

FIFTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE IPCC
Paris, France, 24 – 28 March 2020

IPCC-LII/Doc. 5
(23.I.2020)
Agenda Item: 6
ENGLISH ONLY

ORGANIZATION OF THE FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC IN LIGHT OF THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE (TG-FWLGST)

Final Report of the Task Group on the Organization of the Future Work of the IPCC in Light of the Global Stocktake (TG-FWLGST)

(Prepared by the Co-Chairs and Rapporteur of the TG-FWLGST)

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

ORGANIZATION OF THE FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC IN LIGHT OF THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE (TG-FWLGST)

Final Report of the Task Group on the Organization of the Future Work of the IPCC
in Light of the Global Stocktake (TG-FWLGST)

1. Background Information on the TG-FWLGST

The Panel at the 43rd Session of the IPCC (Nairobi, Kenya, 11 – 13 April 2016) reviewed some of the outcomes of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP-21) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which was held in Paris, France, from 30 November to 11 December 2015. This was motivated by the fact that the Paris agreement underscores the fundamental need for scientific knowledge, particularly the best available science, and that some COP-21 decisions explicitly mentioned the IPCC (e.g. decision 1/CP.21 paragraphs 21, 31(a), 99(b), 100; and decision 3/CP.21 paragraph 4). In particular, in Paragraph 10, the Parties requested the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to provide advice on how the assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change can inform the global stocktake of the implementation of the Agreement pursuant to its Article 14 and to report on this matter to the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement at its second session. The Panel decided ([Decision IPCC/XLIII-5](#)) to take the outcomes of UNFCCC COP-21 into account when determining the IPCC program of work and products for the IPCC sixth assessment cycle and requested the Secretariat to prepare proposals for aligning the work of the IPCC during its Seventh Assessment Report (AR7) with the needs of the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement and to submit these proposals for consideration at a Plenary session of the IPCC no later than 2018.

At the 46th Session of the IPCC (Montreal, Canada, 6 – 8 September 2017), the Panel discussed the issue of aligning the work of the IPCC with the needs of the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement. Three options were presented for the Panel's consideration in document [IPCC-XLVI/Doc.3](#). Subsequently, the Panel ([Decision IPCC/XLVI-5](#)):

- Decided to establish a task group on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement. The task group will be co-chaired by France and Mexico;
- Requested the Co-Chairs of the task group, together with the IPCC Secretariat, to prepare a proposal for the terms of reference of the task group to be decided upon at the 47th Session of the IPCC; and
- Requested the IPCC Secretariat to solicit views from Members of the IPCC on the terms of reference for the task group, and on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement, to inform the work of the Co-Chairs.

At the 47th Session of the IPCC (Paris, France, 13 – 16 March 2018), views expressed by governments and IPCC Observer Organizations on the alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake, as well as suggestions for terms of reference (TORs) for the Task Group were presented to the Panel in document [IPCC-XLVII/Doc.8](#). Subsequently, the Panel decided ([Decision IPCC/XLVII-8](#)) to adopt the TORs for the Task Group (Annex 1) and named it “Task Group on the organization of the future work of the IPCC in light of the global stocktake”. The Panel also decided that the Task Group should operate with the resources available in the IPCC and that agenda items on this issue would be named “Organization of the future work of the IPCC in light of the global stocktake”

2. Main Steps of the TG-FWLGST

After the adoption of the TORs, governments who wanted to be members of the Task Group were requested to indicate by raising up their flags in Plenary. Governments which volunteered to be part of the Task Group are listed under the Membership subsection of Annex 1 to [Decision IPCC/XLVII-8](#). Governments that had expressed their interest to join the group but had been inadvertently omitted from the list notified the IPCC Secretariat and were subsequently included and received all relevant communication. On 27 April 2018, governments which volunteered to be members of the Task Group were invited to designate a contact person. In cases where no contact person was designated, the IPCC Focal Point assumed that role (Annex 2).

Norway volunteered to serve as a Rapporteur for the Task Group. The TORs stipulate that the Task Group should have two rapporteurs. Efforts to get a second rapporteur, preferably from a developing country or a country with an economy in transition (EITs) were not successful and no member volunteered to play this role despite the invitations which were sent.

In June 2018, the IPCC Secretariat created an electronic forum (<https://www.ipcc.ch/apps/eboard/>) to facilitate discussions and sharing of views among the members of the Task Group.

On 20 September 2018, the Task Group's Co-Chairs through the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments and IPCC Observer Organizations to identify and share possible options for organizing and scheduling future work of the IPCC in light of the global stocktake, starting from the Seventh Assessment Cycle (AR7) (Annex 3). The request aimed at soliciting information on the rationale behind the preferred possible options and possible updates of earlier submissions which are contained in document [IPCC-XLVII/Doc.8](#). In response to the invitation, submissions from seventeen member governments and three IPCC Observer Organizations were received by the Task Group. In addition, some governments indicated that their 2017 submission were still valid, and should be considered by the Task Group.

At the 48th Session of the IPCC (Incheon, Republic of Korea, 1 – 5 October 2018), the Task Group's work plan, the list of members and a proposal for an acronym (i.e. TG-FWLGST) were presented to the Panel in the progress report (Document [IPCC-XLVIII/Inf.2, Corr. 2](#)).

The Task Group Co-chairs and Rapporteur attended the 24th Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC (COP-24). An information note on some outcomes of COP-24 was prepared and sent to the Task Group members in order to share with them information which was considered relevant for the Task Group's activities (Annex 5).

On 21 January 2019, the submissions received in response to the September 2018 invitation were sent to TG-FWLGST members. On 19 February 2019, a preliminary compilation of the options identified in the submissions which was undertaken by the Co-Chairs was submitted to Task Group members. In the preliminary compilation, the responses were clustered according to the preferred length of the IPCC assessment cycle (i.e. maintaining the status quo, shortening the cycle to 5 years and lengthening the cycle to 10 years). Suggestions which addressed structural and procedural matters, and other proposals were captured in the preliminary compilation.

An oral progress report was presented to the IPCC Bureau at its 56th Session (Geneva, Switzerland, 18 – 19 March 2019) to solicit advice from IPCC Bureau members and Technical Support Unit (TSU) representatives, consistent with the Task Group's TORs.

At the 49th Session of the IPCC (Kyoto, Japan, 8 – 12 May 2019) the second progress report, which contained a draft summary of the options identified and a full set of the submissions by governments and IPCC Observer Organizations was presented for the Panel's consideration ([Document IPCC-XLIX/INF.6](#)). The options were further discussed during the Task Group's face to face meetings which were held during the 49th Session.

On 2 July 2019, Governments and IPCC Observer Organizations were requested to submit comments on the two alternatives which were identified during the Task Group's face-to-face meetings (Annex 4). A dedicated spreadsheet for submitting comments was provided. A clarification note which responded to a query made by one government was sent on 30 July 2019. In response to the call, 24 responses were received from 22 member governments and 2 IPCC Observer Organizations. These submissions were sent to Task Group members on 17 September 2019.

At the 50th Session of the IPCC (Geneva, Switzerland, 2 – 6 August 2019) an oral progress report was presented to the Panel. A physical Task Group meeting was held during the Session.

An oral progress report was also presented to the Panel at the 51st Session of the IPCC (Monaco, 20 – 23 September 2019). The preliminary analysis of the submissions received in response to the July 2019 call was discussed during the Task Group's meeting which was held at the 51st Session. During the Task Group meeting, members *inter alia*, emphasized the necessity to solicit inputs from the TSUs, IPCC Bureau and the Secretariat in order to integrate them to the whole analysis.

On 7 October 2019, a letter was sent to IPCC Bureau Members, Heads of TSUs and the Secretary of the IPCC requesting their comments and suggestions on the alternatives and options identified by the Task Group. In particular, they were requested to highlight the pros and cons of each of the options and alternatives.

An oral progress report was presented to the IPCC Bureau during its 57th Session (Singapore, 24 – 25 October 2019). A recommendation was made to have targeted conversations with Bureau members as a more efficient way of soliciting their input to the process. Following this recommendation, about 10 Bureau members and Heads of TSUs responded to the invitation from the co-chairs and rapporteur. They expressed their points of view during structured interviews held at COP-25 both physically and via webex.

3. Two different alternatives for the evolution of the work of the IPCC

The TG-FWLGST has identified two top-level alternatives which differ above all in the timing of the decision made by the Panel. Their main characteristics are as follows:

- Alternative-1 has 7 options based on different products and/or different cycle lengths. These options are described in detail below as well as their respective pros and cons which have been identified by the Member countries and the Observer Organizations. According to the Terms of reference of the Task group, a particular attention has been paid to their implementation during the 7th cycle and to the products which would be available for the 2nd Global Stocktake. Alternative-1 considers that the Panel has enough information to engage in a decision process starting during the 52nd Session of the IPCC. It assumes that such a decision will be made early enough for allowing the full implementation of the chosen option at the very beginning of the 7th cycle.
- Alternative-2 consists in undertaking after the 52nd Session of the IPCC a review describing relevant information from both IPCC and UNFCCC/PA/GST after which IPCC will make its decision considering 3 main options on the future organization of the work. These 3 options have not been developed in details by the Task Group and there has been no assumption on the possibility to make a decision after the review early enough for allowing any implementation at the beginning of the 7th cycle. More details on the major axes to be followed by the review are provided below.

4. Main characteristics of the 7 options of Alternative-1 :

The 7 options of Alternative-1 have been identified from submissions by Member countries and Observer Organizations in response to calls from the Secretariat and from proposals made during meetings of the TG-FWLGST. They have been established taking into account the following considerations:

- **Timing of IPCC cycles:** the IPCC procedures do not specify the duration of an evaluation cycle. Each cycle is determined by the work program decided by the Panel.

- **Timing of elections:** the preparations of the 7th cycle will depend on the timing of the plenary that will elect the new Bureau. - Timing of elections: the preparations of the 7th cycle will depend on the timing of the Plenary that will elect the new Bureau. The main assumption made by the TG-FWLGST is that the election will take place around October 2022. It corresponds to a 7 year cycle similar to the length of the last two previous cycles (6 yr 11 months and 6 yr 5 months respectively), but implies that the review of the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau should be done in a session before the Synthesis Report (SYR) approval session whereas this previously have been decided after the SYR approval. Where specified in some of the options below, assumptions are also made with an earlier timing of Bureau election than the main assumption described above.

- **Work program and length of the 6th and 7th cycles:** the 7th cycle will produce at least one special report on the cities following Decision IPCC/XLIII-6.

The duration of the ongoing 6th IPCC cycle is assumed to last for approximately 6.5 years when including 6 months of work to finalize the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) SYR after the final approval of all three AR6 Working Group reports (WGII in October 2021). For the ongoing cycle, Bureau election was held in October 2015, but the production of AR6 itself actually started in mid-2016 with the preparation of a questionnaire to governments and observer organizations.

- **Preservation of the quality of the reports and maintaining scientific integrity and robustness of the reports.** This could imply maintaining the amount of time dedicated to the preparation of the outlines, the selection of the authors, the drafting of the different versions and the expert and governmental reviews.

- **Timing and content of the Global Stocktake (GST):** Decision 19/CMA.1 specifies that IPCC information collected for 2nd GST (2028) should be available by March or April 2027 in order to be taken into account at the earliest stage of the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment (see in Annex 5 the information note distributed to the Panel as Annex 3 to IPCC-XLIX/INF.6). The 6th Assessment Report (AR6) will be available for both the first and the 2nd GST. It can be noted that acceleration of the transition between two assessment cycles would allow the possibility for the 7th Assessment Report to inform the 2nd GST without significantly changing the nature and the length of the work, and therefore eliminate the need to choose between the options provided.

A short title has been given to the 7 options associated with Alternative-1, based on the main products available for the 2nd Global Stocktake. Options A1, A2 and A3 correspond to a 6,5-year cycle, B1 and B2 to a 5-year and C1 and C2 to a 10-year. The list is as follows:

- **A1 : Assessment and special reports currently available inform the 2nd GST**
- **A2 : Special report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST**
- **A3 : Technical paper specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST upon request of UNFCCC**
- **B1 : Full assessment report prepared in time for the 2nd GST**
- **B2 : A shorter, more focused assessment report prepared in time for the 2nd GST**
- **C1 : Full assessment report prepared for the 3rd GST**
- **C2 : Full assessment report prepared for the 3rd GST with interim products in time for the 2nd GST**

The options are presented below for the 7th cycle and the 2nd GST. However, each of these options could be pursued for the 8th cycle and beyond if options B1 and B2 are aligned with GST timelines and the cycles have a total duration of 5 years, or if options C1 and C2 are aligned with GST and the cycles have a total duration of 10 years.

Option A1 : Assessment and special reports currently available inform the 2nd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production before end of **2028 (no change from current practice)**.
- Production during 7th cycle: special reports or technical papers, including special report on the cities and AR7.
- The 3 AR7 volumes are assumed published between September 2027 and April 2028. The SYR is published later in 2028.
- Cycle duration : 6-7 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** AR6 from 2021/22 and any special reports published during the 7th cycle.

*** Should however the timing of election for the 7th cycle be held so that the WGs and their TSUs be operational 6 to 12 months earlier than expected with the current practice, option A1 would make it possible to provide the 2nd GST with a significant part of the AR7 (at least the 3 volumes).

Option A2 : Special report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production before the end of 2028 and production before **March 2027 of a report specifically dedicated to the GST**.
- Production during 7th cycle: special reports or technical papers, including special report on cities and special report for the 2nd GST to be approved before March 2027 and AR7.
- The 3 AR7 volumes are assumed published between September 2027 and April 2028. The SYR is published later in 2028.
- Cycle duration : 6-7 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** Special report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST and other special reports published during the 7th cycle.

Option A3 : Technical paper specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST upon request of UNFCCC

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production before the end of 2028 and production before **March 2027 of a technical paper specifically dedicated to the GST**.
- Production during 7th cycle: special reports and technical papers, including special report on cities and a technical paper dedicated for 2nd GST to be produced before March 2027 and AR7.
- The 3 AR7 volumes are assumed published between September 2027 and April 2028. The SYR is published later in 2028.
- Cycle duration : 6-7 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** technical paper specifically dedicated to the GST and other special reports published during the 7th cycle.

Option B1 : Full assessment report prepared in time for the 2nd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production before **March 2027**.
- Production during 7th cycle: the special report on cities and other special report or technical papers decided by the panel and AR7.
- This option requires a very **early election** of the co-chairs of the 3 WGs and an immediate start of the preparatory work for AR7.
- Cycle duration : 5 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** AR7 and special reports published during the 7th cycle.

Option B2 : A shorter, more focused assessment report prepared in time for the 2nd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: production of a shorter and more focused AR7 than current ARs before **March 2027**.
- Production during 7th cycle: the special report on cities and any other report decided by the panel and a shorter and more focused AR7.
- Cycle duration : 5 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** shorter and more focused AR7 and special reports published during the 7th cycle.

Option C1 : Full assessment report prepared for the 3rd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production **before March 2032**.
- Production during 7th cycle: special reports or technical papers, including special report on cities, and AR7.
- SYR is published before March 2032.
- Cycle duration : 10 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** AR6 from 2021/22 and any special reports published before March 2027 (the AR7 will be available for the 3rd GSTs Technical Assessment).

Option C2 : Full assessment report prepared for the 3rd GST with interim products in time for the 2nd GST

- Implementation in the 7th cycle: AR7 production **before March 2032** and production of a special report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST before March 2027.
- Production during 7th cycle: special reports or technical papers, including special report on cities + a report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST, and AR7.
- The report specifically dedicated to the GST is published before March 2027.
- SYR AR7 is published before March 2032.
- Cycle duration: 10 y.
- **Key IPCC products collected for the 2nd GSTs Technical Assessment:** report specifically dedicated to the 2nd GST and any special reports published before March 2027 (the AR7 will be available for the 3rd GSTs Technical Assessment).

Main characteristics of Alternative-2:

Alternative-2 has been identified later than Alternative-1 from a proposal made by a TG-FWLGST member during a meeting of the TG-FWLGST. Less time has been available for its consideration by the TG-FWLGST members.

Alternative-2 consists in undertaking a review with the objective to collect, analyze and describe relevant information from both IPCC and UNFCCC/Paris Agreement/GST after which IPCC will make its decision considering three options on the future organization of the work. Alternative-2 is a 3-stage process:

- 1) The work in the 6th IPCC cycle will proceed as already laid out.
- 2) A review collecting, describing and analyzing relevant information from the IPCC and the UNFCCC/Paris Agreement/GST will be undertaken along the following major axes:

Axes of Consideration	Specific aspects	IPCC	UNFCCC/PA/GST
Scientific	Objectivity		
	Integrity		
	Method		
		
Methodological	Relationship to Policy		
	Role of Parties/Members		
	Classification (spatial, temporal, etc)		
		
Normative	Equity		
	CBDR&RC		
	Commitments of Developed Countries		
	Financial, Technological and Capacity Differences		
	Parties' Needs and Aspirations		
		
Process	Dispute Resolution		
	Ownership of Output		
		

3) The output of the review should result in the selection of one of the following options:

- IPCC cycles to continue as per the current IPCC process. The Global Stocktake will use the input through SBSTA and SBI at its own discretion.
- Specific outputs to be prepared by IPCC that will specifically cover as much as is determined feasible of the requirements of the GST, as determined following the review described above.
- Specific GST-oriented material to be covered in the outputs of the IPCC in suitable form as appropriate and based on what is determined as feasible following the review described above.

Summary of the pros on cons of each of the 7 options of Alternative 1

The list of pros and cons presented below has been compiled by faithfully reflecting the arguments developed in the submissions made by governments, observer organizations, Bureau members, the Secretariat and Heads of TSUs.

It should be noted that some characteristics of each option were considered both an advantage by some and a disadvantage by others. This important aspect has been faithfully reflected below, sometimes leading to contradictory arguments.

All the submissions received can be consulted following instructions provided in Annex 6.

Pros and cons of Option A1

The main pros identified were:

- The previous climate change assessment reports issued by the IPCC since 1990 have been widely accepted and recognized by the international community as strong science in support of its process of climate change response.
- It delivers more comprehensive reports as until now for UN systems and broader audiences.
- It delivers the latest information available, granting highest relevance.
- Compared to options with a longer cycle, it increases the degree of renewal and dynamic among authors and reduce stress and burn out.
- No disruption of scheduled transition between cycles for all actors and products.

The main cons identified were:

- The AR6 Synthesis Report (2022) will be outdated in 2028 and therefore will not be adequate to inform the GST.
- It does not deliver targeted products informing the GST and is therefore less policy relevant, affecting also the relevance for all audiences.
- The long breaks between assessment reports, according to the current practice, lead to exceptional burdens on the first IPCC product of each cycle.

Pros and cons of Option A2

The main pros identified were:

- The Special Report dedicated to the GST could meet the needs of the GST but would need to avoid being policy prescriptive and maintain the IPCC independence.
- The Special Report dedicated to the GST would be produced on time for 2nd GST.
- It would provide shorter, more frequent and more focused reports for the governments and the UNFCCC.
- It would provide more comprehensive reports as until now for UN systems and broader audiences.
- It would deliver the latest information available to the 2nd GST, therefore granting the highest relevance.
- Compared to options with a longer cycle, it increases the degree of renewal and dynamic among authors and reduce stress and burn out.

The main cons identified were:

- To keep the Special Report dedicated to the GST to a manageable length the IPCC would need to choose scientific assessments that it considers relevant for the GST, thereby it would be done in a policy prescriptive way.
- Special reports rely on smaller teams with the risk of expertise gaps and high workload.
- It requires to rethink the relationship to the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) and that IPCC work is based on most recent climate models.
- A special report would not have the capacity to assess such a large body of literature.
- An Assessment Report and a broad scoped Special Report dedicated to the GST would likely overlap in content and create parallel writing workload for authors.
- It may imply a predominant focus on the conclusion of the 2nd GST at the cost of AR7 which will be produced just one/two years later.
- A Special Report dedicated to the 2nd GST is unnecessary as it would duplicate the AR7.
- The long breaks between assessment reports, according to the current practice, lead to exceptional burdens on the first IPCC product of each cycle.
- Any GST-dedicated product would suffer from political considerations during the approval of its SPM. It would undermine the independence of the IPCC.

Pros and cons of Option A3

The main pros identified were:

- It would provide more comprehensive reports as until now for UN systems and broader audiences.
- Compared to options with a longer cycle, it increases the degree of renewal and dynamic among authors and reduce stress and burn out.

The main cons identified were:

- The AR6 Synthesis Report (2022) will be outdated in 2028 and therefore will not be adequate to inform the GST.
- Technical papers are not appropriate for the GST as they present no new findings, extra workload on authors, not the same impact as Special Reports and Assessment Reports.
- To keep the GST Technical paper dedicated to the GST to a manageable length the IPCC would need to choose scientific assessments that it considers relevant for the GST, thereby it would be done in a policy prescriptive way.
- It requires to rethink the relationship to CMIP and that IPCC work is based on most recent climate models.
- In the 7th cycle the technical paper could only be based on AR6, which would already have informed the previous GST.
- Technical papers only draw on material in existing reports and would fail to provide latest available science.
- The long breaks between assessment reports, according to the current practice, lead to exceptional burdens on the first IPCC product of each cycle.

Pros and cons of Option B1

The main pros identified were:

- Would allow for best available science in time for GST.
- It would provide more comprehensive reports as until now for UN systems and broader audiences.
- IPCC more relevant for policy and the public domain.
- More frequent updates, granting highest relevance.
- Shorter cycles, insofar as they include a more efficient transition between cycles and a less bureaucratic TSU set up could also reduce costs.
- Increased degree of renewal and dynamic among authors; and reduce stress and burn out.
- The volume of new scientific work to be considered is less important even recognizing that knowledge is advancing at an ever-faster pace.
- There would be no need for a special GST report, which would burden the actual cycle of 7 years.
- A shorter cycle would make the need for more efficiency more apparent.
- It could more easily achieve the changes needed for higher efficiency.

The main cons identified were:

- Close alignment of the IPCC and GST cycles may lead to some confusion of the distinction between UNFCCC and IPCC roles and responsibilities.
- Shorter timeframes (as 5-year cycles) put the quality of reports at risk.
- It requires to rethink the relationship to CMIP and that IPCC work is based on most recent climate models.
- The workload of all actors would increase with compressed cycles and therefore the risk of errors.
- It would require a change in IPCC processes as well as TSU set up processes, that would be detrimental for its quality.
- A change in cycle would increase uncertainties in the IPCC assessment and disrupt the scheduled transition between different cycles for all actors and products.

Pros and cons of Option B2

The main pros identified were:

- Would provide a report that presents the best available science in time for the GST and would therefore best meet the needs of the UNFCCC.
- Could be structured around key themes needed for the GST without being policy prescriptive
- Guarantee best available science rather than a dedicated report.
- Would be beneficial given growing volumes of literature and the need for more frequent, more up to date scientific information (literature gets out of date quickly).
- Shorter, more frequent, more up-to-date and more policy-focused reports for the governments and the UNFCCC.
- IPCC more responsive to policy developments and remain influential and relevant for the policy and the public domain.
- Might allow for greater participation of developing countries to provide direct support and in-kind contributions including TSU support and may thereby increase the funding base.
- Provide multiple benefits since securing short term funding for TSUs is much more feasible. Reducing the scope of the AR could reduce the costs.
- Increased degree of renewal and dynamic among authors and reduce stress and burn out.
- The volume of new scientific work to be considered is less important recognizing that knowledge is advancing at an ever-faster pace.
- There would be no need for a special GST report, which would burden the actual cycle of 7 years.
- A shorter cycle would make the need for more efficiency more apparent.
- It could more easily achieve the changes needed for higher efficiency.

The main cons identified were:

- This contrasts the goal to provide comprehensive assessment reports.
- Shorter timeframes (5-year cycles) put the quality of reports at risk.
- Requires rethinking the relationship to CMIP and that IPCC work is based on most recent climate models.
- Such a report would lack a comprehensive picture, diminishing its relevance for all audiences with the exception of the GST.
- The workload of all actors would increase with compressed cycles and therefore the risk of errors.
- It would require a change in IPCC processes as well as TSU set up processes.
- It would imply a change in the IPCC assessment process that would be detrimental for its quality.
- A change in cycle would increase uncertainties in the IPCC assessment and disrupt the scheduled transition between different cycles for all actors and products.
- Any GST-dedicated product would suffer from political considerations during the approval of its SPM. It would undermine the independence of the IPCC.

Pros and cons of Option C1

The main pros identified were:

- Reports could be made more comprehensive and policy relevant than until now. This may lead to interest from broader audiences and increased relevance for other parts of the UN system.
- May reduce budget pressure over the long term, if the same work as currently is undertaken in a longer timeframe.
- Allows the IPCC to inform policy at critical moments, hence increase policy relevance.

The main cons identified were:

- Larger risk of outdated and inadequate information for the 2nd GST. This could weaken IPCCs reputation and relevance as main provider of scientific information to the UNFCCC.
- A 10-year cycle is too long to ensure the political relevance of an assessment.
- It would imply excessive resource requirements on individuals and governments.
- A very high financial burden for countries that would like to host TSUs. This would discourage countries to take on such engagements, in particular challenging for developing countries.
- The larger burden of a longer engagement on personal commitment would increase the risk of bureau members leaving office during an assessment cycle. Would also influence the number of persons that could and are willing to step into office.
- Influence the relationship and timing of the CMIP needs to be reconsidered to ensure that IPCCs work is based on most recent climate models.
- A change in cycle length would increase uncertainties in the IPCC assessment and disrupt the scheduled transition between different cycles for all actors and products.

Pros and cons of Option C2

The main pros identified were:

- A Special Report dedicated to the GST could meet the needs of the GST, but would need to avoid being policy prescriptive and maintain the IPCC independence.
- A 10-year cycle could allow the IPCC to inform policymakers at critical moments, hence increase policy relevance.
- Reports could be made more comprehensive and policy relevant than until now. This may lead to interest from broader audiences and increased relevance for other parts of the UN system.
- May reduce budget pressure over the long term, if the same work as currently is undertaken in a longer timeframe.

The main cons identified were:

- Larger risk of outdated and inadequate information for the 2nd GST. This could weaken IPCCs reputation and relevance as main provider of scientific information to the UNFCCC.
- A 10-year cycle is too long to ensure the political relevance of an assessment.
- It would imply excessive resource requirements on individuals and governments.
- A very high financial burden for countries that would like to host TSUs. This would discourage countries to take on such engagements, in particular challenging for developing countries.
- The larger burden of a longer engagement on personal commitment would increase the risk of bureau members leaving office during an assessment cycle. Would also influence the number of persons that could and are willing to step into office.
- Influence the relationship and timing of the CMIP needs to be reconsidered to ensure that IPCCs work is based on most recent climate models.
- A change in cycle length would increase uncertainties in the IPCC assessment and disrupt the scheduled transition between different cycles for all actors and products.
- Any GST-dedicated product would suffer from political considerations during the approval of its SPM. It would undermine the independence of the IPCC.

Brief summary of the analysis of the ranks given to individual criteria:

In addition to the free comments expressed on the different options in the submissions, Member countries and observer organizations were invited to rank the different options with respect to each of the 35 criteria identified by the TG-FWLGST members.

Ranks were expressed through numerical entire values ranging from +2 to -2, positive (resp. negative) values meaning that a given option has a positive (resp. negative) impact with respect to the considered criterion. The value “0” aimed to express the opinion that an option has a neutral or no significant impact with respect to the criterion, while a blank entry or no entry was used when a Member country or an observer organization did not want to express a ranking for a given option with respect to a given criterion.

22 submissions expressed numerical values (including 20 from governments among a potential of 195). Each of the 245 response cells (35 criteria x 7 options) received at least 16 values. In accordance with the guidance from the TG-FWLGST members, no sophisticated statistical processing of the ranking was developed. The values given to the individual cells have been simply averaged in Table 1 and the cells with the highest two¹ ranks (resp. lowest) have been highlighted in green (resp. in red).

	A1	A2	A3	B1	B2	C1	C2
Topic : IPCC's role, reputation and high-level governance							
Reputation as a leading authority on climate science	-0,1	0,8	-0,1	0,5	0,2	-0,7	-0,2
Policy-relevant, but not policy-prescriptive	0,1	0,4	-0,2	0,5	0,2	-0,3	-0,2
Clarity of the distinction between UNFCCC and IPCC roles and responsibilities	0,6	0,2	0,3	-0,1	-0,2	-0,1	0,3
Scientific independence	0,7	0,5	0,5	-0,2	-0,3	0,2	0,1
Compliance with UN General Assembly Resolution 43/53 of 6 December 1988 (creation of the IPCC)	0,7	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1
Preservation of the compliance with IPCC procedures	0,8	0,7	0,5	-0,3	-0,5	0,0	-0,2
Topic : Scientific integrity, objectivity and quality of reports and scientific input							
Timescales for research	0,4	0,5	0,6	-0,3	-0,4	0,5	0,6
Handling growing volumes of literature and the rate of increase in knowledge	0,2	0,3	0,5	-0,3	-0,4	0,2	0,1
Integration between WGs work	0,3	0,5	0,4	-0,7	-0,4	0,6	0,5
Appropriate timescales for drafting, reviews and approvals of reports	0,6	0,4	0,4	-0,7	-0,3	0,8	0,5
Coherence and consistency between products	0,6	0,1	0,2	0,0	-0,2	0,6	0,4
Comprehensive coverage of the thematic areas of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation	0,2	0,8	0,0	0,1	-0,5	0,3	0,3
Topic : Relevance and timeliness for the IPCC's audiences							
For governments	0,1	1,2	0,1	1,0	0,7	-0,5	-0,4
For the UNFCCC	-0,6	1,1	-0,3	1,2	0,9	-0,8	-0,2
For the GST	-0,8	1,0	-0,3	1,4	1,2	-0,6	0,1
For UN systems	-0,4	0,8	-0,4	1,2	0,8	-0,7	-0,3
For broader audiences (public, NGOs etc. as per IPCC defined broader audiences)	-0,1	1,0	0,1	1,0	0,7	-0,7	-0,5
Topic : Resources and budget							
Costs of scientific products (LAM, ..., exc. TSU)	0,2	-0,2	-0,3	-0,2	-0,1	-0,1	-0,2
TSU funding and other in-kind funding	0,1	-0,1	-0,1	0,2	0,3	-0,8	-0,9
Costs of governing bodies	0,0	-0,1	-0,2	-0,1	0,0	-0,7	-0,8
Costs of Secretariat	0,2	0,1	-0,1	-0,2	-0,1	-0,3	-0,5
Topic : Workload and availability of different contributors to IPCC activities							
Workload and availability of Bureau members	0,5	-0,1	-0,1	-0,8	-0,7	-0,3	-0,4
Workload and availability of authors	0,3	-0,2	-0,2	-0,9	-0,7	0,2	0,1
Workload and availability of TSU	0,4	-0,1	-0,1	-0,9	-0,7	-0,1	-0,1
Workload and availability of the scientific community	0,4	0,0	-0,1	-0,6	-0,5	0,2	0,2
Workload and availability of the Secretariat	0,4	-0,1	0,0	-0,8	-0,6	0,1	0,1
Workload and availability of governments	0,3	0,0	0,0	-0,7	-0,6	0,1	0,2
Topic : Operations and organization							
Efficiency of the transition between cycles	0,3	0,5	0,4	-0,4	-0,6	-0,1	-0,1
Duration of term for Bureau members	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	-1,0	-0,9
Election of the Bureau at the start of the cycle	0,4	0,4	0,3	-0,7	-0,8	0,3	0,5
Earlier election of key positions of the Bureau	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,4
Earlier election of the full Bureau	0,6	0,7	0,5	0,2	0,1	0,3	0,4
TSU handover and set up	0,3	0,4	0,2	-0,2	-0,5	0,0	0,2
Time available for plenaries/decision making	0,5	0,1	0,2	-0,7	-0,7	0,7	0,8
Time pressure during the cycle	0,5	0,2	0,2	-1,0	-0,7	0,9	0,9

Table 1 : Average ranks expressed in the submissions for each option and each criterion. Though the Member countries who submitted rankings do not make a representative sample, Table 1 highlights the following points:

- Most of the average ranks are close to 0, reflecting the very diverse views on each option
- Options A1 and A2 got the maximum number of highest ranks
- Options B1 and B2 got the maximum number of lowest ranks. The relatively low ranks with respect to the criteria associated with the topic “Workload and availability of different contributors to IPCC activities” and the topic “Operations and organization” reflect some of the constraints raised by a 5-year cycle

¹ Or more in case of equality

- Option A2 and B1 got the maximum number of highest ranks with respect to the topic “Relevance and timeliness for the IPCC’s audiences”
- Only the criteria “Earlier election of key positions of the Bureau” and “Earlier election of the full Bureau” got a strictly positive rank for all options, reflecting a broad positive appreciation of accelerating the transition between two cycles independently of their lengths
- The only red marks received by option A1 (status quo) concern the relevance and the timeliness of IPCC products for the UNFCCC, the GST and the UN systems

Summary of the pros on cons of Alternative 2 :

The main pros identified were:

- It would provide more time to identify synergies without changing IPCC working procedures, leading to a deeper identification of the GST needs.
- It will allow a deeper discussion on IPCC processes and products and workload.
- It could provide a better steer for AR6 on requested information in IPCC products.
- it could provide an occasion for further buy-in from actors.
- It is less time consuming than choosing from Alternative-1.
- It is beneficial to the scientific independence of the IPCC.

The main cons identified were:

- Alternative-2 is beyond the mandate of the TG-FWLGST.
- More specifically, the issues in the table are beyond the scope of the group.
- It would delay work and render impossible to deliver in due time for the first 2020 plenary as per mandate.
- No option in alternative-2 foresees the alignment between GST and IPCC cycles.
- Two options of Alternative-2 involve extra work for the IPCC.
- It is essentially out of the hands of the IPCC.
- It is unclear who would deliver the review.
- The analysis is principally to be done by the UNFCCC.
- There is a need to wait until the UNFCCC knows better what its needs are.
- The information to identify the needs of the GST might not be available yet.
- The anticipated needs might change after the 1st GST.
- It would delay the work.
- Prolongs the process of making the appropriate knowledge basis.
- It would send a wrong signal.
- The UNFCCC needs are not the only ones to consider.
- Options b) and c) of Alternative-2 compromise the independent mandate given to the IPCC.

Please note that since the responses were not a representative sample and not all criteria have equal significance, the overall number of positive ranks of an option should not be interpreted as indicating its quality relative to other options.

In addition to the identifications of pros and cons, a Member countries suggested that Alternative- 2 could be considered after the 2nd GST for an implementation during the 8th cycle. Another member suggested that Alternative-2 could be considered after the 1st GST because this GST will provide insights which will be valuable for the 2nd GST and beyond.

Acceleration of the transition between the 6th and 7th cycle :

A large majority of received contributions and submissions points towards a desire for making the transition period between cycles smoother, more coherent and more efficient. Especially having earlier elections than what is current practice, without shortening the mandate of the current Bureau which covers the whole 6th cycle, for some key positions (IPCC Chair elect, IPCC Vice-Chairs elect and Co-Chairs elect of WGs/TFI) or for the IPCC Bureau (Bureau elect), have been highlighted as a

mean to positively influence other criteria relevant for streamlining operations and organization of the IPCC during an extended transition period with overlap between outgoing and incoming IPCC Bureau. However, there was also a member expressing that any action taken that disrupts the scheduled transition between cycles needs to be considered carefully.

Identified pros concerning having an earlier election are as follows

- securing that scoping and production of reports can start earlier to ensure that relevant IPCC products and scientific information are made available for the 2nd GST, even without changing the length and the production of the 7th assessment cycle.
- more time available for logistical set up incoming TSU.
- overlap period between outgoing and incoming bureau members, to achieve more time for incoming bureau members in key positions to set-up and plan for the coming cycle.
- overlap period between outgoing and incoming TSUs, to secure transfer of knowledge to further improve the agility of TSU start-up and handover processes.
- reduce time and work pressure during a cycle.
- ensures a much earlier adoption of the 7th cycle work program.

Identified cons concerning having an earlier election are as follows

- without an overlap period, an earlier election would increase the pressure to fulfill the tasks in the ongoing assessment cycle. Since the pressure to finalize the reports according to schedule will be there also without early elections it seems that this point may be mostly related to the need to have proper management of the transition, the handover, including its timing and preparations.
- one member expressed concern that early election could lead to a conflict of interest between finalizing the AR6 assessment reports and election campaigns, that insufficient time are available for campaigning before the next election and unfair competition between bureau members that would like to be re-elected and other individuals that would like to stand for election.
- may require to change some of the current procedures.
- may induce some confusion during the overlap period if not properly managed.

Miscellaneous information collected among Bureau members:

The discussions with Bureau members provided the opportunity to collect some comments or recommendations more or less related to the objectives of the TG-FWLGST:

- it may be relevant to also consider the lessons learnt from the three AR6 Special Report which demonstrated the added value of reports across Working Groups; and think of the relevance of the usual WG silos for the AR7 (how to enhance integration across disciplines, beyond the current WG boundaries in the future?).

- if we are in the late 2020s and close to 2030, the context would also be related to novel international agendas (after the end of the 2015-2030 period linked with Sendai and SDGs), the end of the ocean decade. It is not easy to anticipate what would be the expectations in terms of scientific information at the end of the decade. A 10-year cycle length would leave less flexibility with a shift in expertise within the IPCC bureau as a function of such evolutions.

- as expressed during the 51st IPCC Plenary, the workload induced by 3 Special Reports and the main WG reports is not replicable with the current capacity (bureau, TSUs). While there is clear added value, continuing on such a track has implications for the design of the IPCC infrastructure too. Some of the 7 options of Alternative 1 are incompatible with the work resources currently available.

- the value of technical papers needs to be seriously considered. There is no such example recently. This would increase a burden without new knowledge to be assessed; what would be the return on investment for preparation?

- the reflection on the future of IPCC may also be informed by other audiences and needs, beyond the global stocktake. The IPCC reports have multiple audiences and contribute to science maturation, dissemination of the state of knowledge in a way that is broader than only the needs for the global stocktake, including for instance information for risk management.

- having an analysis of the other audiences of IPCC reports and the implications of different time horizons beyond the needs of the global stocktake would be complementary to the analysis currently undertaken. For instance, there have been expressions of interest for joint products between IPCC and other assessment bodies (e.g IPBES). The consideration of the GST needs is only one aspect of the dimensions on which an integrated assessment of the state of knowledge related to climate change could be relevant to inform governments.

- the length of an assessment cycle influences the attractiveness of scientific and non-scientific positions when staffing TSUs. Experience has shown that most of the non-scientific staff such as Communication Specialists who were recruited by the TSUs quit before the end of the cycle for different reasons.

- a 10-year cycle which would provide an assessment report, special reports and regional reports could be an additional suggestion. Regional report could be done after the main report which delivers the big state of the climate and then have another set of reports which demonstrate how the findings in the main report tickles down to the regions.

- there is potentially a world where ambitions are greater outside the IPCC process. Nations are willing to actions based on economic benefits. There might be added value in providing information to communities instead of just focusing on the GST.

- a suggestion was made to remove Synthesis Report and replace with Special Report/Technical Paper

Conclusions of the co-chairs and rapporteur of the TG-FWLGST:

The Co-Chairs and the Rapporteur of the TG-FWLGST estimate that the mandate of the Task group has been fully completed, thanks to the active engagement of the Task group members. The submissions and contributions received from the Member countries, the Bureau members, the Secretariat and the Observer organizations were very rich and made it possible to identify all viable alternatives and options for an evolution of the work of the IPCC in the light of the Global Stocktake.

It is clear for the Co-Chairs and the Rapporteur that the Panel expressed very diverse views on the viable options, noting that a significant part of the submissions expressed an interest for an acceleration of the transition between two assessment cycles. Such an acceleration would make it possible to publish the 7th Assessment Report on time for the 2nd Global Stocktake without significantly changing the nature and the length of the work. It would let more time for the Panel to consider the longer term perspective for the 8th assessment cycle and beyond. Many members have highlighted earlier elections for some key positions, with an overlap period between outgoing and incoming bureau members, as a potential measure to streamline operations and enhance efficient organization of the IPCC during transition periods. Should such an approach be retained by the Panel, its implementation would require a review and maybe a revision of the current procedures which are described in Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work. It must be noted that in accordance with the Principles Governing IPCC Work, the IPCC is expected to start the review of its principles and procedures at the 52nd Session of the IPCC in 2020. This review might also provide some analysis of the relevant procedures that would be in need of revision, depending on the options considered by the Panel.

The Co-Chairs and the Rapporteur of the TG-FWLGST believe that there is enough information to make a decision quickly. Given that the strategic plan already includes three approval Plenary Sessions in 2021, any decision must be made before the end of 2020. Postponing the decision until after 2020 would risk compromising the ability of the IPCC to deliver an up-to-date and comprehensive report for the 2nd Global Stocktake. Given the diversity of views of the Member countries and the importance of this issue for the reputation of the IPCC, the Co-Chairs and the Rapporteur believe that the decision-making process should be undertaken under the direct and firm guidance of the IPCC Chair.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TASK GROUP
ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC
IN LIGHT OF THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE**

PURPOSE

To identify issues and options for consideration by the Panel on the organization, including timing, of the future work of the IPCC, including with particular regard to the seventh assessment cycle, taking into account the scientific information needs of the global stocktake and of the UNFCCC more generally, as well as audiences and purposes served by IPCC assessments, in accordance with principles governing IPCC work, and with respect to the rate of progress in the state of knowledge of various aspects of climate change.

- The Task Group will consider the pros and cons of different options, including quality of reports and implications for operations, resourcing, budget and contributions of the research community.
- The identified options will preserve the scientific integrity and the independence of the IPCC, and robustness, scope and depth of its products.

TERM

- The Task Group should start its work following the approval of its TORs by the Panel at the 47th Session of the IPCC. The Task Group should present progress reports at Panel Sessions and comply with IPCC procedures and ensure transparency and inclusiveness. The Task Group should deliver the outcomes of its work and report in due time for the first 2020 plenary.

MEMBERSHIP

- Co-chaired by France and Mexico.
- The Task Group is open to the participation by the members of the IPCC² and consist of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, European Union, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States of America, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
- IPCC Bureau members and TSU representatives are invited to advise the Task group in carrying out its activities.
- Two 'rapporteurs' to take note of discussions and help draft proposals.
- Secretariat support.

MEETINGS AND REPORTING

- Between plenaries and ensuring inclusiveness: mail exchanges, cooperative work, teleconferences, call for submissions, with an option for possible physical meetings in between panel sessions if appropriate.
- Hold physical meetings during plenary sessions, starting from the 49th Session.
- The Secretariat will circulate the draft final report to Governments for comments before submitting to the Panel.
- Present a progress report at each Panel Session.

2 and IPCC Observer Organizations with the right to introduce proposals

ANNEX 2

Our ref.: 5206-18/IPCC/GEN

To Members of the Task Group on the organization of the future work of the IPCC in light of the global stocktake

GENEVA, 27 April 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Forty-seventh session adopted the Terms of Reference of the Task Group on the organization of the future work of the IPCC in light of the global stocktake. The IPCC Secretariat has set up a dedicated web space <http://www.ipcc.ch/organization/gst.shtml> for supporting the work of the Task Group, which already includes the Decision and the adopted Terms of Reference.

The work of the Task Group should start as soon as possible respecting the modalities specified in the Terms of Reference: mail exchanges, cooperative work, teleconferences, call for submissions, with an option for possible physical meetings in between Panel sessions if appropriate.

The Co-Chairs of the Task Group thank you for having volunteered for being member of the Task Group. In order to start the activities effectively, you are kindly requested to nominate a representative **by Friday 18 May 2018** and to inform the IPCC Secretariat of his/her name and contact details (e-mail address, telephone). Your representative will be the contact point for all internal activities of the Task Group.

Please address your responses to the e-mail address: ipcc-alignment@wmo.int

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration of this matter.

Yours sincerely,

(Abdalah Mokssit)
Secretary of the IPCC
on behalf of the Task Group Co-Chairs

ANNEX 3

Our ref.: 5292-18/IPCC/GEN

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

Geneva, 20 September 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

At the 47th Session of the IPCC (Paris, France, 13-16 March 2018), the Panel adopted the Terms of Reference (TORs) of the Task Group on the Organization of the Future Work of the IPCC in Light of the Global Stocktake. The Panel mandated the Task Group (TG) to start its work immediately after the 47th Session .

Member governments and IPCC Observer Organizations are kindly invited to identify and share possible options for organizing and scheduling future work of the IPCC in light of the Global Stocktake, starting from the Seventh Assessment Cycle (AR7). At this stage, we do not expect a detailed analysis of the pros and cons of the different options but encourage that the rationale behind the suggested option(s) be included in the submissions. In accordance with the TORs, the identified options and the supporting rationale should take into consideration the scientific information requirements of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in general, the global stocktake in particular, as well as information needs for other users of IPCC products and other considerations listed in the TORs. Your inputs may consist of new options or an update of earlier submissions as contained in document [IPCC-XLVII/Doc. 8](#).

As part of the action plan to be presented to the Panel at the 48th Session of the IPCC (see [IPCC-XLVIII/INF. 2, Corr. 2](#)), the Task Group expects to undertake an analysis of the options suggested by member governments and IPCC Observer Organizations from early December 2018.

We would be grateful for your inputs by **30 November 2018**. Please address your responses to ipcc-alignment@wmo.int.

IPCC member governments may consult relevant organizations and experts within their countries and consolidate inputs from various stakeholders to form the country's submission. Only submissions received from IPCC Focal Points and IPCC Observer Organizations will be considered by the Task Group.

A copy of this letter is being sent for information to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Permanent Representatives from your country to the World Meteorological Organization and to the United Nations Environment Programme.

Thank you for your kind consideration of this matter.

Yours sincerely,

(Abdalah Mokssit)
Secretary of the IPCC

ANNEX 4

Our ref.: 5234-19/IPCC/GEN

Annex(es): 2

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

Geneva, 2 July 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

On behalf of the Co-chairs of the Task Group on the Organization of the Future Work of the IPCC in light of the Global Stocktake (TG-FWLGST), I would like to request your comments and suggestions on the viable alternatives and options, hitherto identified by the Task Group, in consultation with governments, IPCC Observer Organizations and other relevant stakeholders. In particular, you are kindly requested to highlight the pros and cons of each of the options.

Since its establishment, the TG-FWLGST has solicited inputs for the identification of viable options for organizing and scheduling future work of the IPCC, beginning from the seventh IPCC cycle. The inputs from governments and IPCC Observer Organizations on the possible options were analyzed by the Task Group and were presented in the progress report (Document [IPCC-XLIX/INF.6](#)) at the 49th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-49, Kyoto, Japan, 8-12 May 2019). These options formed input into the Task Group discussions during its three physical meetings which were held at the IPCC-49.

Subsequent to the Task Group physical meetings, two alternatives were identified, and the initial options associated with the first alternative were further developed in order to be presented in the final report to the Panel at the 52nd Session of the IPCC. The first alternative has seven options. Some of these options also influence the timing of elections of the new Bureau. The second alternative would be to launch a review in 2020 which could provide more information for both the IPCC and UNFCCC GST before a decision is taken (see Annex I for more information about alternatives and options). A method to use when considering the pros and cons associated with each of the viable options for alternative 1 was developed. This method is meant as supplementary to any written comments (see Annex II for detailed instructions). In addition, the Task Group agreed during their physical meetings in Kyoto that its main focus should be on the 7th cycle and deliverables to the 2nd GST.

To further advance the work of the Task Group, governments and IPCC Observer Organizations are kindly requested to submit comments using the dedicated spreadsheet by **31 August 2019** (see download and upload instructions in Annex 2).

Further questions on this request and related matters could be submitted to the IPCC Secretariat by email to ipcc-alignment@wmo.int.

A copy of this letter is being sent for information to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Permanent Representatives from your country to the World Meteorological Organization and to the United Nations Environment Programme.

Yours sincerely,

(Abdalah Mokssit)
Secretary of the IPCC

Information note for the TG-FWLGST - Outcome of COP-24 regarding the Global Stocktake
The following information note has been prepared in order to share with the TG FWLGST members some information which is considered as relevant for the TG activities by the co-chairs and rapporteur. It is not an official document which will not have to be endorsed neither by the TG FWLGST nor by any other body of the IPCC.

Decision 19/CMA.1, adopted at COP-24 in Katowice, defines the modalities and sources of inputs of the global stocktake, referred to in Article 14 of the Paris agreement. It also decides that equity and the best available science will be considered in a Party-driven and cross-cutting manner, throughout the global stocktake. It gives some indications on how IPCC reports³ will be taken up in the global stocktake, and when they need to be available. It consists of three components: "information collection and preparation", "technical assessment" and "consideration of outputs" as described below.

The global stocktake will assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose and long-term goals of the Paris Agreement, including under Article 2, paragraph 1(a–c), in the thematic areas of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation and support, noting, in this context, that the global stocktake may take into account, as appropriate, efforts related to its work that:

- (i) Address the social and economic consequences and impacts of response measures;
- (ii) Avert, minimize and address loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.

Short description of all three components of the global stocktake

- **Information collection and preparation**, focusing on gathering, compiling and synthesizing information.
 - The latest reports of the IPCC are explicitly mentioned in the decision from COP24 as source of inputs for the global stocktake.
 - Furthermore, the COP-24 decision lists additional sources of inputs and specifies information needs, additional to those already identified in the decision 1/CP.21. For example in preparation for the technical assessment, the UNFCCC secretariat is requested to prepare four synthesis reports, listed below, where IPCC reports also may be relevant:
 - the state of greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks and mitigation efforts undertaken by Parties;
 - the state of adaptation efforts, experiences and priorities;
 - the overall effect of, and progress made by Parties related to their, communicated nationally determined contributions;
 - the finance flows, including both means of implementation and support as well as information on financial flows consistent with low emission pathways and climate resilient development.
- **Technical assessment**, focusing on taking stock of the implementation of the Paris agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose and long-term goals of the Paris Agreement, as well as opportunities for enhanced action and support. The technical assessment will be facilitated by two co-facilitators.
 - Reports from the IPCC should be considered in an effective and balanced manner, as part of the overall input to the global stocktake.
 - In addition, the COP24 decision also recognizes that a dialogue between IPCC experts and Parties, through the SBSTA-IPCC special events, should be used to enable a focused scientific and technical exchange of information on the findings of

³ IPCC reports includes Assessment reports, Synthesis reports, Special reports and Methodology reports.

the IPCC in an open and transparent manner. Traditionally, such special events have been held as soon as possible after IPCC reports are approved, and may be an additional opportunity to consider IPCC reports independently of the timing related to the technical assessment.

- The SBSTA-IPCC joint working group should continue to be used to enhance communication and coordination between the two bodies in the context of the global stocktake.
- **Consideration of outputs**, focusing on discussing the implications of the findings of the technical assessment with a view to informing Parties in updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, their actions and support, as well as enhancing international cooperation for climate action. A high-level committee consisting of the Presidencies of the COP⁴ and the Chairs of the SBSTA/SBI will chair the high-level events.

This component of the global stocktake should identify opportunities and challenges in enhancing action and support in collective progress, as well as possible measures, good practices and international cooperation. It should also summarize key political messages, including recommendations, for strengthening action and enhancing support, and will be referenced in a COP decision and/or a declaration.

Timeline

The endpoint of the first global stocktake, during which the consideration of outputs will take place, will be at the COP in November 2023, and similarly such endpoints will be repeated every five years thereafter. The COP-24 decision describes when the other components of the global stocktake should start relative to these endpoints. The technical assessment will take place during the two (or depending on the timing of the publication of the IPCC reports, three) preceding SBSTA/SBI sessions. Lastly, the information collection and preparation component of the global stocktake will commence one session before the start of the technical assessment. The COP-24 decision also specifies that inputs to the global stocktake should be submitted at least three months before their consideration in the technical assessment.

The first Technical assessment component could therefore start at either the 2022 mid-session or the 2022 COP session depending on the availability of IPCC reports. Since all three working group reports of the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report will be available during 2021 and the Synthesis Report are to be approved as soon as possible in 2022⁵, it is reasonable that the technical assessment of the first global stocktake should consist of three sessions starting at the mid-session in 2022. This would imply that the first information collection and preparation component should commence at COP in 2021.

The subsequent global stocktakes will follow the same patterns, but the length of the technical assessment will again depend on the timing of the IPCC reports in the coming IPCC cycles. For example this means that for the second global stocktake the technical assessment could start at the 2027 mid-session or 2027 COP session, and to be repeated every fifth year for subsequent global stocktakes.

Furthermore, the COP-24 decision also recognizes the role of the SBSTA-IPCC joint working group when it comes to communication and coordination between the two bodies in the context of the global stocktake.

In addition, the dialogue between IPCC experts and Parties through SBSTA-IPCC special events could be expected to be held as soon as an IPCC product are available e.g. at the 2021 mid-session meeting for the IPCC Working Group I report.

Information note for the TG-FWLGST – The Talanoa dialogue process

The Talanoa dialogue, which ran during the whole of 2018 and concluded at COP-24, had been described by some as a prefiguration of the global stocktake. There are some lessons that can be drawn from the Talanoa experience even if the global stocktake will be longer, more structured, with roles given to various bodies, and covers more thematic areas.

⁴ Serving as the meeting of the parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA).

⁵ As decided in IPCC/XLIII-7

The Talanoa dialogue comprised two phases: a **preparatory phase**, and a **political phase**. The first one ran from January to December 2018, with submissions by Parties and non-Party stakeholders both in April and October 2018. At the April/May intersession, meetings were held, both in plenaries and break-out groups, focusing on the selected three questions i) where are we ; ii) where do we want to go ; iii) how to get there.

The IPCC Special report on global warming of 1.5°C was used to inform the discussions of the Talanoa dialogue. However, it was released after the May intersession and could not be discussed then at the technical level. A [SBSTA-IPCC special event](#) was organized on December 4 to enable scientific and technical exchanges on the findings of the report. During the **political phase of the Talanoa**, there was also a key note speech by the IPCC to inform Ministers of the content of the report.

The Talanoa Dialogue and the IPCC Special report are both referred to in Decision 1/CP.24. The Talanoa dialogue resulted in a "[Talanoa Call for Action](#)" from the Presidents of COP-23 and COP-24.

ANNEX 6

The submissions received from the call sent July 2019 the 2nd (Annex 4), including the spreadsheets, are accessible via the link:

http://bit.ly/survey_fwtgst