

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE IPCC
Georgia, 14 - 18 October 2013

IPCC-XXXVII/INF. 1
(17.VII.2013)
Agenda Item: 8
ENGLISH ONLY

FUTURE OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

FUTURE OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments

With her letter of 13 March 2013 (provided in Annex 1) the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide their views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC, as well as suggestions about the process the Panel may establish for efficient and timely consideration of the matter. Submissions received are collated in this document by alphabetical order:

Governments:

- Argentina
- Australia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Canada
- Chile
- China
- Colombia
- Cyprus
- Denmark
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Ireland
- Italy
- Japan
- Kenya
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mongolia
- Netherlands (the)
- Panama
- Singapore
- Sweden
- Syrian Arab Republic
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- United Republic of Tanzania
- United States of America
- Uzbekistan

GOVERNMENTS COMMENTS

ARGENTINA



*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

Questions

Which should be the key future IPCC products and what would be the timing?

Should the IPCC continue to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports and carry out other reports as required, following the "Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers" as amended at the 29th Session?

Should the IPCC prepare more focused thematic reports that would jointly constitute an assessment report?

How should regional issues be covered in the future?

What should be the duration the future assessment period?

Should Reports be staggered?

How to get appropriate feedback about AR5 and input from IPCC users and contributors to the preparations for the next round of assessments?

For the above mentioned questions and topics that may be addressed we consider the following issues:

First, the periodicity of 7 years 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 three years between each other, and taking into account timeline requirements and decisions of the UNFCCC process.

On the other hand, it also raises the possibility of changing the approach to the issues. 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



Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable

vulnerability and finally, Group III evaluates adaptation strategies and mitigation, enabling, at the same time, analysis of synergies.

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.

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.

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

AUSTRALIA



AUSTRALIA

Submission to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change | June 2013

On 13 March 2013, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Secretariat invited submissions on topics and questions relating to the future of the IPCC. The Australian Government welcomes the opportunity to present its views, and discuss further with Parties at the 37th IPCC Plenary Session, 14-18 October 2013 in Batumi, Georgia.

Overview

The Australian Government values the IPCC's work, acknowledging the important and successful role the Panel plays in providing comprehensive and authoritative information on climate change. The IPCC's reports are central to the national development of climate policies and measures – and progress under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on a new 2020 climate agreement that will apply to all countries.

The Australian Government supports the periodic review of the IPCC's scope and timelines in the context of the *Principles Governing IPCC Work*.

Australia seeks consideration of the following issues at the 37th Plenary Session:

- A possible Special Report on mitigation in 2018 prior to start of the 2020 new agreement;
- Offsetting the delivery of the working groups for the Sixth Assessment Report; and
- Undertaking a survey of end users

Question 1. What are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

The IPCC Assessment Reports are the authoritative source on climate change science, and provide regular assessments of the world's changing climate and the potential environmental and socio-economic consequences. The Working Group contributions to the Assessment Reports provide:

- comprehensive assessments of the latest climate change science (WGI);
- consolidated understanding of different sectors and regions in terms of impacts and adaptation strategies (WGII); and
- information on emission trends and drivers, including countries' individual and collective contributions to emissions, and mitigation options in individual sectors (WGIII).

The Assessment Reports inform government policy making, and help encourage ambitious global responses to climate change in the UNFCCC. The timing of the delivery of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report will help inform the UNFCCC negotiations on new 2020 climate change agreement, and Working Group III of the AR5 will be the primary input for the 2013-2015 Review of the goal to hold global average temperature rise to below two degrees Celsius above pre-industrialised levels.

The Assessment Reports should remain the IPCC's principal focus, complemented by Special Reports.

Based on the current six to seven year assessment cycle, a Sixth Assessment Report is to be delivered around 2020 or 2021. Australia would support consideration of a Special Report in 2018 on the efforts by all countries to meet the global two degree goal prior to start of the 2020 new agreement.

A Special Report between the Fifth and Sixth Assessment Reports would provide continuity of IPCC contribution to the UNFCCC's work and provide a basis for Working Group contributions to a Sixth Assessment Report.

Timeline for Sixth Assessment Report

Australia supports a new timeline for the Sixth Assessment Report that would allow the Working Groups to be considered in subsequent Working Group reports. Offsetting the delivery of Working Group reports would allow impacts and adaptation assessments to be based on the latest science assessed in the Working Group I report. This would also serve to enhance the integration between the three Working Group reports and allow for the timely release of the Synthesis Report.

The proposed structure would provide more time between reports so that Working Group I contribution could be produced in 2020/2021, and the Working Group II and Working Group III reports in 2022/2023 (See Table 1).

Table 1: Proposed timeline for the Sixth Assessment Report

<i>Current Timeline</i>	<i>Proposed Timeline</i>
WGI – September 2020	WGI – September 2020
WGII – March 2021	WGII – April 2023
WGIII – April 2021	WGIII – April 2023
Synthesis Report – October 2021	Synthesis Report – October 2024

The Sixth Assessment Report process will also need to consider the alignment and complementarity between Working Group II and the intended outputs of the *Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (IPBES), to avoid duplication and overburdening of the scientific community.

Election of IPCC Bureau

If the delivery of the Working Group reports is offset, consideration will also need to be given to the process for electing IPCC Bureau members given the Bureau terms currently align with the Assessment Report cycle. Mechanisms will be required to ensure the continued functioning of the IPCC Bureau if moving to a more effectively timed reporting cycle.

Survey of end users

Consideration could be given to surveying the end users of the IPCC Assessment and Special Reports, to gather a comprehensive assessment of their utility. This would provide an opportunity to consider ways to improve the reports and the process for delivering them. The end user community would include: governments; authors; review editors; research organisations; observer organisations; and, wider society. This survey would aim to inform the Panel on how to progress with decisions on the scope and structure of future Assessment and Special Reports.

Question 2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

Decisions on the future of the IPCC should be progressed without delay. Areas that require resolution at the 37th Plenary include:

- The length and timeframe of future Assessment Report cycles including the timing of Working Group contributions to a Sixth Assessment Report
- The merits of undertaking an end user survey.
 - o The process and timeframe for proceeding with a survey of end users
- The scope and process for the election of the next IPCC Bureau

Following this, further discussion should continue at the 39th Session to be held in Germany in April 2014.

Question 3: Any other comments and suggestions?

The Australian Government strongly supports the continuation of the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI), and sees no reason to change the TFI's mandate. The TFI performs an invaluable role in assessing, evaluating and promoting the widespread use of internationally acceptable methodologies for the implementation of country reporting under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.

The Task Force Bureau (TFB) should also be retained unchanged. The current TFB size, structure and composition provides an acceptable geographical balance while facilitating access to critical expertise in the development of national greenhouse gas inventories.

The Australian Government strongly prefers that all method reports that address national inventory issues should be governed by the Task Force Bureau on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories to avoid duplication and /or conflicts in IPCC guidance that would undermine the standing and reputation of the IPCC.

AUSTRIA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

- Austria welcomes a broad discussion relating to the future of the IPCC. Austria sees a need to consider e.g. whether it is the most efficient and effective way forward to prepare a sixth assessment cycle after the AR5 or whether e.g. a range of other products such as Special Reports would be a better option.
- This implies for Austria that also the current structure with respect to 3 Working Groups should be reconsidered according to the principle: form follows function. There might be benefits in having only two Working Groups in the future, one addressing the science of climate change (the "science of CC plus impacts plus attribution) and the other addressing the policies of climate change, including adaptation, vulnerability assessments, mitigation and others (geo-engineering, insurance etc).
- Austria suggests to consider also the range of IPCC products. What might be needed (in addition to current products) are products more up-to-date than current products ("rapid response reports"). This should help to avoid that IPCC products are of little relevance with regard to certain aspects because of relevant new material. This will require a revision of current rules and procedures.
- With respect to the TFI Austria does not see an alternative or a need for revision.
- Another important topic relates to communication and the consideration of the use of e.g. social media to allow for a more open and transparent process.
- It might be useful to develop a common vision of the IPCC in the long-term first before considering short- and medium term changes. In this context an assessment of how other persons/organizations see the IPCC and which should be the role of the IPCC in our view might be useful. The next step might be to provide answers to the question: how can we strengthen this role of the IPCC?
- Above all the financial consequences must be kept in mind. Do the organisational changes lead to higher expenses?

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

- Austria suggests to establish a Task Group at the beginning of the next IPCC plenary with a mandate to
 - a) prepare a proposal on the process based on the submissions;
 - b) establish a list of possible topics to be addressed in the long and short/medium term.
- This TG might continue to work if necessary also after the next plenary meeting in order to forward a well considered proposal on decisions to be taken well before the 38th session of the IPCC for final consideration of the IPCC plenary.
- The process should allow to elect a new IPCC bureau in 2015 as scheduled - recognizing that the option of having only two WGs in the future might allow to reduce the size of the bureau. However, the structure of the IPCC should be agreed well before 2015 in order to allow members of the IPCC to identify candidates for the bureau with the necessary qualifications and skills.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

Austria has the expectation that the IPCC will also in the future deliver products which have at least the same high quality than in the past.

Austria also feels that the financial resources for the IPCC will be limited in the future and moderns means of communication should be used to the extent possible to reduce travel expenditures.

BELGIUM

Draft Submission by Belgium related to the Future of the IPCC.

Thank you Chair for giving us the opportunity to make a submission regarding questions and issues to be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC and the process and timeline for considerations of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC

We discussed this issue within the Coordination Committee for International Cooperation in the area of environmental research and with scientists that actively participated in the IPCC processes as well as the stakeholders, members of the Federal Council for Sustainable Development.

1. Questions and issues to consider

1.1. Assessment cycle: aims, users, products, duration.

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. Without any doubt, the IPCC is highly policy relevant 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 as well as the evolution of the society and scientific knowledge.

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 without being prescriptive,
 - Inform the society as a whole on the topic of climate change, their impacts and the links with human societies and the environment.
- The production of high quality IPCC documents: through the application of severe 'quality control' procedures, comprehensive use of scientific analyses available in the literature etc.
- The independency of the scientists preparing the reports
- 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 dynamic way by at the same time keeping the high quality and robustness.

Furthermore the IPCC faces a number of challenges:

- flexibility
- increasing efficiency and effectiveness
- Increasing transparency (e.g. stakeholder engagement, public web consultation,...)
- the ever increasing demand of policymakers and their short term need
- 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 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 and security aspects related to CC..

- the fact that other organisations provide quick assessments in the area of expertise of the IPCC but without similar review process so that one can have doubts about the quality
- the need for a still more integrated, multidisciplinary approach (experts from different WGs working better together)
- the need for a more integrated regional approach
- the many different aspects of CC: physical science + ethical, social, technological, economic, environmental and security aspects
- the ever-lasting sceptics and the 'disinformation' on climate change issues; consideration of a more offensive approach
- the need to built awareness within the public at large which could infer the consideration of more public friendly, easy readable short documents

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 type of products.

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 mega 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 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.

1.2. Organisational issues and the structure of the Bureau

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

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

- The mandate of the IPCC: this could involve the description of the mandate of the IPCC Vice Chairs as well as the WG Vice Chairs. In the past 2 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;
- The number of working groups and their mandate,
- Changes that could facilitate the collaboration and exchange of information between the working groups
- 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
- General organisation of the work, including the role and composition of the TSUs

1.3. Processes and methods

Depending on the outcome of the discussions regarding the assessment cycle, 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
- possibilities for fast reviews of fast track assessments 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) involvement scientists from developing countries, ...)
- 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
- continue to strengthen drafting and reviewing process
- develop a climate friendly approach to reduce IPCCs C 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 en CO2 emissions. ...)
- organise broad consultation for scoping next assessment, involving stakeholders

1.4. 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 (cfr '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.

1.5. 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 on 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. The funding of such an independent agency could be inspired by different funding models such as the mechanisms used in UNEP or in UNFCCC...).

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

2. Process and timeline for consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC

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. Based on the submission, a number of priority items could be identified. The next plenary could then decide upon the organisation of contact groups for these items and a mandate (including calendar) for these contact groups to work in between and during plenaries.

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.

3. Other issues

For the AR5, authors have indeed suffered greatly because the climate model results were only available in a tle stage of the process and had to be analyzed in a hurry. It is expected that in the weeks and months to come many more papers devoted to the results of these models will be published. It is therefore very unfortunate that they have not been assessed in the AR5. For this reason we suggest to discuss the consideration of the potential role of the IPCC for a better coordination of the timing of the future intercomparison exercises of climate models and the assessment reports.

* * *

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

- 1 physical climate change
- 2 impacts on ecosystems and human activities

Group 2 - Solutions: Mitigation, adaptation and vulnerability

- 2 Scenarios, role of socio-economic drivers in shaping emissions, mitigation potential, adaptation potential, and vulnerability
- 3 Technical potential
- 4 Costs
- 5 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

CANADA

1. What are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

The IPCC has been very effective in fulfilling its role to conduct scientific assessments of climate change. Canada believes that this role will continue to be relevant for the IPCC moving forward. However, as the IPCC nears completion of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), it is timely to once again review the IPCC's accomplishments and determine how the organization can continue to fulfill its role in the most useful and efficient ways possible.

Canada appreciates the initial analysis by the Secretariat (BUR-XLVI/Doc. 15) of the main questions and issues that could be considered in determining the future of the IPCC. We believe this document serves as a useful starting point for guiding further thinking on this matter. To further advance discussion of these ideas it would be helpful if they could be grouped and sequenced. The following are proposed groupings with key sub-questions (drawn and adapted from Doc. 15) that could be considered in each area:

1. Products of the IPCC
 - What should be the key future IPCC products and what would be their timing?
 - Should the TFI and TGICA continue and, if so, are any changes to their mandates required?
2. Structure of the IPCC
 - Are the structures and mandates of the IPCC Working Groups still adequate or should adjustments and changes be considered?
3. Governance of the IPCC
 - What should be the size, structure and composition of the next IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau?
4. Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports
 - Based on the IPCC's experience with the AR4 and AR5, are revisions to the Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports required?
5. IPCC Communications
 - Based on the IPCC's experience with the AR4 and AR5, are revisions to the IPCC Communications Strategy required?

Canada suggests that grouping the questions in such a manner would provide the structure necessary to facilitate the process of determining the future of the IPCC, with the first two groupings being of more immediate and overarching priority.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

Regarding the process for determining the future of the IPCC, Canada notes that the IPCC successfully considered and implemented changes in response to the 2010 InterAcademy Council (IAC) review. We suggest that this experience offers some valuable tools and lessons to draw from when considering a process to determine the future of the IPCC. In particular, the key qualities that drove the success of these changes were:

- A decision-making process driven by government task groups with advice and strong support from the Bureau, Secretariat and Technical Support Units (TSUs)

- Consultation with key partners where useful and appropriate (e.g., UNFCCC, WMO and UNEP)
- A transparent process open to all government members and well-communicated by the IPCC Secretariat.

For the process of determining the future of the IPCC, Canada suggests that a government driven process similar to that used for changes in response to the IAC review would be appropriate. For example, based on the main topic areas proposed in Canada's response to question 1, the IPCC could consider forming three task groups dealing with (i) products and structure; (ii) governance and communications, and (iii) procedures.

However, we also recognize that the IPCC's work is driven and fulfilled by the many hundreds of scientists and experts who lead the development of IPCC reports and that there are many other organizations, most significantly the UNFCCC, that rely on the work of the IPCC to inform their decisions. In regards to consultations and engagement with these stakeholders, Canada would support focused and targeted outreach led by the IPCC to key user organizations like the UNFCCC. With respect to broader engagement, Canada suggests that governments can play a role in consulting with national contributors and stakeholders in the IPCC. The Government of Canada has already initiated consultations within Canada on the future of the IPCC and will continue to serve as a national focal point for consultations about the future of the IPCC moving forward.

With respect to the timeline for determining the future of the IPCC, the greatest considerations for Canada are to avoid the risk of interfering with the completion of the AR5 and to remain sensitive to demands placed on the IPCC Bureau, Secretariat and TSU staff. The AR5 will be a significant achievement for the IPCC, which is vital to informing the UNFCCC review of the global goal of limiting global warming to below 2°C. Over the next year, it is important that the process to initiate discussions about the future of the IPCC not interfere with or detract from the completion of the AR5 and the IPCC's efforts to share and communicate it globally. During this period, there will also be many demands placed on members of the IPCC Bureau and staff of the Secretariat and TSUs. As these individuals will play key roles in helping to guide the future of the IPCC, it is important that the timeline take into account their workloads so that they are able to effectively contribute.

To avoid the risk of adversely impacting the completion of the AR5, we suggest that an appropriate timeline would be for governments to agree to key topics/questions and a detailed process by no later than mid-2014. In late 2014 to 2015, the full process for consulting and taking decisions on the future of the IPCC would be carried out, with the goal of completing all decisions by mid-2015. This timeline would leave sufficient time for the election of a new Bureau by late 2015, therefore supporting the rule of the IPCC that requires a new Bureau to be elected within one year of the completion of an assessment report.

3. Any other comments or suggestions?

Canada remains strongly committed to the IPCC and its work to conduct scientific assessments of climate change. Thank you for the opportunity to provide preliminary input on the topics, process and timeline for determining future of the IPCC. Canada looks forward to further discussions on this matter beginning at the 37th Session of the IPCC in October.

CHILE

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

Which should be the key future IPCC products and what would be the timing?

How should regional issues be covered in the future?

Relationship and possible cooperation with other relevant assessment processes

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

This is a decision that must be taken by the country members. In my opinion, one year is a reasonable timeline for a discussion based on a scoping paper that can be produced by the secretariat with the inputs from country members.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

There are several networks in climate change in Latin America (EUROCLIMA RIOCC, IAI, etc.) that drive studies and technical reports on issues of adaptation and mitigation. It would be useful to collect the reality of the region that the work of these networks is considered in the future assessments reports.

On the other hand, the feedback about AR5 and input from IPCC users and contributors to the preparations for the next round of assessments is very important. Six month after finish the AR5 would be appropriate, using questionnaires in a web based systems. And the target group should be in first place Authors, and Review editors, and then governments and other target groups

CHINA

The Chinese government appreciates the preparations made by the Bureau, Executive Committee and Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) for the discussion on the future of the IPCC, and would like to take this opportunity to comment on this issue of importance to its further evolution. We believe that:

I. The main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC are:

(1) Form and cycle of an IPCC assessment product

- Any other better option if the basic form of three working group reports plus one synthesis report is discontinued?
- Any need to launch the Sixth Assessment Report? If yes, when? Will the same timeline as that for the Fifth Assessment Report be adopted?
- Can selected regional or specific issues be assessed by way of a special report?

(2) Enhanced visibility of the IPCC and its assessment products

- The possibility of the IPCC, building on the strength of its experience and advances in scientific assessment, to introduce assessment products of greater relevance that are distinguished from and complementary to those by other organizations, such as the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).
- The possibility of the IPCC to better meet the needs of the international community in scientific assessment of climate change, such as that from UNFCCC for its negotiation processes and that from stakeholders for their proposed assessment of selected regional or specific climate change related issues.
- The possibility of the IPCC to facilitate the greater participation of developing countries in the assessment process so that they can make better use of its reports as scientific support to their actions on climate change.
- An appropriate feedback mechanism to be put in place in connection with the ongoing communication strategy, under which reactions, comments and suggestions of the international community on the Fifth Assessment Report will be acquired, reviewed and responded to so that reserves can be made for any future assessment initiative while the report be made more visible.

(3) Setup of the Bureau and Working Groups

The core mission of the IPCC is to provide the international community with scientific assessment reports on climate change. Therefore, the size and composition of the future IPCC Bureau and the setup of each Working Groups are both subject to the form of its future assessment reports. Thus, their setup and functions should be discussed not until these issues are well addressed.

II. The process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC should cover two steps:

(1) It is suggested that key issues to be discussed and resolved be identified at the 37th plenary session, and that a task team be set up to develop a report of recommendations on IPCC's future assessment products, which will be submitted to the 38th plenary session for discussion and decisions after being discussed and revised at the IPCC Bureau session.

(2) When the form of assessment products is decided upon at the plenary session, the task team will be requested to develop proposals on the composition and terms of reference of the new Bureau and Working Groups, which will be submitted to the 40th plenary session for discussion and

decisions after being discussed and revised at the IPCC Bureau session. At the same time, the election of the new Bureau will be decided upon.

III. Other comments and suggestions

The Chinese government believes that, since IAC's evaluation, IPCC has reviewed its own assessment process, governance and communication strategy carefully, made decisions on improved rules and procedures at plenary sessions, established the Executive Committee (EC), and redefined the terms of reference (TOR) of the Bureau and the Secretariat. These improvements, which have contributed to the process of the current IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, serve as a solid groundwork for any assessment initiative by IPCC in the future, hence be maintained.

COLOMBIA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

- Timing and future products of the IPCC

The relationship between the IPCC and the international climate regime is two-way. Whilst the IPCC informs decisions at the global level – that is, under the UNFCCC – the outcomes of climate negotiations should drive changes in the work, structure and/or procedures of the IPCC.

With this in mind, we are of the view that the Doha agreements on a post-Kyoto climate architecture and further developments on this outcome should determine the timing and contents of future IPCC products. For instance, the urgent need to closing the global emissions gap within the following years calls for an enhancement in the frequency of reports on mitigation, which should not be restricted to emissions abatement and will most certainly have to make greater emphasis on issues such as mitigation and sustainability, frameworks and assessment of capacity building activities and technology transfer and development. Likewise, the inclusion of “loss and damage” considerations under the UNFCCC and possibly within the next climate regime, suggests that improved IPCC review/reporting efforts will most likely be required in areas such as the economic valuation of climate change impacts on health and ecosystem services.

By the same token, enhanced methodological and technical guidance by the IPCC could be required as new or more stringent MRV requirements, particularly for developing countries, are set under the UNFCCC.

- Views and questions for consideration based on the current work of the IPCC

Assessment reports are significantly useful and informative. However, in relation to adaptation to climate change the IPCC should provide more guidance. The assessment reports consolidate good information on adaptation strategies applied in different sectors or regions, yet we are of the view that in terms of methodologies these reports should provide more guidance (even though it is not their main objective). Developing and least developing countries need assistance and technical information about available methodologies to develop national, regional and/or sector-specific adaptation plans. In this sense, some methodologies and steps to follow in the process of adaptation should be published by the IPCC. Taking this into account, the 37th Session of the IPCC should consider the next questions:

- Can the IPCC begin to give more importance to the development of Methodology Reports and Technical Papers, without harming the quality and resources devoted to the preparation of Assessment Reports?

- What kind of Methodology Reports and Technical Papers should be developed by the IPCC in the future in order to guide countries in terms of adaptation?

- Could the IPCC develop Methodology Reports and Technical Papers for adaptation to climate change that resemble the guidelines to calculate GHG inventories? (e.g. Methodologies to analyse hazards, impacts, exposure, vulnerability or risk to climate change and climate vulnerability)

- Could the IPCC consider providing training or assist developing countries and least developing countries with regards to adaptation to climate change methodologies or frameworks? (e.g. Short courses or workshops about conceptual frameworks for adaptation and its relation with disaster risk management, or methodologies to analyse hazards, impacts, exposure, vulnerability or risk to climate change and climate vulnerability)

- What are the expectations of the future IPCC in terms of the IPCC scholarships? Could the IPCC extend these scholarships and the number of grants in the future?
- Should the IPCC consider establishing an online mechanism in its website to share the information collected (e.g. papers)?

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

Without a doubt, the next decade will be decisive in terms of how the world will have to cope with climate change during a much larger timespan. In line with commentaries in question 1, we would like to suggest that the timeline for consideration of and decisions regarding the future of the IPCC be set in accordance with UNFCCC actions to tackle climate change. This timeline should guarantee that the IPCC is as dynamic as changes in international climate policy, technological breakouts, and local and regional needs and progress regarding climate science, mitigation and adaptation. Importantly, the IPCC should also be able to scientifically inform key UNFCCC decisions such as a) the level of ambition of a post-Kyoto binding agreement, b) emissions metrics, c) which mechanisms can be put in place to address the pressing needs of global adaptation and d) how could loss and damage considerations be effectively incorporated into a new climate regime.

As rapid responses are needed, we suggest that an action plan and/or other decisions regarding the IPCC are designed within the next 18-24 months.

Broadly, we are of the view that the process for deciding upon the future of the IPCC should be backed by streamlined processes of consultation and follow the current governance arrangements of the Panel.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

- Although IPCC procedures have been crafted so as to promote participation by developing countries, there is still room for much improvement with this regard. By 2011, nearly half of the member countries, all developing, had never had expert representation in any of IPCC Assessment Reports (Ho Lem et al. 2011). Low participation by developing countries in the IPCC has two main negative impacts on the work of the Panel: first, it could negatively affect its credibility in the developing world. Second, it could lead to

Whilst relatively low participation rates reflect low capacity and weak research infrastructure in most developing countries, the IPCC could also consider deploying innovative strategies that promote a more effective engagement of their specialists in the science network that is in charge of IPCC reports' preparation, revision and approval.

- Assessment reports should be written not only for policy makers, scientifics and experts but also for citizens and local communities in order to increase local actions and awareness.

CYPRUS



Rocg WMO REGISTRY (2)		11 JUN 2013	
9108-13		IPCC	
SG	DSG		
PASSED TO			
Annexes		Filed	



Our Ref.: 02.09.007.06.1/04

4 June, 2013

Renate Christ
Secretary of the IPCC, WMO
7 bis, avenue de la Paix
Case postale 2300
CH 1211 Geneve 2
SWITZERLAND

Subject: The Future of IPCC

Madam,

With reference to your recent letter on 13 March, 2013 (reference number 5141-13/IPCC/GEN) regarding the future of IPCC, this is the reply of the Cyprus' Meteorological Service to your questions.

- **Country:**
Cyprus

- **Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of IPCC?**

1. We believe that the continuation of comprehensive assessment reports, enriched with new challenges related to research climate change will be invaluable, especially for small countries without the capacity or resources to create their own future projections.
2. The assessment reports are considered as the common scientific background for any local research activities and are used as guidance for decision-making.
3. The value of the assessment reports will further increase with more focused thematic reports / assessments. Regional issues are of paramount importance and we think that areas that exhibit special scientific interest (as the Eastern Mediterranean "hotspot" should be further investigated.

- **What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of IPCC?**


1

The overall time schedule is deemed satisfactory for assessment reports. More frequent fast track assessments as a responsible expert response about hot scientific issues are considered as a necessity.

- **Any other comments and suggestions**

A task force of experts able to travel and inform decision makers on relevant issues would help small Countries to keep track on IPCC activities.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Filippou Tymvios', with a stylized flourish at the end.

(Filippos Tymvios)
For the Director
Cyprus Meteorological Service

- CC: - Director - General of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
- Director - General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 - Theodoulos Mesimeris, IPCC Focal Point, Department of Environment

DENMARK

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

Scoping for a possible AR6

Consider the balance between continuity and renewal in the author team: for new authors on the team it takes a considerable amount of time to become familiar with the process, so while it is important with changes in the author team, the importance of continuity from the previous author team should also be considered. Input and experience from review editors should be included in the scoping process. Transparency in the scoping process is desirable, e.g. possibility for countries to nominate participants for the scoping meeting. Knowledge gaps should be pointed out in future assessment reports. Transparency in the review process, including publishing review comments, is essential.

Working group structure and timing of contributions for a possible AR6

The time lag between WGI and WGII/WGIII contributions to AR5 was not adequate to achieve the intended input from WGI into WGII/WGIII. A possibility is to change the timing further, e.g. by updating the WGII/WGIII contributions before updating WGI. Impacts, vulnerability and adaptation have huge political attention, and it should be considered how the WGII contribution can be strengthened. It may be desirable to move from large Assessments Reports to more rapid updates; however, the large Assessment Reports have more authority and impact than Special Reports. Consider shortening the assessment cycle to five years. Rapid updates on limited focus areas might be provided via the WG chairs in case of new results, new knowledge or changed conditions. A standing committee might comment on behalf of the IPCC on new results.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

3. Any other comments and suggestions

Suggestion: IPCC Special Report on food systems, food security and climate change

Food systems will be one of the first human systems to be impacted by global warming, putting enormous strain on global food security if temperatures move to 3-4 C warming. Adaptation measures are only partly effective at these temperatures, and the warming will coincide with a global population of 9 billion, mostly living in the world's already warmest regions.

FINLAND

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

A) IPCC products

General comment: IPCC is the most significant science-policy interface institution, which has a global impact on political decision making. It gives advice for the basis of decision making based on knowledge which is best available and scientifically securitized. The independence of IPCC of political views and its integrity are crucial for the success. The current practice to include only peer-reviewed scientific articles for the analysis supports these principles. It is vital that the IPCC can maintain its credibility and sound scientific base.

The ability to respond efficiently to questions and needs that arise in the UNFCCC process is crucial. There are no indications that the number of such questions would be diminishing.

1) The assessments

Current assessments provide essential and reliable background information for long time policy making.

The preparation of the assessments is a long and demanding process. On the other hand, the process promotes global participation and commitment, which is very important.

Giving up the assessments is not a good solution. It should, however be considered, if the assessment cycle could be longer (especially with WG2 and WG3). Thematic and focussed reports could be prepared more frequently in between the assessments.

The role of summaries is key for policy making. Good summaries clarify concepts, illustrate processes and visualise results in a clear manner. The IPCC has already put a lot of effort in this area but the need is continuous. Some IPCC graphs and figures have become icons, and they build common understanding. In Finland we make continuous use of IPCC materials in the policy and public debate. This issue is closely linked to the communication strategy of the IPCC.

2) Communication and thematic reports

A "highlights summary" of the most important changes that have occurred since the previous corresponding IPCC report would be extremely useful. Usability of materials for the decision makers (general public) vs. for scientists should be considered. The availability of visual and easy to understand materials should be considered. E.g. the production of infographics would be a welcome addition to the current selection of background materials.

Also thematic IPCC reports have proven useful. Possible new themes of general interest might be: Energy efficiency and Local climate action.

3) Methodology reports

IPCC guidelines and good practice guidance for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals for national greenhouse gas inventories are used reporting under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. Use of these guidelines plays a crucial role in monitoring and verifying emission limitation and reduction efforts (pledges, commitments) under these and other international agreements. The

need for developing the methodologies is continuous so that the latest scientific information, new sources and sinks and impact of abatement measures can be reflected properly in the emission/removal estimates. Future work could also review the reporting framework to make the classification used more systematic, transparent, and to improve consistency with international classifications used in data collection. The development and improvement of the inventory guidelines should be done in close cooperation with the UNFCCC, the main user of these guidelines.

Methodological work in support of planning and implementation of climate policies is necessary. The themes for future work could include assessment of methodologies for estimating impacts of policies and measures to abate emissions.

B) Enhancing the processes

The first IPCC assessments were made when the amount of relevant scientific publications was small. It is likely that the IPCC process will need modifications in order to maintain its functionality during these times of very active climate research.

The process should facilitate the production of focussed and sometimes technical papers that address specific problems in the negotiations. Presently the IPCC doesn't have such functions nor there are formal requests to that end.

There are ideas to make use of the IPCC web pages in presenting updates of scientific information. Such proposals have their plus and minuses but they merit consideration:

For example, information on observed climate changes could be routinely updated on IPCC web pages on an annual basis between the main assessments provided that (i) an agreement is reached on the main data sets used for this purpose [as a rule, the same data sets as used in the main reports] and (ii) specific author teams are assigned for the task. To some extent, this also applies to projections of climate change. A web-based resource on e.g. "Projections of the 21st century climate change" could be maintained, which would include a critical subset of the graphics, tables and discussion given in the main reports but would be updated when new model simulations fulfilling pre-specified criteria become available. However, updating process should be thoroughly considered, e.g. too frequent updating of scenarios may lead to confusion. As a whole, a key issue is what information needs to go through the multiple review process and be labeled with the likelihood / amount of evidence statements, and what the IPCC can provide to users following a lighter procedure. However, updating process should be thoroughly considered, e.g. too frequent updating of scenarios may lead to confusion.

Interaction between the IPCC and the UNFCCC is important. Successful timing of the IPCC reports is linked to the processes in the UNFCCC (example: AR4 and Copenhagen). There are also new issues and terms in the UNFCCC (e.g. historical emissions, blue and yellow carbon, shale gas / oil), and the IPCC might have a role in preparing concept papers to facilitate discussions on a sound scientific basis.

Broad geographical coverage of both IPCC authors and cited references has been an aim for long in the IPCC process and relevant steps to this end have already been taken.

Enhancing the processes and participation in the IPCC often have cost implications. Funding issues are an integral part of considerations. Utilisation of modern communication technologies for meetings, when appropriate, and other cost saving procedures should also be considered.

C) Feedback about AR5

The timing of the feedback varies from actor to actor. There will be numerous AR5 seminars and events in 2013-2014. Collecting systematic feedback from these events may be useful. National IPCC focal points could possibly be asked to do this.

The government feedback and the civil society feedback are both important. AR5 has multiple uses at different time scales, and collecting feedback may be wise to organise over a longer time period.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The importance of the timing of the reports cannot be underestimated. AR4 and AR5 are recent examples of assessments that were wisely planned to serve important UNFCCC meetings.

One should start the planning process in the October 2013 Plenary. One could start with defining the scope and procedure for formation of task groups for the renewal process. For example, task groups could be assigned with different viewpoints - science community, UNFCCC, policy making in general, etc. Later on work of task group contributions should be synthesized into a document for comments and discussion for the Plenaries in 2014.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

Also the broader context is important. How can the UNFCCC process make use of other relevant organisations and how can the planning in the IPCC be pragmatically linked to the planning in other relevant organisations who also provide relevant information to the UNFCCC.

It is important that the IPCC process will be renewed through new Bureau members, authors, etc. However, it is equally vital that continuity is retained. Therefore, it would be beneficial, if a significant portion (e.g. 50% or so) of members and experts who have participated in IPCC work could continue to the following assessment cycle.

I

FRANCE

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC ?

A list of questions and issues which should be considered is proposed hereafter.

N.B. : The comments or ideas here enclosed are the result of compilations of comments from some contributors ; they are *only elements for discussion and do not represent an official position or preference*.

Preamble

The main purpose of the IPCC is to inform the Governments in view of their decisions and actions in the domains of climate policies and climate negotiations.

It is well known that, for the time being, the international community has not yet found or chosen the ways that lead to a sufficient protection of the climate system.

Is this situation due to the lack of scientific information regarding the present or projected (future) state of the climate and the corresponding impacts – or in other words : regarding the problem ? we think that the answer is “no”. As a matter of fact, the science has provided many results which are reported in the AR1, AR2, AR3 and AR4. These results have improved in precision and completeness along the years and describe a very concerning present and future climate. The scientific information regarding the “climate problem” is abundant and it is well reflected in the IPCC reports.

The international community is not in need of more information about the problem but of more information and ideas about the “solutions” – solutions for mitigation. The IPCC, here again, has reflected in its reports the present state of scientific information regarding mitigation.

Thus, generally speaking, the IPCC has fulfilled its mission of synthesis - the “evaluation” - and information.

Generally speaking, there is no need of more frequent voluminous reports, but of some qualitative evolutions and additional products. In general and relative terms, the work content and organization could enhance the provision of information regarding the solutions.

Frequency of the reports

This is an issue of primary importance.

A lesser frequency than the present one for a complete assessment of the various aspects – typically : the three WGs domains - of the climate issues, may be considered.

A different frequency for the three WGs may be considered.

A global periodical assessment of the physical science basis – the Volume 1 – and of the impacts – a part of the present Volume 2 - seem a fundamental mission of IPCC and should be maintained. A periodical report on this part “the climate problem” is justified by the fact that the main object which is studied is “one” : it is the global climate system. A regular – periodic - update is needed on this global matter of common interest. A full assessment is not needed with a higher frequency than today ; and there may be complements through dedicated reports – at higher frequency – on narrower aspects.

The report(s) on “the solutions” – adaptation, mitigation, socio-economic evolutions ... - might be organized in a different way and with a different frequency than the report on the “climate problem”.

Another option is to have heavy, extended report every 10 years, and an intermediate report – e.g. on the present and future state (scenarios) of the climate system – every 5 years.

Volume of the task

There is a concern with the rapidly increasing number of papers to be dealt with. The consequences on the methods and resources should be analysed.

Number of working groups and linkage between working groups

Presently, the linkage seems too weak. Common meetings might be considered. The delayed time table of the three WGs have positive and negative aspects. The WG2 and WG3 have little time to exploit the scenarios described by WG1.

The creation of two WGs, one dealing with “the problem” – state of the climate system, impacts, vulnerabilities - and the other one with “the solution” – adaptation, mitigation, evolution of the socio-economy trajectories, etc.. – could be considered.

The IPCC work about “solutions” could give place to a high number of sectorial reports –food supply, water, energy -, as well as to reports about more general macro-socio-economical studies.

One could consider to have periodical reports on “the climate problem” and to have non-periodical reports on “the solutions”.

Scientific research and studies about the “Uncertainties” issue

The issue of uncertainties should be treated as a scientific objective linking all three groups – going further than just providing a uniform language.

Regional information

More regional information is often requested by some users. However, the volume of the task and its feasibility need to be examined.

Handling of socio-economic evolutions issues or other emerging issues

In the future, and with respect to the availability of the corresponding scientific literature, more importance may be given to :

- evolutions of the consumption systems, ways of life, integration of trans-sectorial evolutions
- transition issues from the present socio-economic paradigms to new paradigms – more consistent with the climate system protection
- governance issues regarding climate policies and decision-taking
- and possibly anthropology, history, sociology in relation with changes of socio-economic patterns and overcoming of environmental issues.

New issues may be handled via Special Reports.

Complementarity with other UN organizations

One could consider joint efforts in some areas like e.g. :

- assessment of impacts and vulnerabilities, or adaptation, in a particular sector (joint effort of IPCC and a UN agency in charge of this sector)
- MDGs or SDGs (joint effort of UN and IPCC).

Resources

The IPCC central budget is very low in comparison with the services delivered by IPCC.

The yearly budget – covering grossly the Secretariat costs and the missions-expenses for the support of the developing countries – amounts to some 4 M Euros.

The future budgetary needs of IPCC should be studied.

TSUs

The Technical Support Units are financially supported by three host-countries. Alternative schemes may be necessary in the future. A study of the future of the TSUs might be undertaken.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of IPCC ?

A working-group should be created by IPCC-37 in October 2013. This WG would work until 2015. It would produce intermediate reports in-between. Decisions would be taken in 2015.

3. Other comments and suggestions

Undertake a study about the review process itself : evaluation of the existing process, goals, methods ; possible improvements.

Clarify the role of Review Editors.

GERMANY

WHICH ARE THE MAIN QUESTIONS AND ISSUES THAT SHOULD TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FUTURE OF THE IPCC?

1. What should be the **scope and format** of future products of the IPCC, in order do be more responsive to **policy needs** with regard to comprehensiveness, frequency, and flexibility, while at the same time protecting the IPCC's **scientific integrity** as well as be in line with the scientific progress?
2. **Which Working Group structures** would best suit a modified work programme or modified products? Is the current organisational structure of the three Working Groups and the Task Force on Greenhouse Gas Inventories suitable to address the shifting requirements for scientific assessments of the scientific basis, impacts and solution strategies of the climate change problem, as well as for methodological issues for GHG reporting?
3. Is the **organisational** (secretariat, including communication, and the technical support units) and **management** (size, structure and composition of the WG- and TF-bureaux) **structure** of the IPCC adequate and appropriate for its tasks and responsibilities? How can potential **financial constraints** of the IPCC be addressed?
4. How can the **scientific excellence** of bureau members and authors be further strengthened in order to maintain the high quality and the integrity of the IPCC?
5. Should the **Processes and Procedures** of the IPCC, further be improved?
6. How can the **high quality standards** of IPCC-products be maintained and further improved, given the increasing **workload** on the authors due to the ever growing wealth of information and the challenges of scientific assessment making?

WHAT SHOULD BE THE PROCESS AND TIMELINE FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF AND DECISION WITH REGARDS TO THE FUTURE OF THE IPCC?

Sufficient time is needed for deliberations on the future of the IPCC. However, only limited time will be available until the end of the current assessment cycle by the end of 2014.

It is therefore suggested to establish open-ended Task Groups (TGs) on the Future of the IPCC at IPCC 37 (October 2013), co-chaired by a representative from a developing and one from a developed country under the guidance of the IPCC chair and in consultation with the Executive Committee. IPCC 37 should invite governments and observer organizations to submit their views on the future of the IPCC in early spring 2014.

The TGs would then elaborate potential options based on the deliberations at IPCC 37 and on the submissions, in consultation with the IPCC-Bureau, the IPCC-Secretariat and the heads of the TSUs, as well as CLAs from AR5 as appropriate. The TG co-chairs would report to the Panel on the progress of the work of the TGs at all Panel sessions in 2014. Additional submissions could be invited as needed.

The Panel would take decisions on the future of the IPCC at its first session in early 2015. The new bureau should be elected at the second Panel session in 2015.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The IPCC has been very successful during the last 25 years in providing policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive scientific information on climate change to policy-makers as well as broader audiences in an objective and transparent manner. We are very grateful to the international research community for their ongoing engagement for the IPCC on a voluntary basis. The rules of procedure including the comprehensive review process guarantee the high quality of IPCC-products. The scientific and intergovernmental nature of the Panel and the endorsement of its reports by 195 governments make the IPCC a unique and internationally recognized authority on the science of climate change, now and in the future.

The IPCC is a learning organisation and has continuously responded to the changing needs of its users, most recently during the 2010-2012 review of IPCC processes and procedures, based on the recommendations of the IAC. The beginning of a new assessment cycle in 2015 provides an excellent opportunity to further reflect on the structure and functioning of the IPCC. We welcome the invitation for this submission as a first step and look forward to constructive discussions in the next two years.

IRELAND

Ireland welcomes this opportunity to provide its views on the future of the Inter Governmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC).

The IPCC has a unique position and role in informing the world governments on the state of knowledge on the science of climate change as well as mitigation and adaptation response options. The role of the IPCC in informing policy actions has been fundamental to the development of the UNFCCC. The 5th Assessment Report will be a key input for the development of a global agreement on actions to address climate change in 2015 as well as the 2013-15 Review of the long term global goal.

Ireland considers that the IPCC should continue in its roles as an authoritative sources of information on climate change which is used individually and collectively by Governments to take actions to address climate change. However, the IPCC should examine its structures and processes to determine how to best respond to current circumstances and the requirements of governments, decision makers, practitioners and importantly the public.

In this context the IPCC should consider if the current working groups are best designed to address issues which are being considered by governments including the links between mitigation and adaptation and approaches to transition. Other options for the working groups should be considered by the Panel before embarking on a further assessment report.

Ireland also notes that volume of peer review literature that is now published has placed considerable demands on the assessment work of the IPCC. Options to reduce these demands should be identified. These should not compromise the standards that the IPCC has set.

There is also an increasing need for prompt responses to emerging issues and miss-information. Recent requests from the UNFCCC provide good examples of this. The IPCC may have to consider options to do this while retaining the integrity of its working practices.

The IPCC should consider increased use of modern internet based communication platforms to communicate and engage more with a wider audience. Again these need to be inline with its standards and be aware of negative engagement processes in the media.

In conclusion, the IPCC should continue its work. However, a full review of the requirements and demands of this work is needed. This should be kicked off in 2013 at its October meeting. This may be informed by a consideration of these issues by the IPCC Bureau ahead of that meeting. The outcome from this should be reported to the meeting.

ITALY

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

- 1) kinds of products to be released (Assessment Reports, Special Reports or other kinds of Reports)
- 2) timing of preparing and releasing the products with the effort to have no delay between releases of SPMs and full reports.
- 3) further strengthening the communication and performing an evaluation of that.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

It is fine to start to address this issue at 38th Session (14-18 October 2013 in Batumi, Georgia) and conclude the discussion at the next IPCC session in 2014, if needed.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

- 1) The IPCC should try to prepare more focused thematic reports, in particular for the Working Group I. We see no automatic need to finalize again full Assessment Reports for WGI in the future. It will be adequate to finalize some thematic experts when new science outcomes become available on a specific issue (e.g. climate sensitivity, new model developments, new kind of observations).
- 2) Further attention on the communication issue need to be given, since it is fundamental to the IPCC process. In particular, we stress the need of:
 - 2a) exploring new communication approaches (e.g. webinars) in order to engage more frequently the press and possibly some specific stakeholders on topics relevant to WGII and WGIII. These stakeholders engagement should be done following the IPCC Principles, in particular as stated in Article 2 "IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy, although they may need to deal objectively with scientific, technical and socio-economic factors relevant to the application of particular policies."
 - 2b) exploring the usage of different media, such as facebook and twitter.
 - 2c) increasing the release of multilingual press releases and other press communiques, if finance is available.
- 3) Need for IPCC products to be consistent and aware of other assessment reports on topics of IPCC focus, such as UNEP reports, IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) reports.
- 4) Need to make the release of the full reports (Assessment and Special Reports) jointly with the release of SPM or with a very short delay. Try to avoid what happened with IPCC-SREX Report: the SPM SREX at the end of 2011, and the SRES Full Report in 2012.

JAPAN

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

Japan considers most of the questions referred in the attached document BUR-XLVI/Doc. 15 are important and need to be discussed further.

In addition, the following questions also should be discussed:

“How to keep and promote the motivations of scientists who get involved in the assessment process of IPCC?”

“Whether the current expert review process of assessment reports is still appropriate or not, considering the current situation where information are transmitted and shared through the internet such as SNS?”

Japan would like to take this opportunity to state its attitude related to the following questions at the present moment.

– Which should be the key future IPCC products and what would be the timing?

Firstly, Japan thinks that the assessment reports would continue to be the main IPCC products in the future as they were in the past. Also, Japan thinks the present roles played by WG1, WG2 and WG3 are appropriate on the whole.

– Should the IPCC continue to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports and carry out other reports as required, following the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” as amended at the 29th Session?

– Should the IPCC prepare more focused thematic reports that would jointly constitute an assessment report?

– What should be the duration the future assessment period?

– Should Reports be staggered?

Japan thinks the difficulty and urgency to prepare new reports varies in each WG. As climate models continue to evolve to be more refined and higher in resolution, and increasingly greater computational resources are demanded, it needs to be recognized that coordination and communication with the scientific community in drawing up the future IPCC schedules are increasingly important. In addition, promoting coordination and improving consistency between each WG are getting more important. Furthermore, based on the WG1 results, we need to consider how to promote the emission reduction of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) and build the low carbon society (WG3), and how to promote adaptation measures keeping the many risks in mind (WG2), and putting these knowledge into practice in actual circumstances becomes a big issue. Considering these situations, it is necessary to discuss if each WG report is to be published as a set and if it is possible to publish as a set in the future.

As one of the solutions to the issues mentioned above, Japan suggests the interval to produce the each assessment report to be longer, and to produce special reports of the mitigation, impact and adaptation between the publication of assessment reports as needed, and reflect these information to the assessment reports. The special report should include the information which can be referred by not only policy makers but also main actors of these activities, such as workers at local governments and industry sectors, and civil citizens.

It is very important to promote cooperation and mutual understanding between each WG and to improve consistency between contents of each WG report. Japan thinks the schedule for compiling assessment reports should be discussed to improve these situations. Also, some arrangements are necessary to make information clear and comprehensive enough for policy makers and general public. More efforts should be put into economic evaluation about mitigation and adaptation process.

- How should regional issues be covered in the future?

Though regional issues should be considered with the examination of adaptation measures, it is difficult to deal with this issue with the current organization structure. This issue needs to be considered with the discussion of TSU structure and capability.

- Should the IPCC prepare methodology reports other than those prepared by the TFI on national GHG inventories?
- Should the TFI continue and if yes are any changes to its mandate required?

Japan admits much of the necessity of guidelines such as inventory guidelines made by TFI. TFI activities need to be continued considering the situation that the revision of guidelines would be required if a new framework are established under UNFCCC, and the necessity of REDD+ MRV guidelines have been pointed out. If TFI activities are continued in the next term, Japan will support its activities as Japan has done in the past.

- Should the IPCC prepare more frequent fast track assessments?

Regarding the preparation of more frequent fast track assessments, further discussion is required considering the impact of IPCC assessment reports on the world. However, it is worth considering as long as they are small scale enough and the information can be reflected and applicable to the assessment reports and special reports.

- Is the structure and mandate of the IPCC Working Group still adequate or should adjustments and changes be considered?

As mentioned above, Japan considers the assessment reports as the main IPCC products in the future as in the past. Also, Japan thinks the roles played by WG1, WG2 and WG3 are appropriate on the whole. To consolidate the benefits associated with the current WG structure, the mission of each WG should be reminded at this time. The reports are needed to be evaluated from the following perspectives; whether the assessment reports have been effectively playing its role which is to provide scientific information to the policy makers; how has the message from these reports been received by wider stakeholders and general public.

- Relationship and possible cooperation with other relevant assessment processes

Japan thinks the cooperation with other relevant assessment processes such as IPBES should be promoted positively. Also, Japan thinks it is important to cooperate with related knowledge network such as GAN/APAN. In addition, as the Global Environmental Change research programmes (i.e. WCRP, IGBP), which have internationally coordinated research to be assessed by IPCC, will be rearranged and reorganized under a new initiative called the Future Earth, IPCC should communicate, coordinate and collaborate well with the initiative with an aim to produce better assessments.

- Are revision to the Principals governing IPCC work and its Appendices required?

It should be examined if the governance and process are appropriately revised followed by IAC recommendations, and checked if more improvements and enhancements could be achieved.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

To take the enough consideration time, there should be the opportunity to hear the public opinions at the publication of each WG report. It would be better to hear opinions not only from interested parties such as governments and authors but also from concerned citizens.

It is desirable to reach the conclusion around the time of the publication of AR5 SYR.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

KENYA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

a.) How should the accuracy of model projections for future climate change be improved and reported?

b.) The default values used in some model inputs. How representative are these default values for the various regions? Is it realistic to use a default value for ice in the tropical regions when indeed it is known there is no ice in these areas? Is it not possible to run the models on a region to region basis with a different value, where necessary, specific for the region under consideration?

c.) Is it possible to project the future characteristics of a rainy season e.g.

i. Onset and cession times

ii. Rainfall distribution within a season

iii. Nunber of dry spells and wet spells in a given season as well as respective lengths

iv. The forecast amount of rainfall or precipitation for the season

These parameters are very important for the planning of agricultural activities in tropical Africa where agriculture is principally rainfed

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

a.) The five year cycle for production of IPCC assessment Reports is adequate but there is need to consider providing regular(yearly) report on the progress and findings as of that date for each of the thematic areas

b) Given that the past five assessment Reports have proved beyond reasonable doubt that climate change is real and is happening, much of the the future assessment Reports should emphasize on methodologies for adaptation and mitigation as well as illustrative examples of good practices so far adopted in selected areas of the world

3. Any other comments and suggestions

There is need for a chapter, in the next Assessment Report, dedicated to an analysis/evaluation of the impact the previous five assessment Reports have made to society in selected areas of the world

MALAYSIA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

Insofar as assessments are concerned, comprehensive assessments should remain the principal output and strong focus of the IPCC. The assessments cycles every 5-6 years are still appropriate and very relevant to fulfil the need of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties Decision 2 at its seventeenth session on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, which reads in the Article 167: "Decides that subsequent reviews should take place following the adoption of an assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or at least every seven years." The comprehensive nature and up-to-date scientific knowledge provided in assessment reports is critical for both ongoing national and international efforts to respond to climate change, especially when the wide-ranging and diverse fields of climate change science are advancing rapidly. Therefore production of comprehensive assessment reports every 5-6 years period would maintain the IPCC's efficacy in providing information to the policy making community. IPCC cannot release assessment reports with an interval of longer period, because trends of scientific research may change largely and the content of reports may become obsolete during that period, in view of the current development of science and rapid change of social circumstances.

Special reports are also of great value and they are also appropriate to meet the fast changing knowledge particularly in some areas of climate change. Special reports, however, should be reserved only for areas where there is considerable potential to add value to regular comprehensive reports. For example, special reports could be considered if there is a request for specific advice from the UNFCCC to IPCC or if there is a significant new development in science or technology, which has not been addressed sufficiently in previous comprehensive (regular) assessments.

Synthesis reports (SYR) of future comprehensive assessments are very valuable to policy makers. They present an integrated picture of the science, that could not be achieved simply by reading the summaries for policy makers of each of the working group (comprehensive) reports. However, design of the SYR must be planned at an early stage, that is well before the process of preparing working group (comprehensive) reports. IPCC should plan the broad subjects/issues to be dealt with in the SYR in light of the science and then filter these requirements, including requirements for integration, into the planning for each working group. SYR structure/ design, therefore, must be improved by taking care on the evolving needs of policy makers at the regional and local levels, i.e. not only at global level.

With regards to regional issue to be covered in future, coverage of regional and local issues should be more details and comprehensive in the future IPCC products. Aspects that need to be handled better in future assessments include assessment of risks at regional and local levels, extensive evaluation and treatment of uncertainties at regional and local levels, as well as evaluation of the main findings from an economic point of view (economics of climate change) at these levels. The current weakness, which needs to be carefully addressed in the future IPCC products, is to ensure it caters to the evolving needs of policy makers at those regional and local levels, which are inadequate with the current state of IPCC outputs and products.

It has already been identified that inadequate research in developing countries as one of the key issues of concern for the IPCC. Therefore, IPCC must come up with a programme of action that should aim at promoting research activities specifically in developing countries. In this regard, the WMO/ICSU/IOC World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) research efforts should be synergised within the IPCC works and processes and given more significant role to optimally contribute to the assessment process of the IPCC for better products in the future. Key international programmes on climate observation and research are coordinated through the World Meteorological

Organization (WMO), and many of the observations that underpin climate science are provided by the world's National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (NMHSs). These NMHSs provide information and services that improve the lives and livelihoods of the people who are most vulnerable to climate variability and climate change. Moreover, the framework for climate services at the national level will transform the most up-to-date knowledge about climate change impacts and adaptation into actionable information and predictions for decision-making. IPCC, therefore, must work more closely with NMHSs and WMO to enhance research capacities and capabilities in developing countries. With this process in place, the science can be better organised and strengthened in developing countries for the betterment of the future IPCC assessments and products.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

Some organizational changes on procedures and practices are needed. This can be done through task groups to discuss issues relating to the future of the IPCC. The decision should be by the IPCC Plenary Session and if possible during this cycle so that the decision can be implemented in the next assessment cycle. However, any change made should be driven by the need to increase transparency and smoother functioning of the IPCC process. A particularly important point to address is the need to avoid future occurrences of stalemate, as occurred in 2007 for the approval of WG2 and SYR SPM reports.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

With regards to organizational issues, due to the relevant work done by IPCC, changes in its organizational structure and in the products that the IPCC will produce in the future should not move away from the procedures and quality of reports already produced by the Panel. It is expected that more and even better and improved IPCC documents might be produced in the future, since they have become valuable contributions to researchers and policy makers.

The paucity of climate relevant research in many parts of the developing world is definitely a current problem. It is important that IPCC not only focus on identifying gaps and funding opportunities but also on ensuring that work that is carried out, for example in relation to human resource development planning, which must be tackled in more systematically by IPCC. This could be done through a proper cross fertilization between the IPCC and the broader scientific community, and build upon stronger collaboration with the whole UN system to further enhance the credibility of the IPCC in the future.

The management of the process and the mandate of the chairs of IPCC should be improved with enhanced coordination / cooperation / communication across Working Groups being strengthened and directed by the IPCC. Possible ways to do this include special treatment by the IPCC Bureau and a cross-WG task forces.

It is essential that the distinction between being policy relevant and policy prescriptive is kept in the future of IPCC. It will be particularly important to ensure the assessments and products of the IPCC remain policy relevant but not policy prescriptive.

MALDIVES

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the IPCC?

Since its inception in 1988, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has withstood the test of time and proven to be United Nations leading international scientific body for the climate information. The Panel has authoritatively provided up-to-date climatic, technical and socio-economic information to the United Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Though the IPCC does not conduct any research nor does it monitor any realtime climate data the Panel has provided policy-makers and decision-makers a platform on which they could make informed decisions. The Panel's reports always has been and will be policy-relevant and yet policy-neutral, never policy-prescriptive. This is clearly the way forward for IPCC in its future.

The IPCC 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. Therefore, Maldives believes the continuation of the IPCC reporting procedures is crucial.

Furthermore, the IPCC data center has been a critical center. It has played a key role in being a repository and a quality controller of observational and simulated climate data and coordinate the suite of future climate simulations by research. The data center has been a key focal point in coordination of climate simulations and projections and act as a bank for central data storage. If the data center was not there, the climate simulations by different organisations would have been carried in an ad-hoc manner and with variable standards and the data would be sitting in different repositories where access to the data would be difficult.

On the structure of the IPCC and the bureau:

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 assessments 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.

2. What should be the process and the timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

Since the process of the IPCC is a country driven process, the future considerations should be made by the plenary based on the submissions by the member states.

The synthesis reports have been a useful piece of information for decision making. The synthesis reports should be made at the very early stages of the assessment cycle so that cross-cutting issues and other matters relating to climate change could be incorporated within the report.

The special reports have also been a key component in the assessment cycle. The special report within the first 2-3 year paved the way for the final assessment report and the contributions to the report from the governments/experts would make the endeavour easy for the final assessment report.

Given the fact that 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, synthesis reports and the special reports would act as interim reports in easing their task. Moreover, these reports would keep the governments updated on the latest critical issues and would help in the informed decision making process.

3. Any other comments and decisions

Since IPCC remains as the only internationally accepted scientific body providing policy guidance on climate change to the governments, public and private enterprises and other communities based on scientific evidence. It is very crucial that this science-based decision making process should not be co-mingled or diluted with any other processes. IPCC has been subjected to lots of scrutiny and has managed to have a firm position and yet made itself more robust with clear proofs and evidence. This showed that the IPCC have the caliber and the capacity to be the leading scientific body providing evidence and guidance in the climate change arena.

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 scarce 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 coherence and credibility of scientific findings.

Therefore it is highly recommended to keep the current structure of IPCC and explore further means to assist IPCC in fulfilling its role.

MONGOLIA

Country View on the topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

In the future, the IPCC should continue its work to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports (CAR) as it was done so far, but adding further more complimentary reports with increased resolutions in term of timing, space and topics mobilizing mostly the existing capacities and experiences.

Thematic reports in more broad context within framework of the given comprehensive assessment report would enrich assessment reports making them more accessible and applicable in term of implementation. On the other hand feed back from thematic reports would contribute to the improvement of the assessment exercise as a whole.

Regional issues need to be covered through both good practices and lessons learnt in less declarative manner with more specifics while pursuing general procedures for subsequent up scaling and generalization exercises for global picture.

Unified methodology reports, especially GHG inventory guidelines are important for countries with limited human power and for consolidation of reports from countries and regions with different capacities.

Duration of the future assessment period should be consistent with a climate variability cycle rather than fiscal cycles in countries or timing dragged down do to bureaucratic barriers.

General Assessment Report should not be staggered but balanced. On the other hand its regional interpretation could be more or less flexible with localized options including low probability but high risk extremes.

Fast track assessments would be essential if they would be based on up scaling approach with science based generalization and possible calibration inputs to the Global Climate Models (GCM).

2. What should be the process and timeline for the considaration and of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The IPCC Bureau should consider and take a decision with regards to the future of the IPCC in the remaining part of 2013 and might be some time in 2014 with close collaboration of the Governments and National Meteo Services of the countries and scientific communities. In addition, the decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and KP as well as its SBSTA should be solid background of the consideration of and decision with regards to the future of the IPCC.

3. Any other comments and suggestions?

Enhanced active participation of DC/EIT experts as authors, Bureau members and as co-chairs would promote to produce an assessment report with less biased content, covering most vulnerable countries in respect of natural hazard impact and capacity building. It is important to engage in different ways wide specter of research and other observer organizations and wider outreach to civil society for national capacity building at all level. More synergetic collaboration is needed among UN family and other intergovernmental organizations to maximize benefits and reduce costs of relevant assessment processes.

NETHERLANDS (THE)

Submission by The Netherlands on the future of the IPCC

The Fifth Assessment has been a particularly turbulent period for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The unfortunate mistakes in the Fourth Assessment, and the delayed response to these, unveiled serious vulnerabilities in the organisation, the process of producing reports, the perceived integrity of the people involved and the communication. Based on the recommendations by the InterAcademy Council (IAC), the IPCC entered into a prolonged period of self-reflection and decided to implement a large number of incremental improvements. This has increased the ability of the IPCC to cope with the Fifth Assessment successfully, but the pace at which the world changes is stepping up, and we can be sure that the IPCC must adapt to these changes if it still wants to retain significance in the future.

Current practice

- IPCC produces extensive assessments, containing an enormous amount of knowledge, which, in varying combinations, represent valuable assets for different countries, sectors, private enterprises, research communities, the media and the public.
- Accessing the right combination of knowledge from the four separate volumes of the IPCC assessment, is nearly impossible, because of the sheer size of three of these assessments. It would be different if the IPCC products were fully web-based and accompanied by functionalities that allow the creation of maximum relevance for any user.
- Because of the huge effort needed, new assessments appear with increasing intervals, now seven years; literature must be available a substantial period before the approval of an IPCC report. Parts of the information in the reports are quickly outdated, and this influences users' perception of value of the entire reports.
- Although the IPCC reports contain internal references, the derivation of conclusions is very difficult. This lack in transparency is not only fuels climate skepticism concerning the reliability of the conclusions of the reports, but also reduces the usefulness of IPCC reports to access the underlying literature.

Proposal

- The IPCC should adjust its focus and organisation to policy and societal needs.
- The IPCC needs to adjust its principles.
- The IPCC needs more transparent, focused and up-to-date assessments.
- The IPCC should focus more on interactions with societies.
- The IPCC should reconsider the regionalisation of the assessments, aiming for an efficient division of work among relevant organisations.
- A task group needs to be formed on the future of the IPCC.

The IPCC should adjust its focus and organisation to current policy and societal needs.

Despite the improvements following the recommendations by the IAC in 2010, there is room for further improvement. The demands the IPCC will be confronted with in the future for providing more transparent, focused and up-to-date assessments can best be met by having an organization that is led by an Executive Director. This appointed official would have the managerial and scientific capabilities to lead a continuous and flexible assessment process and implement the changes proposed below. An Executive Director could also more easily be a policy-neutral spokesperson than an elected Chair. The central organisation should have sufficient resources to coordinate assessment processes and prepare tailor-made communication materials.

Even the role of the IPCC, its position in the UN system (as a daughter of WMO/UNEP), the management structure (an elected Chair and Bureau), the role of civil society in scoping, drafting and accepting its products, and increasing the relevance of its products for a wide range of user groups should be discussed. The outcome of these discussions should be reflected in the principles governing the work of the IPCC to take effect in time for the Sixth Assessment.

The IPCC needs to adjust its principles. We believe that limiting the scope of the IPCC to human-induced climate change is undesirable, especially because natural climate change is a crucial part of the total understanding of the climate system, including human-induced climate change. The Netherlands is also of the opinion that the word 'comprehensive' may have to be deleted, because producing *comprehensive* assessments becomes virtually impossible with the ever expanding body of knowledge and IPCC may be more relevant by producing more special reports on topics that are new and controversial.

The IPCC needs more transparent, focused and up-to-date assessments. The use of the internet continues to expand. It would be easier to keep IPCC assessments up to date if they would be fully web-based. Digitalisation also increases the transparency of the reports. For example, in addition to internal links in the SPM to the underlying chapters (already done for AR4), links can be added in the chapters to the relevant parts of scientific publications to simplify the accessibility to the sources. The assessment should be more dynamic by regular updates of the chapters, with only one round of expert review, and by shortening the assessment cycle. The reports are currently perceived to be quite dated already a few years after they have been published. We suggest:

- two working groups instead of three. For example, it is possible to expand WGI to include WGII subjects that are closely connected to the information in WGI. An example is the SREX special report, where climate extremes and risk-based information are combined. WGIII would then include adaptation and mitigation measures and their environmental impacts. In this way there would be two working groups, which would shorten the cycle but will also to improve the consistency in the assessment cycle and facilitates the synthesis. A separate Synthesis Report would not be needed if the second WG would synthesize its information with the first WG, also in its summaries.
- to put more emphasis on Special Reports.
- to provide more regular SPMs, based on updated chapters.
- to coordinate the contents of the assessment with other organisations that provide assessments on climate change, like WMO, UNEP and IEA. Coordination may strengthen the assessment capacity and avoid repetition. This would reduce the pressure on scientists contributing to the assessments.

The IPCC should focus more on interactions with societies. ICT innovations facilitate interactions with knowledge and perspectives that are present within societies. Besides broad participation in quality control and review processes and harvesting knowledge from many groups, we believe that it would be beneficial to actively deal with the questions relevant to societies. We also suggest to investigate the policy makers' needs more systematically, and involve actors outside policy making and scientific arenas (e.g. industries and large companies but also civil society), especially in the scoping process.

The IPCC should reconsider the regionalisation of the assessments, aiming for an efficient division of work among relevant organisations. The regionalisation is subject of discussion. On one hand, there is a need for more regionalisation to increase the policy relevance. On the other hand, regionalisation significantly increases the volume of the assessment, makes it more difficult to read and causes an almost unmanageable writing process. It becomes more vulnerable to uncertainty, inconsistency and the existence of potential errors. Consequently, regionalisation puts more pressure on the contributors. It also complicates the synthesis of the assessment. Finally, there is a demand for up-to-date accessible climate services, for which the length of the assessment cycle is too long.

We are aware of the relevance of regional information, particularly for vulnerable regions in developing countries with limited resources. However, we believe organisations such as the WMO should strengthen the position and the resources of the Global Framework of Climate Services (GFCS) in line with the Nairobi work programme. The main goal of GFCS is to enforce the resilience of vulnerable regions by facilitating the access to tailor-made climate information on spatial scales that are more useful to stakeholders than IPCC can ever provide. This does not diminish the possible role there is to play for the IPCC in providing guidance for interpreting regionalised climate information and also building capacity in this respect in developing countries.

Task group on the future of the IPCC

Our suggestions relate to the functionality of the products of the IPCC and the setup and governance of the organization that merit careful consideration. That is why the Netherlands advocates the creation of a task group, that would report at every upcoming Panel meeting, and will present a widely supported proposal for the revised approach of the IPCC for the Sixth Assessment Report.

PANAMA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

IPCC is doing an outstanding work by providing all levels of society with the state of the art knowledge on climate change to help governments of all countries in dealing with climate change mitigation and impacts in a more effective way. Although there have been significant advance on the topic of participation of scientists from developing countries in the IPCC Assessment Reports, some issues remain unsolved:

- a. There is a need to increase participation from developing countries within the IPCC working groups, especially in relation to impacts, vulnerabilities, and adaptation.
- b. There is also a need to increase sources of information on the impacts of climate change in developing countries. In this regard, the Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA) could seek and fund research on impacts on climate change in developing countries and how can these countries build resilience to the impacts of climate change. Research on impacts, vulnerabilities, adaptation, and resilience is crucial in developing countries suffering from the impacts of climate change. However, the lack of funding for research is the main limitation for conducting research and publishing results.
- c. Language barriers that limit participation of experts from developing countries should be solved. Translation of papers that are in languages other than English, so they can be part of IPCC sources of information, is a way of overcoming this limitation.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The process applied in the context of the previous assessment reports is adequate. In relation to timeline, it is convenient to keep the five year- period that was applied for the First and Second Assessment Reports, because climate change is evolving faster than the original projections.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

Congratulations to all members of Working Groups and Secretariat of IPCC for the excellent work on the IPCC AR5.

SINGAPORE

Dear IPCC Secretariat,

With regard to the invitation to Governments to Provide views on the future of the IPCC (ref: 5141-13/IPCC/GEN, 13 March 2013) We would like to offer the Following comments, On Behalf of Singapore, for consideration:

1 Which are the main issues and issues That should be Considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

IPCC May wish to Consider a regional focus in Greater icts work on climate science to Provide countries with more data That caries Greater resolution, as well as Strengthening the Guidance Provided to Policymakers on the representation and communication of the reliability of climate change projections. In Particular, for countries to Develop national adaptation plans, it is essential That Estimates of the reliability of future climate change in Their respective areas are available. Additionally, the parts of the IPCC report All which Regionally Evaluate the Global Climate Models (GCMs) should be Strengthened, with a Particular Focus on regional patterns of climate variability and extreme events.

2 What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The timing of the WG1 and WG2 reports should be phased to Ensure a consistency in the model projections used in the respective assessments.

3 Other comments and suggestions

(NIL)

We appreciate the opportunity to Provide our feedback, and look forward to the future work of the Following The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Thank you.

SWEDEN

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

IPCC – both when viewed as an organisation and through its activities – enjoys a solid reputation for producing comprehensive and unbiased assessments of the scientific knowledge and understanding in relation to climate change. The series of the comprehensive Assessment Reports is the fundamental carrier of the IPCC results, reputation and authority. Any changes to the processes have to weigh the risk of losing the IPCC's credibility.

There is merit in a continuous provision of assessment by each of the three Working Groups aspects every 5-7 years. These areas should be covered by the IPCC also in the future, regardless of possible changes in the Working Group structure. However, the coherency of assessment across the Working Groups is an issue. The results assessed by Working Group II often build on earlier climate data and projections than those assessed by Working Group I. As the climate impact, adaptation and vulnerability research process needs to have sufficient time to proceed after new projections become available, some alternative staggering of the reports could be considered, allowing for increased consistency across the WG I and II reports.

As to the already existing types of reports, the provision of Technical Reports should not be a priority for the IPCC as they do not carry additional information. Special Reports provide concrete added value in between the main Assessment Reports. One possible change would be to merge the WG II and WG III into one assessment that focus on society's different aspects on adaptation and mitigation, and WG I, while still being discipline oriented also include a climate science integrated approach as well as risks and uncertainty.

We do not believe that a solitary focus on fast-track assessments approach would be a good way forward, other than the Special Reports, which could be seen as a faster production of a certain issue. It is important to maintain the legitimacy and trust, which is underscored by the thoroughness of the assessment process. If IPCC were to frequently publish fast track assessments, each assessment will carry less weight not only as there will have been less progress between each assessment, but, perhaps, also risk disappearing in the general noise of reports, reviews, briefings, etc. that is constantly produced in relation to climate change. IPCC would become more like the many other organizations and groups which prepare specific assessments with less rigor. Albeit these often are excellent and informative, they do not have the same standing as the IPCC reports.

Responding to emerging and other urgent knowledge needs in between the main assessments is a relevant issue to rise. Still, a key consideration is how fast the scientific understanding of the complex issues of climate change can advance. Consequently, material that pertains to new emerging issues is very likely limited for some time and may not support rapid informative assessments, not least when complied consistently with the IPCCs rigorousness.

There is merit that IPCC considers possibilities for a fast track response mechanism to emerging urgent knowledge needs. Such a mechanism could possibly be organized in collaboration with relevant international scientific unions and or/ make use of the IPCC Expert Workshop reports, perhaps developing the latter further as information carriers. In any case, it is essential that IPCC is not seen as both defining research needs and then at a later stage assessing the outcome of the ensuing research efforts. This highlights that the call for specific knowledge production should still come from some external body or process.

A main issue for the IPCC is to provide improved assessments on potential high-impact outcomes that are uncertain or of low probability. While the IPCC guidance note for AR5 authors on consistent treatment of uncertainty acknowledges the policy-relevant value of information on the full range of

possible consequences and associated probabilities, this effort needs increased focus from the IPCC in the future. Improved assessments on low-probability high-impact outcomes are important for making better integrated assessments of climate change impacts. It is also very important for effective use of so-called “robust” decision-making strategies for adapting to climate change

We note especially five areas where the IPCC currently provides only limited assessments, and on which focused efforts of strengthening assessments could be considered;

1. The “dangerous tail-ends” of the probability distributions.
2. Large-scale discontinuities in the climate system (“tipping points”).
3. Security implications from climate change including communication
4. Risks that arise from the interaction of phenomena in a complex system (“emergent risks”), including also perspectives of perception, behaviour, equity and gender etc.
5. Integrated science assessment on climate stabilisation including climate sensitivity, climate/carbon cycle, emission pathways, avoided and unavoidable impacts, etc.

More in general, yet more interaction and interdisciplinary should be pursued in the Assessment. For example, WG III is quite dominated by engineering and economic perspectives. There should be more on research on transitions, innovations, political perspectives and sociology. IPCC should extend its efforts on assessing society’s response capability. There should also be more focus on the interaction between the main drivers of global change: climate change, land use change, and environmental pollution (incl. N and P), and the feedback between them. Not to forget the interference and feedback from risk perception and their responses and other events and developments in society.

In terms of the future efforts, it would be important to have a formal arrangement with IPBES (for WGs II and III) concerning which platform should tackle which issues relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES is still in its initial process, mostly discussing procedural matters, but sooner or later it will start to aim for an assessment report and to gather writing teams of scientists. There could be a practical issue here since the number of possible senior candidates is limited. “Double citizenships”, i.e., such scientist’s involvement in both the IPCC and the IPBES may not be possible for many of them, especially if assessments are being produced simultaneously. And, of course, the overlap between IPCC and IPBES should be kept at minimum for efficiency reasons, which again requires a mutual agreement on “who does what”.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

As before, the way ahead now should be outlined within a year after the completion of the AR5 SYR. Thus, the discussion on the future of the IPCC needs to start parallel to the finalization of the AR5. This would seem to require careful managing as the next few sessions are focused on the AR5 and also need to deal with the normal organizational matters.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

The WG reports are still very long and also not wholly without some repetition from previous ones. The focus should be on the most important new insights and on high-level messages.

The calibrated uncertainty language is a good development, but its transparency and lucidity should be further developed and promoted. It should be explored how well this works also for social sciences, which might need another uncertainty language.

Regional information

There are practical aspects in how much regional and local detail the assessments can delve into. For example, increasingly more extensive regional considerations by Working Group II may not be the best way forward on the IPCC main assessment level. Regional information can, certainly provide added value to the overall knowledge provision in many regions., therefore, alternative ways of addressing such needs may need to be investigated within or outside the IPCC, for example by some development of regional workshops and or IPCC-guided regional assessments.

Communication

It would seem that not least the Working Group I report generates much media and decision-maker interest. Given the significance of the issues addressed by Working Groups II and III, additional measures could be taken to increase communication of those reports and their visibility, not least as they carry considerable policy-relevant information for mitigation and adaptation.

Scientific issues for possible IPCC scoping workshops

- i. The marine environment, and the local aspects, consequences and solutions; Local variability in a multi-parameter context needs to be assessed, since recent research highlights that when it comes to ocean warming and acidification effects on species, one cannot extrapolate from one species to another.
- ii. Large-scale natural carbon sinks in the aquatic environment; The impact of limiting nutrients, and resulting carbon dioxide fixation and sequestering should be assessed to improve the reliability of budgeting and modelling of the global carbon cycle, particularly since the oceans are the single largest carbon sink on Earth.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Dear Sir / Madam,

With reference to the letter No.5141-13/IPCC/GEN on the matter of the future of the IPCC, we think That the All which shoulds be Addressed topics are as follows:

Focus on: GHG Inventory, adaptation and mitigation and monitoring procedures of the parts Commitments.

- We think That shoulds IPCC continues to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports and carry out other reports as required.
- For more Effectively covering the regional issues, we Suggest to be connecting through Regionally with all parts Directly through the focal point, projects and monitoring The Commitments.
- The feedback and revision of the AR5 in addition to find a more effective mechanism for this revision are needed.
- Increase the dissemination of the concepts and methods of the IPCC in the Developing Countries through continuous regional workshops with the possibility of sending trainers to do the Necessary training.

Thank you and best regards



Future of the IPCC – UK Government Response to IPCC

This document sets out the UK Government's response to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) request for views to inform the scope and timescale of its post Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) review process.

The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) has consulted with the devolved administrations, other relevant UK government departments, and UK based Review Editors (RE) and Coordinating Lead Authors (CLA) of the AR5.

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

The UK considers that the AR5 preparation process shows that the IPCC faces several challenges but also has opportunities. We consider the IPCC needs to deal more effectively with increasing complexity and volume of material to be assessed, the challenge of regional issues, and the needs of different report end users. It also needs to be more flexible and expand its product range. Communication will grow as a key issue and the IPCC will need to work with the growth in social media to exploit opportunities afforded by new technology.

We suggest the following topics for consideration under the post AR5 review:

IPCC Products

User requirements

The IPCC should consider how better to understand and respond to questions relevant to policy makers and other users in a timely manner.

We suggest that feedback on AR5 be collected from users and contributors, with a view to informing future work.

Assessment products

The current 6 to 7 year reporting period is increasingly challenging, given the size and complexity of the assessment reports (ARs), which is linked to the enormous amount of literature now being generated.

The IPCC should consider the merits of a full assessment process on a 6 to 7 year cycle, coupled to more frequent updates of key findings and more focussed Special Reports. Consideration should also be given to developing reports which are able to provide a more rapid response to the UNFCCC. This would have implications for the procedures for preparing reports.

Web-based "wiki" type tools may be useful for both report preparation and publication. We suggest the IPCC evaluates the idea to determine suitability and possibilities for use.

IPCC structure

The current three working group (WG) report structure attracts specialists and delivers comprehensive knowledge across these areas. However, there is a risk that it promotes a "silo approach" rather than facilitating cross-cutting/integrated assessment reports, which may be of more value to policy makers.

We do not propose fundamental change to the three WG structure, but suggest it could be beneficial to examine opportunities to promote more cross-working between them. Consideration should be given to:

- Integration between WGs at very early stages to bring information together in a more synergistic way;
- Reports being produced by multi-disciplinary, cross-working group author teams;
- Changes to the timing/sequence of WG reports that could facilitate better integration (e.g. by giving more time for WGI scenarios to be used in WII) or bring other benefits.

Report structure and scope

We think governments should continue to define and agree on the scope of reports. Consideration should be given to whether authors could have more flexibility over report structure, to ensure duplication is avoided and emerging issues can be incorporated.

Report preparation

The workload for authors in preparing reports is already considerable. The IPCC should consider opportunities to simplify the preparation process:

- Is there the opportunity to produce any reports in partnership with other relevant organisations, either for major publications or for on-going work between reports?
- Would the appointment of more full time specialists assist preparation and reduce the burden on voluntary authors?
- Should financial assistance be provided to CLAs (e.g. to appoint research assistants or full time junior scientists to support each contributor)?

Expert selection process

The process for identifying, selecting and appointing contributors could benefit from revision, to promote greater inclusivity and transparency:

- Could more specific criteria be developed to attempt to improve the balance of the geographical distribution, experience and gender of contributors?
- Should the selection criteria and a "Register of Interests" be published online?
- Leading expert REs cannot input technically to chapters. Is this appropriate? Is the role too narrow? Could RE roles be held by experts from closely related disciplines?

Expert retention and succession planning

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.

Methodology reports

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.

IPCC structure, size, mandate and governing Principles

Next IPCC Bureau

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.

Task Force Bureau

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.

Revision of Principles governing IPCC work and Appendices

These may require revision depending upon the outcomes of this consultation, particularly if new products are developed.

Review process

During the AR5 preparation there has been some external criticism of the review process and the decision of the IPCC not to openly release draft reports. "Leaked" reports can be quoted misleadingly, however they cannot be commented on by the IPCC or its members. Authors need space to prepare reports, the early drafts of which may appear misleading if considered in isolation or out of context. Consideration should be given to possible options:

- Would full and open public review be useful? What processes/resources would be needed to deliver this? Could draft reports be made publically available, whilst retaining the review for experts only?
- How could IPCC manage a large increase in comments, whilst ensuring sufficient expert views are generated?

Communication and outreach

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 questions should be considered:

- How can the IPCC communication strategy be made more proactive?
- How can IPCC better communicate both the nature of assessment process and its findings, across a range of levels and types of audience (e.g. public, industry, government, NGO)?
- Is there a role for specialist communication experts in the preparation process?
- Can the IPCC produce further approved materials or pursue new partnerships, to catalyse educational activities (e.g. UNEP education programme)?
- What opportunities are there for IPCC to engage with stakeholders and the public both before and after assessments?
- Can the IPCC make more use of digital and social media as tools to increase accessibility and enhance awareness of the results of the assessments?
- Is there a role for non-text based products, e.g. graphics or video?

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The process and timeline must be in accordance with IPCC procedure. We endorse the timescale outlined in the invitation letter and background paper.

The timescale should be sufficiently rapid that plans for future work can be proposed at the earliest opportunity post AR5 Synthesis Report publication, so they can be considered and implemented at an early stage of the next Bureau.

The process should include a comprehensive review and consideration of lessons learned. This should include seeking feedback from contributors and end-user groups. It should also include work to consider/understand the relationship of IPCC with its stakeholders in order to identify what needs they have from the IPCC, and enable the IPCC to improve interfacing with them.

A dedicated Task Group could be set up to undertake this review, as there is likely to be considerable work to undertake between meetings. This group should be established at the next plenary session.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

Questions and topics that may be addressed could include:

Which should be the key future IPCC products and what would be the timing?

THE CURRENT PRODUCTS ISSUED BY IPCC ARE ADEQUATE BUT THESE COULD BE INCREASED ON DEMAND BY COUNTRIES. SINCE THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING REPORTS REQUIRES INPUTS FROM MANY RESEARCH REPORTS THE TIMING SHOULD REMAIN AS IS.

Should the IPCC continue to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports and carry out other reports as required, following the "Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers" as amended at the 29th Session? YES, INDEED THESE SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE GIVEN PRIORITY

Should the IPCC prepare more focused thematic reports that would jointly constitute an assessment report? YES MORE FOCUS SHOULD BE GIVEN

How should regional issues be covered in the future?

AS DIFFERENT REGIONS ARE AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF VULNERABILITIES REGIONAL ISSUES SHOULD HANDLED WITH CARE FOR REGIONS HAVING LESS INFORMATION. MORE INFORMATION COLLECTION AND RESEARCH SHOULD BE DONE

Should the IPCC prepare methodology reports other than those prepared by the TFI on national GHG inventories? IF THERE IS A NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION

What should be the duration the future assessment period? FIVE TO SIX YEARS IS OK

Should Reports be staggered? NO

Should the IPCC prepare more frequent fast track assessments? NO

Note: In this context reference is made to decision 2 taken by Conference of the Parties

To the UNFCCC at its seventeenth session on long-term cooperative action under the Convention which reads as follows:

"167. Decides that subsequent reviews should take place following the adoption of an assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or at least every seven years;"

– Is the structure and mandate of the IPCC Working Groups still adequate or should adjustments and changes be considered? ADEQUATE

– What should be the size, structure and composition of the next IPCC Bureau? SHOULD REMAIN THE SAME

– Should the TFI continue and if yes are any changes to its mandate required? Should there be any changes to size, structure and composition of the Task Force Bureau (TFB)? TFI SHOULD CONTINUE WITH ITS CURRENT MANDATE AND THE STRUCTURE SHOULD REMAIN THE SAME

– How to get appropriate feedback about AR5 and input from IPCC users and contributors to the preparations for the next round of assessments?

o Timing of feedback

o Format (e.g. questionnaires, meetings, web-based systems)

o Target groups :

Governments

Authors

Review Editors

Research organizations

Other observer organizations

Wider outreach to civil society

BUR-XLVI/Doc. 15, p.3 [THE CURRENT SYSTEM IS OK AND THE WEB-BASED SYSTEMS AND MEETINGS ARE ARE QUITE FINE. BUT QUSTIONAIRES ARE ALWAYS A CHALLENGE IN GETTING RESPONSES]

How to enhance active participation of DC/EIT experts as authors, Bureau members and as co-chairs, e.g. through facilitating the hosting of a Technical Support Unit (TSU) by a Developing or EIT country? IF DC/EIT COUNTRIES HAVE FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY THIS IS OK.

Relationship and possible cooperation with other relevant assessment processes

Note: The outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference “The future we want” which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in resolution 66/288 calls for bringing together information from dispersed assessments to support informed decision-making (See e.g. paragraph 85.(k) and 88.(d)).

Furthermore in the decision on the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) it was agreed that the Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will be observer to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel that will carry out key scientific and technical functions of IPBES.

IF THEIR REPORTS GO THROUGH THE SAME PROCESS LIKE IPCC IT IS OK. FOR THE CHAIR TO ATTEND THE MEETINGS AS AN OBSERVER IT IS OK

– Are revisions to the Principles governing IPCC work and its Appendices required? YES, AS IPCC IS A DYNAMIC INSTITUTIONS

o Do the recent changes provide all the necessary improvements to address the InterAcademy Council (IAC) recommendations? I THINK SO, BUT IF NEW IDEAS ARE BROUGHT IN THEY CAN BE DISCUSSED AND ADOPTED.

o What can we learn from the experience of the AR5 writing and review process? Are methodological or technical improvements possible / desirable? THERE IS STILL MORE TO LEARN PARTICULARLY ESTIMATION OF EMISSION IN SOME SECTORS.

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

The IPCC involves government representatives so its future should be discussed by members at plenaries. The timeline for consideration of and decisions

3. Any other comments and suggestions

THE CHALLENGES OF CLIMATE CHANGE STILL EXIST SO WE NEED TO HAVE MORE INFORMATION FOR ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?

- Should the IPCC continue producing Working Group assessment reports with periodic Special Reports, or should it focus more exclusively on Special Reports?
- If the current structure is retained, how can the timeline be amended to ensure each Working Group report is informed by the most up-to-date science? Should the reports be more staggered? For example, how could the findings in one report (e.g., CMIP5 model results) better inform the findings of another report (e.g., impacts as presented in the WG2 report)?
- How can the IPCC provide more regionally-specific information in a useful manner? Would the regional element of the IPCC be more effective if undertaken as cross-Working Group, Region-specific reports were developed (perhaps in lieu of a Synthesis Report at the end of an Assessment cycle)?
- If the status quo were to remain, how can the process for developing the Synthesis Report (SYR) be improved? Should the drafters of the SYR be nominated and vetted by the international community? Should the timing of the SYR be such that it is developed after WG reports are in reasonably final form?
- How do we ensure continued, universal representation of the scientific community from all regions?
- Are there ways we can better incorporate and/or address the questions and issues that are of most importance to those who will implement responses to climate change (e.g., corporate sector, communities, etc.)? Are there outreach models that might generate broader engagement with expert/user communities during the development of the reports (e.g., such as the industry outreach activities undertaken by WG3).
- How can the IPCC more effectively use new communication and information technologies, e.g., to facilitate targeted searches for information and make the reports more user-friendly, accessible, and navigable, in general?
- How can the IPCC provide links to the data and information used in each figure and Summary for Policymakers to increase transparency for the reader?

2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?

- A single Task Group should be convened, chaired by governments. The Task Group could be established at the 37th Session in Georgia in Oct 2013, and the Panel could aim to make decisions that will be needed prior to the next assessment cycle at the 40th Session in Denmark in Oct 2014.

3. Any other comments and suggestions

- As the experience with SREX shows, there is great value in more focused Special Reports and whatever the future holds, these should be retained.
- SREX illustrated the value and need for exploring areas that are of interest to policy-makers and that promote integration across the various Working Groups - as well as demonstrate how the Working Groups can work well together. Consideration should be given to exploring future cross-WG Special Reports.
- If there is a decision to move ahead with a compelling proposal for a Special Report in the 2015-2017 time frame, it will be important to initiate the report process either during the AR5 cycle or immediately after its close, with attention to the importance of having a consistent set of co-chairs and TSUs throughout the development of the SR.

- We would see the first full session of the Panel in which new co-chairs are in place as a logical time to make decisions regarding Special Reports. It would be useful to solicit ideas for Special Reports in 2014-2015.
- If the status quo (or some form thereof) is retained, WG reports should be more staggered. In AR5, much of WG2 is based on CMIP3 model runs and not CMIP5 because of the tight timing between the two reports. Many important advances in our understanding of the biogeophysical Earth system are reflected in CMIP5, so not being able to base an impacts-centric assessment such as the WG2 report on the latest science does somewhat of a dis-service to the world.
- To follow up on this 'timing' issue, the timing / spacing of the review periods for AR5 were taxing for Governments. More careful thought ought to go in to ensuring sufficient temporal spacing between reports so that Governments are not over-taxed (and as a result, the quality of the reviews and, therefore reports themselves may suffer), but also - and perhaps more importantly - to ensure that the Working Groups can adequately inform one another (i.e., reduce redundancies, eliminate contradictions, be current, etc.)

UZBEKISTAN

O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
VAZIRLAR MAHKAMASI
HUZURIDAGI
GIDROMETEOROLOGIYA
XIZMATI MARKAZI
(O'ZGIDROMET)

100052, Toshkent shahar,
Q. Maxsumov ko'chasi, 72

Telefonlar: +(99871) 233 61 80
 +(99871) 150 86 27
 +(99871) 237 35 11
Telegraf manzili: Toshkent GIMET
Fax: +(99871) 233 20 25
E-mail: uzhymet@meteo.uz



REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
CABINET OF MINISTERS
THE CENTER OF
HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL
SERVICE
(UZHYDROMET)

72 K. Makhsumov st.
Tashkent 100052,
Republic of Uzbekistan

Telephones: +(99871) 233 61 80
 +(99871) 150 86 27
 +(99871) 237 35 11
Telegraph: Tashkent GIMET
Fax: +(99871) 233 20 25
E-mail: uzhymet@meteo.uz

201 3 yil 10.06 № 07-42-104

sonli xatga

Renate Christ
Secretary of IPCC

e-mail: IPCC_IPCC-Sec@wmo.int

Dear Mrs. R.Christ,

Referring your letter 5141-13/IPCC/GEN from 13 March 2013:

Currently IPCC is the most authoritative scientific body which is referred to and the outcomes and forecasts of which create the basis for the decision making by the Governments regarding the problems coming from the climate change.

Taking this opportunity we express our gratitude for the support from IPCC and think that IPCC should proceed with the activities on preparation of assessment reports, manuals, special analytical reports on the best practices, vulnerability assessments, etc., support of the young scientists.

Sincerely yours,

V.E.Chub
Director General of Uzhydromet
Focal Point of IPCC

Our ref.: 5141-13/IPCC/GEN

Annex(es): 2

To designated IPCC Focal Points and
Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs)
(if no focal point has been designated)

Geneva, 13 March 2013

Sir/Madam,

With the fifth assessment period coming to a close I have the honor of addressing you on the matter of the future of the IPCC.

You may recall that in the past the IPCC carried out a discussion about the future of the IPCC at the end of an assessment process, addressing questions such as mandate of the IPCC Working Groups, structure and scope of future products, and duration and schedule of the next assessment cycle. Such a consultation process was also carried out after the completion of the Fourth Assessment Report. Governments, observers, authors and scientific organizations were invited to provide comments and suggestions. A Task Group was set up by the Panel to study all submissions and to facilitate consideration by the Panel. The Panel addressed the matter at its 28th, 29th and 30th Sessions and took a number of decisions to guide the Fifth Assessment Report. At the 31st Session (Bali, Indonesia, 26-29 October 2009) after the outlines of the Working Group contributions to the Fifth Assessment Report were approved it was suggested to address remaining longer term issues in more depth two years before the end of the fifth assessment cycle.

I also draw your attention to Rule 7 of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work, the Procedures for the Election of the IPCC Bureau and Any Task Force Bureau, which requires that the "size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau will be reviewed and amended, as necessary, by the Panel at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected."

According to Rule 8 the "Term of the Bureau shall be sufficient for the preparation of an Assessment Report and shall extend approximately one year after the Session at which the Assessment Report has been accepted and shall end at the Session at which the succeeding IPCC Bureau is elected." Rule 8 requires also that the Term of the IPCC Bureau shall be defined at least one Session prior to the one at which the IPCC Bureau is elected and that the Term of any Task Force Bureau shall normally be the same as the Term of the IPCC Bureau.

In accordance with the guidance by the Panel referred to above and the provisions of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work consideration of the future of the IPCC should start at the 37th Session of the Panel scheduled from 14-18 October 2013 in Batumi, Georgia. Consistent with its Terms of Reference, the Bureau held an initial discussion at its 46th Session, Geneva, 28 February -1 March 2013. The background document prepared by the IPCC Secretariat for the 46th Session of the Bureau is attached for your information (BUR-XLVI/Doc.15).

The Bureau agreed that a discussion on the future of the IPCC should start at the 37th Panel Session. It further agreed that the questions raised in the background document could be among

those addressed in the context of the debate. To advance the process and facilitate the conduct of the 37th Session of the Panel, the Bureau requested the IPCC Secretariat to invite written submissions from government with respect to the process for consideration of the future of the IPCC and topics to be addressed.

I therefore would like to invite your government to provide by **14 June 2013** your views on which topics and questions should be addressed with respect to the future of the IPCC, as well as suggestions about the process the Panel may establish for efficient and timely consideration of the matter. We kindly ask you to use the attached form for your submissions and send it to ipccfuture@wmo.int. The Secretariat will collate and synthesize the submissions. A discussion document will then be prepared for consideration at the 37th Session of the IPCC.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, IPCC Contact Point(s), the Permanent Representative with WMO and Focal Point(s) of UNEP of your country for information.

Yours sincerely,



(Renate Christ)
Secretary of the IPCC

Country:

1. Which are the main questions and issues that should be considered in the context of the future of the IPCC?
2. What should be the process and timeline for the consideration of and decisions with regards to the future of the IPCC?
3. Any other comments and suggestions

IPCC BUREAU – FORTY-SIXTH SESSION
Geneva, 28 February - 1 March 2013

BUR-XLVI/Doc. 15
(5.II.2013)
Agenda Item: 11
ENGLISH ONLY

FUTURE OF THE IPCC

Background paper

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

FUTURE OF THE IPCC

Background paper prepared by the IPCC Secretariat

Rationale

Rule 7 of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work requires that the “size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau will be reviewed and amended, as necessary, by the Panel at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected.”

According to Rule 8 the “Term of the Bureau shall be sufficient for the preparation of an Assessment Report and shall extend approximately one year after the Session at which the Assessment Report has been accepted and shall end at the Session at which the succeeding IPCC Bureau is elected.” Rule 8 requires that the Term of the IPCC Bureau shall be defined at least one Session prior to the one at which the IPCC Bureau is elected.

Rule 8 further states that the “Term of any Task Force Bureau shall normally be the same as the Term of the IPCC Bureau, and elections for any Task Force Bureau shall take place at the same Session at which the IPCC Bureau is elected, unless decided otherwise by the Panel.”

Background and next steps

In the past the IPCC carried out at the end of every assessment process a discussion about the future of the IPCC, addressing questions such as mandate of the IPCC Working Groups, structure and scope of future products and scheduling of IPCC products and invited comments and input from inter alia governments and the scientific community.

After completion of the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) the IPCC Chair circulated on 4 January 2008 a discussion paper about “Some issues related to the future of the IPCC” (contained in Annex 2 of document IPCC-XXVIII/Doc. 7) for comments by governments, IPCC observer organizations and authors involved in the AR4 assessment cycle.

At its 28th Session (Budapest, Hungary, 9-10 April 2008) the Panel considered the future of the IPCC. It decided to prepare a Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), which should be finalized in the year 2014. Therefore, according to Rule 8 the term of office of the current Bureau will end in the year 2015.

However, due to lack of time, the large number of detailed submissions (see IPCC-XXVIII/INF.1 and Add.1), which provided guidance for the scoping of the next assessment, could not be considered at that session. Therefore a task group chaired by the IPCC Chair and composed of delegates from Belgium, the Netherlands, Morocco, USA, China and Uganda was set up to facilitate the consideration of the matter at the 29th Session of the Panel.

At the 29th Session (Geneva, Switzerland, 31 August - 4 September 2008) Mr Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Belgium presented reflections from a task group to further advance the preparation of IPCC activities for the Fifth Assessment cycle and it was agreed that the task group will present a more complete document to the next Bureau session and prepare a final document for next Plenary.

At the 30th Session (Antalya, Turkey, 21-23 April 2009) a number of decisions were taken on the basis of the task group report (IPCC-XXX/Doc.10) to guide the Fifth Assessment Report, including the AR5 scoping process, scoping of the Synthesis Report (SYR), participation of Developing countries (DVCs) and countries with economy in transition (EITs) experts, regional issues and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). For longer term issues not covered by these decisions, the task group on the future of the IPCC set up at the 28th Session was invited to come up with a document identifying main issues to be addressed in the longer term, which would be sent to governments well in advance of the 31st Session of the Panel.

At its 31st Session (Bali, Indonesia, 26-29 October 2009) the Panel further considered the future of the IPCC. IPCC Vice-chair Jean-Pascal van Ypersele reported on behalf of the task group on some of the longer term issues raised, and suggested to re-address those issues in more depth two years before the end of the fifth assessment cycle.

In accordance with the overall schedule noted above these considerations should therefore start at the 37th Session of the Panel scheduled from 14-18 October 2013 in Batumi, Georgia. Consistent with its Terms of Reference, paragraph 3.b the Bureau is invited to provide guidance on how to introduce and advance the matter at the 37th Session of the Panel and onwards.

Questions and topics that may be addressed could include:

- Which should be the key future IPCC products and what would be the timing?
- Should the IPCC continue to give priority to comprehensive assessment reports and carry out other reports as required, following the “Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers” as amended at the 29th Session?
- Should the IPCC prepare more focused thematic reports that would jointly constitute an assessment report?
- How should regional issues be covered in the future?
- Should the IPCC prepare methodology reports other than those prepared by the TFI on national GHG inventories?
- What should be the duration the future assessment period?
- Should Reports be staggered?
- Should the IPCC prepare more frequent fast track assessments?

Note: In this context reference is made to decision 2 taken by Conference of the Parties To the UNFCCC at its seventeenth session on long-term cooperative action under the Convention which reads as follows:

“167. Decides that subsequent reviews should take place following the adoption of an assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or at least every seven years;”

- Is the structure and mandate of the IPCC Working Groups still adequate or should adjustments and changes be considered?
- What should be the size, structure and composition of the next IPCC Bureau?
- Should the TFI continue and if yes are any changes to its mandate required? Should there be any changes to size, structure and composition of the Task Force Bureau (TFB)?
- How to get appropriate feedback about AR5 and input from IPCC users and contributors to the preparations for the next round of assessments?
 - Timing of feedback
 - Format (e.g. questionnaires, meetings, web-based systems)
 - Target groups :
 - Governments
 - Authors
 - Review Editors
 - Research organizations
 - Other observer organizations
 - Wider outreach to civil society

- How to enhance active participation of DC/EIT experts as authors, Bureau members and as co-chairs, e.g. through facilitating the hosting of a Technical Support Unit (TSU) by a Developing or EIT country?
- Relationship and possible cooperation with other relevant assessment processes

Note: The outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference “The future we want” which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in resolution 66/288 calls for bringing together information from dispersed assessments to support informed decision-making (See e.g. paragraph 85.(k) and 88.(d)).

Furthermore in the decision on the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) it was agreed that the Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will be observer to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel that will carry out key scientific and technical functions of IPBES.

- Are revisions to the Principles governing IPCC work and its Appendices required?
 - Do the recent changes provide all the necessary improvements to address the InterAcademy Council (IAC) recommendations?
 - What can we learn from the experience of the AR5 writing and review process? Are methodological or technical improvements possible / desirable?