

Your Excellency Mr. Maanee Lee, Minister of Environment, Republic of Korea
Mr. Byung-Seong Chun, Administrator of the Korea Meteorological Administration
Mr. Nam-sik Hur, Mayor of Busan Metropolitan City
Mr. Seung-Soo Han, Chairman of the Global Green Institute
Mr. Lengoasa, Deputy Secretary General, WMO
Mr. Peter Gilruth, Director UNEP
and my colleague Dr. Renate Christ, Secretary of the IPCC

We'll also have a special message from Ms Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, who is unable to join us today.

I am pleased to open this 32nd session of the IPCC, which is being held in the beautiful city of Busan in the Republic of Korea, and to welcome all the distinguished delegates present at this meeting. I would like to pay special thanks to our Korean hosts and to the local organising committee for their work in enabling this meeting to take place. As an intergovernmental panel which relies on member governments not only for its governance, but also for much of its organisation, we are always indebted to our hosts and we are particularly thankful for the hard work and attention to detail which has been put into this meeting. We are deeply grateful for the warm hospitality provided by our Korean hosts. A special debt of gratitude and appreciation to my friend and colleague, Dr. Hoe Sung Lee, Vice Chairman of the IPCC.

The world is watching with great expectation the implementation of Korea's green growth plan, and I hope that during the development of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) we will see publications of value documenting the initiatives taken and results achieved from this country's visionary growth plan. The world is also watching the outcome of this plenary session of the IPCC for its significance in respect of the important agenda to be covered.

The AR5 is now well on its way, and I am happy to inform the Panel that we are deeply gratified with the enthusiastic response we have received from the scientific community worldwide. A total of about 3000 nominations of authors were received for the AR5, which was considerably more than the almost 2000 nominations received for the AR4. Out of this total we have selected for the three Working Groups a total of 831 authors and review editors of outstanding caliber. It is also gratifying that the percentage of those drawn from the developing countries and countries in transition total 30 %, which represents an increase over previous assessments. The gender balance also on this occasion is significant at 25 %, which is better than what we were able to achieve in the AR4. Even more significant is the fact that this time more than 60 % of those selected are new to the IPCC process, which means that we would have the infusion of new knowledge and new ideas that hold a great deal of promise for the presentation of updated science and new perspectives that would be reflected in the AR5.

The first lead authors meeting of Working Group I is due to be held in November 2010, and thereafter the other two Working Groups would also be embarking on the process of preparation of their reports, to ensure that we not only produce the AR5 on a timely basis but to the highest standards expected of the IPCC.

The past ten months or so have been a challenging period for the IPCC, and while there have been some shortfalls and mistakes on our part, what we have been through is also a reflection of the heightened scrutiny and interest that we have been subjected to. At the IPCC we understand that perhaps our biggest challenge is our own effectiveness in being able to provide scientific knowledge on climate change in a manner that has implications for a large range of human activities. A diversity of reactions is, therefore, to be expected. The greatest challenge facing the IPCC is the very success of the organization. As the preface of the review carried out by the Inter-Academy Council clearly says: "Since its founding more than twenty years ago the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) can claim many important accomplishments to its credit". It also describes the IPCC as "a significant social innovation". It is to the credit of my colleagues that we have been able to continue with the tasks that the Panel has

entrusted us with, and we are making significant progress not only with the AR5 but also the two special reports that are currently in hand, namely on Renewable Energy and Extreme Events, respectively. It is also worth noting that we have made early preparations and have put in adequate effort for outlining the Synthesis Report, as the outcome of a successful scoping meeting held in Liege in Belgium during August 2010, building on the initial work carried out during the scoping meeting in Venice in 2009 and in the last plenary session of the IPCC held in Bali. In this particular session, we would be presenting the outcome of the scoping meeting on the Synthesis Report for the consideration of the Panel. Having made a timely and well planned beginning with the Synthesis Report, I am sure we would be able to come up with a policy relevant document that would draw effectively on the material contained in the Working Group reports as well as the special reports due to be completed in this cycle. There are huge expectations that the AR5 would be a scientifically robust and policy relevant document, which goes far beyond previous assessments.

We also need decisions on some other important budgetary items and related subjects. I would seek the attention of the Panel on them on the first day itself. Beginning possibly this afternoon we would take up consideration of the review carried out by the IAC. This was a review requested jointly by the Secretary General of the U.N. and me in March of this year and for which we set out clear terms of reference. We are grateful that Sir Peter Williams, a member of the IAC Review Committee will be with us on Tuesday, and he would make a presentation before the Panel as well as hold a question and answer session, so that the delegates get a full appreciation of the logic and rationale of the recommendations provided by the IAC. We expect this session to take up a good part of the time on the second morning of the plenary.

It is entirely the prerogative of the governments to consider and take decisions on each of the recommendations presented by the IAC as well as the manner of their implementation if they are accepted. I would personally refrain from expressing a view on most recommendations, particularly those which have direct implications on the term of office of the Chair and the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups.

I will set up a process at this plenary to address the recommendations and observations of the IAC review which is both transparent and government-driven. Having been an initiator of this review and being committed to bringing about the required improvements in the functioning of the IPCC I shall do all that the Panel requires of me to carry this process forward. I believe that a full discussion and treatment of this review and the implementation in the manner that the Panel determines will strengthen the functioning of the IPCC and prepare it much better for the changing world that we are living in. We must ensure that we take clear decisions on those recommendations of the IAC review which can be resolved in this session. As the IAC report has stated: "Most of the Committee's recommendations can be implemented during the fifth assessment process and should be considered at the upcoming Plenary. These include recommendations to strengthen, modify, or enforce IPCC procedures, including the treatment of gray literature, the full range of views, uncertainty, and the review process. Recommendations that may require discussion at several Plenary sessions but that could be implemented in the course of fifth assessment, include those related to management, communications, and conflict of interest. Because the fifth assessment is already underway, it may be too late to establish a more transparent scoping process and criteria for selecting authors." (p.65 of the published IAC review)

The IAC review also addresses the structure of the Secretariat. I would like to inform the Panel that in the first seventeen years of its existence, the Secretariat structure remained frozen. In precise terms between 1988 and 2005 the IPCC Secretariat consisted of a Secretary who was an employee of the WMO, a Deputy Secretary employed by UNEP, two Secretarial Assistants and one Administrative Assistant. Quite apart from the fact that the reporting relationships of the senior staff of the Secretariat were linked to the WMO and UNEP respectively, and had no formal accountability to the Chairman of the IPCC, changes were essential. Given the growing demands that were expected on the Secretariat, there was need not only to bring about organizational

cohesiveness within the structure but also to expand its capacity. Hence, I was pleased that the Panel approved of the position of an Information Officer in 2005, which was filled up in 2006.

In subsequent exercises during 2008 to 2009 to evaluate the requirements of the Secretariat, the Panel agreed to allow additional staff to be employed. As a result we now have ten positions in the Secretariat, but additions of staff have been very recent, and the Deputy Secretary will join only a few months from now. The demands particularly for effective communications require further enhancement of capacity. It is important for the Panel to come up with a full assessment of how the IPCC should equip itself to deal with communications and information dissemination requirements in a world where information spreads instantaneously across the globe. To that extent the past one year has been an important learning experience for all of us in the IPCC, and I would submit that the results of the modest capacity enhancement which we have implemented will start showing only now. I am very happy that the IAC has addressed the issue of capacity.

In carrying out a discussion of the recommendations of the IAC review and deciding on their implementation we should not lose sight of some realities. The IAC Committee has clearly stated "the Committee found that the IPCC assessment process has been successful overall". It has also said that the work of the IPCC is extremely challenging. To quote from the report "the task is extraordinarily complex because of the broad scope of the assessment and the fact that it is assembled by a complex, decentralized, worldwide network of scholars".

Change and improvement in an organization as important and complex as the IPCC is inevitable and overdue, but it must build on the demonstrated strengths of the system. Together with my colleagues in the Secretariat, the vice-chairs of the IPCC, the cochairs of the working groups and TFI and the TSU heads, we have already made attempts at change and I thank them for their cooperation, advice and ideas in this context. However we all recognize there is still more to do. I am committed to carry reform forward as the Panel takes decisions on the outcome of the IAC review process. It is also important to remember that we have a gigantic task in hand, that of completing the preparation of the AR5 at the highest levels of quality and rigour. Nothing that we decide on must in any way impede progress towards our most important mission of producing an outstanding AR5, which the world rightly expects of us.

Finally, I would like to say that I feel grateful and very fortunate to have received an unprecedented measure of support in this period from the Panel. Your support has been a great asset during all kinds of weather, both fair and foul. Were it not due to this huge asset, perhaps we would have been unable to complete the AR4 in the manner that we did, particularly the Synthesis Report, on which a decision to go ahead was taken rather late in the last cycle. I do wish to express my own personal gratitude for all that I have received in this respect both during the AR4 cycle and subsequently.

Thank you very much!