOT HAVE ROBUST INFORMATION ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE AT THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVEL, THERE IS A REAL RISK THAT PEOPLE RELY ON THEIR OWN INTERPRETATIONS OF IPCC WGI INFORMATION, WHICH IN SOME CASES HAS PROVEN TO BE SERIOUSLY WRONG. THE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES FOR THE IPCC SPECIAL REPORT ON MANAGING THE RISKS OF EXTREME EVENTS AND DISASTERS TO ADVANCE CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION (SREX), WHICH WERE BASED ON REGIONAL SUMMARIES, SUCCESSFULLY DELIVERED DECISION-RELEVANT INFORMATION TO DIFFERENT REGIONS. THERE IS A STRONG MISMATCH BETWEEN THE NEED FOR TAILORED LOCALISED CLIMATE INFORMATION AND WHAT THE WMO IS AT PRESENT ABLE TO DELIVER IN THE CONTEXT OF ITS GLOBAL FRAMEWORK FOR CLIMATE SERVICES. EXPERT ASSESSMENTS ON CLIMATE CHANGE CAN BE MAINSTREAMED IN STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING AS SOON AS THE RELATION TO RISK IS CLARIFIED. IF THERE IS A FRAMEWORK IN PLACE OF DECISION MAKING ON RISKS, SPECIALISTS' ADVICE CAN READILY BE INCLUDED IN SCENARIO-BASED STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING.

IPCC WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THIS TAILORED LOCALISED CLIMATE INFORMATION, NOR CAN IT PROVIDE INFORMATION ON OPTIMIZED POLICIES AND MEASURES FOR INDIVIDUAL DECISION MAKERS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS AND IN DIFFERENT SOCIETAL ROLES. WE THINK THAT THERE IS GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE IPCC TO FURTHER THE PRODUCTION OF LOCALISED INTEGRATED DECISION SUPPORT INFORMATION HOWEVER. THIS COULD BE DONE BY:

- CREATING AN EASY TO USE AND OPEN ACCESS DATA FACILITY, THAT INCLUDES ALL THAT IS USED IN MAKING IPCC ASSESSMENT REPORTS,
- CREATING AND ALLOWING USERS TO DEVELOP AND APPLY DATA SELECTION AND INTEGRATION TOOLS,
- DESCRIBING METHODOLOGIES AND BEST-PRACTICES FOR DOING ASSESSMENTS,
- INCLUDING THE RELATION RISK,
- TRAINING AND ACCREDITING PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS PERFORMING CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS,

- CONSULTING WITH UN AND OTHER ORGANISATIONS ON HOW TO MAKE MAKE AVAILABLE NECESSARY INFORMATION NOT FROM IPCC.

NOW WE RETURN TO THE ASPECTS PERTAINING THE FUTURE PRODUCTS OF IPCC.

LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD, TYPES OF ASSESMENT, TIMING, SYNTHESIS, FAST TRACK PRODUCTS
IF THE DATA FACILITY AND THE DATA SELECTION AND INTERGRATION TOOLS WOULD BE AVAILABLE, OUR ASSESSMENT IS THAT THERE WOULD BE LIMITED USE FOR COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENTS. SHORT SYNTHESIS REPORTS AND UPDATES ON CLIMATE SCIENCE COULD BE PRODUCED EVERY TWO OR THREE YEARS OR ON REQUEST BY UNFCCC. SPECIAL REPORTS MAY BE PRODUCED ON AREAS IN WHICH KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPED RAPIDLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH PARTNERS THAT HAVE EXPERTISE THAT IS LACKING IN IPCC. THE OPTIMAL LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD WOULD THUS BECOMES A GOVERNANCE ISSUE, AND WE WOULD BE CONFORTABLE WITH A PERIOD OF 4 TO 6 YEARS.

METHODOLOGY REPORTS

WE SEE GREAT MERIT IN DEVELOPING METHODOLOGIES FOR DOING DIFFERENT TYPES OF ASSESMENT, TO ENSURE QUALITY AND COMPARABILITY. THESE METHODOLOGIES WOULD NEED TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE POTENTIAL USERS OF THESE METHODOLOGIES.

READABILITY

FUTURE ASSESSMENTS SHOULD TAKE A MUCH MORE READABLE FORM THAN THE CURRENT SPMS THAT ARE HARD TO READ. WE WOULD SUGGEST TO INVOLVE COMMUNICATION SPECIALISTS AND INTERACTION WITH THE USERS EARLY ON IN THE WRITING PROCESS FOR THE SUMMARIES. THIS WOULD ALSO ENTAIL THE USE OF FOCUS GROUPS FOR THE FIGURES: IT SHOULD BE CHECKED WHETHER READERS SEE THE SAME THINGS IN THE FIGURES AS WAS INTENDED BY THE AUTHORS.

LATEST INSIGHTS

WE CONSIDER THE STATIC CONTENT OFFERED BY THE IPCC INCAPABLE OF CATERING ALL THE DIFFERENT NEEDS OF THE VARIOUS AUDIENCES. A WEB-BASED DYNAMIC MODEL COULD BE FREQUENTLY UPDATED AS THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY FEELS A CHANGE NEEDS TO BE MADE. A WEB-BASED DYNAMIC MODEL COULD ALSO FACILITATE A HIGH LEVEL OF TRANSPARENCY, IN WHICH IT WOULD TAKE MUCH LESS EFFORT FOR USERS TO GET TO THE SOURCES OF STATEMENTS AND DATA (INCLUDING DATA BEHIND FIGURES). TAILORED PORTALS COULD BE ADDED THAT CATER TO DIFFERENT SPECIFIC USER GROUPS. FURTHER THOUGHT HAS TO BE PUT INTO HOW THE FILTERING AND REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD TAKE PLACE IN THIS MODEL.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

As expressed above, structure and modus operandi should result from the products and services that IPCC will perform. It would be counterproductive to devote attention to these aspect before the discussion on the products and services is concluded. We are not in the position to assess proposals now, and would be happy to leave the structure as it is today, although we do not object taking up this question after concluding on the products and services either.

There are limits to what the IPCC can do. There is no appetite for revolution or to become more engaged in national or local specifics. However, there is a recognition of the need to evolve if the IPCC is to retain its global standing. An ecology of institutions should work together to deliver the information that different user communities need. The IPCC could be better connected to other organisations, and tailor its information to other assessment activities.

The Taskforce on Emission Inventory Reporting is to continue its work in the future, although the users should be consulted to ensure the practicability of the methodologies.

There is merit in combining risk assessment, adaptation and mitigation in one working group, as well as combining the climate system and impacts on natural systems. However, increased across-working group cooperation will be necessary in the future regardless of the delineation of the working groups.

Different set-ups for TSUs may be workable. TSU that are hosted by the Developed Country that nominated the co-chair suffer from a lack in continuity. Experience is essential in organising author meetings and adoption sessions

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

To enhance developing country participation in the IPCC, others could first of all stimulate an increased size and quality of the national research base vis-à-vis climate change in developing countries. This involves setting up collaborations between developed and developing country institutions. The IPCC can help in expanding the group of experts available for participation in the IPCC by building capacity for performing climate-change assessments and the associated writing tasks. Such capacity building is also needed for facilitating regional, national and local assessments which can make use of improved IPCC products. Furthermore, the establishment of joint TSUs, which are shared between developed and developing country Working Group/Task Force co-chairs, could be another way to address the present unbalance in the involvement of developing countries in the production of the IPCC reports. Finally, resources could be sought to disclose literature from other languages than English.

IPCC could partner with academic institutions to provide training in climate assessment (e.g., through summerschools), using training manuals and a system of accreditation. This would also facilitate translating IPCC findings to other venues. Both adaptation and mitigation solutions could be included, which require different practical hand-on protocols, assessment methods and decision tools (e.g. risk profiles; economic appraisal tools; finance tools; methodology for producing mitigation road maps; portfolio management for adaptation and mitigation). Note that this is not similar to copying the IPCC assessment model (studying peer-reviewed literature), which works fine for the global scale, to the national or local scale: other assessment tools will be needed and should be included in the methodological toolbox offered by the IPCC.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

Significant gaps in the knowledge exist on climate impacts and adaptation. This knowledge is still undergoing stepwise development involving an increasing number of disciplines. In particular a knowledge gap is observed vis-à-vis the issue of loss and damage related to climate change. There are also major gaps in the knowledge on transitions, that is, on how sociotechnical transitions work, the study of which involves many disciplines and is still under development.

Even though the remit of the IPCC is only to do large-scale assessment and not to do large-scale research, the assessment model can also be used to identify gaps in the knowledge base. This of course requires a significant intellectual effort.

We emphasized that many of our views were already expressed in our previous submission, though some have not been repeated here.

COUNTRY: NORWAY

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

WHEN CONSIDERING THIS QUESTION ON WHAT TYPES OF PRODUCTS IPCC SHOULD FOCUS THEIR EFFORTS ON IN THE FUTURE WE HAVE KEPT IN MIND THAT IPCC IS A WELL ESTABLISHED ORGANISATION THAT HAS A UNIQUE POSITION IN THE WORLD, BOTH IN SCIENTIFIC AND END-USER COMMUNITIES (ESP. AMONG POLICYMAKERS). IN BROAD WE WANT TO KEEP THE PRODUCTS AS THEY ARE. BUT, WE THINK THAT THE PROSESS IN BETWEEN ARS COULD BE BETTER UTILIZED AND USED FOR THE SRS, AND THAT NEW FAST TRACK PRODUCTS OR UPDATES COULD BE CONSIDERED.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE THE ALREADY HUGE CHALLENGES, EFFORTS AND WORKLOAD THE INVOLVED SCIENTISTS IN THE DIFFERENT REPORTS CARRY. WE BELIEVE THAT IT MIGHT BE DIFFICULT TO DECREASE THIS EFFORT AND WORKLOAD, BUT ORGANISATIONAL MEASURES CAN BE TAKEN TO MINIMISE LOGISTICAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONSTRAINS FOR THE SCIENTISTS. IF BOTH THE IPCC SECRETARIAT AND TSUS WERE STRENGTHENED WITH RESPECT TO IT, COMMUNICATION AND SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT WE BELIEVE THAT THE SCIENTISTS INVOLVED WOULD FIND THAT THEY GET MORE IN RETURN FOR THEIR EFFORTS.

ONE IMPORTANT CHALLENGE WITH THE REPORTS AS THEY CURRENTLY ARE PRODUCED IS TO COMMUNICATE THE MAIN MESSAGES FROM THE REPORTS. GIVEN THE AMOUNT OF WORK THE WRITING TEAMS INVEST IN THE REPORTS AND THE COMPLEXITY IN THE SPMS WE FEEL THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR ANOTHER EVEN MORE AGGREGATED LEVEL THAN CURRENTLY PROVIDED. WGI DID A VERY GOOD EFFORT IN THE AR5 WITH THEIR "TWO-PAGER" WITH CLEAR AND CONCISE KEY FINDINGS. IT SEEMS THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR SUCH A PRODUCT FOR ALL REPORTS, AND IN OUR OPINION THIS APPROACH SHOULD BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND INCLUDED AS A STANDARD PROSEDURE FOR SPMS IN THE FUTURE.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE PRODUCTION OF SRS SHOULD BE STARTED EARLIER THAN IN THE FIFTH ASSESSMENT CYCLE, AND THAT AT LEAST ONE SR NEEDS TO BE PUBLISHED EARLY IN THE CYCLE (WITHIN 2 YEARS AFTER THE NEW BUREAU IS ELECTED). THE PROSESS FOR IDENTIFYING RELEVANT TOPICS AND SCOPING SHOULD BE IN PARALLELL WITH THE PROSESS OF ELECTING A NEW BUREAU SO THAT THE WRITING PROCESS CAN START JUST AFTER. WE BELIEVE THAT 2-3 SRS IN AN ASSESSMENT CYCLE IS OK. THE TOPICS OF THE SRS SHOULD BE POLICYRELEVANT AND SUFFICIENTLY COMPLEX AND WITH JOINT EFFORT FROM SEVERAL WGS (AS WAS DONE WITH SUCCESS FOR SREX).

THE FOCUS ON CASE STUDIES, AS WITH A SEPARATE CHAPTER THAT WAS INTRODUCED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THE SREX OR AS IT IS DONE IN SOME OF THE AR5 WG-REPORTS, IS ALSO AN EXAMPLE OF A NEW APPROACH THAT WE APPRICIATE AND THAT SHOUD BE CONSIDERED IN FUTURE PRODUCTS. THIS COULD ALSO ADDRESS REGIONAL ISSUES.

ARS AND SRS SHOULD IN GENERAL BE FOCUSED ON POLICY RELEVANT ISSUES WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON NEW, EMERGING SCIENTIFIC RESULTS. TEXTBOOK TYPE OF SECTIONS COULD BE REDUCED.

THE SYNTHESIS REPORT IS VERY IMPORTANT AND SHOULD AS FAR AS POSSIBLE BE MADE AS A REAL SYNTHESIS.

WE BELIEVE IT SHOUD BE CONSIDERED IF IT CAN BE MADE A SHORTER UPDATE-REPORT OF THE ARS IN THE MIDDEL OF THE ASSESSMENT CYCEL SPECIALY FOR WGI AND WGII FOCUSING THE MOST RELEVANT ISSUES AND INCLUDING NEW LITTERATURE PUBLISHED AFTER ONE AR IS FINISHED.

THE IPCC SHOULD CONTINUE TO PREPARE METHODOLOGY REPORTS (MRS) ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES, AND THE TWO REPORTS PUBLISHED IN 2013 ARE GOOD EXAMPLES THAT IPCC ADAPTS TO USER NEEDS AND ARE PRODUCING COMPREHENSIVE AND RELEVANT MRS IN A RELATIVELY SHORT TIME.

IN THE NEXT ASSESSMENT IT COULD BE CONSIDERED TO SEPARATE THE CUT-OFF DATES FOR LITTERATURE, DEADLINES AND LAUNCHING/PUBLISHING OF THE DIFFERENT WG REPORTS MORE IN TIME. AT THE SAME TIME IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THIS DOES NOT DELAY THE FINAL LAUNCH OF THE SYR. THEREFORE IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO START THE WORK ON WGI EARLY.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

In general we are satisfied with the way IPCC and its WGs are organised, but the organisation can benefit from strengthening key positions/functions to focus on policy relevant topics without compromising the scientific quality, balance and credibility and to ensure that IPCC are in continuous operation also when a new Bureau take over for the existing one.

The communication activities have been considerably improved the last years, but still, it is our view that the IPCC secretariat should be strengthened, especially with respect to further develop the already established and well-functioning communication services.

The cooperation between the different WGs can be further improved, and the SREX report is an example on how this can be done in the future. To ensure cooperation and consistency across the different WGs it is important that some authors in the AR are involved in several WG reports. And that authors in a WG report should also be encouraged to review and comment on the other WG reports, this would also ensure more consistency and correct use of results.

It needs to be established a formal process to provide a TSU for the Synthesis report.

An alternative approach to the current organisation of TSUs might be to have a more continuous or permanent organisation structure and decouple the TSUs from the election of Co-chairs. We believe this could ensure a better solution in between assessment cycles, provide more efficient operation, ensure transition of knowledge, improve organisational memory and probably stimulate to more interaction and cooperation between the IPCC secretariat and the TSUs.

We believe that the establishment of Ad Hoc Task Groups has been successful and that this could be used more in the future, maybe also for identification of possible topics for SRs etc.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

We think it should not be more TSUs than there are WGs, but TSUs in the future could be co-hosted between both developed and developing countries under a common leadership. Financial issues will need to be sorted out, and maybe the IPCC Thrust fund could contribute with support to the part of a TSU situated in a developing country, while the part of a TSU in a developed country could be financed in the same manner as today. This would ensure that more resources are made available for the scientists from developing countries, and would also be a contribution to capacity building.

We believe that making information and communication material easier accessible for focal points in developing countries and countries with economies in transition would be a vital step forward to increase publicity for IPCC products in such countries. This is elaborated further under question D.

Increase the financial support to Co-chairs and authors (CLA, LA, and RE) from developing countries (f. ex. Lower-Middle-Income and Low-Income countries), so that not only their travel expenses are covered, but also need for additional assistance etc., could be considered supported from the IPCC Thrust fund.

Resources could be sought to hire translators in order to be able to include more relevant literature from other languages than English.

Continue to motivate and stimulate industrialised countries to support outreach activities in developing countries and in countries with economies in transition as it was done for SREX.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

Communication of key results and main findings from the different reports is an essential part of what the IPCC needs to further develop for its future work. The measures already taken to strengthen the IPCC secretariat on this crucial matter are good, but we believe it is needed to further strengthen the IPCC secretariat and also ensure that the TSUs has available resources with skills in how to edit reports in an understandable way and to make good graphical material. It is important that the IPCC communication strategy should be implemented and anchored from an early stage of the writing process of reports, and should be reflected in the work on all levels (Bureau, ExCom, Secretariat, WG TSUs, and authors).

The IPCC should create and maintain a system to make it easier to share communication materials that are based on their material but produced by other parties. Such products would need to be quality checked, but we believe this would make more material available for IPCC focal points and give them a better basis to do efficient outreach for the IPCC in their countries.

IPCC should also make high resolution versions of the SPM figures and the standard presentations available for focal points already when the SPM is launched and published. Such products would increase focal points ability to create national events back-to-back with IPCC press conferences and also help to create more publicity for the IPCC products in other countries. The initiative taken to make informative movies to the AR5 WG reports is very much appreciated. It would be good if such films could be translated to UN languages, and focal points could be encouraged to translate to their own language.

The IPCC should consider to create a group (with both scientists and representatives from some governments) to identify candidates/scientists/experts that could be nominated as CLA, LA, and RE in the production of future reports. This group could be a supplement in addition to the already established procedure that experts are nominated by focal points etc. But we believe that such a group with scientists involved would have a very good comprehensive overview of relevant experts/scientist. Such a group or a search committee could have a special focus on identification of relevant scientists from developing countries and from countries with economies in transition, and thus improve nominations.

IPCC could exploit pre-policy analyses of audiences and user groups, as part of the scoping.

Country: SAUDI ARABIA

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's responses are as following in regard to questions that have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

- *What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period*

Assessment period length shall be full cycle timing i.e. 5 years period as Assessment Reports are reliable, comprehensive and independently reviewed (three-tier) products.

- *Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the "Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers" (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)*

Emphasis shall remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports supplemented with occasional Special Reports since Assessment Reports and occasional Special Reports are reliable, comprehensive and independently reviewed products.

Assessment Reports shall be comprehensive in nature and receive three-tiers of review process. Moreover, there is a need to involve more experts, reviewers and authors from different regions and from developing countries in particular. Regional issues should also be highlighted within these reports on issues such as desertification, water issues and sea level rise etc.

Thematic Reports (Special Reports) must be limited to very specific topics if relevant and must have short cycles. These reports should be informative in nature to very specific topics through technical short-cycles reports if relevant. They should also focus on specific issues such as desertification, water issues, coastal zones, sea level rise etc.

- *Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period*

IPCC should refrain from producing thematic assessments in parallel with Assessment Reports as it may overlap engagement by scientists and results/outcome may vary.

- *Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period*

Optimal timing of preparation of reports shall be full cycle i.e. 5 years as this will ensure three-tier independent reviews in order to be verified for being reliable and comprehensive.

- *What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports*

Role of synthesis report shall be to convey messages from Assessment Reports outcomes to the policy makers in making policy decisions. Scope of Synthesis Reports shall be covering all issues from the Assessment Reports. Timing of synthesis report shall be well planned as it shapes along the way to produce final Assessment Reports.

- *Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures*

IPCC shall not produce frequent fast track products as it may jeopardize IPCC's unique position in preparing comprehensive Assessment Reports that conform to three-tier review process. Special Reports could be produced along with Assessment Reports as these could assist understanding and decision making on emerging issues.

Even though a large time gap exists between every assessment, the special reports, thematic reports or fast track reports should be informative in nature. Indeed the IPCC's unique position remains in providing scientific evidence influences long-term policies.

- *Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories*

IPCC may involve preparing Methodology Reports on national GHG inventories as these are useful for countries where no such data are available.

- *Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics*

With IPCC's capacity on methodology, IPCC may prepare Methodology Reports on relevant topics such as mitigation and adaptation measures.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

- *Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups*

Current structure of WGs (with three WGs I, II, and III) is adequate. However, balance shall be between developing and developed countries and regional groups.

- *Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs*

Enhance cooperation could include: joint meeting, joint workshops, cross WGs collaboration at various levels of engagement i.e. between Authors, Co-Authors to Co-Chairs level on various topics.

Enhancing cooperation shall focus on consistency i.e. using a common database and datasets during assessment.

- *Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters*

Cross-cutting issues often less focused in Assessment Reports as less detail of cross-cutting issues are covered in the Assessment Reports. However, some cross-cutting issues require special attention for example, climate financing, response measures, emerging issues – loss & damage, extreme vulnerable regions, biodiversity, desertification, water issues, coastal zone and sea level rise. These issues may cover by producing Special Reports focusing on cross-cutting issue and by engaging cross WGs scientists.

- *Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions*

Number of bureau members:

Number of Bureau Members from Asia region shall be increased by at least 2 in IPCC Bureau. This is due to that Asia not only has a large number of countries and various sub-regions but it also bears complex situation that involved various interest and different national circumstances.

The Asian regions contains the most populated countries and hold unique characteristics such as containing both developed and developing countries, containing different regions and sub-regions and each with their own unique characteristics and interests. For example, Asia region include developed countries like Japan and South Korea and developing countries like China, India and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia etc.

Vice Chairs of WGs should be given more responsibility especially to outreach within their respective regions.

- *Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi*

Based on adjustments in composition of Bureau, Executive Committee shall be adjusted – its composition, terms of reference and modus operandi.

Executive Committee shall be balanced in terms of regional groupings and developing and developed countries.

Current mandate of Executive Committee is adequate and fulfilling the tasks that's why it was established.

- *Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature*

IPCC can maintain a central database with all literatures as they become available. This will also ensure developing country scientists to use the common database source as central resource center. In this way, IPCC can take a leading role as information source.

Representation of literatures in IPCC review assessment shall be balanced sourcing from both developed and developing countries.

- *Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)*

TSU is always hosted by a country and not by an Intergovernmental entity such as IPCC. In order to avoid the risk of having the host country's influence, the TSU should be held by IPCC. This would guarantee equal authority, responsibility and engagement by Co-Chairs, which shall be treated equally by TSU.

TSU (Technical Support Unit) appears to be dominated by host country as it bears high risks to express views by host country. In order to avoid such impartiality risks, TSU shall not be with Co-Chair's host country.

TSU shall be comprised by both Developing and Developed Country Institutes. TSU shall be managed by Secretariat and under the IPCC Chair. Direct management shall be with two Co-Chairs.

Financing shall be sourced from several countries and shall be managed and coordinated by the Secretariat.

Developing country institution as part of TSU shall be sponsored by Developed countries.

Developing country institution (as part of TSU) shall get finance and contribution directly. This will assist capacity building in developing countries.

- *Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs*

Change should include a balanced representation between developed and developing country Parties as well as an unbiased platform to perform in.

TSU (Technical Support Unit) appears to be dominated by host country as it bears high risks to express views by host country. In order to avoid such impartiality risks, TSU shall not be with Co-Chair's host country.

TSU shall be comprised by both Developing and Developed Country Institutes. TSU shall be managed by Secretariat and under the IPCC Chair. Direct management shall be with two Co-Chairs.

Financing shall be sourced from several countries and shall be managed and coordinated by the Secretariat.

Developing country institution as part of TSU shall be sponsored by Developed countries.

Developing country institution (as part of TSU) shall get finance and contribution directly. This will assist capacity building in developing countries.

Other governance and administrative matters include: strengthening the role of WG Vice-Chairs via consulting and involving them thoroughly in the selection of authors, reviewers etc.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

- *Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting and hosting of TSUs in developing countries)*

TSU (Technical Support Unit) appears to be dominated by host country as it bears high risks to express views by host country. In order to avoid such impartiality risks, TSU shall not be with Co-Chair's host country.

TSU shall be comprised by both Developing and Developed Country Institutes. TSU shall be managed by Secretariat and under the IPCC Chair. Direct management shall be with two Co-Chairs.

Financing shall be sourced from several countries and shall be managed and coordinated by the Secretariat.

Developing country institution as part of TSU shall be sponsored by Developed countries.

Developing country institution (as part of TSU) shall get finance and contribution directly. This will assist capacity building in developing countries.

This step can be achieved by providing them with proper background and legal advice on the IPCC process. They should be included in governing manual and all aspects of the WGs as well as any other meetings, bodies and units.

- *Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)*

Enhance financial support through IPCC Secretariat to developing country Bureau Members and authors (CLA, LA, RE).

Provide supports (accessibility to literatures via accessing several databases). If TSU is being located in universities, a formal arrangement could be initiated with universities to receive complementary access of several databases.

IPCC can maintain a central database with all literatures as they become available. This will also ensure developing country scientists to use the common database source as central resource center. In this way, IPCC can take a leading role as information source.

The support should be in administrative, financial and technical form.

- *Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions*

Training for the expert and staffs working for Bureau Members and financial support to Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries to enhance collaboration for example with regional scientific agencies, MoU with developed and developing country institutions and joint workshops.

As a first step, they should be able to access all materials containing information specific to their regions. Hence, they should be provided by packages underlining the main literatures and sources as well as providing them with access to the authors and respective agencies.

- *Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English*

Literature other than in English shall also be included in the database as being maintained by IPCC. Indigenous information and literature other than English shall be given higher priorities when citing specific examples. Selected authors could be asked to serve as contributing author in order to reflect outcome from such literatures.

IPCC can maintain a central database with all literatures as they become available and shall be accessible by developing country authors. A central database can be

maintained by IPCC in order to use unified database for assessment. This will ensure harmonized information in all WGs assessment reports.

Government reports, studies/reports from universities and papers/reports on climate change from specialized institutes in developing countries shall be dealt likewise from developed countries.

IPCC should consider providing all literatures in the main languages of the UN (English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and the Russian).

- *Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts*

Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries to enhance collaboration for example with regional scientific agencies and interest groups via dialogue and expert meetings and facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts.

Call for contributing authors and experts to provide review comments shall be facilitated by Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries.

- *Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English*

Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries shall play important coordination and information dissemination role in order to encourage developing country experts to engage expert review of IPCC reports.

IPCC shall acknowledge government reports and literature published in other than English language from developing countries. UN-based language service could assist in translating such documents. Authors of such literature could be approached to provide expert opinion or specific inputs on relevant topics.

- *Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data*

A centralized database shall be maintained by IPCC. IPCC shall coordinate with national governments and international agencies to contribute creating centralized inventory systems. Gaps in data shall be identified as part of IPCC's database management and shall coordinate with respective agencies to build database.

- *Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity*

IPCC could initiate leading cooperation role with several regional institutes in developing countries, funding agencies and developed country partners with identified developing countries scientists/experts and respective institutions.

IPCC with support from member countries can initiate exchange research program/visits by developing country scientists/experts in TSU or relevant institutions and IPCC Secretariat.

Bureau Members and Vice Chairs of WGs from developing countries shall play important coordination and information dissemination role in order to identify such possibility with developing countries.

- *Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Program*

IPCC could initiate leading cooperation role with several regional institutes in developing countries, funding agencies and developed country partners with identified developing countries scientists/experts and respective institutions.

IPCC with support from member countries can initiate exchange research program/visits by developing country scientists/experts in TSU/IPCC Secretariat or relevant institutions.

Short visit/guest scientist scheme for developing country scientists by IPCC in coordination with relevant organization/funding agency or governments

D. Other matters

- *Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations*

Cooperation with all UN agencies and other international agencies shall be enhanced. This cooperation could cover accessing database and information and using local premises if such facilities are available particularly in developing countries.

- *Matters related to communication*

IPCC communicates notices and other information particularly via Internet and email systems. Knowing a vast population is still lack of electricity as well as lack of such communication mediums, more target-based communication systems shall be established particularly in developing countries. Examples could be workshops, information dissemination sessions and via printed materials.

- *Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports*

IPCC works/outcomes primarily are used by policy makers. In order to broaden wider use of IPCC work and receiving feedback, IPCC shall be reached to all relevant stakeholders including disseminating IPCC reports as supporting reference. Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries shall play a pivotal role.

COUNTRY: SOUTH AFRICA

SOUTH AFRICAN SUBMISSION ON FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

UNDER THE TASK GROUP ON FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

The Government of South Africa welcomes the opportunity to submit views regarding the future work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) under the newly established Task Group on Future Work of the IPCC.

A. WHAT SHOULD BE THE FUTURE PRODUCTS OF THE IPCC?

The IPCC processes and products address the needs (negotiated during the IPCC scoping process) of the user community (namely Party negotiators and policy makers engaged in the UNFCCC).

This is a far better starting point for assessing where in the current model improvements could be made, rather than the cavalier abandonment and redesign of a model that has developed through 5 successive iterations into one of the most influential, inclusive, comprehensive, error-free and policy-sensitive reports the world has yet seen.

It will be difficult, if not impossible, to establish the IPCC today, especially with regard to its careful approach of reaching a science/policy consensus in its final plenary processes. Such a powerful approach should not be abandoned without very clear justification.

While we see opportunities for improving and streamlining the process, we feel that the radical revisionist view expressed above is informed by a perspective that is overly strongly influenced by the notable advances in the IPCC Working Group 1 (Science of climate change) and possibly Working Group 3 (Mitigation), but ignores the advances that are still required by Working Group 2 (Impacts and adaptation).

The IPCC has not yet been able to provide clear guidance on the level of dangerous climate change, a core need of the UNFCCC Parties, the regional distribution of this threat, and the potential for adaptation. This is because the science of climate impacts and adaptation is in its infancy relative to mitigation and climate science. The IPCC should focus far more strongly on encouraging advancing the technologies and tools of impacts and adaptation assessment, especially through quantified modelling approaches, including the economics of this area of endeavor. Knowledge on impacts and adaptation will be sorely needed over the

next two to three decades at least, and there are substantial international aspects to these that require an IPCC process to address and inform the UNFCCC negotiating process.

This is not to say that Working Group1 has reached fruition. Key questions we now face concern the recent hiatus in atmospheric warming rate and its relationship to solar cycle and internal planetary energy distribution, mainly in the form of oceanic processes. The IPCC should therefore be assessing global scale uncertainties, as well as improving regional and sub-regional scale projections.

Furthermore, there is a need to identify issues that require scoping upfront. The following are areas that require special attention:

- i. The scoping process should consider emerging issues that might be addressed via special reports;
- ii. Assessment of socio-economic impact of identified adaptation or mitigation measures;
- iii. Guidance on monitoring, reporting and verification approaches for adaptation and mitigation measures (responsibility for Task Force Inventory (TFI));
- iv. Guidance from TFI on analysis of GHG emission results in a way that informs policy making especially for developing countries;
- v. The indicators based on science and equity that can be used by policy makers in the assessment of national commitments;

B. WHAT WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE STRUCTURE AND MODUS OPERANDI FOR THE PRODUCTION OF THESE IPCC PRODUCTS?

The current IPCC Working Group structure should be kept because of its approach in giving more weight to understanding climate science; adaptation and mitigation issues in a focused manner, however, TSU should comprise of members from developed and developing countries. There needs to be more emphases on appointing more highly skilled Authors than it is currently the case, which will help to address the problem of responding to dramatic increase in literature because it is a capacity issue that needs to be addressed. To address this capacity issue, Working Group II and III should provide training to young scientists in developing countries on undertaking reviews and full assessments in the future assessment cycle.

To enhance coordination among the Working Groups, there should be a standing agenda item whereby the WGs reports to plenary on integration and cross cutting issues. The structures that have been put in place in response to the IAC review should be maintained and there is no need for new structures.

Before the beginning of the next assessment cycle, there needs to be an assessment by the Working Group Chairs and Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) on the principles and procedures applied in the previous cycles. This assessment needs to be used to revise IPCC principles and procedures for approval by plenary.

C. WAYS TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

There is a clear need to move the Technical Support Units (TSUs) to the developing countries. If this is not possible then the same TSUs should be based in both the developing and developed countries. This will help the developing countries in avoiding brain drainage and will also catalyse research outputs thereby addressing data challenges currently experienced in the developing countries particularly Africa.

D. OTHER MATTERS

We propose a (i) once off quality assurance process of the IPCC and its work after every assessment period and (ii) a special Intergovernmental Task Group responsible for analysing, assessing and evaluating the impact of data gaps in the assessment reports.

COUNTRY: SPAIN

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

THE PROCESS OF PREPARATION OF IPCC ASSESSMENT REPORTS - RIGOROUS, INDEPENDENT, TRANSPARENT AND INCLUSIVE- NEEDS A TIMING SUFFICIENT TO ENSURE AND GUARANTEE THESE FEATURES. HOWEVER, THE NEED IS FELT TO REVISIT TIMING FOR THE DELIVERY OF DIFFERENT WG VOLUMES. CRITERIA BASED ON A MORE UNIFORM DISTRIBUTION (TO FACILITATE A BETTER INTEGRATION OF DIFFERENT WG VOLUMES) COULD BE CONSIDERED AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE CURRENT AND PREVIOUS PRACTICE BASED ON QUASI-SIMULTANEOUS (WITHIN THE RANGE OF 1 YEAR) DELIVERY OF ALL WG VOLUMES. THIS IS ESPECIALLY APPLICABLE TO THE SYR, WHOSE ADDED VALUE LIES IN THE INTEGRATION OF MESSAGES AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE OTHER VOLUMES, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES. IT IS REASONABLE ALSO TO THINK ABOUT DIFFERENT WGS WITH DIFFERENT TIMING, CONSIDERING UNCOUPLED PRODUCTION, E.G. TO PRODUCE WG I WITH HIGHER FREQUENCY THAN THE OTHER WGS.

SPM ARE KEY ELEMENTS OF IPCC ARS. THERE IS A NEED TO REINFORCE ITS CLARITY, SIMPLIFYING THE CALIBRATED LANGUAGE AND FOCUSING ON THOSE MESSAGES AND FINDINGS ABOVE A CERTAIN LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE AND LIKELIHOOD. HEADLINES OF WGI AR5 SPM ARE A GOOD EXAMPLE. THE ACKNOWLEDGED QUALITY OF GRAPHICS PRODUCTS IN IPCC REPORTS IS AN ADDED VALUE TO BE RETAINED AND REINFORCED, ESPECIALLY IN THE SYR.

SO FAR THE FOCUS HAS BEEN PUT ON ARS. TOGETHER WITH THIS CORE FOCUS, WE FIND THE NEED TO COMPLEMENT IT WITH SR AND TR ON SPECIFIC ISSUES, DIRECTLY ADDRESSING ITEMS IDENTIFIED BY THE UNFCCC PROCESS, TOGETHER WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS.

AMONG OTHER POSSIBLE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES THAT IPCC COULD PROVIDE, WE SEE A NEED TO MAINTAIN AN ON-LINE PLATFORM WITH A REFERENCE INVENTORY OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS ON CLIMATE CHANGE IN ALL THE FIELDS. ARS COMPILE ALL THE REFERENCES ON WHICH ARE BASED, BUT THE CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE IN ALL ASPECTS IS SO ACTIVE THAT THE INFORMATION IN THE ARS IS RAPIDLY OUTDATED. THIS KIND OF COMPREHENSIVE AND STRUCTURED INVENTORY OF CLIMATE CHANGE BIBLIOGRAPHY -IF PERMANENTLY UPDATED AND WITH A SEARCH ENGINE- COULD BE THE REFERENCE BASE TO CONSULT, IDENTIFYING WHICH REFERENCES HAVE BEEN ASSESSED IN PREVIOUS ARS AND WHICH ONES ARE PENDING FOR NEXT IPCC PRODUCTS. THIS TOOL MAY ALSO BE USED TO ANALYSE BIBLIOGRAPHY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT AXES (REGIONAL, SECTORAL, AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE...) OF RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS, ALLOWING TO IDENTIFY GAPS AND STRENGTHS. MOREOVER, THIS TOOL COULD INCLUDE ALSO FACILITIES TO SEARCH SCIENTIST, GROUPS, INSTITUTIONS, PROJECTS, ETC.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

We find it interesting to consider grouping IPCC work in two main WGs: (i) physical science of climate change, ecological impacts and impacts on human systems and sectors (with a growing importance of regional aspects, as AR5 reflects) and (ii) responses/proposal to climate change challenge in the field of adaptation and mitigation. The former group could be split into two clearly differentiated parts, observation and projections, producing reports at different timing, uncoupled. Projections are constrained by organization of CMIP experiments which are costly in terms of computing and organization. Observations could be updated more frequently. The latter group – responses- can address some sectors with a clear win-win approach (agriculture, forestry, soils, health...), and others with a more independent way between adaptation and mitigation. This WG on solutions can be structured according to a sectoral approach.

The structure of the IPCC Bureau should adjust to the resulting WGs structure, but keeping the balance in all its dimension (regional, developing/developed countries...) The Executive Committee is proving to be a useful way to the day-to day IPCC decisionmaking.

We also consider the need to enhanced coordination and cooperation among Working Groups, and consider ways to have authors crossing the WGs or to set up ad-hoc cross-WG.

We also consider the need to explore ways to keep the memory between consecutive assessment cycles, including overlap of Bureau members and a minimum and maximum number of previous authors in next reports.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

We consider the need to address support for developing countries' participation in IPCC process. On one side, promoting balanced authors participation and, on other side, promoting capacity building activities that lead to produce scientific literature from developing countries. The IPCC scholarship fund can be a tool for this that need to be scaled-up.

To enhance participation of developing countries in IPCC work there is a need to reinforce cooperation with UN bodies and other international and regional organisations to promote funding fluxes for science in DC.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

We consider the need to reinforce the governance and collaboration of IPCC with other Rio Conventions where climate change is also an important element in their conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fight against desertification issues. Special attention to IPBES.

We also consider the need to assess the social perception of the IPCC reports in a stratified manner, evaluating the use and application of the reports from different stakeholders at different levels, and their demands of new and oriented products. This could provide orientation and guidelines to progress in the IPCC communication strategy, to convey IPCC message reaching different sectors and groups in the society and explore new formats using more graphical and support materials. This reflection includes also the need to go beyond in the communication strategy and explore new products and formats using more graphical material and supported by e.g. videos, movies, brochures, products for internet distribution/consumption, etc.

We also consider the need to explore the role of national focal points for coordinated communication actions.

Special care and attention in the work of translation, with a quality control of all the steps of translations.

COUNTRY: SWEDEN

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

5-7 YEARS, AND AS FAR AS POSSIBLE ALIGNED TO THE MAJOR EVENTS OF UNFCCC. IN PRINCIPLE, THERE IS A BALANCE TO BE ACHIEVED IN THE LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD. AFTER THE STARTUP PHASE (THAT WILL TAKE SOME ROUGHLY FIXED TIME IRRESPECTIVE OF THE LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD) THE BALANCE IS BETWEEN I/ DURING A SHORT PERIOD LESS SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE, AND LESS NEW LITERATURE HAVE BEEN ACCUMULATED. THIS WILL IN SOME SENSE EASEN THE DEMAND ON THE AUTHOR TEAMS. ON THE OTHER HAND, II/ IT IS TYPICALLY EASIER TO TAKE STOCK OF - AND ASSESS - THE PROGRESS OF SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING WITH SOME DISTANCE.

THE SPM WOULD BENEFIT FROM AN EVEN MORE THOROUGH POLISHING FROM PROFESSIONAL POPULAR SCIENCE WRITERS. WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THE SIZE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE TASK OF CONDENSING 10000 SCIENTIFIC PAPERS INTO AN ASSESSMENT REPORT OF 2000 PAGES, AND THEN FURTHER INTO A TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF 100 PAGES, AND FINALLY INTO A SUMMARY FOR POLICYMAKERS OF 20-40 PAGES, THIS IS NEVERTHELESS THE TASK OF THE IPCC WORKING GROUPS. AND AN ESSENTIAL AIM OF THE IPCC ASSESSMENT CYCLE IS THAT THE SPMS ARE ACTUALLY WIDELY READ AND UNDERSTOOD BY POLICYMAKERS. TO SUCCESSFULLY MEET THIS GOAL THE AUTHOR GROUPS MAY BENEFIT FROM ENHANCEMENT OF THE ASSISTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL SCIENCE WRITERS TO HELP CRAFTING THE TEXT TO THE INTENDED READERSHIP. HOWEVER, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE AUTHOR TEAMS STILL HAVE THE FINAL WORD ON THE CONTENT OF THE FINAL DRAFT SPM THAT IS PUT FORTH THE IPCC FOR DECISION AND ACCEPTANCE.

THE EMPHASIS SHOULD REMAIN ON COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS, WHERE THE FOCUS SHOULD BE, AS DISCUSSED IN THE PREVIOUS POINT, ON NEW RESEARCH FINDINGS AND PROGRESS IN THE SCIENTIFIC

UNDERSTANDING BEYOND WHAT WAS REPORTED IN THE PREVIOUS ARS. THESE ARS SHOULD BE COMPLEMENTED BY SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS AS RELEVANT, BUT NOT TECHNICAL REPORTS AS THEY CARRY LESS WEIGHT AND AUTHORITY.

THERE ARE SEVERAL ARGUMENTS FOR 'MODERNISING' AND REFORMING THE STYLE AND STRUCTURE OF THE ARS, POSSIBLY USING MODERN ONLINE DISSEMINATION METHODS AND FACILITIES. BUT THESE CHANGES SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY AND CAREFULLY EVALUATED IN TERMS OF WHAT IMPLICATIONS THEY MAY HAVE ON THE AUTHORS' ENGAGEMENT, AS WELL AS THE POSSIBILITY TO HANDLE THE NEW STYLE AND FORMAT WITHOUT HAVING A FULL-TIME EMPLOYED AUTHOR TEAM. THIS WOULD INVARIABLY HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE SOLID BACKING THROUGHOUT THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, WHICH IS FUNDAMENTAL FOR THE SUPERIOR AUTHORITY THE IPCC REPORTS ENJOYS.

SYNTHESIS REPORTS SHOULD BE VERY SHORT AND FOCUS ON THE NEWS IN THE UNDERLYING WG:S, AS WELL AS WRITTEN IN A STYLE THAT IS ACCESSIBLE TO A WIDER PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE. AS FOR THE WG SPMS A PROFESSIONAL POPULAR SCIENCE WRITER SHOULD BE INVOLVED THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE WRITING PROCESS.

ANY FAST TRACK WILL BE AT THE SAME 'EVIDENCE' LEVEL AS ORDINARY SHORT UPDATES AND WILL NOT ADD ANY VALUE. MORE PROBABLY, IT WILL DILUTE THE AUTHORATIVE MESSAGES FROM IPCC AND THUS RISK LOWERING THE TRUST FOR IPCC AND ITS REPORTS.

IPCC SHOULD CONTINUE WITH METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES.

A SPECIFIC ISSUE TO CONSIDER PLANNING FUTURE REPORTS: REGARDING LARGE-SCALE CARBON SINKS IN THE AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT, THE IMPACT OF LIMITING NUTRIENTS AND THE ENSUING EFFECT ON CARBON DIOXIDE FIXATION AND SEQUESTERING SHOULD BE ASSESSED. THIS TO IMPROVE THE REALIABILITY OF BUDGETING AND MODELLING THE GLOBAL CARBON CYCLE, PARTICULARLY SINCE THE OCEANS ARE THE SINGLE LARGEST CARBON SINK ON EARTH.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

There is merit to restructure the Assessment Reports so that the WG I report is merged with the impacts chapters of the WG II report, and the vulnerability and adaptation chapters of WG II report is merged with the WG III. In this way the first report would deal with climate change and its impact, and the second report would deal with the measures to prevent, ease and handle the situation. Moreover, this should lessen the current (AR5) overlapping between WG I and WG II and it would enhance cooperation between scientific issues on one side and more policy related on the other side. When dealing with how to meet climate change and its impacts, measures in adaptation and mitigation would benefit from a closer connection. These two reports should have sufficient time elapsed in between them to allow the report on 'measures' to rely on the latest scenarios used in the report on climate change and impacts. This restructuring could be reflected in changes to the IPCC organisational structure (two WGs/TSUs) or remain as three WGs (and TSUs) in which the present WG II should be given the special responsibility to bridge the gap between the new WG1 and the the new WG2.

The Bureau is fine as it is, but if you consider to merge WG:s then of course also the Bureau has to adapt. However, this may be complicated for practical reasons. In that event, the solution may be to keep the working groups/TSU structure as is but still organise the report into two volumes as outlined above.

Regarding the ever increasing volume of scientific literature, some practical measures may be considered:

a) With respect to AR5/WG I, many of the subject areas covered may be mature enough to allow the next assessment to specifically focus on the incremental progress since the AR5. This may, or may not, be the case for AR5/WG II and WGIII.

b) The authors' workload may be eased if TSU staff includes professional documentalists, preferably with experience from the relevant scientific fields. They could

begin sifting through online literature index databases already at an early stage of the scoping process.

c) The author teams typically have a very good overview of emerging scientific advances that have not reached the scientific literature to be included (i.e. published/accepted/in press before the final deadline for inclusion into the AR) could still be very briefly and summarized in an informal document for the TSU and its documentalists to keep track of and follow up. In this way, the author teams and the TSU/Secretariat would be better prepared to respond to demands regarding recent developments. Moreover, this will assist in handing over from one author team to the next, and thus aid in producing the ZOD.

d) Would it be possible to develop a mechanism to more or less constantly keep track of relevant new literature? For example, would it be possible to set up an on-line system where scientists could register their own papers and reports and tag them with the sections in the previous AR that they themselves find relevant. This database could then be monitored by the TSU scientific staff and the documentalists to keep track of new literature, and possibly aid the author teams in the early phase of structuring the content of the next AR. This would benefit the production of the ZOD.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

Money is important, but not the only question. A TSU in a developing country (but not a LDC) should be a next step in the IPCC development. Building trust between IPCC and the potentially hosting developing country is important. Co-operation on the developing country's premises and close contacts via internet if possible, should help in trust building and ownership.

If representation from developing countries increase, their knowledge will be better taken onboard the IPCC process. IPCC could develop a trainee programme for younger skilled researchers from developing countries to participant as junior scientific staff or documentalists at each TSU. That will give experience and access to new knowledge while at the same time stay within the scope of the IPCC to assess the scientific progress and knowledge without carrying out the research itself. Financial support for such programmes may be sought from other sources than the ordinary national funding for each TSU. While the increased participation of development countries and their scientists in research activities is indeed needed, it is beyond the scope of the IPCC. However, the Secretariat should consider ways and means to engage with the parent organisations (WMO and UNEP) to extend this request to various international and national research organisations, platforms, and programmes, as well as internationa and national aid organisations.

Use available platforms, established collaborations etc. where local champions well known by reputation in their areas/regions. Those persons will be the best carriers of new knowledge, and are also well updated on their regions needs.

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

Make simpler fact sheets (1-2 pages) that easily and at almost no cost can be translated into different native languages.

Other matters:

Nomination process: important to make sure that each chapter has the right balance of disciplines involved. Make sure that the authors have good skills in social collaboration.

Chapter outline: make sure already from the beginning that chapters do not duplicate in scope or personal resources.

Polar regions: should be separated into two chapters since the Arctic and the Antarctic is so different in every aspect.

Is it necessary that all sub chapters in WG II has the same amount of pages?

The relation between IPBES and IPCC has to be considered carefully. It could be difficult to avoid overlapping and even more difficult to find authors to both of them.

.

COUNTRY: SWITZERLAND**Elements for the discussion on the future of
the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**

February 2014

Switzerland welcomes the opportunity to present its views on the future of the IPCC. This submission focuses on proposals and solutions.

- A. In our view, the IPCC should maintain its current mandate and develop new products in view to realize its enormous potential taking into account a number of principles such as:
- Complete independence;
 - Respect of the highest scientific standards;
 - Robustness and transparency;
 - Universal participation involving the best expertise from public and private institutions and countries;
 - Responsiveness to the needs of the users, including with new products;
 - User-friendliness of products;
 - Facilitating the access to the products.
- B. We consider that on matters of climate change the IPCC should continue to be:
- The scientific reference body;
 - The provider of methodologies, in particular for the inventories of greenhouse gases (GHG);
 - A credible source of relevant information on climate change.
- C. Therefore, the discussions on the future of the IPCC should consider:
- Users' needs and requests;
 - IPCC products that respond to these needs;
 - The optimal organization and governance of the IPCC for delivering these products.
- D. We propose to improve the IPCC products (assessments, methodologies and information) and to expand the activities as presented in the following tables.
- E. The current mandate and governance of the IPCC have to be maintained, with a Plenary, a Bureau with its current composition, an Executive Committee and, as appropriate, Technical Support Units. Each of the organs has to improve its functioning and its cooperation with the other bodies. This is particularly relevant for the Secretariat and the TSUs.
- F. As a result of the proposed increase of tasks and activities, the Secretariat has probably to be reinforced.
- G. TSUs should be established for specific assessments. Given the complexity and the size of the task devoted of the TSUs, some activities could be delegated to institutions working under the control of the TSUs. The involvement of these institutions should be conducted in full transparency.
- H. Increased participation of expertise and countries has to be fostered, particularly from developing countries.
- I. Sustainable financial procedures and support by an increased number of countries have to be ensured to cope with the increase of tasks and activities of the IPCC, that may imply additional financial burden.

J. Finally, periodic reviews of the functioning of the IPCC have to be considered in view of taking into account the lessons learned and adapting to new situations and challenges.

IPCC Products

Product	Status	Area	Current performance / Future
1.1 Assessment	Current	Science	Good
1.2 Assessment	New	Science	Assessments should be improved considering a broader range of regional studies and activities with the aim of increasing spatial and temporal resolution Adapt scope, coverage and frequency according to user's needs and requests
2.1 Methodologies	Current	Methodology	Good To be improved through inclusion of methodologies for more climate relevant gases
2.2 Methodologies	New	Methodology	Methodologies related to climate change e.g. technology, products and processes, policies evaluation and performance Expansion of the current methodological work on GHG inventories to other areas of climate change for mitigation and adaptation
3. Information	Current	Information	Medium To be improved with the help of the IPCC Portal. A summary of the key messages that have changed or where significant new knowledge has been gained (including reduced uncertainty) would be very helpful

IPCC Activities

Activities	Status	Area	Future performance
4.1 IPCC Portal	New	Information	Continuously updated user-friendly web portal facilitating access to the IPCC products (assessments, methodologies, information)
4.2 Data used in the IPCC works	New	Data	Facilitate the access to and the understanding of the data used and processed by the IPCC in its assessments

4.3 Publications and studies used in the IPCC works	New	Information	Facilitate the access to the literature that has been assessed by the IPCC
4.4 New publications and studies	New	Science / Information	While not endorsing them, signal and facilitate the access of users to remarkable relevant scientific articles published in the middle of an assessment
4.5 Assessments made by other bodies	New	Science / Information	While not endorsing them, signal and facilitate the access of users to those assessments made by other bodies relevant for the IPCC works
5. Structured relations with relevant bodies (e.g. WMO, UNEP, UNFCCC, IPBES, GEO/GEOSS)	New	Policy Help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Establishment of channels for:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of relevant information to these bodies Collection of their needs related to climate change Assistance in the elaboration of Policy Tools such as: Manual for Adaptation Planning; Manual for Technology Assessment; Optimization of Policy Design; Optimization of Environmental Synergies - <u>Assistance for updating information</u> that is IPCC-consistent, such as time series of observed temperature, precipitation, etc. with new annual data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update of material serving for the use of the IPCC methodologies - <u>Assistance for reacting and commenting weather and climate events</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistance to bodies such as GFCS for comments on events such as floods; etc. - <u>Assistance for the provision of services</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate the access to information and expertise in view that these bodies provide specific services on request of users - <u>Help to establish communities of users of the IPCC products</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community of users of the IPCC products will serve purposes such as exchange of good practices associated with the IPCC products, identify users needs and provide inputs and feedbacks to the IPCC

Notes on the tables:

1.1 – 1.2 Assessment: The current way of producing the assessments has to be revised in order to meet the needs and requests of users. It is necessary to better identify the users, their needs and their requests. To that aim, the IPCC has to consider appropriate processes and channels for engaging in a permanent dialogue with users (e.g. enhanced collaboration with service-oriented bodies such as the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) and establishing communities of users). Special Reports on well focused topics are very useful and should gain on importance. The frequency of full assessments could be reduced in favor of the Special Reports.

2.1 – 2.2 Methodologies: The current methodologies provided by the IPCC for national inventories of GHG should be extended to precursors and other climate relevant gases and pollutants for which methods for estimating emissions should be provided.

IPCC should also provide additional relevant methodologies for mitigation and adaptation, including methodologies for monitoring and assessing the effects of policies and technologies.

3. Information: The current concept of outreach (that conveys the notion of persuading users to accept unsolicited and predefined information that is judged good for them) should be abandoned and replaced by the concept of the IPCC becoming a credible source of continuously updated relevant information on climate change.

4.1 – 4.5 IPCC Portal: A web portal is the best way to facilitate the access of users to IPCC products. The portal has to be user-friendly and allow for users' feedbacks.

The IPCC has to facilitate the access to data and metadata used of the IPCC works, in particular those used for figures and tables. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that making data available is critical if no scientific assessment is performed first and no guidance for the user is given. Graphical material used in the IPCC works should also be made available in the IPCC Portal.

Ideally, all the scientific papers and studies referred to in the IPCC works should be made available in the IPCC Portal. At least, the IPCC should facilitate the access to these publications.

Furthermore, without endorsing them, the IPCC should draw attention in the IPCC Portal to relevant new scientific papers and studies recently published. This bears the risk of "cherry picking". To overcome this, the production of a weekly Paper Bulletin – as done for WGI during the AR5 – can be envisaged. However, this cannot be an "IPCC Product" but could constitute "living" background material in help of an ongoing assessment.

Is it enough to read only the IPCC works to have all the climate relevant assessments and information? Are there other assessments done by other bodies that are relevant to climate change? Are these assessments done using the same high scientific standards like the IPCC? How do these assessments complement the work of the IPCC? How should the IPCC refer to these assessments? Such and other questions have to be addressed by the IPCC. Furthermore, without endorsing them, the IPCC should indicate how to access these studies through the IPCC Portal.

5. Structured relations with relevant bodies: The IPCC should establish permanent and structured relations with Conventions and processes, without creating additional bureaucratic load. The adoption by the IPCC of clear rules and procedures for the relations with these bodies would probably be necessary. These relations are beneficial for the IPCC and for these bodies. Furthermore, the IPCC can support Conventions and other institutions to develop, e.g.

Policy Tools to meet the needs of users in specific areas such as risk management, planning adaptation, and procedures for assessing technology needs and choices. The IPCC should neither participate nor endorse Policy Tools that are police-prescriptive.

In the framework of its relations with other relevant bodies and on request, the IPCC should assist these bodies when they update, consistently with the IPCC assessed records, climate indicators such as temperature, precipitation and sea level using WMO and other national observing networks' data that fulfill IPCC standards. To do this for the SPM figures on observations might be helpful, since IPCC figures are often used. However, the update of the corresponding time series has to be done by the corresponding research teams, and thus updates can only be made where the source data has been updated by the source institution. The IPCC should also assist the update of material serving for the use of the IPCC methodologies.

When important weather and climate events happen, Governments, the public and the media expect reactions and comments from the IPCC. The IPCC should not react as such. But it may assist other bodies such as Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) to provide such comments, under the condition of the respect of the IPCC mandate.

The IPCC, within its mandate, may assist bodies that request its help to access information and expertise in view that these bodies – e.g. in the course of a negotiation – provide specific services such as assessments of policy or technical options.

The IPCC may help to establish Communities of users for its products and for the provision of feedbacks. The management of these communities should make use of the internet and should not constitute a bureaucratic burden.

COUNTRY: THAILAND

A. What should be the future products of IPCC?

- Regional adaptation and climate change effect such as effect to health and agriculture should be focused in Assessment Report. The solution side, best practice and examples of current problems and adaptation in each region should be included.
- The Special Reports should illustrate on extreme climate events occurring during an assessment period. There should be reports on the emerging science or policy maker needs such as disaster management to advance climate change adaptation.
- Regional reports should be developed to identify current situations and adaptation in specific countries, in particular in high vulnerability regions.
- Southeast Asia is one of the fastest growing economic regions, this lead to a rapid change of land-use and intensification of atmospheric pollutants, causing a change in atmospheric composition. Therefore IPCC should pay more attention on the local data in Southeast Asia where atmospheric system is complex system.

- IPCC should provide the pilot projects that illustrate using of climate change management and technologies in order to cope with situations related to climate change.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and model operation for the production of these IPCC products?

- Current structure and model operation of IPCC are suitable and consistent with climate change situation. However, selection procedure of IPCC Bureau and Working Groups should be just and transparent.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC?

- IPCC should set up regional committees to enhance involvement of developing countries and to access literatures in several languages other than English. Representatives of countries and regions of these committees can facilitate assessment of literatures and engagement of developing country scientists and experts at the same time.
- IPCC should provide financial support for developing country scientists and experts to enhance regional research and knowledge. The outcome results can be share for IPCC regional reports. The support should include holding

conferences, workshops and meetings for sharing knowledge and enhance capacity building. Also, Training for Trainer Programme should be organized.

- IPCC should support the setting up of network collaboration in regional and international level by setting up contact points or centers in each region. This network will open opportunities to access government reports and other papers in several languages other than English. Additionally, this network can increase active participation of experts from developing countries.



**Department
of Energy &
Climate Change**

Renate Christ
Secretary of the IPCC
IPCC Secretariat

**Department of Energy & Climate
Change**

3 Whitehall Place,
London SW1A 2AW
E: foi@decc.gsi.gov.uk
www.decc.gov.uk

Your ref: 5283-13/IPCC/GEN

25-02-2014

Dear Renate Christ

Thank you for inviting the UK to submit our views on the future work of the IPCC. Please see attached the detailed responses to your questions.

The IPCC has achieved much of which it can be proud. Its products, of which the best known are the Assessment Reports, are respected, authoritative documents. The review, approval and acceptance processes which they undergo give them a unique credibility amongst the policy makers who are its most important audience.

However, these processes take such a long time that they make it difficult for IPCC to be responsive to needs arising outside its 6 or 7 year assessment cycle, and to produce up-to-date material.

Therefore the UK proposes that, whilst the IPCC embarks on a further assessment cycle, it should trial some new ways of working.

We believe the Synthesis Report is the most important part of the assessment reports, providing (ideally) answers to policy-makers' questions in a single location, but it has not usually received the attention it deserves. It needs to become the focus of authors' attention, with a writing team focussed on answering these questions without constraint by Working Group boundaries. There is in fact a case for treating the Synthesis Report as the main output from the IPCC which would draw on all the products prepared in previous years with the addition of new assessed material.

There is a strong appetite for updates more frequent than the 6 or 7 year assessment cycle allows. Whilst frequent updates might not be compatible with existing review, approval and acceptance processes, they ought to be possible for material of a factual nature such as "Observed Changes in the Climate System" and "Drivers of Climate Change" in Working Group I's SPM, "Observed Impacts, Vulnerability and Exposure" and "Adaptation Experience" in WGII's SPM, and technological developments in WGIII. Technical Papers may be a suitable method to deliver such updates – but with the crucial modification that they include new material.

We do not propose any significant change to the Working Group structure, but the nature of their products needs to be reviewed to ensure they continue to meet the needs of policymakers. WGIII needs to focus on analysis of global pathways to stabilisation and the mitigation requirements to meet long term objectives.

We feel that these proposals would have further benefits eg the full Assessment Reports would not have such a large volume of literature to assess, thus the burdens on authors would be less and this might encourage wider participation.

We would like to see IPCC's Communication and Outreach activity given much more emphasis, and consideration given to use of electronic media.

Yours sincerely



**Department
of Energy &
Climate Change**

David Warrilow
Head of Science
Department of Energy and Climate Change

Future of the IPCC Review - UK Government 2014 Response to IPCC

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period?

The idea of an assessment cycle is tied to the current product list and may not need to be an enduring concept. However if comprehensive Assessment Reports were to continue in a similar form, the assessment cycle should not be more than 6-7 years as presently. However there is great demand from policy-makers for more frequent updates so ways should be considered to bring these into the cycle. The optimal period will need to reflect any changes in the products as discussed below.

Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)?

The major assessment reports (AR) have been the bedrock of the IPCC’s success over the years and they represent an enormous achievement which has supported Governments and provided a uniquely authoritative assessment of all aspects of climate change. Whatever we do in the future we need to ensure that we do not lose that reputation and standard.

However we believe that the time is ripe to rethink the IPCC products to address changing circumstances and requirements. We suggest that feedback on AR5 be collected from users and contributors, with a view to informing future work. Future products must address the challenge posed by the sheer volume of material now needing to be assessed; the availability of rapid means of dissemination by electronic means; and the need for policy makers to have answers to policy relevant questions, which don’t readily map to specific WG reports.

This leads us to the following suggestions:

- 1. The primary product of the IPCC in the future should be the Synthesis Report, prepared on 5 to 7 year timescales, drawing on all material prepared by the IPCC during the period but not constrained to be only based on such material. Indeed the SYR would be able to include newly assessed material itself to ensure it was as up to date and policy relevant as possible.*
- 2. The approach would be to reduce the amount of re-assessment when little has change. In that the regard the SYR could be treated like the edition of a book that would be updated subsequently and not written from scratch. We believe this is now possible as a lot of science is quite mature. Mostly we would see numerical values*

- updated, though clearly where the science is still evolving we would see greater changes. It might even allow more limited and more frequent updates to be made.*
- 3. The IPCC could then additionally focus on areas where the science is still fluid and prepare more but shorter special reports. In our view there seems to be a need for a more frequent update on the climate science and risks associated with climate change in specific areas such as, for example: “Observed Changes in the Climate System” and “Drivers of Climate Change” in Working Group 1, and “Observed Impacts, Vulnerability and Exposure” and “Adaptation Experience” in Working Group 2. In addition there is a need for regular analysis of global pathways to stabilisation and the mitigation requirements to meet long term objectives by Working Group 3.*
 - 4. The IPCC also needs to develop a product which enables it to respond quickly to questions relevant to policy makers and other users. This might include a fast response process to address questions from the UNFCCC.*
 - 5. Electronic media and Web-based tools may be useful for both report preparation and publication. We suggest the IPCC evaluates the idea to determine suitability and possibilities for use.*
 - 6. Working with others. In some areas of the IPCC’s remit there is quite a bit of international activity – for example in technology assessment and consideration should be given to avoiding unnecessary duplication.*

Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures?

Yes see our response above. The aim should be an ability to be more flexible and nimble whilst maintaining rigour. The current procedures for producing a SR are probably too slow for this. Consideration could also be given to the role of Technical Papers and whether the rules governing the production of these should be revised to allow new information to be included beyond that in AR or SR reports.

Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period?

At the beginning of a cycle it would be important to map out likely products but it should not preclude flexibility and an ability of IPCC to respond to new requests for information.

What would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period?

That rather depends on the products we eventually agree to. We would not envisage a major change if we retained the current process.

What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports?

As noted above, we consider the Synthesis Report to be the most important IPCC Product which is comprehensive, deal adequately with cross-cutting issues, avoids the disciplinary constraints of the WG reports and ideally provides answers to policy-makers' questions in a single location. But we think it is not given the attention it deserves at present. It is at the end point of the process but it is constrained by the contents of the WG reports. We believe it needs to become the main product, prepared by a writing team focussed on answering these questions across Working Group boundaries. The focus of the IPCC work would be synthesis from the start.

Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories?

The UK notes the reliance of the UNFCCC reporting and review process on IPCC inventory methods, and the importance of continuity in the Inventory Task Force and the Technical Support Unit (especially given emergence of new requirements e.g. unconventional oil and gas or CCS), and emerging developments in verification and remote sensing. The UK suggests these developments should be handled by reports that are supplementary to the 2006 Guidelines, with consideration of a full update of guidelines post 2015.

Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics?

We do not think that the IPCC should add more to its portfolio of work but rather concentrate on re-engineering its assessment process.

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups?

The current three working group (WG) report structure attracts specialists and delivers *comprehensive knowledge across these areas; we do not propose fundamental change to the three WG structure. However we think there may be fewer WG only products and that increasingly IPCC products will be prepared by cross- WG teams.*

Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs?

Consideration should be given to:

- *Integration between WGs at very early stages on particular projects to bring information together in a more synergistic way;*
- *Reports being produced by multi-disciplinary, cross-working group author teams;*
- *Developing the process for preparation and publication of the IPCC cross cutting products such as the synthesis Report. For example, this might require an additional cross cutting working group. It could also eventually oversee all publication matters to ensure consistency of style and approach.*

Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters?

An effective way to cover cross-cutting matters would be to make the Synthesis Report the focus of the IPCC's activities, with a writing team responsible for its preparation from the beginning, working closely with the Working Groups.

Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions?

The UK has no specific proposals for the next IPCC Bureau at this stage, but note that it is likely to be shaped by the outcome of this review. We would be reluctant to increase its size. The UK considers a Task Force Bureau (TFB) should continue to direct the Task Force for Greenhouse Gas Inventories work. Any issues raised for assessment reports could also be considered with respect to the development of Methodologies.

Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi?

The UK has no suggestions to make at this time.

Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature?

The workload for authors in preparing reports is already considerable. The IPCC should consider opportunities to simplify the preparation process:

- *By having more frequent subject focussed reports*
- *Moving to a synthesis report which is regularly updated, avoiding doing everything from scratch.*
- *Working with other organisations to avoid duplication of work and products particularly in the mitigation area of WG3*
- *Consider the appointment of more full time specialists to assist preparation and reduce the burden on voluntary authors.*
- *We note that experienced experts are important to the success of the IPCC, but that they may find work load too great to continue full participation in future. We suggest the IPCC further considers how to retain and use experienced experts, whilst introducing new authors to the report preparation process.*
- *The approach taken by the IPCC should capitalise on advances in methodology for systematically reviewing scientific evidence. For example, in the health sector it is considered good practice to use pre-defined search strategies and quality criteria for systematically synthesizing the findings of research. Consider providing or increasing financial assistance to CLAs (e.g. to appoint research assistants or full time junior scientists)*
- *The writing process should operate as efficiently as possible e.g. using new technology to encourage participation by all.*

Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)?

Nothing to add at this stage

Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs?

To maintain expertise, consideration should be given to trying to retain some WG TSU staff between one assessment cycle and the next

Consideration should be given to alternate funding models to increase the diversity of host countries.

Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices?

The Principles may require revision, depending upon the outcomes of this consultation, particularly if new products are developed.

The process for identifying, selecting and appointing contributors could benefit from revision, to promote greater inclusivity and transparency. Specific criteria could be developed to improve geographical distribution, the range of experience and gender balance of contributors.

Consideration should be given to increasing the open review of draft reports, recognising that we primarily need to attract expert views.

Other governance and administrative matters?

The role of Review Editors should be re-considered, such that they are allocated to chapters outside their own immediate speciality. They would then they'd be free to contribute their expertise to the most appropriate chapter. Consideration should be given to publishing Review Editors' reports.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

This is a long-term issue which ultimately rests on wider capacity building in the scientific world.

Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)?

Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLS, LA, RE)?

Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions?

Co-chairs could be given a definite responsibility to engage developing countries in TSUs, author teams and as reviewers. They could be asked to report to Plenary the initiatives they have undertaken and how successful they have been.

Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play?

We don't see an additional role for the Secretariat.

Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English?

IPCC should consider a strategy for working with other organisations to increase developing country participation e.g. National Academies might help identify potential participants and non-English literature, and facilitate translation.

Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts?

IPCC should consider working with other organisations to increase developing country participation e.g. National Academies might help identify potential participants

The writing process should be as efficient as possible e.g. using new technology to encourage wide participation.

Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English?

Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data?

Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity?

Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme?

D. Other matters

Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations?

- *A fast response process is required to address questions from the UNFCCC and other UN bodies (e.g. CBD, ICAO, IMO...).*

Matters related to communication?

Communication and outreach work is of fundamental importance to the IPCC deliverables and vital to ensuring the work has maximum impact, reaching the largest number and range of stakeholders and different language speakers possible. The following ideas should be considered:

- *Better communication of the nature of the IPCC assessment process and its findings, across a range of levels and types of audience (e.g. public, industry, government, NGO).*
- *Electronic media and Web-based tools may be useful for both report preparation and publication. We suggest the IPCC evaluates the idea to determine suitability and possibilities for use.*
- *Including independent professional writer(s) in SPM author teams, to facilitate production of SPMs more accessible to non-specialists.*
- *The IPCC developing new partnerships, to catalyse educational activities (e.g. UNEP education programme).*
- *IPCC should look for opportunities to engage with stakeholders and the public both before and after assessments.*
- *Greater use of digital and social media as tools to increase accessibility and enhance awareness of the results of the assessments.*
- *There should always be clear published information at the outset of every report on what underlying materials will be published e.g. Review Editors' reports.*
- *A working group of media professionals to advise on dissemination and social scientists involved in the study of research – policy interface to advise on maximising policy impact.*
- *An advisory group of current or recent policymakers in relevant sectors could also provide useful input.*

Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports

We suggest users be consulted about their requirements and opinions of the AR5, and their views made available to the Task Group.

COUNTRY: UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Introduction

At its 37th Session (Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013) the IPCC set up a Task Group on the future work of the IPCC. The objective of the Task Group is to help the IPCC to continue to improve its operations and products. The Task Group will develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel during the period leading to the 41st Session in 2015. The full text of the mandate and other relevant documentation can be found on a dedicated webpage on <http://www.ipcc.ch/apps/future/> .

As decided by the Panel, the Task Group will draw on multiple sources, including submissions from members of the IPCC. With her letter of 13 March 2013 the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their initial views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC. Governments in Batumi expressed the view that a second round of submissions by members of the IPCC will be desirable in providing inputs for consideration by the Task Group.

The following questions have been structured around the mandate of the Task Group agreed by the Panel. Explanatory notes and points for consideration are drawn from earlier submissions and the discussion at the 37th Session.

A. What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following:

- What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period
- Whether emphasis should remain on comprehensive Assessment Reports (AR), supplemented with occasional Special Reports (SR) agreed according to the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” (as agreed by the IPCC 20th Session and amended at the 29th Session)
- Whether a mix of assessment reports and/or focused thematic assessments/SRs may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period
- Which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period
- What would be the role, scope and timing of Synthesis Reports
- Whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused SRs prepared according to current procedures
- Whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports (MR) on national greenhouse gas inventories
- Whether the IPCC should prepare MRs on other topics

WE STILL BELIEVE THAT THE CURRENT LENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENT PERIOD IS STILL APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE TO PROVIDE UPDATED AND ACTIONABLE INFORMATION TO SHAPE AND PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION EFFORTS AND OPTIONS.

WE ARE OF THE VIEW THAT EMPHASIS SHOULD REMAIN ON COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT (AR) SUPPLEMENTED WITH OCCASSIONAL SPECIAL REPORTS (SR). WE TOTALLY DISCOURAGE THE IDEA OF HAVING MANY REPORT WITHIN THE ASSESSMENT CYCLE.

A SPECIAL DOCUMENT OR A BOOK COULD BE WRITTEN DOCUMENTING THE SUCCESS, CHALLENGES, AND GAPS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IPCC OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES SINCE ITS INCEPTION

IPCC MAY CONSIDER INTRODUCING FACT SHEET AND POLICY BRIEF ON SOME OUTSTANDING RESULTS FROM RESPECTIVE WORKING GROUP REPORTS. ALTERNATIVELY IPCC FOCAL POINT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES SHOULD CAPACITATED TO PRODUCE RELEVANT POLICY BRIEF FROM WORKING GROUP REPORTS FOR DISSEMINATION TO POLICY MAKERS

B. What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including the following:

- Changes in the IPCC Working Group (WG) structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current Working Groups
- Means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among WGs
- Effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters
- Adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks for Bureau positions
- Adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi
- Ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature
- Further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU)
- Adjustments to the structure and support of TSUs
- Specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices
- Other governance and administrative matters

THE CURRENT SETUP OF THE IPCC WORKING GROUP (WG) STRUCTURE IS STILL GOOD AND APPROPRIATE, HOWEVER COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE WG COULD BE ENHANCED, FOR EXAMPLE THROUGH ORGANIZING JOINT OUTREACH PROGRAMME

COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAMME INCLUDING WMO AND ITS GFCS PROGRAMME ALSO NEED TO BE ENHANCED

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects, including:

- Strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the establishment and governance of TSUs, co-hosting or hosting of TSUs in developing countries)
- Support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA,LA,RE)
- Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions
- Which additional role can the IPCC Secretariat play
- Access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English
- Other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts
- Other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English
- Ways to support and expand access to knowledge to fill existing gaps in data
- Ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity
- Ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme

MECHANISM SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE ENHANCED PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE WORK OF THE IPCC THROUGHOUT THE ASSESSMENT CYCLE. IN PARTICULAR STRENGTHENING THE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES CO-CHAIR TO ENHANCE THEIR PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES OF THE IPCC INCLUDING HOSTING TSUS AND OUTREACH PROGRAMME

THE PARTICIPATION OF SCIENTISTS AND UNIVERSITIES FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE IPCC WILL NEED TO BE ENHANCED.

DELIBERATE EFFORTS SHOULD BE DONE TO ENSURE INCREASED AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF DATA IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. VARIOUS MECHANISM COULD BE SUGGESTED.

MORE FLEXIBILITY MUST BE ALLOWED IN THE IPCC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME. THE CURRENT AGE LIMITATION IS A LIMITING FACTOR FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. WE THEREFORE SUGGEST THAT AGE LIMIT SHOULD BE INCREASED TO ALLOW MORE PARTICIPANTS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO QUALIFY FOR THE SCHOLARSHIP.

ENHANCE THE CAPACITY OF IPCC FOCAL POINT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IPCC OBJECTIVES WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES AND IN PARTICULAR OUTREACH PROGRAMME

DISSEMINATING THE IPCC FINDINGS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES AND REGIONS.

PROMOTE THE PARTICIPATION OF AFRICAN SCIENTISTS IN CLIMATE CHANGE RELATED RESEARCH, PARTICULARLY PUBLICATION IN PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL

D. Other matters

You may also express your view on any other matters regarding future work of the IPCC such as:

- Cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations
- Matters related to communication
- Process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports
- Any other matters

SINCE CLIMATE CHANGE RELATED COURSES ARE BEING STARTED GLOBALLY. EFFORTS SHOULD BE DONE TO FACILITATE THE USE IPCC PRODUCTS , PARTICULARLY THE WG REPORT AS LEARNING AND TEACHING RESOURCES IN UNIVERSITIES

COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH PROGRAMS NEED TO BE ENHANCED AND UPSCALED IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. IPCC FOCAL POINT IN COLLABORATION WITH OTHER STAKEHOLDERS IN RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES WILL NEED TO BE ENHANCED.

Future of IPCC *USA Response*

What should be the future products of the IPCC?

In responding to this question you may consider a range of aspects related to timing and type of reports, including the following: What would be the optimal overall length of an assessment period; should emphasis remain on comprehensive assessment reports (AR), special reports (SR), or methodology reports (MR); whether a mix of assessment report and/or focused thematic reports/special reports may be planned at the beginning of an assessment period; which would be optimal timing of preparation of reports within an assessment period; what would be the role scope and timing of Synthesis Reports; whether additional fast track products are needed to respond to emerging science or policymakers needs or can these be accommodated through focused Special Reports prepared according to current procedures; whether the IPCC should continue to prepare Methodology Reports on national greenhouse gas inventories; whether the IPCC should prepare Methodology Reports on other topics.

- One of the most valuable attributes of the IPCC (which is shared by only a tiny fraction of scientific assessments) is that IPCC assessments acquire the approval of over 190 governments. The IPCC, therefore, provides a uniquely authoritative input to the scientific assessment space. As a result, we believe the IPCC should continue to provide such assessments, with some modifications.
- With this in mind, we offer this proposal for consideration, if the status quo is not retained:
 - Consolidate the portion of WG2 that focuses on historic and projected impacts on physical systems with the physical science basis information contained in WG1 to provide a regular “State of the Science” assessment every ~7 years. Such an evolution of the WG1 content would mirror the evolution of and advances in in the scientific community. Within this report, summarize concisely the foundational science that has not changed significantly and focus the remainder of the report on advances in science and practice that have been documented in the published literature since the last assessment.
 - Readers of the IPCC reports value regional information that helps them to connect the science of climate change with their own lives and circumstances. Putting the regional information from WG1 (i.e., Annex of “Atlas of Global and Regional Climate Projections”) and WG2 (i.e., Chapters 21-30) and possibly WG3 in the same place would be an efficient way to synthesize the information and be important for communicating the holistic regional story. This report could include information on vulnerability currently in WG2. Consideration should be given to the timing of such reports so as not to draw on the same administrative and scientific resources or upstage the release of the main comprehensive assessment reports.
 - Re-work the substance on adaptation and mitigation options currently contained in WG2 and WG3 into a report on the “solution space” (i.e., mitigation and adaptation) for climate change. If not in the re-envisioned WG2, this report could include information on vulnerability currently in WG2. Such a report could still be on a 5-7 year cycle, but more staggered from the WG1 report to ensure the scientific

communities have sufficient time to digest and publish the results from the WG1 literature.

- Between these regular assessments (which would be easily search-able on a web-based platform), IPCC authors could add relevant publications to the web site to yield a “living document.” This would not only increase the value of the resource in between Assessment Reports, but would lower the “activation energy” needed to initiate the next Assessment. Such an approach would need to ensure high standards of scientific integrity (i.e., review) are retained for content added in this manner. A possible solution could be the kinds of modalities used in various moderated listserves and wikis – which can have thorough reviews. We could, for example, have our chapter authors constitute a review team for some set period for a given topic. Membership could rotate over a year or two – giving some authority to the review and some continuity in assessments of what is relevant and robust.
- Consider taking advantage of the significant advances in information technology by providing the full content of the reports online in an interactive format that hyperlinks in-text citations to the abstracts/articles/reports they reference, as well as links to underlying data and research, where available. This should be a requirement from the very early stages of drafting to minimize any additional administrative burden and resource implications on the Secretariat.
- Given the attention garnered by recent Special Reports and the growing demand for targeted information, we see value in preparing the IPCC to deliver a broader range of Special Reports as a mainstay of its assessment products suite, including production of a Special Report on the 2016-17 timeframe. A number of compelling topics seem ripe for consideration in such a report, including – but not limited to – (1) Food Security, (2) Arctic Change, (3) non-CO₂ gases, (4) Climate Teleconnections, (5) Urban Mitigation and Resilience, (6) Blue Carbon / Oceans, and (7) Hydrologic Cycle.

What would be the appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products?

Please consider the following in developing your response: Changes in the IPCC Working Group structure and/or adjustments to the mandates of the current working groups; means to enhance cooperation, consistency and integration among Working Groups; effective ways to cover cross-cutting matters; adjustments to the IPCC Bureau structure and terms of reference, including definition of more specific tasks Bureau positions; adjustments to the IPCC Executive Committee composition, terms of reference and modus operandi; ways to address the challenge of dramatic increase in literature; further clarification of the respective roles and interrelations of the IPCC secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSU's); adjustments to the structure and support of TSU's; specific needs for revisions, and streamlining of the Principles Governing IPCC Work and its Appendices; other governance and administrative matters.

- If we follow the hypothetical structure put forward in the previous response, one could envision a three-working group structure where WG1 does State of the Science, WG2 does Regional Information, WG3 does Solution Space and, as in current practice, Special

Reports could be tasked to the WG most relevant to the topic (e.g., Arctic (regional) to WG2; urban mitigation and resilience to WG3)

- There may be reason to prolong the interval between WG1 reports – to give the science sufficient time to develop novel findings – and to inform the other reports. For example, insufficient time was allowed between WG1 and WG2 in the AR5 cycle to allow a robust set of literature to be published on the incorporation of CMIP5 model results into downstream models of agricultural productivity and other impacts.
- Special Reports could be issued every ~1-2 years.
- This would, of course, have implications on the timing of elections, as well as on Bureau membership, length of tenure, and structure.
- Relevant decisions on the content (i.e., products) of the IPCC need to be made rather soon. Only then can we determine what the appropriate structure for the IPCC should be – i.e., “form follows function”.
- In addition, we note the ever-increasing constraints placed on travel budgets. As a result, greater use of regional UN centers / facilities and telecommunications technologies to convene authors, experts, etc. should be made a priority.

Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC.

Please consider the following in developing your response: strengthened support for developing country Co-chairs (e.g. through Panel guidance on the guidance on the establishment and governance of TSU's, co-hosting of TSU's in developing countries); support for developing country Bureau members and authors (CLA, LA, RE); Ways and means to utilize and enhance involvement of Bureau Members and Co-Chairs from developing countries in their respective regions; which additional role can the IPCC secretariat play; access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English; other ways and means to facilitate engagement of developing country scientists and experts; other ways and means to enhance coverage of knowledge from developing countries, including both published and government reports, and in languages other than English; ways to support and expand access to knowledge and fill existing gaps in data; ways to enhance research in developing countries without jeopardizing IPCC objectivity; ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries, including expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme.

We strongly support the concept of increased participation from developing countries and encourage the IPCC to pursue a variety of mechanisms to accomplish this goal. This could include soliciting nominations for authors and experts from National Academies of Science or TWAS, professional societies, international organizations and research centers, in conjunction with the relevant IPCC Focal Points. This could provide an excellent way to recruit developing country scientists who are temporarily residing at institutions outside of their native country and provide “organizational vetting” for early career scientists and experts, beginning to build the cohort of future IPCC scientists.

Other matters.

Please offer your thoughts on other matters regarding the future work of the IPCC for example: cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations; matters related to communication; process to discuss future IPCC work, including input from wider user groups and feedback on value and use of IPCC reports; any other matters.

- The IPCC must remain singly focused on assessing the state of climate science in a robust, thorough manner that maintains strong scientific integrity throughout the process. The authoritativeness of IPCC products, which flows directly from the comprehensive review processes they are subject to, must be preserved.
- Given some criticism that the IPCC reports can be “silos” of information with each chapter dealing with its topic – and only its topic – there may be value in having a pan-report author team that identifies overlaps, links, knowledge/research gaps, etc. It would be distinct from an SPM or TS author team.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH & INNOVATION

Directorate I - Climate Action and Resource Efficiency
I.4 - Climate Action and Earth Observation

Brussels, 20 February 2014
AT/ek(2014)459630

Dr Renate Christ
Secretary of the IPCC
IPCC Secretariat
Geneva

Sent by email only

Dear Dr Christ,

With reference to your invitation letter, dated 9 December 2013, to submit views in relation to the future work of the IPCC, please find attached the submission of the EU on that matter.

Yours sincerely

Andrea Tilche
Head of Unit

Annex: Future work of the IPCC: Views submitted by the European Union

Future work of the IPCC: views submitted by the European Union

The European Union (EU) thanks the IPCC Secretariat for the invitation to submit its views on the future of the IPCC in relation to the works of the relevant Task Force, following the decision taken by the Panel at its 37th Session (14-18 October 2013, Batumi, Georgia). The EU¹, using the rights of its special observer status within the IPCC as reflected in the IPCC Observer Policy, would like to submit its views regarding the post 5th Assessment Report (AR5) cycle. The present document outlines these views.

Foreword

The IPCC has developed over the years important *strengths*. It represents today a globally recognised institution that is fully supported by governments and able to mobilise different scientific communities at global scale; its assessment reports - prepared and reviewed thoroughly by thousands of scientists and approved by governments - constitute a worldwide standard of scientific consensus in the complex area of climate change and a reference point for policy debate at global level. The IPCC is a lean and efficient organisation, working successfully with limited financial resources. Furthermore, it provides an important network for the broader scientific community, creates standards for conducting research and influences climate research agendas worldwide.

However, especially within the context of a fast moving world, where information and knowledge are both created and made available much faster and to a wider spectrum of users than a decade ago, the IPCC faces a number of challenges and risks that need to be taken into consideration in order to ensure success in the coming years. Key *challenges* and *risks* include: the exponential increase in the volume of relevant scientific/technical literature and associated difficulties for analysis and synthesis; the need to maintain the relevance of the reports vis-à-vis the actual needs of the various end-users taking into consideration the rather slow process in finalising these reports; ensure the continuous involvement and motivation of highly-qualified experts worldwide taking into consideration the constantly increasing workload and the voluntary basis of their participation; the need for better treatment and communication of potential shortcomings of the IPCC work, such as errors and uncertainties; the perceived transparency/openness of the IPCC process and its final products by the general public;

¹ Here represented by the European Commission, not acting on behalf of its Members States.

the insufficient treatment of cross-cutting issues; the need for customised regional-scale information which is of high relevance for decision making (e.g. measures and investments related to adaptation).

We believe that the IPCC should build upon its strengths and at the same time address the key challenges and potential risks in a proactive manner, in order to adapt successfully to changes, take advantage of the opportunities and continue to provide scientific and technical assessment of the highest quality addressing societal and policy needs. We suggest the following issues for reflection and discussion in relation to the post-AR5 cycle:

A. Future IPCC products

The EU recognises the enormous value of the IPCC reports in building scientific consensus and supporting policy making and therefore strongly supports the continuation of the IPCC assessment work after the finalisation of the AR5 cycle. We believe that the IPCC should continue to provide, as part of its 'core business', comprehensive assessment reports covering the full spectrum spanning from physical science basis to solutions and response options (adaptation and mitigation). These reports will remain the cornerstone and reference point for strategic decision making at national and international level.

We suggest that the IPCC considers the publication of assessment reports in two parts instead of three: the first part should incorporate the *'physical science basis and the assessment of associated impacts, risks and vulnerabilities'* while the second part should focus on the *'response measures: adaptation and mitigation'*. Such an approach will allow for a more coherent treatment of cross-cutting issues, mark a clearer distinction between 'diagnostics' and 'solutions/proposed measures' and also make it easier for policy makers to extract relevant information. It will also cover adaptation and mitigation in an integrated manner –which is highly pertinent for policy making- and also facilitate the final synthesis of the assessment report.

However, given the relatively long period between assessment reports (currently seven years) there is a clear need for updates over shorter time-periods, especially when important new elements of information are available and existing pieces of information become outdated. This could be facilitated by a full digitalisation of the reports and complementary use of a web-based 'wiki-type' approach, to provide an 'interim' (advanced) version of the assessment report (which will simply incorporate only the important policy-relevant new findings) approximately three years after the publication of the assessment report. The use of such a web-based, wiki-type product would also increase the relevance as well as the transparency of the reports through direct links and instant access to the source of key statements/findings. We recognise that for such

an approach, provisions for a much shorter, less exhaustive preparation and approval process for this interim version of the report will be required.

The IPCC should also reflect on the merits of providing short 'fast-track' products focusing on emerging issues that are of high relevance to/demanded by the UNFCCC, not addressed sufficiently in the current assessment report and require treatment in a relatively short time (e.g. within 1 year). Using a format similar to technical papers in this instance may be a possible way forward, in order to be able to provide a timely response and avoid the heavy and time-consuming procedures associated with the assessment reports. Partnership and/or coordination with other international bodies performing similar assessments may facilitate this process. Provisions for less exhaustive approval process will be needed in such cases.

There is a growing demand for in-depth regional assessments of climate change both from policy makers and also the private sector. IPCC assessment reports to date have largely provided information at global or continental scale and therefore it has very often been difficult to identify the implications of the key findings of the IPCC reports for particular regions. Nonetheless, we recognise that to provide such regional assessments fundamental changes in the IPCC structure, scope, resources, mandate and modus operandi will be needed and as such production of regional assessments may not be feasible. On the other hand, we see a clear added value for the IPCC in providing methodological guidance on conducting regional assessments that can be used as a reference point by institutions/organisations that perform regional assessments of climate change. To that end, we encourage the IPCC to consider the merits of such a provision, especially in view of building capacity and know-how in developing countries (see also point ii under section C). Links with the WMOs Global Framework for Climate Services and with GEO should also be explored as means to further increase the quality of such regional assessments.

B. Appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products

The current structure of three Working Groups (WGs) has proven successful in attracting the relevant scientific communities and the necessary critical mass of high level scientists and experts needed for conducting such comprehensive assessments. On the other hand, the current WG division is built around scientific disciplines rather than policy-relevant themes or questions, creating a 'silo-approach'. However, we feel that a drastic change concerning the current structure (that is to reduce the number of WGs and/or change completely their mandate) may not be appropriate as it will create confusion and add complexity to the process. Therefore, and given the fact that we do not deem it necessary to have a one-to-one link between the number and scope of WGs vis-à-vis the number and scope of key products (in this case the parts of the assessment report), we propose to keep the current WG structure.

However, the IPCC should explore ways to foster integration between WGs in order to maintain its policy relevance and impact. This can be achieved for example by creating, multi-disciplinary leading author teams around cross-cutting issues that work together with the responsibility to oversee, from the very beginning of the process, the coherent treatment of all identified cross-cutting issues in the assessment report and improve their consistency. The scoping meeting of the next assessment cycle should also be designed to facilitate this integration process by identifying, where possible, key thematic blocks of high relevance to policy and decision making, rather than separate and specific scientific topics.

Selection of experts can further benefit from actions that will increase inclusiveness and transparency of the process. For example, high quality experts beyond those nominated through the official procedure, should –if they fulfil all necessary requirements- be eligible for consideration. This may be achieved through an open (online) expression of interest (in addition to the official government-led current practice of nominations by IPCC). Publication of the specific criteria/requirements for such a selection should be made publicly available on the web, in order to increase transparency and credibility in the process.

Preparation of IPCC reports is a labour-intensive process and the workload of authors is increasing continuously; this may pose a serious risk for future reports in terms of motivation and continuous involvement of the best scientists and as such compromise the quality of the assessment reports. To that end, the IPCC should consider ways to reduce the ever increasing pressure on scientists and make the preparation cycle more efficient such as: appoint full time research assistants/specialists to support the work of the Technical Support Units (TSUs) and/or of the coordinating lead authors; expand the list of contributing authors; explore ways to collaborate with other relevant international organisations and assessment bodies (e.g. UNEP, IPBES, IEA) in producing special reports or technical papers in partnership with those bodies. Such partnerships should be developed with specific objectives (e.g. conclusion of a mutually-agreed joint technical paper or a special report) and be part of a broader strategy of building partnerships with key international organisations (see also relevant point under ‘section D’).

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation & contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

The EU recognises the importance of increased participation and contribution of developing countries in the future works of the IPCC and of strengthening capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries. Hence, a significant part of the current EU financial contribution to the IPCC is devoted to supporting the engagement of scientists from developing countries in the IPCC process and the dissemination of IPCC products in those countries. In addition, future financial contribution to the IPCC,

currently planned under the new EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon2020 (2014-2020), will also support the participation of scientists from developing countries in the IPCC process.

We suggest that IPCC can contribute to capacity building by:

- i) Employing more experts from developing countries in the TSUs and/or explore the possibility of TSUs being hosted by developing countries.
- ii) Providing methodological guidance for regional assessments in order to assist institutions from developing countries in conducting regional assessments which are extremely relevant especially for adaptation action.

Furthermore, we encourage the IPCC to initiate a dialogue with developing countries on this issue in order to identify and analyse in depth the key bottlenecks, problems and needs that should be addressed in order to seek attainable solutions for the next IPCC cycle. We would also like to suggest that the IPCC Executive Committee consults with relevant UN and international organisations, the European Commission's Development and Cooperation services as well as international programmes (e.g. start.org), that have capacity building in developing countries at the core of their mandate, in order to benefit from their expertise and identify best practices that can also be adopted by the IPCC.

We would also like to note that numerous research programmes and actions worldwide that target developing countries in the area of climate change and sustainable development already exist or are planned for the coming years. In that respect, it might be beneficial for the IPCC to perform a mapping of those activities that by definition incorporate scientists from developing countries and are potential sources for -very much needed- input to future IPCC reports. For example, international cooperation has been a key component of the EU's 7th Framework Programme for Research. As a result, a significant number of research projects targeting climate change issues relevant to developing countries (e.g. tropical deforestation, water cycle, regional climate projections and impacts) have been funded and many institutions and experts from developing countries have participated in these projects. We will be happy to provide to the IPCC a detailed list of such EU-funded research projects/activities in the area of climate change.

D. Other matters

Communication & outreach: We consider communication activities a crucial component of the IPCC process. It is important that IPCC assessments and other related products have the maximum impact to all relevant stakeholders. In order to achieve this, the IPCC should consider the following issues:

The IPCC should implement its communication strategy in a more proactive mode, make extensive use of available new technologies and means and engage with a broader range of stakeholders and the general public also before and during the assessment cycle activities (and not only towards the finalisation of the assessment reports). Such engagement should go beyond the simple dissemination of scientific results outlined in the reports or the provision of factual information on the products and also incorporate outreach actions with the aim of increasing the visibility of the IPCC 'brand', and disseminate the purpose, importance, and societal value of the IPCC in the broader climate change debate, in order to create trust, minimise disinformation and engage all relevant stakeholders on a continuous basis.

To that end, the extensive use of internet and social media should be further explored as means to i) communicate in an attractive, modern, continuous and fast manner and ii) increase visibility of and accessibility to IPCC products. Special attention should be given to more extensive use of visual means of providing information (figures, graphs, maps, short videos) rather than long, text-rich documents. We also invite the IPCC to consider the merits of producing educational material and activities with the aim of attracting/engaging young generations.

Partnership with UN and other international organisations/bodies: We feel it is important that the IPCC explores means of cooperation with other relevant assessment bodies, international organisations and intergovernmental platforms (e.g. UNEP, IEA, IPBES, WMO, GEO), in order to better coordinate the scope and content of the assessments, avoid overlapping and capitalise upon possibilities for cooperation and even co-production of certain technical papers or special reports with these organisations. Co-production of special reports and/or technical papers will result in co-ownership, guarantee pluralism of information and increase further the credibility and acceptance of such 'joint' products.

Additional end-users & stakeholders: We propose that the IPCC expands its stakeholder target beyond governments and the scientific community, reaching and interacting with a number of additional stakeholders and potential end-users such as civil society organisations, private sector, industry and also the general public. This can be done to some extent during the scoping process (so to better incorporate stakeholders' needs when deciding the content and structure of reports), but most importantly through well-designed, customised outreach activities and products targeting, for example, specific economic sectors.