

ipcc

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON climate change

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE IPCC
Montreal, Canada, 6 – 10 September 2017

IPCC-XLVI/INF. 14
(30.VIII.2017)
Agenda Item: 4
ENGLISH ONLY

AD HOC TASK GROUP ON FINANCIAL STABILITY OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from members of the Ad Hoc Task Group on Financial Stability of the IPCC

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

IPCC Secretariat

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



IPCC TRUST FUND PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

Collated comments from members of the Ad Hoc Task Group on Financial Stability of the IPCC

	Country	First round comments
1.	Sierra Leone	This is a good development and I welcome the initiative of increasing the revenue base for the financial sustainability of IPCC. My only concern is the increment of the mandatory contribution because even with the existing amount, some countries including mine are still struggling to pay. But if that is what has been agreed on then I fully welcome the decision.
2.	Bahamas	I would like to thank you for the excellent draft on Finance. The draft covers all the basic elements discussed during the 45 th Plenary of the IPCC and with additional input will provide a good basis for discussions at the 46 th Session. At this time, I would like to mention that the paragraph on “Why Support the IPCC?” needs strengthening and look forward to making my contribution on the same at the 46 th Session.
3.	Canada	<p>1. Overall, it is our view that the draft document covers all the basic elements, however the balance of content could be improved such that greater emphasis is placed on the key item for discussion (i.e. fundraising options). Uncertainty around future financial support from the IPCC’s top contributor should be acknowledged. It would also be helpful for the report to include a concluding/next step section to clarify how the information presented will be used to advance decision-making on addressing the financial situation. Recognizing the urgency of the situation, it is important to move from discussion of the issue, to decision and action.</p> <p>2. Two points on fundraising option of increasing contributions from Governments: (a) To inform discussions on this option it would be helpful for the report to include a brief cost-benefit analysis of the outreach efforts to embassies and high-level government representative to-date and (b) Under this option, the idea of revisiting the list of countries that receive travel support from the IPCC Trust Fund could be explored. Recognizing that some countries’ economic situations may have improved considerably since Trust Fund beneficiaries were originally identified, there is an opportunity to see if any member countries are willing to forgo this support to help alleviate the resource constraints facing the IPCC.</p>

4.	China	China appreciates the efforts made by the Ad Hoc Task Group on Finance concerning the Financial Stability of the IPCC draft. It made a good summary of the status, trend, challenges and options of IPCC funding. However, it requires enrichment before submission to the next session. China would like to make the following comments. 1. Considerations shall be given to the differences from institutions such as WMO and UNICEF when addressing the limits of implementation of assessed or mandatory contributions. These differences may have implications on IPCC funding. 2. As the private sector contribution need to be analyzed and elaborated.
5.	Australia	(see letter attached)
6.	Japan	(see letter attached)
7.	UK	<p>Thank you very much for producing this zero draft. To answer your specific questions, we feel: 1) It does cover the basic elements, and 2) With additional inputs will provide a good basis for discussions at P46.</p> <p>We have the following comments: 1) Whilst many possible options are identified, it would be helpful to see more analysis of the pros and cons (eg reputational risks) of each. Such analysis is provided in some instances, for instance the risk of CoIs is identified for private sector donations, but this could be done more thoroughly. Perhaps a table of the pros and cons of each option could be produced. 2) Our GCF/GEF experts caution against approaching the GCF/GEF. IPCC is a poor fit with the GCF's mandate – it doesn't fund participation or secretariat functions, it only funds projects. And both it and the GEF can only provide funds to organisations which are accredited - which is a lengthy process. 3) It would be useful to see how other UN organisations are funded. This information is provided for WMO, which is very relevant, but it would be good to see more – I think this may be what is meant by option A (b) on page 9? 4) Likewise completion of option A (c) (lessons learned from past tentative introduction of new fundraising) may be useful. 5) Can we draw conclusions from the Chair's and Secretary's visits and letters to government representatives? The low level of contributions to date (in 2017) suggests these visits and letters are not producing many positive responses. It may help us in our work to know why. The responses may need to be anonymised but we would like to know how people are responding to these approaches. 6) On "Why Support the IPCC?" – this could be stronger, with compelling arguments as to why funders would want to support it or the benefits to them and others. 7) It says AR6 funding needs but think it should actually say the 6th Assessment cycle. 8) On the use of reserves, we don't understand the</p>

		<p>figure. Why did the cash reserve decrease in 2011 and 2013 when income exceeded expenditure? Also the figure needs to be brought up to date, with 2016 added.</p> <p>9. It would be good to include in the report a statement on whether or not IPCC's funding model is unique among UN bodies. I suspect it is, because the IPC has its own financial procedures.</p>
8.	France	<p>In general, France appreciates the draft report on Financial Stability to be submitted to IPCC-46 after further revisions. The document addresses in a comprehensive way most of the challenges to be faced by the IPCC in terms of resources which are necessary for achieving the AR6 objectives. The document properly summarizes the current and planned activities of the IPCC as well as the general breakdown of expenditure items. The list of options for a long-term increase of the IPCC incomes seems complete and we do not see any other major options to be added.</p> <p>We would like to express the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the report should mention the ongoing and future efforts for reducing the expenditures while maintaining the already decided activities. - the report should mention that the IPCC should limit the current and systematic overestimation of the annual budgets submitted to the Plenaries in order to provide the governments with the most possible clearer picture of the planned expenditures - page 6, §4: we do not understand the amount of 17.7 M CHF mentioned for the item "Other Expenditures" since the corresponding sum in the following table amounts to about 6.5 M CHF. - page 6 : some developing countries are presently partially supporting TSUs which should be reflected in the paragraph on TSU supports. - page 10 § 6.B.d.ii on crowd-funding: we suggest to modify the example in order to target a realistic and sufficient 7.5 M USD annual income instead of 150. 1 USD donation by 1/1000 of the world citizen would be a better example. - page 11 § 6.B.d.f on UN entities: we suggest to mention also as an option an increase in the funding by agencies contributing already. - page 11 § 6.B.d.g on Private Sector: we suggest to mention explicitly that contributions from the Private Sector should not be earmarked in order to ensure the integrity and independence of the IPCC.

9.	Sweden	<p>Sweden feels that the paper does lay out most of the possible alternatives that could be explored. In order to complete the picture, as also raised by some governments, the option of reducing the costs should be included, however unfortunate it would be.</p> <p>Sweden is strongly of the opinion that the core funding of the IPCC should come from the governments (options a-c). Contributions could be on a voluntary basis as at present, or modelled after the present practice in the WMO or other relevant UN agencies.</p> <p>Sweden is very disinclined to extend the base of contributions to the IPCC's core budget to any parties with distinct vested interests, especially the private sector (option g). The risks to the IPCC's reputation and its possibilities to fulfil its core missions are clear and considerable. Different UN entities are different in scope and mission and the general UN guidance on fundraising is not directly applicable to the specific case of the IPCC</p> <p>Overall, Sweden is both mindful of the importance and open for discussions on how to best ensure that the IPCC can fulfil its core mission both over the AR6 cycle, and beyond.</p>
10.	Brazil	<p>Thank you very much for this first draft and for leading such a relevant initiative. We understand the draft covers two main themes: recent situation and trends in contributions to IPCC; and fundraising options.</p> <p>Concerning the contributions received along the past years, we believe it is paramount to acknowledge the role of in-kind contributions by specifically listing the countries who have hosted IPCC meetings.</p> <p>When it comes to fundraising options, we think the zero draft could further explore the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to increase voluntary contributions, including in-kind contribution, and/or how to make them more predictable; - How to mix voluntary and assessed contributions (building WMO's experience, for instance) <p>By further developing these topics, we believe the ATG-Finance would address its mandate in a more balanced way and thus deliver a more complete basis for discussions at IPCC-46.</p>

11.	Germany	<p>We appreciate the comprehensiveness of the information and the range of options provided. The task of our group is to inform about potential funding options and their implications. The Panel should be brought in a position to take decisions on these options based on the information provided to IPCC46. To this end, we encourage to provide pros and cons in a more explicit manner for all options. Below we provide suggestions for further improvement of the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Governments need clarity on the budget situation of the IPCC and the funding needs, in particular Section 4: The IPCC budget estimates are generally ~30 % higher than the actual expenditure. The target for the resource mobilisation is another ~10% higher (e. g. the 2016 budget was about 7 Mio, the expenditure was about 5 Mio, but for the resource mobilisation a target of 8 Mio was indicated). We suggest providing more realistic budget estimates and setting more realistic funding needs / resource mobilization targets (including in Annex 1). <input type="checkbox"/> As suggested in the introductory paragraph, please indicate pros and cons for all options provided in section 6, including an assessment of the administrative or legal challenges and feasibilities of the options provided (e.g. considering whether terms & conditions of finance mechanisms allow for IPCC funding). More information is also needed with regards to the eligibility of potential donors (see paragraph 3.3 of the ToRs), bearing in mind their potential or perceived conflicts of interests. <input type="checkbox"/> It would be useful to highlight that the IPCC provides a large proportion of its work based on in-kind support that is not visible in budget estimates for the IPCC Trust Fund. This would clarify that the funding gap actually represents a relatively small amount compared to the total value of the IPCC products. <input type="checkbox"/> We suggest shortening and streamlining the document, some statements should be revised to improve coherency with IPCC's current practice or more recent decisions (details could be provided). <p>Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide general feedback to this zero order draft. While the ATG finance has core members, it is open ended to all governments and we therefore expect that the opportunity for participation will be provided to all interested governments in the next round of comments. Many thanks indeed for all your efforts.</p>
-----	----------------	---

12.	Saudi Arabia	<p>1- On the section titled "Global Commitments to Limit Climate Change", with regards to the reference of the Objective of the Paris Agreement we suggest reflecting Article 2 of the Paris Agreement which speaks to the objective of the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>2- With regards to the section titled "IPCC Commitments"; the sequence of the reports should be reflective of the Plenary discussions and the IPCC meetings report to be: 1. The Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5 C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways. 2. Climate change, decertifications, land degradations, sustainable land management, food security and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. 3. Climate change and oceans and the cryosphere.</p> <p>3- We wold like to register our concern about any mandatory contribution approach and require further clarification on the scale assessment method.</p> <p>4- We would like to highlight the importance of agreeing on a criteria for funding received and the role of the private sector. In that light, we would like to ensure avoiding earmarking in any funding received.</p> <p>5- We want to highlight the importance of having more clarity and transparency in the work program of the IPCC.</p>
-----	---------------------	---

	Country	Second round comments
1.	St Lucia	<p>The Government of Saint Lucia recognizes the financial constraints being experienced by the IPCC and notes the recommended fund raising options for addressing this issue. The options presented appear to be comprehensive and, for the most part, feasible. However, Saint Lucia would like to express concern about the option on assessed or mandatory contributions. While Saint Lucia's assessed contributions may be viewed by some as minimal, this will have a compounding effect on the country's financial responsibilities, as we are a Small Island Developing State with limited resources and heavily indebted at this time. We therefore request that this be given due consideration and factored into this option for fund raising.</p>
2.	France	<p>Though some of the comments from France have been taken into account, I am still confused by the amount of 17.7 M CHF mentioned page 8. I have not been able to find the corresponding amount in the Table, which could be a source of confusion.</p>

		<p>I suggest to add an additional recommendation in §7: e) Request the Secretary of the IPCC to further explore some of the other options, including Crowdfunding (option d).</p> <p>Since the recommendations were not in the zero-draft version of the document, I think it necessary to have one more iteration. Would it be possible to know which members have been consulted and whether it meets the requirement expressed in the ATG Finance mandate?</p>
3.	Germany	(see attached)
4.	Saudi Arabia	<p>Thank you for your email and for sharing the report. Kindly note that as the Saudi Arabian representative at the ATG Finance Group, I am wondering how did this document develop and how those fund raising options were considered. Please note that we found difficulty on expressing our comments on a pdf document and it would be much appreciated if future documents were circulated in word format. Kindly find below the comments by Saudi Arabia on the Final Draft of the document on Financial Stability of the IPCC by the Ad-Hoc Task Group on Finance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · On the section titled "Global and IPCC Commitments to Limit Climate Change", with regards to the reference of the Objective of the Paris Agreement we suggest reflecting Article 2 of the Paris Agreement as it is. · Moreover with regards to the sequence of the reports, they should be reflective of the Plenary discussions and the IPCC meetings report to be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5 C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways. 2. Climate change, decertification, land degradations, sustainable land management, food security and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. 3. Climate change and oceans and the cryosphere. <p>With regards to the fundraising options in section 6 of the document, kindly note the following:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · With regards to the increased contributions by governments, it is important to refrain from using the term “in a position to do so”. Furthermore, the contributions by governments should be voluntary. · We are of a strong view of ensuring the voluntary nature of contributions to the IPCC as it has been the practice since its inception. We do not agree to any mandatory contributions by member countries including assessed contributions scales. · With regards to contributions by the private sector, it is important to ensure that the only exclusion should be inline with the recommendations by the UN Global Compact Office that UN entities do not deal with companies from industries such as arms, tobacco, alcohol, gambling, and companies who are not in compliance with child labor and human rights abuse rules. All other companies should be considered and should be given an equal opportunity. · Earmarking by no means should be considered in any IPCC fundraising options in anyway. <p>Finally, while considering funding options, it is important to also highlight the need for considering options to enhance the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the secretariat of the IPCC by opting to conduct virtual meetings, webcasting, seminars, web-based conference calls. Those are standard practices of large UN organizations including the UNFCCC, GCF, etc.</p> <p>I would want to stress that this document is not accepted by Saudi Arabia to be the basis for discussion and we do require further consultations.</p>
--	--

	Country	Third round comments
1.	Sierra Leone	I think the report is good and I fully support it.
	Bahamas	<p>Thank you for the clear and concise document. I take note of the decline of contributions that would ultimately impact the smooth operation of the work of the IPCC and would like to make the following comment. I feel that a strategic approach to in-kind contribution is to liaise with both Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Tourism. By including both, the IPCC meetings will be seen from one perspective as a touristic event while at the same time serve as public awareness event to further educate locals on climate change.</p> <p>I support the idea of approaching the private sector but with the caution presented by the Co-chairs.</p>
2.	UK	<p>Thank you very much for the latest draft, which we received yesterday (31 July).</p> <p>I would like to re-iterate 3 of our earlier comments, ie:</p>

		<p>1. We would like to see a table of the options with their pros and cons. This need not contain any extra information beyond what is already in the report, but it would make it easier for government representatives to find that information, and so lead to more focussed discussion in Plenary 46.</p> <p>2. The GCF/GEF – we fear that if we don't make clear this is NOT a promising option, some may want this explored and insist on delay in decision-making until P47 whilst this is done.</p> <p>3. The figure "Financial Status in AR5 cycle" – I still don't understand why the cash balance was smaller in 2011 than in 2010. I will be happy to be told I have misunderstood and the figure is correct, but please will someone explain?</p>
3.	Croatia	<p>Thank you very much for a comprehensive ATG-Finance Report. All options are welcome for consideration.§</p> <p>I had minor intervention in the text related with wording (possible done by intention).</p>
4.	New Zealand	<p>Thanks you for the opportunity to provide comment on this. Please find attached a copy of the document, with suggestions and comments from New Zealand included as Tracked Changes. We look forward to discussing the issue in Montreal.</p> <p>We found no major problems, and the main one is that the document should be consistent regarding "member countries" or "member governments". I believe that the WMO (and other bodies) has member countries, but the IPCC has member governments.</p>
5.	Mauritius	<p>This is to inform you that we have gone through the document and that we have no further comments.</p>
6.	Germany	<p>Thank you very much for this updated draft. We appreciate that many of our comments have been taken on board, in particular the revision of the funding targets.</p> <p>We have three major requests/comments:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The alarming funding gap of almost CHF 6 Mio in 2017 and in the coming years should be emphasized. To this end we suggest alternative text on the bottom of page 8 of the draft report of the ATG Finance.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> We welcome the recommendations at the end of the document, but would suggest a stronger and clearer wording that gives clear guidance to the Panel, see page</p>

		<p>14 of the draft report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unfortunately the new version still does not provide the comprehensive list of pros and cons. Such information is however needed to enable an informed discussion of the Panel and the urgently needed decision on funding options at the upcoming plenary meeting.</p>
--	--	--

AUSTRALIA

Dr Thelma Krug and Dr Youba Sokona
Co-Chairs, Ad Hoc Task Group on Financial Stability of the IPCC
c/o World Meteorological Organisation
7 bis, Avenue de la Paix
C.P. 2300
CH-1211 Geneva 2
SWITZERLAND

Dear Dr Krug and Dr Sokona

Thank you for your email of 1 June 2017, which invites comment on the zero draft report from the Ad Hoc Task Group on Financial Stability of the IPCC, following the decision at the IPCC Plenary during its 45th Session to establish this Task Group and submit to the Panel a report on the issues raised.

The Australian Government is pleased to support the ongoing work of the IPCC and thanks the members of the Task Group for this report. We recognise the budgetary pressure faced by the IPCC at this time and support the efforts of the Task Group. This zero draft presents a useful framework for discussions on this topic at the Plenary meeting in Montreal, Canada, in September 2017. Further elaboration of some of the issues raised may also be helpful, our suggestions are provided below for your consideration.

In order to provide the sense of urgency this topic deserves, we suggest this paper clearly sets out the current status of IPCC finances. For example, please include the forecast for the cash balance for 2017 and update the table on page 5, *IPCC Financial Status in AR5 Cycle*, to reflect the additional information available at the beginning of the AR6 cycle, in 2016.

We look forward to further detail in *A. Fundraising approaches* (page 9), including guidance available from other institutions on how they assess eligibility of potential donors, including the private sector, and the Task Force's views on the suitability and adaptability of this guidance for the IPCC.

Similarly, the Task Force may wish to explore how the IPCC can assess and minimise potential conflicts of interest from the scientific research and philanthropic institutions (page 11) to ensure the integrity and independence of the IPCC is maintained. The Task Group may also consider including the 134 organisations that have been admitted as observer organisations to the IPCC, as a separately identified potential source of voluntary contributions, as the IPCC has already established relationships with these bodies.

The Australian Government is supportive of a fiscally responsible budget to ensure the satisfactory completion of the activities and products planned for the Sixth Assessment cycle.

Yours sincerely



Rob Sturgiss
Assistant Secretary
Department of the Environment and Energy

8/06/2017

JAPAN

Financial Stability of the IPCC by the ATG-Finance
Comment to Draft version 0

Japan is very grateful for the ATG Co-Chairs' untiring efforts to produce this draft version 0. We, recalling the discussion and decisions taken by the Panel at its 45th Session regarding the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget,

- Support significance of raising awareness of all member countries and observer organizations regarding the IPCC's severe financial situation and its gap against the increasing importance of / expectation to the IPCC;
- Note that not more than 32 member countries have ever provided any financial contribution to the IPCC, and since 2012 with the exception of 2013, the number and the level of contributions have decreased, requiring the IPCC to draw on its cash reserves to cover the costs of implementing the work programme;
- Support, considering the situation above, importance of urging member countries to maintain their generous contribution in 2017 and to invite governments, who are in a position to do so, to increase their level of contribution to the IPCC Trust Fund or to make a contribution in case they have not yet done so;
- Support importance for all member countries to increase in-kind contributions, including hosting of meetings, in addition to the Trust Fund;
- Also support significance of the contributions from UN entities such as UNEP, UNFCCC and WMO. However, broadening of the donor base to the international and regional financial institutions such as GEF and GCF should be well-considered in line with their own mandate;
- Further support necessity of careful consideration in terms of crowdfunding from science/research and philanthropic institutions as well as private sectors. It is intrinsic to ensure there is no conflict of interest and that the integrity and independence of the IPCC is maintained in any case.

We, recalling the discussions and decisions taken by the Panel at its 45th Session regarding the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget,

- Request the Secretariat, on an on-going basis:
 - To provide detailed information on the breakdown of the "Secretariat" budget line;
 - To provide information on Secretariat expenses that are included under other budget lines;
 - To provide further information about what is included under each budget line;
 - To tabulate historical annual expenditures since the beginning of the AR5 cycle;
- Request the Secretariat to analyse reasons for over-estimation of budget needs in the past in order to enable more accurate forecasting to be submitted to IPCC-46.
- Also request the Secretariat to minimize cost on the Trust Fund, including consideration of:
 - Length of travel period and appropriate airfares;
 - Necessity of each meeting such as the 47th Session of IPCC where no specific output is expected.

Japan is one of the very few countries who have maintained its voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund since IPCC's inception in 1989. We have kept hosting the Technical Support Unit of IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories since 1999. Appropriateness of country contribution should be assessed comprehensively by considering those elements, too.

Page: 3

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:48:16

We feel that the process was not inclusive enough. We had indicated in our comment to the previous version "While the ATG finance has core members, it is open ended to all governments and we therefore expect that the opportunity for participation will be provided to all interested governments

Page: 4

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:05:02

Editorial comment: The IPCC website lists eleven SRs?

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:05:21

Editorial comment: Please add the number of staff, as done for the Secretariat later in the text.

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 18:53:59

This generalized statement of TSU-support only coming from industrialized is not correct, and is indeed specified in the next sentence. CHN has already supported its WG1-Co-Chair during the AR5, in the AR6, at least IND, CHN, ZAF are providing support, we do not know about PER for the TFI. The text should reflect current practice, please amend.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:06:15

Editorial comment: This is only one of the objectives of the Paris Agreement, outlined in Article 2.1.a. Please add all elements of Article 2.1 related to adaptation/resilience and climate-friendly finance flows.

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:26:46

Editorial comment: The IPCC agreed on a modified scope of the report. The approved

Page: 5

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:08:31

Editorial comment: This is not in the mandate of the IPCC and To our knowledge, there has been no decision of the Panel that would justify this statement. Therefore, please delete this last sentence of the para.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:10:06

We suggest to mention the FITT: "The budget is discussed by the Financial Task Team that reviews income and expenditures, assisting in preparing the budget proposals and developing other recommendations related to finance for consideration by the Panel." (IPCC Principles, App B)

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 05/07/2017 19:56:05

How about TGICA?

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject:

Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:14:58

As indicated in our comment to the previous version of the document: "The IPCC budget estimates are generally about at least 30 % higher than the actual expenditure. (e. g. the 2016 budget was about 7 Mio, the expenditure was about 5 Mio). We suggest deleting this sentence.

See also our comment on the top of page 9.

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:21:45

These are not the "biggest" contributors but only the most regular ones. E.g. Austria has not contributed regularly, but its contribution to the total is higher than that of some of the countries listed, e.g. China. Therefore this information might be misleading and we suggest to also mention those countries with relevant contributions.

Number: 6 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 18:54:23

This assessment is misleading because it is based on the number and contributions of pledging countries, not the real realised contributions for each year. As stated in our previous comment: The trend of contributions provided is based on pledged contributions, i.e the date

of submission of indicated multi-year contributions to the IPCC and not on the actual year of reception of the yearly contributions. Because this leads to somewhat misleading figures we suggest to amend these figures.

Number: 7 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:25:58
In our assessment Belgium would be among the top five contributors in 2016 instead of the UK, see Annex 1 of IPCC-XLV/ Doc.2

Page: 6

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 18:56:43
This assessment is misleading because it is based on the number and contributions of pledging countries, not the real realised contributions for each year. As stated in our previous comment: The trend of contributions provided is based on pledged contributions, i.e. the date of submission of indicated multi-year contributions to the IPCC and not on the actual year of reception of the yearly contributions. Because this leads to somewhat misleading figures we suggest to amend these figures.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:57:47
Editorial comment: The total income during the AR5 cycle is around 41 Mio CHF, the amount taken from the reserve is about 5 Mio CHF. Therefore this sentence does not seem appropriate, please replace the word "largely" with "also".

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:54:16
The numbers shown for expenditure do not correspond to the information provided in the financial statements, the numbers shown in the figure are generally higher, e.g. the expenditure for 2015 amounts 5.8 CHF Mio but the number shown is above than 7 Mio CHF. The audited financial statement, IPCC XLIV/Inf.1, Statement V on Page 6 gives 5.8 Mio CHF for the expenditure, and this is compared with the budget of 7.5 Mio, i.e. an underspending of 1,73 Mio = 23 %.
Please explain and amend if needed.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 17:58:00
From the audits "funds held by WMO" (is this equal to "cash balance/reserves"):
13.403.0 201
10.433.0 201
11.189.0 201
10.816.0 201
9.276.0 201
6.597.0 201
no 5

These numbers do not seem represented in this figure nor in the text (the exception was in 2012, not in 2013, and there was not a steady fall since 2010?)

Page: 7

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 09:52:13
Editorial comment: From the 2015 audit 6,597 -> should be rounded to 6,6 ?

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:00:16
It is not transparent to us what the appropriate/ideal size of the funding reserves should be for the IPCC. (This would also include some insights on what would happen if the reserves went negative.) This information could also be a basis for a risk assessment of the full cycle.

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:00:33
Editorial comment: Please do not show the expenditures for the future as they are not yet known to avoid confusion.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:04:08
"need to be reestablished and maintained" is not clear enough, information is needed about the appropriate size of the reserve, see our second comment on the first paragraph above.

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:09:19
The introduction of a core budget is a good idea, but we do not support the proposed definition and suggest deleting the related text. The reasons are:
"core budget" is not defined in the IPCC. We do not agree with the attribution of budget items to "core budget" and "other expenditures". DC co-chair support, IT and web, audit, COI, TFI, EFDB should also be part of the core budget, because they are essential for the delivery of the products. Indeed, all but outreach-related activities (although these are very important too!) should be added to the core budget.
In addition, the definition provided for "core budget" is not appropriate because Plenaries are often funded by host countries, and because travel and publication costs are not mentioned.

Page: 8

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:09:43
Editorial comment: There are more in-kind contributions, e.g. for LA-meetings or Plenaries. In addition, the work of the authors is voluntary.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:10:03
Editorial comment: "total budget" is misleading, because the real costs are much higher. Please replace by "the estimated budget to be provided by the IPCC Trust Fund is.."

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:13:29
It necessary to explain, why the financial need is 9 mio while the budget is only 8.3 mio. See also our comments on the funding targets below.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:14:03
Editorial comment: very useful paragraph, but seems to be better placed in section 2?

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:15:40
It is very important to explain the reasoning of the increase of the budget to obtain the target for resource mobilisation. Is the increase related to the desired refillment of the reserve?

Number: 6 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:20:54
Again, it is not clear whether the IPCC needs a cash reserve and what its appropriate size would be.

Number: 7 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 13:45:42
These numbers do not represent the budgets from Decision IPCC/XLV-3., but the higher number for the resource mobilisation have been used - please clarify.

Page: 9

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:22:29
But still, the expenditure is always much lower (at least 20 %) than the budget estimate. Therefore, the decision from IPCC-37 perhaps needs to be revised.

It is difficult to justify that the amount for resource mobilisation is higher than the budget, because the budget itself is always an overestimation of the expenditures.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:22:55
This assessment is misleading because it is based on the number of pledging countries, not the real realised contributions for each year. As stated in our previous comment: The trend of contributions provided is based on pledged contributions, i.e. the date of submission of indicated multi-year contributions to the IPCC and not on the actual year of reception of the yearly contributions. Because this leads to somewhat misleading figures we suggest to amend these figures.

Editorial comment: Please remove 2016, as this is not a biennium.

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:07:52
Please see previous comment

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 10:24:39
Please mention the voluntary contributions of the expertise of bureau members, authors and reviewers; and the DDC.

Page: 10

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject:
Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 15:58:28

In order to provide balanced information to the Panel, all options should be treated equally and the same amount of information should be given. A comprehensive list of pros and cons ("ways and limits of implementation") should be provided in sections a, c, e, f, g, h.

We also suggest to provide recommendations only in Section 7.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 15:51:18
Please add "voluntary" to this title ->Increasing voluntary contributions from governments

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:06:56
What is meant with "in-kind contributions to the Trust Fund"? Does this mean savings for the Trust Fund, because a budget line is covered by an in-kind contribution, e.g. when a budgeted panel meeting is payed by the host country?

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 15:54:46
We do not agree: Multiyear pledges/announcements by member states would enable the predictability of funding. Please reformulate this paragraph in a more neutral way.

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:07:05

Editorial Comment: Please add "from governments"

Page: 11

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:08:46
Why "similar"? In which way would we change the assessment? Or which alternative scales are more suitable? This might entail very long discussions.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 15:59:12
With the current practice of a mixture of in-kind contributions (e.g. TSU funding by host countries) and cash contributions to the Trust Fund, and because some expenditures of the Trust Fund can be avoided by in-kind contributions (e.g. plenary meetings funded by the hosting country leading to savings for the Trust Fund) it might be difficult to find a fair balance of contributions through an assessed scale.

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:11:50
We do not support this paragraph which seems biased against assessed contribution. For example, we do not know, if the Panel members would have the same opinions as before.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:11:50
The sequence of events is not clear to us: Why first a decision on Appendix and then a decision on the assessed contribution? Would the latter not be included in the first?

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:30:47

It is unclear what the main topic of this section is (mixed funding model? donors?) Please clarify.

Page: 12

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:43:23

Limits of implementation: It should be mentioned that this option could bring about political damage for

the IPCC as an institution and for its member countries not willing to sufficiently support the Panel is not mentioned here.

Page: 13

Number: 1 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:43:44
Limits of implementation: Please mention that existing funding practices / ToRs are in conflict with envisaged contributions to IPCC.

Number: 2 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 18:58:20
Please delete judgment "important"

Number: 3 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:41:38

Limits of implementation: It should be mentioned that this option could bring about political damage for

the IPCC as an institution and for its member countries not willing to sufficiently support the Panel is not mentioned here.

Number: 4 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 06/07/2017 14:51:34
This should also exclude companies that are active in the renewable energy sector, or any other business that is related to the content of the assessment reports.

Number: 5 Author: text_ch Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017 11:47:26
This needs further considerations to be added in the missing paragraph on "ways and limits of implementation", e.g.:

- Who would be invited to such an event?
- How can Col be excluded?
- How can the IPCC avoid influence by donors on its work programme?
-
-

Page: 15

Number: 1 Author: text_ch
Subject: Notiz Date: 07/07/2017
15:25:27

This is useful information (if funding targets were more realistic) which should be provided as standard element of the IPCC budget information to incentivize

appropriate contributions by member states, even if the IPCC continues with the voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund.

Number: 2

Author: text_ch

Subject: NotizDate: 07/07/2017 15:25:35

The approved budget for 2016 is 7.089 Mio CHF, the expenditure was 4.910 Mio CHF, the total contribution was 4.382 Mio CHF (IPCCXLV.Doc.2, Annex 3). The simulation for a funding target of 8 Mio does not seem realistic, see also our previous comments on the funding target.