

**SUMMARY OF THE 45TH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE: 28-31 MARCH 2017**

The 45th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC-45) convened from 28-31 March 2017, in Guadalajara, Mexico, and brought together approximately 320 participants from over 100 countries. The IPCC's agenda included: the outline of the Special Report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems; the outline of the Special Report on climate change, oceans and the cryosphere; the IPCC Scholarship Programme; and the IPCC Programme and Budget, including budgets for the years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, and resource mobilization. IPCC-45 also heard reports on: communications and outreach activities; the IPCC carbon footprint; the future of the Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impact and Climate Analysis (TGICA); and the Strategic Planning Schedule for the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). In addition, the Panel discussed a proposal presented by Mexico to consider short-lived climate forcers. The IPCC adopted decisions on: "Climate Change and Land: An IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems"; the "IPCC Special Report on Oceans and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate"; and the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget. The Panel also decided to create an *Ad Hoc* Task Group on Financial Stability of the IPCC and agreed to its terms of reference.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE IPCC**

The IPCC was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to assess, on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis, the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation. The IPCC is an intergovernmental and scientific body with 195 member countries. It does not undertake new research, nor does it monitor climate-related data. Instead, it conducts assessments of the state of climate change knowledge on the basis of published and peer-reviewed scientific and technical literature. IPCC reports are intended to be policy relevant but not policy prescriptive.

The IPCC has three Working Groups (WGs): Working Group I (WGI) addresses the physical science basis of climate change; Working Group II (WGII) addresses climate change impacts,

adaptation and vulnerability; and Working Group III (WGIII) addresses options for limiting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and mitigating climate change. Each WG has two Co-Chairs and six Vice-Chairs, except for the fifth assessment cycle when WGIII had three Co-Chairs. The Co-Chairs guide the WGs in fulfilling the mandates given to them by the Panel and are assisted in this task by Technical Support Units (TSUs).

The IPCC also has a Task Force on National GHG Inventories (TFI) to oversee the IPCC National GHG Inventories Programme, also supported by a TSU. The Programme aims to develop and refine an internationally-agreed methodology and software for the calculation and reporting of national GHG emissions and removals, and encourage its use by parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The Panel elects its Bureau for the duration of a full assessment cycle, which lasts between five and seven years and includes the preparation of an IPCC assessment report. The Bureau assists the IPCC Chair in planning, coordinating and monitoring the IPCC's work, and is composed of climate change experts representing all regions. Currently, the Bureau comprises 34 members, and includes the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs, the WG Co-Chairs and Vice-Chairs, and the TFI Co-Chairs and its Bureau. In 2011, the IPCC established an Executive Committee (ExComm) to assist with intersessional work and coordination

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the IPCC . . . . .	1
IPCC-45 Report. . . . .	3
Adoption of the Agenda . . . . .	3
Approval of the Draft Report of the 44th Session . . . . .	4
IPCC Programme and Budget . . . . .	4
Admission of Observer Organizations . . . . .	5
Reports . . . . .	5
Sixth Assessment Report Products . . . . .	6
IPCC Scholarship Programme . . . . .	10
Any Other Business . . . . .	10
Place and Date for IPCC-46 . . . . .	11
Closing of the Session . . . . .	11
A Brief Analysis of IPCC-45 . . . . .	11
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	13
Glossary. . . . .	14

among the WGs. The ExComm consists of the IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, WG and TFI Co-Chairs, and advisory members, including the IPCC Secretary and the four Heads of the TSUs. The IPCC Secretariat is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and is hosted by the WMO.

**IPCC PRODUCTS:** Since its inception, the IPCC has prepared a series of comprehensive assessment reports, special reports (SRs) and technical papers that provide scientific information on climate change to the international community and are subject to extensive review by experts and governments.

The IPCC's First Assessment Report was completed in 1990; the Second Assessment Report in 1995; the Third Assessment Report in 2001; the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) in 2007; and the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) in 2014. Currently, the assessment reports are structured in three parts, one for each WG. Each WG's contribution comprises a Summary for Policymakers (SPM), a Technical Summary and an underlying assessment report. All sections of each report undergo an intensive review process, which takes place in three stages: a first review by experts; a second review by experts and governments; and a third review by governments. Each SPM is then approved line by line by the respective WG. A Synthesis Report (SYR) is then produced for the assessment report as a whole, which integrates the most relevant aspects of the three WG reports, and a SPM of the SYR is then approved line by line by the Panel.

In addition to the comprehensive assessments, the IPCC produces SRs, methodology reports and technical papers, focusing on specific issues related to climate change. Thus far, SRs include: Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (2000); Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage (2005); Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation (2011); and Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (2011). Technical papers have also been prepared on, among other things, Climate Change and Water (2008).

In addition, the IPCC produces methodology reports, which provide guidelines to assist countries in reporting on GHGs. Good Practice Guidance reports were approved by the Panel in 2000 and 2003, and the latest version of the IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines) was approved in 2006. The IPCC also adopted the 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement), and the 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement).

For its work and efforts "to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about manmade climate change, and to lay the foundations needed to counteract such change," the IPCC was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, jointly with former US Vice President Al Gore, in December 2007.

**INTERACADEMY COUNCIL (IAC) REVIEW:** In response to public criticism of the IPCC related to inaccuracies in AR4 and the Panel's response to the criticism, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and IPCC Chair Rajendra Pachauri (India) requested the IAC to conduct an independent review of IPCC processes and procedures and to present recommendations to strengthen the IPCC and to ensure the quality of its reports.

The IAC presented its results in a report in August 2010 and made recommendations regarding, *inter alia*: the IPCC's management structure; a communications strategy, including a plan to respond to crises; transparency, including criteria for

selecting participants and the type of scientific and technical information to be assessed; and consistency in how the WGs characterize uncertainty.

**IPCC-32:** This session (11-14 October 2010, Busan, Republic of Korea) addressed the recommendations of the IAC Review. The Panel adopted a number of decisions in this regard, including on the treatment of gray literature and uncertainty, and on a process to address errors in previous reports. For recommendations requiring further examination, the Panel established task groups on processes and procedures, communications, the Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy, and governance and management.

**IPCC-33:** This session (10-13 May 2011, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates) focused primarily on follow-up actions to the IAC Review. The Panel established an ExComm, adopted a COI Policy, and introduced several changes to the procedures for IPCC reports.

**IPCC-34:** This meeting (18-19 November 2011, Kampala, Uganda) adopted revised Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports, as well as Implementation Procedures and the Disclosure Form for the COI Policy.

**IPCC-35:** This session (6-9 June 2012, Geneva, Switzerland) concluded the Panel's consideration of the recommendations from the IAC Review by approving the functions of the IPCC Secretariat and TSUs, and the Communications Strategy.

**WGI and IPCC-36:** During these meetings (23-26 September 2013, Stockholm, Sweden), WGI finalized its AR5 contribution: "Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis." The Panel then met to approve the WGI SPM and accept the underlying report, including the Technical Summary and annexes.

**IPCC-37:** During this session (14-17 October 2013, Batumi, Georgia), the Panel decided to establish a Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC (TGF). It also considered and adopted two methodology reports, the Wetlands Supplement and KP Supplement. The IPCC also undertook initial discussions on mapping the IPCC's future.

**WGII and IPCC-38:** These meetings (25-29 March 2014, Yokohama, Japan) finalized the WGII contribution to AR5: "Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability." The Panel then met to approve the WGII SPM and accepted the underlying report, including the Technical Summary and annexes.

**WGIII and IPCC-39:** These meetings (7-12 April 2014, Berlin, Germany), finalized the WGIII contribution to AR5: "Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change." The Panel then approved the WGIII SPM and accepted the underlying report, including the Technical Summary and annexes. The Panel also discussed, *inter alia*, COI and future work of the IPCC.

**IPCC-40:** This meeting (27 October – 1 November 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark) considered and finalized the SYR, which integrates the findings from the three IPCC WGs. The Panel also approved the SYR's SPM line by line, and adopted the longer SYR section by section.

**IPCC-41:** This meeting (24-27 February 2015, Nairobi, Kenya) addressed the future work of the IPCC, including the recommendations of the TGF, and took a decision on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and TFI Bureau (TFB). The Panel also adopted decisions on: IPCC products, their timing and their usability; IPCC structure; respective roles of the IPCC Secretariat and the IPCC TSUs; options for the selection of and support to Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors; and improving the writing and review process. Following the

resignation of IPCC Chair Pachauri, Ismail El Gizouli (Sudan) was appointed Acting IPCC Chair pending election of a new Chair at IPCC-42.

**IPCC-42:** This meeting (5-8 October 2015, Dubrovnik, Croatia) elected members of the IPCC Bureau and the TFB, including the IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the WGs and the TFB, Vice-Chairs of the WGs and TFB members. The Panel elected Hoesung Lee (Republic of Korea) as IPCC Chair for the sixth assessment cycle.

**IPCC-43:** This meeting (11-13 April 2016, Nairobi, Kenya) discussed Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) products, including SRs and strategic planning. IPCC-43 agreed to undertake three SRs on: the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above preindustrial levels and related global GHG emission pathways; climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security and GHG fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems; and climate change and oceans and the cryosphere. The Panel also agreed that a SR on cities would be prepared as part of the next assessment cycle.

**IPCC-44:** During this session (17-21 October 2016, Bangkok, Thailand), the Panel adopted decisions on the outlines of: the Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above preindustrial levels and related global GHG emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty (SR15); and the Methodology Report to refine the 2006 Guidelines on National GHG Inventories. The IPCC also adopted decisions on, *inter alia*: the Expert Meeting on Mitigation, Sustainability and Climate Stabilization Scenarios; communications and the scoping process; the future of the TGICA; review of IPCC the communications strategy; review of the IPCC COI policy; and a workshop on climate change and cities.

### **IPCC-45 REPORT**

On Tuesday, 28 March, IPCC Chair Hoesung Lee opened the session. He cited the findings of the WMO report on the State of the Global Climate, including that 2016 was the warmest year on record, with an average temperature 1.1°C above preindustrial levels, and emphasized the urgency of the Panel's work in helping to understand climate change impacts and risk, and options for addressing them. He called on governments to enable the IPCC to continue its work by investing in scientific research that targets knowledge gaps highlighted in AR5.

Elena Manaenkova, WMO Deputy Secretary-General, highlighted the synergies, complementarity and co-benefits of WMO and IPCC work. She said the special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and GHG fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems (SRCCL), and the special report on climate change and oceans and the cryosphere (SROCC) are crucial for WMO modeling and predictions.

Miguel Ruiz Cabañas Izquierdo, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico, emphasized his country's commitment to undertake work to establish scientific criteria for policymakers to take ambitious action to limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C above preindustrial levels. He urged the global community to support the IPCC's work and to defend the role of multilateralism to meet the objectives of the Paris Agreement on climate change.

Ibrahim Thiaw, UN Environment Deputy Executive Director, outlined some of the climate records being set and impacts witnessed, concluding that "it is clear we risk fueling conflicts and swelling the stream of refugees." He stated that the Paris

Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development provide a roadmap for action, and urged countries to build on current momentum through: clear, accessible science; effective leadership at all scales; and solving the IPCC's financial difficulties.

Patricia Espinosa, UNFCCC Executive Secretary, via video message, said the Paris Agreement's entry into force begins the era of implementation to restore climate neutrality and limit global temperature rise to near 1.5°C. She said the IPCC has laid a foundation for this work but stressed its ongoing and future work, noting that science is needed to establish the link between actions implementing the Paris Agreement and desired outcomes on the Sustainable Development Goals through evidence-based decision making.

Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Mexico, welcomed participants on behalf of Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. He highlighted Mexico's leadership on and vulnerability to climate change, stressing his country's commitment to reduce its GHG emissions by 22% and black carbon by 50% by 2030. He noted actions to meet these commitments, including eliminating fossil fuel subsidies and encouraging low-carbon energy through clean energy certificates.

Jorge Aristóteles Sandoval Díaz, Governor of Jalisco, Mexico, underscored climate change as a security matter and stressed the need to follow expert recommendations based on science. He called out the US President for taking a "backwards step" in rolling back actions on climate change, increasing military spending and promoting the fossil fuel industry. He noted Jalisco's support for the IPCC's recommendations and its position at the forefront of resistance against "stupidity" and against the industrial interests that deny the reality of climate change. He then declared IPCC-45 open.

### **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

IPCC Chair Lee introduced the provisional agenda (IPCC-XLV/Doc.1).

New Zealand requested an update on the AR6 scoping process, stressing the need to begin strategic planning for the SYR early. The Panel agreed to discuss this under the agenda item on the Strategic Planning Schedule.

Saudi Arabia expressed preference for taking up SRCCL before SROCC, in accordance with the order reflected in Decision IPCC/XLIII-6 (AR6 Products: Special Reports). SROCC Scientific Steering Committee Chair (SSC) Ko Barrett noted that the order of the outlines' adoption in plenary will depend on progress made during the meeting. With that understanding, the Panel agreed to consider SRCCL before SROCC.

France called for considering proposals that align the Panel's work during the seventh assessment cycle with the needs of the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement, since these proposals are expected to be submitted for IPCC consideration no later than 2018. The Panel agreed to take this up under the agenda item on "Any Other Business."

The UK requested an update on progress on the IPCC library facility and that sufficient time be allowed for consideration of the IPCC budget. The Panel agreed to address this issue under "Any Other Business."

Norway, with Mexico and Chile, called for discussions to include short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs) in the TFI's work. IPCC Chair Lee suggested this be taken up under "Any Other Business," and the Panel agreed.

With these and other minor amendments, the IPCC adopted the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE 44TH SESSION**

IPCC Chair Lee then introduced, and the Panel adopted, the IPCC-44 report (IPCC-XLV/Doc.5).

**IPCC PROGRAMME AND BUDGET**

**Resource Mobilization:** On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced its proposed **resource mobilization strategy** (IPCC-XLV/Doc.3), which aims to generate interest in the IPCC's work in order to obtain funding for its products. She noted the overall target of raising CHF 58 million by 2022, starting with a 2017 budget of CHF 9 million. She pointed out that contributions and the number of funders have steadily declined since 2008 and that the strategy endeavors to reverse those trends. She said fundraising will take place in two phases: 2016-2019 and 2020-2022.

Sweden announced an increase in its contribution to CHF 110,000 in 2017 and by an additional SEK 2 million later in the year. France and Morocco pledged to increase their financial contributions to the IPCC and/or in-kind contributions.

The Panel disagreed on the role of external funders in resource mobilization. Sweden, supported by Germany, Belgium and the UK, recommended that the IPCC be resourced primarily by governments to ensure its integrity and neutrality.

Saudi Arabia, with the Republic of Korea, Bahamas and Zambia, countered that the IPCC's integrity and neutrality need not be negatively affected by accepting contributions from external donors, saying "the door should be wide open to all who want to do good." The Bahamas added that external funding could be sought if a country is unable to make its contribution, and noted that the strategy document already ensures the IPCC's integrity. Saudi Arabia, with South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, and Zambia, warned that earmarking funds could potentially harm the IPCC's integrity. South Africa, supported by Poland, Trinidad and Tobago, and Zambia, urged against linking countries' contributions to their participation in the IPCC. Supporting Saudi Arabia, Senegal recommended focusing on ensuring contributions from current donor countries.

Switzerland underscored that one way to achieve "predictable and sufficient funding" is to ensure that all IPCC members contribute their "fair share" by using an indicative scale of contributions, as is standard UN practice.

Japan, supported by the UK and Poland, asked what budget cuts could be made if the strategy is not successful. Indonesia and Belgium suggested that the Secretariat's budget could be reduced by conducting Bureau meetings without interpretation. Poland noted that 50-70% of the IPCC's budget relates to travel. WGIII Vice-Chair Diána Ürge-Vorsatz expressed concern about potentially compromising quality through attempts to save resources, such as through piggybacking meetings or discontinuing interpretation for Bureau meetings.

The UK expressed openness to philanthropic organizations contributing a small proportion of the IPCC's funding and asked for information on the Secretariat's ongoing implementation of resource mobilization. Norway urged agreement on which types of organizations would be acceptable, and noted the complexity of the issue of earmarking, saying that overly restricting it could jeopardize some countries' willingness to contribute to the IPCC's work.

Germany suggested creating an intersessional group to consider these issues. France and others suggested that a small group develop terms of reference (ToR) for such a group. IPCC Chair Lee supported the proposal, suggesting that IPCC Vice-

Chairs Thelma Krug and Youba Sokona co-chair a group to develop ToR for an open *ad hoc* group on the IPCC's financial stability, and requested time for the ToR to be developed.

On Friday afternoon, Krug presented the ToR for the *Ad Hoc* Task Group on the Financial Stability of the IPCC (ATG-Finance) for approval by the Panel. Outlining the ToR, she explained that the ATG-Finance's objective is to propose funding options for the predictable, sustainable and adequate implementation of the IPCC's programme of work, and that ATG membership consists of Financial Task Team (FiTT) Co-Chairs and core members, the IPCC Secretary and Deputy Secretary, and is open to all government representatives. She said the Group will be co-chaired by Krug and Sokona, and detailed the ATG-Finance's roles and responsibilities include: increasing contributions from governments, including in-kind contributions, and the number of contributing governments; exploring means to mobilize additional resources, including from UN organizations and others, and evaluating their potential implications, particularly with regard to conflict of interest and legal matters; and providing guidance on eligibility of potential donors including the private sector. She explained that the ATG-Finance will begin work immediately following IPCC-45 to draft a work plan in close cooperation with the FiTT and will present a progress report, including lessons learned from other international organizations, at IPCC-46, where the ATG's term will be reviewed.

Belgium expressed hope that the ATG-Finance will be able to achieve financial stability, reiterated his country's suggestion that the IPCC expand funding for the Scholarship Programme and link it to wider ATG-Finance fundraising efforts, and lamented that this was not included in the ToR. Belgium, supported by Ghana, requested that IPCC-46 return to this issue when the initial ATG report is presented, that the Scholarship Programme Board of Trustees be appointed at that time, and that they be mandated to work together with the ATG.

Sweden, supported by Switzerland and Ghana, asked that the ATG-Finance consider risks to the IPCC's reputation when choosing funding sources. Switzerland reiterated its call that all IPCC members contribute equitably to the process.

The plenary then agreed to the ToR for the ATG-Finance.

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced the document on the **IPCC Partnership Policy and Procedures** (IPCC-XLV/Doc.8), outlining: resource mobilization options, including through donor contributions from governmental and non-governmental organizations, as well as from the for-profit sector; and guiding principles to ensure the IPCC's impartiality and integrity.

Germany, Sweden and France requested, and the Panel agreed, that the document be considered by the ATG-Finance.

IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit introduced an information document on the **status of implementation of planned activities** (IPCC-XLV/INF.6), updating the Panel on progress made on resource mobilization since IPCC-44. He commended Montenegro for becoming a first-time contributor and Mali for pledging for the first time, and thanked those countries that increased their contributions. Emphasizing that "we will not get results unless there is mobilization across the board," Mokssit encouraged countries to make: in-kind contributions for their experts to participate in IPCC meetings; in-kind contributions by hosting IPCC meetings; their 2017 financial contributions if they have not yet done so; and, if possible, a multi-year pledge.

Japan said it is crucial that the Secretariat provide the Panel with detailed information on the IPCC's projected financial status for the AR6 cycle. Canada urged all IPCC members to exercise

leadership and innovation on resource mobilization. Highlighting his country's first-time pledge, Mali underlined the importance of good will, not just the amount given.

Switzerland cautioned against relying on a limited number of contributors while "we have universal participation and benefits for all." Sudan urged consideration of all proposals for additional avenues of resource mobilization.

In response to a query by Germany, IPCC Chair Lee assured the Panel that all the suggestions and comments will be incorporated in a revised report to be submitted to the ATG-Finance.

**Budget for the Years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020:** On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced this agenda item (IPCC-XLV/Doc.2), noting the document addresses income and expenditures in 2016 and the revised 2017 budget, as well as the budget proposals for 2018, 2019 and 2020. IPCC Chair Lee invited the FiTT to meet and report back to Plenary with any recommendations for decisions. The Panel provisionally approved the revised 2017 budget and took note of the budget proposals for 2018, 2019 and 2020.

**Other Matters:** The Secretariat presented the revised travel policy (IPCC-XLV/INF.3) that came into effect in 2015 and the new travel process that became effective in 2017. The Secretariat made a plea to experts who receive financial support to let the Secretariat know as far in advance as possible when they are unable to travel in order to stem financial losses. The Panel took note of the document.

**FiTT Report to Plenary:** On Friday afternoon, FiTT Co-Chair Helen Plume presented the draft decision developed by the FiTT. She highlighted revisions to the budget approved at IPCC-44, including: movement of the Library Facility budget line from 2016 to 2017 and an increase of CHF 103,000; addition of a budget line on Resource Mobilization, which increases the budget by CHF 15,800 over that approved at IPCC-44; and adjustment in the number of journeys for SRCCL lead authors and an increase of CHF 65,520. She noted that requests for more journeys, given the number of reports being undertaken, threaten the AR6 work programme, given the implications for future budgets. Following a brief discussion, the decision on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget was adopted.

**Final Decision:** The final decision (IPCC-XLV/CRP.4), *inter alia*: approves a revised budget proposal as modified from the one approved at IPCC-44; notes budgets for 2018, 2019 and 2020; urges member countries to maintain, increase or initiate contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund; requests the Secretariat to continually provide information on the breakdown of its budget, expenses and other budget items, and tabulate historical annual expenditures since the beginning of AR5; requests the Secretariat to analyze reasons for past over-estimation of budget needs to enable more accurate forecasting; and requests the WG Bureaux to minimize costs for the Trust Fund, including through considering the numbers of journeys made.

An attached appendix includes the ToR for the ATG-Finance. The decision also includes appendices listing in-kind contributions and activities for August-December 2016 and January-July 2016.

#### ADMISSION OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced this agenda item (IPCC-XLV/Doc.10), and presented eight organizations that requested observer status. He noted that half of them, including the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, the International Social Science Council, the International Energy Agency, and SILVA, Arbres, Forêts et Sociétés, already have

observer status with the UNFCCC and therefore did not need to submit additional documentation. The other four, including the Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases, the American Psychological Association, the Indian Institute for Human Settlements, and Carnegie Council, did provide additional documentation. The Panel agreed to admit all eight organizations as observers.

#### REPORTS

**Communication and Outreach Activities:** On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced this agenda item and provided an update on activities undertaken since IPCC-44 and plans for the coming year (IPCC-XLV/INF.1). He noted recent presentations on the IPCC's work aimed at increasing the IPCC's impact, and acknowledged funding from Norway for outreach, requesting other countries to consider similar contributions. The Panel took note of the report.

**IPCC Carbon Footprint:** On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced this item and presented proposals for enhancing efforts to reduce the carbon footprint of IPCC activities (IPCC-XLV/Doc.4, Rev.1), including that the IPCC: work with the UN's Environmental Management Group; continue bundling missions to cover more than one meeting or objective with one ticket; and use teleconferencing rather than face-to-face meetings. He noted helpful suggestions from the Bureau, including an IPCC inventory to quantify its emissions. The Panel took note of the report.

**Future of the TGICA:** On Tuesday, TGICA Co-Chair Bruce Hewitson provided a progress report on ongoing activities of the TGICA and the Data Distribution Center (DDC) (IPCC-XLV/INF.4, Rev.1). He noted, *inter alia*, preparation of general guidelines on the use of scenario data for climate impact and adaptation assessment, and engagement with the Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling Experiment to provide broader access to its research products. He announced that the last meeting of the TGICA as currently constituted will take place in June or July 2017. He noted increased downloading of DDC information, particularly in Africa. The Panel took note of the report.

On the future of the TGICA, Edwin Aldrian, Co-Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Task Force on the Future of TGICA (ATF-TGICA), outlined efforts to review the mandate of TGICA functions during and beyond AR6 and to design a strategic plan for its transformation (IPCC-XLV/INF.5). He highlighted mapping work to identify overlaps and gaps between the TGICA and other organizations doing similar work, and the need to develop a long-term vision and a short-term strategy. He called for sustainable resourcing to support its transformed functions, including possible ways of expanding country contributions. He said the process produced a questionnaire for the mapping exercise, which is currently being analyzed for IPCC-46, and noted two categories of participants: "members" who contribute actively and "friends" who are kept informed.

Swaziland, supported by Kenya, expressed frustration that the ATF-TGICA was a rubber stamp for work by a few individuals, saying he, as a member, has not been regularly informed about the work of the Task Force. He lamented that some developing country members had been unable to participate in meetings.

ATF-TGICA Co-Chair Andreas Fischlin noted the difficulty in participation caused by time differences. ATF-TGICA Co-Chair Aldrian said the imbalance in developing country participation had been noted, pointing to technical difficulties. Supported by Kenya and South Africa, he asked other developing country participants to become active members. Kenya asked that all member comments on the questionnaire be considered and a reason be provided if a comment or proposal is not accepted.

Zambia asked how the ATF-TGICA's outcome will be taken forward, whether information on teleconference participation can be shared, and how much weight will be given to the mapping. In response to South Africa, Co-Chair Fischlin explained that friends can participate in teleconferences but 52 participants in one teleconference presents technical difficulties. He said the Task Force's ToR only allow for teleconferencing but encouraged everyone to participate in the ATF-TGICA meeting that was taking place during IPCC-45. The Panel took note of the report.

**Strategic Planning Schedule:** On Wednesday morning, IPCC Deputy Secretary Kerstin Stendahl presented the revised Strategic Planning Schedule (IPCC-XLV/INF.8), which integrates comments provided at IPCC-44 regarding plenary agendas and intervals between plenary meetings, SROCC and SRCCL planning sessions, Lead Author meetings, overlapping meetings in 2021 and coherence with the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement. Germany, supported by Luxembourg and China, asked to extend the period between the SROCC and SRCCL approval sessions, scheduled to take place at IPCC-50 and IPCC-51, respectively, from two to three weeks. Noting there are three Lead Author meetings in October 2017, WGIII Co-Chair Jim Skea proposed moving the second SRCCL Lead Author meeting back by one week so that it is back to back with the third SR15 Lead Author meeting, given the geographic proximity of the two meetings. The US sought clarification on issues to be addressed during plenary meetings from 2019 to 2021. Norway requested that one of the 2019 IPCC plenaries address the outcomes of the second scoping meeting on the SYR.

On SR15, WGI Co-Chair Valérie Masson-Delmotte, supported by WGII Co-Chair Hans-Otto Pörtner, WGIII Co-Chair Skea, SR15 SSC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair Thelma Krug, Denmark, Switzerland, Niger, and El Salvador, proposed a seven (instead of eight) week government review period to provide authors with six (instead of five) weeks to write the report. Brazil, supported by Saudi Arabia, Gabon, Maldives, India, Venezuela, Tanzania, Zambia and Malaysia, preferred eight weeks for government review given the need for developing country governments and those that require translation to languages other than English to better understand the report and its contents, in order to execute a thorough review. China, supported by New Zealand, France, Togo, Ireland, Norway, Colombia, Senegal and others, noted that giving both authors and governments adequate time requires striking a delicate balance, and flexibility is necessary. Norway and Colombia proposed setting exact dates to send draft reports to governments and/or providing intermediary drafts to governments.

On the AR6 scoping process, IPCC Chair Lee explained that outline documents emanating from the May 2017 AR6 scoping meeting will be approved during IPCC-46. He said the scoping meeting in May will be based on four materials: the Chair's vision paper; comments from government focal points and observer organizations that are received by 13 April 2017; scoping meeting guidelines; and responses received from governments regarding scientifically- and policy-relevant questions to be answered. He said that further details of the scoping meeting programme will be developed the first week of April 2017. Chair Lee also noted that a second SYR scoping meeting will convene in June 2019 and that IPCC-50 will approve the SYR outline.

A number of countries requested preparation of a revised Strategic Planning Schedule. Norway and Germany stated that a new Strategic Planning Schedule should be completed as soon as possible. Switzerland said the Schedule formed an acceptable basis for the Panel's work and that only slight adjustments should

be made. Chair Lee proposed, and the Panel agreed, that the Secretariat take note of the discussion and integrate comments into a revised Schedule, including proposals from countries to host scoping meetings, to be made available prior to IPCC-46. The Panel took note of the document.

### **SIXTH ASSESSMENT REPORT PRODUCTS**

**Outline of the Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and GHG Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems (SRCCL):** This item (IPCC-XLV/Doc.7 and IPCC-XLV/INF.7) was first taken up on Wednesday. Youba Sokona, SRCCL SSC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair, reported on the scoping process, explaining that, following the IPCC-43 decision to prepare the SR, nominations for scoping meeting participants representing a broad range of expertise were finalized in November 2016. He noted that a stakeholder questionnaire was sent out to the focal points and relevant organizations, including the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), the results of which were provided to participants ahead of the scoping meeting held in Ireland in February 2017. He said the outline emerging from that meeting was the result of a facilitated process, but that he himself was unable to attend the meeting due to his inability to secure a visa.

Andy Reisinger, SSC Vice-Chair and WG III Vice-Chair, said that a broad range of perspectives from stakeholder consultations was transmitted to the scoping meeting. He informed the Panel that a FAO-IPCC expert meeting on climate change, land use and food security was held as part of the stakeholder consultations.

On the SRCCL outline, Reisinger highlighted the proposed title, "Climate and Land: IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and GHG Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems," noting it echoes the approach adopted by SR15 to have both a long and short title. He provided an overview of the outline's proposed chapters and the provisional timetable.

During the ensuing discussion, Saudi Arabia, supported by Venezuela, Zambia, Ecuador, Egypt, Madagascar, Mali, Cuba, South Africa, Tanzania and many others, lamented that the SRCCL SSC Chair had been unable to attend the scoping meeting due to his inability to obtain a visa. He noted that many developed countries' strict visa rules particularly affect developing country participants; called for a host country agreement to secure visas upfront for IPCC officers; and suggested that IPCC groups meet in countries with UN headquarters unless these conditions are met. Venezuela, with Ecuador, said, more generally, that the presence of developing country representatives at meetings must be guaranteed, with Madagascar and Tanzania adding that host countries must facilitate visas for developing country participants. Mali, supported by Cuba and Tanzania, added that difficulties hindering developing country participation affect the attention given to developing country concerns during meetings.

On the SR's title, delegates diverged on whether to have a long title, a short title or both, as with SR15. Venezuela, supported by Spain and others, favored a short "attention-grabbing" title, such as "Climate Change and Land." Norway, Dominican Republic, Ukraine, and Nicaragua agreed that the current report title is too long. Cuba, Madagascar, Tanzania, Saudi Arabia, Luxembourg and others supported the title as presented. Mali proposed adding "drought" to the long title. Chair Sokona, supported by

Luxembourg, Germany, Turkey, and Hungary, noted the utility of both a full title and a shorter informal title.

Ecuador, supported by Belgium, Austria, Chile and Madagascar, called for a technical summary for SRCCL. Some called for it to be translated into all UN languages.

The Dominican Republic, supported by Switzerland, Turkey, Italy, Norway, Ukraine, Côte d'Ivoire and others, suggested that the **land degradation** chapter precede the **desertification** chapter, and that overlap between the two chapters be avoided. Côte d'Ivoire, Nicaragua and Mali called for including reference to drought in the chapter on desertification.

Poland, supported by Hungary, opined that GHG fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems are insufficiently reflected in the report and, with Belgium, India, the US, Norway, Dominican Republic, Ukraine, France, and Côte d'Ivoire, requested more attention to forests.

Switzerland, supported by the US, recommended: reference to "land" rather than "land as a finite resource" in the framing chapter; clearer and relevant regional coverage; explicit attention to the quality of soils; and consideration of how new forms of modeling may influence projections in SRCCL.

South Africa called for: contextualizing land degradation by including the human element; including woodlands and grasslands; and referencing land reform and land tenure.

Norway preferred that the chapters on **interlinkages** and on **emergent risks, decision making and sustainable development** focus on "climate risks" and "synergies and solutions," respectively. In the chapter on interlinkages, Brazil preferred replacing a bullet point on "competition for land" with "interaction of different types of land use." Brazil suggested that both chapters include case studies.

Germany called for addressing how the land sector can contribute to fulfilling the aims of the Paris Agreement. Belgium, Norway, the European Union (EU), and Luxembourg also called for an explicit reference to the Paris Agreement. Luxembourg proposed including a bullet point on how SRCCL relates to carbon sinks as referenced in the Paris Agreement. Nicaragua disagreed, stating that reference to the Paris Agreement would serve to undermine the IPCC's neutrality and that these reports ought to focus on "strengthening the science and technical aspects that are crucial for science-based policy making."

The Republic of Korea, with Turkey, called for referring to the land degradation neutrality target agreed under the UNCCD in 2015. India noted the SRCCL outline focuses on production landscapes and called for greater attention to natural ecosystems. France underscored the link between forests and carbon capture efforts. Cuba emphasized the need to reflect more explicitly the relationship between ecosystems and forests, and droughts and meteorological events. Luxembourg called for mentioning ecosystem services.

In the chapter on **land-climate interactions**, Japan suggested including approaches beyond surface modeling, to consider the interaction between land and air, and highlighting synergies and tradeoffs associated with mitigation possibilities arising from negative emissions.

Saint Lucia, supported by Trinidad and Tobago, Haiti, Cuba, and Dominica, called for inclusion of loss and damage. Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, US, Japan, France, and Nicaragua supported reference to food security. Nigeria called for referencing the link between extreme weather and conflict. Saint Lucia, supported by Nicaragua, pointed to linkages between the issues of loss and damage, freshwater availability, extreme

weather events and food security. Hungary, supported by the Dominican Republic and Trinidad and Tobago, favored including reference to the role of GHGs in land degradation.

WWF urged highlighting, *inter alia*: the loss of forests as well as conversion/degradation of other ecosystems; the importance of soil as a carbon store; solutions, particularly regionally-specific solutions; and habitats and ecosystems.

Belgium, supported by India, the US, Dominican Republic, France and the EU, suggested including reference to biodiversity; noted that IPBES is dealing with similar issues and cooperation could avoid overlap; and stressed that including reference to biodiversity is necessary for SRCCL to be comprehensive.

The US and Saudi Arabia emphasized the indicative nature of the outline, with Saudi Arabia cautioning against opening its structure. Germany asked the Panel to trust the experts to include all relevant ecosystems of importance.

The US stressed the need to include economic considerations, such as the role of technology and markets in addressing climate change, throughout the SR.

India and the US stressed the need to avoid repetition of concepts between the AR6 and the three SRs. The US expressed confidence that the Chair and Vice-Chairs would effectively guide this process to ensure "nothing is lost and nothing is repeated across the AR6 products."

The SSC then convened to refine the SRCCL outline based on comments made in plenary.

On Thursday morning, SSC Chair Sokona presented the revised SRCCL outline, noting the addition of reference to a technical summary of 20-30 pages, and inclusion of references to, among other things, limits to adaptation. He noted the inclusion of new references to, *inter alia*: other relevant IPCC reports and institutions, under framing and context, and terrestrial GHG fluxes "in natural and managed ecosystems (e.g. soils, forests and other land cover types)" under land-climate interactions. Under desertification, he noted the addition of reference to extremes such as drought, observed and projected impacts, which could include "the role of aerosols and dust" and specific impacts on ecosystem services and socio-ecological systems, and limits to adaptation. Regarding the chapter on land degradation, he noted additions on: linkages between degradation and extremes, including floods and droughts and erosion; land restoration; observed and projected impacts on ecosystem services and socio-ecological systems; and limits to adaptation.

On food security, he noted, *inter alia*, references to affordability, trade and markets, mitigation options associated with food supply and demand, and the influence of land-based mitigation options. On the interlinkages chapter, he noted specification of interlinkages between all the topics addressed in the report in the chapter's title, and reference to: the "economic and social dimensions" of response options, including "synergies/trade-offs/side effects/co-benefits"; limits to adaptation; the role of forests, soils, and use of biomass in balancing anthropogenic sources and sinks; and case studies. On the chapter addressing risk, he mentioned additions on: "risk management" decision making in relation to sustainable development in the title; and risks arising from the interaction of climate change with development pressures, including conflicts and migration.

IPCC Chair Lee reiterated that any elements not addressed in SRCCL will be addressed in AR6.

In the ensuing discussion, Brazil, with South Africa, objected to mentioning forests without other land covers. Turkey, with Switzerland, Senegal, Belgium and the UK, opposed by Saudi

Arabia, reiterated the call to place the chapter on land degradation before the chapter on desertification.

Regarding the chapter on food security, Mali, with Senegal, Guinea, Niger, Togo and Ghana, called for a bullet point on the impact of drought, and Colombia suggested mentioning the impact of land degradation on food security. Nicaragua, with Venezuela, called for reference to vulnerable communities.

Opposed by Saudi Arabia, the US asked for reference to market forces and technological changes in improving land uses and productivity.

Norway, Poland and Germany reiterated their request to include reference to the Paris Agreement. India, opposed by Nicaragua, welcomed the inclusion of reference to relevant intergovernmental institutions.

Many, including Saudi Arabia, Mexico, France, Morocco, Venezuela, Jordan, Germany, Ghana, Haiti, Argentina, Chile, South Africa, Norway, and the US, indicated readiness to accept the revised outline.

The EU cautioned against removing references to specific ecosystems, noting it would be difficult to attract authors with appropriate expertise. Japan highlighted the importance of discussing synergies, tradeoffs, side effects and co-benefits in relation to negative emissions and soils.

Saint Lucia, supported by Maldives, Federated States of Micronesia, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Haiti, Grenada, Bahamas, and others, stressed the need to include an explicit reference to loss and damage, noting the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts adopted by UNFCCC COP 19. The US, New Zealand and the UK objected, stating that the term “loss and damage” is political, not scientific. Nicaragua emphasized the need to maintain neutrality by not getting involved in political discussions.

Trinidad and Tobago, supported by Ghana, said that limits to adaptation have already been exceeded in his region, noting that loss and damage is not a political question but one of survival. Switzerland proposed considering when limits to adaptation may be reached. Germany expressed an understanding that “extremes” and “limits to adaptation” includes loss and damage.

El Salvador and Ghana identified the need for a science-based term to describe “catastrophic realities” if “loss and damage” is deemed inadequate. China, with South Africa and Cuba, urged the SSC to find appropriate wording to address the concerns raised by Saint Lucia and others, and suggested adding the UNFCCC to the list of relevant institutions in the chapter on framing and context.

IPCC Chair Lee and SSC Chair Sokona reminded the Panel that the outline contains an indicative list of bullet points and that scientific literature on issues not included in the outline will be reviewed in the SR itself. Jim Skea, WGIII Co-Chair, suggested that, while the bullet points as drafted will enable accessing existing scientific literature on loss and damage, explicit reference to loss and damage could be included in the decision adopting the outline.

Saint Lucia observed while loss and damage will be included in AR6, that report is “many years away,” and policymakers may be left without guidance in the interim.

WGII Co-Chair Roberto Sánchez-Rodríguez proposed adding the concept of vulnerability assessment.

WGI Vice-Chair Edvin Aldrian observed that the SR15 outline contains no reference to loss and damage.

SSC Vice-Chair Andy Reisinger proposed including a bullet point under framing and context on “key concepts and definitions, including the relationship of loss and damage to observed

impacts, limits to adaptation and residual impacts.” The Bahamas and Maldives supported this revision, while the US and UK opposed it.

Saudi Arabia, supported by France, Haiti, Niger, the US and others, proposed that the outline be adopted as revised by the SSC and that any additional concerns be reflected in the report of the session.

On Friday morning, the Bahamas, supported by Belgium, Norway, Maldives, the UK, Cuba, Saint Lucia, France, Grenada, Trinidad and Tobago, and Cook Islands, proposed text identical to that which was just agreed for the SROCC on “including vulnerability assessments, adaptation limits and residual risks” under key concepts and definitions in the SRCCL framing and context chapter.

IPCC Vice-Chair Sokona then presented the draft decision as revised after Thursday’s discussion, and the decision and outline were adopted.

Ireland expressed regret for the problems incurred regarding visas to attend the SRCCL scoping meeting. He said this was the first of four IPCC-related meetings it has hosted in which such visa problems were experienced, but said that difficulties had been largely overcome through the use of technology. He stated that Ireland is reviewing its procedures.

Chair Lee thanked Ireland for its support for IPCC activities over the past 10 years, including the SRCCL scoping meeting.

**Final Decision:** In the decision (IPCC-XLV/CRP.3), the IPCC decides: to agree to the outline of the SR on “Climate Change and Land: An IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems”; that the SR assess literature relevant to all these subjects, especially since AR5, consistent with IPCC guidance; and that the text resulting from the scoping process and comments by the plenary be considered by authors as indicative.

The decision also provides a timetable for producing the SR, with approval and acceptance planned for September 2019, and refers to the IPCC-45 decision on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget (IPCC-XLV/CRP.4) regarding the budget for this activity.

SRCL will total approximately 330 pages. The outline is attached as an annex, and specifies that the SR will contain a SPM of approximately 10 pages and a technical summary of 20-30 pages, consisting of chapter executive summaries with figures. The outline also details seven chapters: framing and context (15 pages); land-climate interactions (50 pages); desertification (35-40 pages); land degradation (40 pages); food security (50 pages); interlinkages between desertification, land degradation, food security and GHG fluxes: synergies, trade-offs and integrative response options (40 pages); and risk management and decision making in relation to sustainable development (40 pages). SRCCL will also include boxes, case studies and frequently asked questions (up to 20 pages).

**Outline of the Special Report on Climate Change, Oceans and the Cryosphere (SROCC):** This item (IPCC-XLV/Doc.6 and IPCC-XLV/INF.6) was first taken up on Wednesday. Ko Barrett, SSC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair, presented this agenda item, stating that a scoping meeting convened in Monaco in December 2016 to produce a draft outline of the SROCC. She said a dynamic, iterative and inclusive process had produced consensus on the outline and title, which the Bureau approved and forwarded to IPCC-45.



On Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning, delegates provided initial comments on the SROCC and the proposed outline. India lamented low developing country representation in author nominations. Venezuela requested that the report consider how climate change will impact national sovereignty. Kenya, Belgium and Norway suggested strengthening the policy relevance of the outline and clustering policy options together in one chapter or box. Dominica, supported by Egypt, requested that the report address best practices to facilitate decision making.

Canada asked how ocean acidification will be treated throughout SROCC and suggested adding reference to coastal erosion and changing ice. The Republic of Korea, with Saint Lucia, stressed coastal fisheries, saying that SROCC must provide information on sustainable fisheries management and on natural and social impacts of Arctic warming on mid-latitudes.

Australia, supported by France, Madagascar, Maldives, Saudi Arabia, Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, Kenya, Philippines, Belgium, Grenada, Indonesia, Egypt and others, called for inclusion of coral reefs and the climate impacts affecting them.

Ecuador proposed that the chapter on **high mountain areas** include consideration of the Andes and the Amazon and their influence on the global climate and vulnerable populations. India urged that the chapter refer to Himalayan ecosystems and glaciers. Belgium, opposed by China, recommended changing the chapter title to “high mountain areas and the cryosphere.”

In the chapter addressing **polar regions**, China requested that the most recent literature on mountain glacier retreat, associated risks and adaptation options be adequately reflected. Pakistan called for consideration of the “third pole” or Hindu Kush-Himalayan region, which, he noted, contains more snow and ice than anywhere else outside the polar regions. The UK requested clarification on whether the chapter will consider all climate feedbacks, such as changing albedo. Japan recommended including new knowledge from ocean-atmospheric circulation models, and reference to ocean heat content. WWF called for considering, *inter alia*, loss and creation of habitats, changes in krill and its impacts on the oceanic food chain, and glacial retreat in the Antarctic.

Regarding the chapter on **sea level rise and implications for coasts and communities**, Maldives, supported by Saint Lucia, Jamaica, Suriname, Federated States of Micronesia, Grenada and Indonesia, proposed including reference to small island states in the chapter title. Japan stated that the title should remain general enough to accommodate all countries with coastal areas that will be affected by sea level rise and suggested addressing the concerns of small island states within the chapter. Belgium supported considering issues facing low-lying areas more generally. China, India and Dominica urged consideration of the impacts of rising sea levels on the development of, and populations living in, densely populated coastal areas. Dominica, supported by Egypt, requested that the chapter address adaptation options, lessons learned, and best practices to facilitate decision making. India requested consideration of plastic in the oceans, biodiversity and adaptation options, and suggested that open oceans be treated separately from coastal areas. WWF supported consideration of ocean-cryosphere climate feedbacks.

Norway emphasized the importance of: identifying social scientists to address the social, cultural, political, institutional and economic aspects of the phenomena discussed in the SROCC; addressing how changes in the polar regions affect other regions; enhancing treatment of governance and management practices; the role of the cryosphere and oceans for implementing the Paris Agreement; and including text on pathways for enhancing

resilience. Belgium and the Philippines urged greater emphasis on multidisciplinary perspectives and socio-economic aspects, suggesting a chapter on adaptation to unavoidable climate impacts.

Saudi Arabia suggested including geoengineering options like carbon capture under the seabed and ocean fertilization. The US, the UK, Spain and others suggested that geoengineering be included in AR6 rather than in the SRs. WGI Co-Chair Masson-Delmotte responded that geoengineering will be a topic for all three WGs in AR6. Saint Lucia suggested referring to “nature-based solutions” instead of “blue carbon.” Chile and Saudi Arabia stressed the importance of addressing blue carbon to outline the possibilities for carbon capture and conservation strategies, while Dominica, Jamaica, Germany and Luxembourg said that the SROCC is not the place to consider blue carbon.

The Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, and Dominica requested addressing the issue of resettlement due to tropical cyclones and other climate impacts. Saint Lucia, supported by Dominica, Philippines, Egypt, Jamaica, Bahamas, and Trinidad and Tobago, requested that loss and damage be addressed in the SROCC. Egypt sought the addition of ways to quantify loss and damage. Dominica added that the Paris Agreement’s preclusion of compensation and liability was a “loss” for small island developing states and requested that the Panel take note of that in the SROCC draft in some fashion. The US asked that, if loss and damage was included, the IPCC acknowledge its climatic and non-climatic drivers.

Switzerland, Venezuela and the US urged coordination with other UN processes and organizations to avoid repetition in the treatment of such issues as indigenous and community knowledge or ocean-cryosphere-climate interactions.

Switzerland and Kenya called for consistent and robust treatment of concepts, such as adaptation, resilience, risks and impacts. Luxembourg, the UK and Switzerland urged consideration of interlinkages and areas of overlap.

Austria cited the need for a technical summary. Belgium, Spain and Venezuela requested that it be translated into all UN languages. Belgium suggested that it be 30 pages in length and the SPM 10 pages. Indonesia suggested that the SROCC be limited to 250 pages.

The SSC was then requested to produce a revised outline based on comments made in plenary.

On Friday morning, SSC Chair Barrett presented the revised outline for consideration by delegates. She noted a number of changes, including reference to: a 20-page technical summary; Antarctic glaciers; ocean heat content; ecosystem services; “low lying islands” in the chapter title on sea level rise; coastal flooding, displacement and resettlement; adaptation measures, pathways and limits; coral reefs; “blue carbon” as a subset of nature-based solutions; and storm surge as it relates to sea level rise.

Pakistan, supported by India and China, reiterated its call to include explicit reference to the “third pole” region. France, supported by Lebanon, Spain and Italy, reiterated its call to include a case study on the Mediterranean; Tanzania, supported by Zambia, proposed reinserting reference to “tropical regions”; and Ecuador asked for mention of the Andes. Colombia and El Salvador also requested reference to their regional concerns. Argentina, supported by Germany and Brazil, opposed specific regional considerations, citing the report’s length.

Saudi Arabia, supported by Egypt, lamented that their proposal to include geoengineering was not reflected in the revised outline and that blue carbon was not more prominently reflected, and

requested considering the interaction between dust and oceans as well as explicit reference to the UNFCCC. France, supported by Spain, favored considering geoengineering in AR6, not in the SRs. ETC Group, supported by Germany, opposed reference to geoengineering in both AR6 and the SRs.

The Federated States of Micronesia, opposed by the Philippines, preferred “low lying islands” to “small island developing states” in the chapter title on sea level rise.

Norway, supported by Belgium, the EU and Nicaragua, reiterated its request that the draft report enhance its consideration of governance and solutions.

The Bahamas, supported by Maldives, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada, Cuba, Belize, Ecuador, Germany, Mexico, New Zealand, Jamaica, and Dominica, proposed including the phrase “vulnerability assessments, adaptation limits and residual risks” in the chapter detailing the framing and context of the report, as an alternative to referencing loss and damage. The Bahamas suggested that this phrase also be included in the SRCCL outline, which was supported by many others.

The SSC then reconvened to further revise the outline based on these comments. Reporting back to plenary, SSC Chair Barrett presented the further revised outline for consideration. Addressing the concern raised by India regarding developing country participation, she stated that the situation has greatly improved, pointing out that, while only 29% of author nominations came from developing countries, 48% of the chosen authors are from developing countries. She noted changes to the outline, including insertion of the proposal presented by the Bahamas on “vulnerability assessment, adaptation limits and residual risks”; reference to policy options and guidance, the UNFCCC, the “Andes, Himalayas and East Africa” and dust inputs; mention of “relevant ocean regions” to enable regional case study considerations; and reworked language on blue carbon. She clarified that geoengineering is not included since it will be addressed in AR6.

Responding to a request by Senegal, SSC Chair Barrett proposed mentioning Africa more generally rather than East Africa specifically. She pointed out that the language on case studies gives authors ample guidance to decide which to include based on available literature. The US requested altering dates listed in the timetable to reflect the six weeks required for author nominations. With these amendments, the Panel agreed to the outline and adopted the decision.

**Final Decision:** In its decision (IPCC-XLV/CRP.2), the Panel agrees to this outline of the SR, titled “IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate,” which is contained in an annex to the decision. The Panel decides that the bulleted text in the outline is to be considered indicative by the authors, and that the authors elaborate on the relevant scientific literature on the oceans and the cryosphere, especially literature available since AR5, consistent with IPCC guidance. The decision also mentions that scientific gaps will be explicitly identified.

The SR will total approximately 280 pages. The outline will contain a SPM (10 pages) and a technical summary (20 pages), as well as six chapters: framing and context (15 pages); high mountain areas (30 pages); polar regions (50 pages); sea level rise and implications for low lying islands, coasts and communities (50 pages); changing ocean, marine ecosystems and dependent communities (65 pages); and extremes, abrupt changes and managing risks (20 pages). Also included are case studies, frequently asked questions and boxes (20 pages) to be included throughout the chapters. The approval of the SR is planned for IPCC-50 in September 2019.

## **IPCC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME**

On Thursday afternoon, Science Board Chair Ko Barrett introduced this agenda item (IPCC-XLV/Doc.9), noting that the Science Board reported on the IPCC Scholarship Programme’s progress at IPCC-44. She explained that challenges and options were presented to IPCC-44, but consensus was not reached. She said three improvement options were presented at the Bureau meeting, with the Bureau indicating a clear preference for identifying institutions with whom to develop a partnership for use of scholarship funds.

Germany, with Switzerland, requested additional information on the status of documentation, including a list of activities, financial issues and status of the programme’s Ph.D. students. Belgium and Germany stated that the Programme presents a financial strain on the Secretariat and should “not compromise core IPCC work.”

Monaco, Swaziland, Ghana, Mali and Kenya stressed the importance of the Programme for building capacity in developing countries. Monaco, supported by Kenya, suggested that the duration of financial support for Ph.D. students be extended.

Suggestions from the floor included: using the Programme to support larger IPCC fundraising efforts (Belgium); reporting to the Secretariat on student performance (Nigeria); and piggybacking fundraising efforts onto the newly established ATG-Finance, noting that potential funders may be more interested in funding the Programme than core IPCC efforts (Germany).

The Panel decided to take note of all suggestions and requested that the Science Board and the Secretariat continue pursuing options for improving the Programme’s long-term sustainability.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

This agenda item was discussed on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning.

TFI Co-Chair Kiyoto Tanabe reported on **ongoing TFI work** regarding: the methodology report on the 2019 Refinement of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories, including selection of authors and editors, and related and ongoing assessment of any conflicts of interest; a recent TFI Editorial Board meeting on the Emissions Factor Database in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2016; and improvement of IPCC inventory software, including an expert meeting to collect user feedback in Kitakyushu, Japan, in March 2017. Germany asked that progress reports on the methodology report be put on the agenda of future IPCC sessions. Togo, with Mali and Guinea, asked for additional training on technology and methodology at the subregional level in order to achieve good estimates rather than “default” emissions estimates for countries lacking capacity. Mali requested information on who attended the Bali meeting and on how to improve attendance. Co-Chair Tanabe took note of the comments.

France then asked for information on **aligning AR6 and the UNFCCC’s global stocktake** in 2018. She said the stocktake will “radically change” the way the IPCC works, affecting several IPCC cycles and adding to an already heavy workload for the Bureau and the Secretariat. The Secretariat said it is preparing the issue for consideration at IPCC-46. She noted that AR6 is already making required changes for alignment with the 2018 stocktake, and that SR15 will be published before emissions targets are revised in 2018, with AR6 finalized prior to the 2023 stocktake.

The UK asked for an update on the **IPCC library facility**. The Secretariat reported agreement between the organizations involved on how to meet the needs of authors, most urgently for SR15. She said a brief on this and a manual for users are currently being finalized, and looking forward to continuing

collaboration. Switzerland suggested that private entities could provide free access to commercial publications as a “partnership,” for which they could claim credit for enhancing the common good with no negative implications for the IPCC’s neutrality.

On matters related to the UNFCCC, Norway requested that this issue be included on the IPCC-46 agenda and that the UNFCCC Secretariat update the Panel on activities relevant to the IPCC. The UNFCCC Secretariat presented an update on COP 22 held in Morocco in November 2016 and issues relevant for the Panel’s work. He noted, *inter alia*: the recommendation of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on how IPCC reports can be considered in the global stocktake; a recommendation that the SBSTA-IPCC Joint WG be strengthened in the context of the global stocktake; that IPCC participation is welcome in the upcoming meeting of the research dialogue and an expert meeting on emissions scenarios; and that COP 24 in 2018 was postponed until December, which gives the IPCC more time to finalize SR15.

The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Germany and others supported Norway’s proposal that matters related to the UNFCCC be included on the IPCC-46 agenda. Saudi Arabia, Mali, Brazil and others requested that no agenda item be approved until it has been sent to all focal points. The Secretariat assured delegates that the proposed agenda will be sent out well in advance of IPCC-46.

Mexico presented a draft proposal, developed with Chile and Kenya, after informal consultations with 25 other country representatives, asking the ExComm to develop options for continuing IPCC discussions on **short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs)**, particularly black carbon, such as an expert meeting to produce recommendations for IPCC-47. Many countries expressed support for this. Canada offered to organize a parallel event on the issue during IPCC-46.

TFI Co-Chair Tanabe noted that SLCFs are already covered in the IPCC Inventory Guidelines although black carbon is not; said the TFI’s mandate is flexible but that new TFI work on this is not feasible given time constraints; recommended including air quality in this work; said the ExComm should plan this work carefully; and noted potential impacts on the Strategic Planning Schedule.

Switzerland suggested that the IPCC inform the UNFCCC and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition of any work undertaken on SLCFs, and that the TFI study the feasibility of such work and consider how to take advantage of existing methodologies, such as those used in Europe.

China asked WGI to clarify the science for addressing black carbon; noted that it is not part of the climate negotiations and will require political will to address; and asked if the TFI had time to work on this prior to IPCC-47.

On Friday morning, Mexico explained in more detail that the primary objective of the proposal was to obtain technical advice from the IPCC on methodologies for countries to use in their national inventories, if desired.

Saudi Arabia and others generally supported the proposal and, with Chile, asked that it be formally considered at IPCC-46. Germany, with Belgium, requested that WGI and the TFI provide information on SLCFs for IPCC-46, and Norway, with the US, recommended ExComm consideration of how to address this issue. Belgium called for a proposal for an expert panel or workshop to be considered at IPCC-46.

WGI Co-Chair Masson-Delmotte noted that the Chair’s vision paper for AR6 covers air quality, which encompasses SLCFs, and that the AR6 scoping meeting in May 2017 and further WG deliberations could further discuss the issue. She recommended

that an expert meeting on SLCFs should be considered when deciding on topics for expert meetings.

IPCC Chair Lee said the proposal and ensuing discussion would be recorded in the report of IPCC-45 and that the ExComm would address the issue and report back to IPCC-46.

On Friday afternoon, the Secretariat reported back on the results of a survey distributed to delegates to gather feedback on the **pre-plenary briefing** held on Monday afternoon. Approximately 80% of respondents indicated they thought the briefing: was well developed; offered adequate presentations and time for their consideration; and would help developing countries better participate in IPCC activities. A large majority felt that the pre-plenary briefings should continue in the future.

#### **PLACE AND DATE FOR IPCC-46**

IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit noted Canada’s offer to host IPCC-46. Canada said it was honored to host the meeting the week of 3 September 2017. Thanking Canada for its offer to host the meeting, Saudi Arabia, supported by Morocco, Maldives, Senegal, Mali, and Guinea, noted that the proposed dates of the meeting conflict with the Eid al-Adha holiday, and asked that consideration be given to changing the dates of the meeting. The Republic of Congo expressed hope that securing visas for Canada would not be a problem and asked that the dates be changed since it overlaps with the UNCCD COP. IPCC Chair Lee said that these concerns will be considered.

#### **CLOSING OF THE SESSION**

IPCC Chair Lee welcomed Kerstin Stendahl as the new IPCC Deputy Secretary. He thanked Mexico for its generous hospitality, and said the meeting resulted in a clear pathway to reach financial stability and address resource mobilization. He commended delegates for agreeing on strong SR outlines, and noted that Lead Authors could now be recruited for the reports. He thanked delegates, Bureau members, the interpreters and the Secretariat, and gavelled the meeting to a close at 5:07 pm.

### **A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF IPCC-45**

*There is air and the sun, there are clouds. Up there, a blue sky, and beyond perhaps there are songs; perhaps the best voices.... There is hope, in short. There is hope for us, against all our regret. (Juan Rulfo, “Pedro Páramo,” (as quoted by IPCC Chair Hoesung Lee in the opening plenary)*

#### **THE SUN AND THE CLOUDS**

The IPCC convened for its 45th session in Guadalajara, Mexico, at an auspicious time: this was the first IPCC meeting since the entry into force of the Paris Agreement on climate change nearly six months ago, which, as UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa noted in her opening address, marked the beginning of “the era of implementation to restore climate neutrality and limit temperature rise to near 1.5°C.” It was also the Panel’s second meeting to focus on its Sixth Assessment Report cycle products agreed in Nairobi, Kenya, in April 2016. With the outline of the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C adopted in October 2016 in Bangkok, Thailand, IPCC-45 focused on the outlines for the special reports on: climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security and GHG fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems (SRCLL); and oceans and the cryosphere in a changing climate (SROCC).

While it is generally agreed that science is necessary for evidence-based decision making that could enable implementation of the Paris Agreement and help the international community realize the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), dark clouds

were on the horizon. There is overwhelming evidence that 2016 was the warmest on record, and on 28 March 2017, as IPCC-45 was beginning its work, US President Donald Trump signed an Executive Order, making it clear that climate action would be taking a backseat to energy policies favoring fossil fuels. Even though it may take years and many court battles to dismantle the Clean Power Plan—former President Barack Obama’s policy seeking to reduce US power sector emissions and increase renewable energy production—the Executive Order sends a daunting message. The Trump Administration’s assault on climate change was recognized by the Governor of Jalisco, Jorge Aristóteles Sandoval Díaz, who, in his opening speech, called out the US President for taking a “backwards step” in rolling back actions on climate change and described denial of the “reality of climate change” as amounting to “stupidity.” Whatever it may be, US climate policy has very real implications for the IPCC’s work, including how it affects annual budget contributions and, thus, budgetary priorities.

This brief analysis examines the decisions taken by IPCC-45 on the SR outlines and resource mobilization under the specter of uncertainty and addresses the Panel’s ability to adapt to the challenges ahead.

### **SONGS, PERHAPS THE BEST VOICES**

In accordance with its mandate from Nairobi, IPCC-45 considered, and ultimately agreed to, the outlines of the two SRs. In response to Saudi Arabia’s request, the Panel took up the SRCCL outline before the SROCC, reversing the order for the outlines’ consideration reflected in the provisional agenda. Some speculated that this move might result in inadequate time being allotted to the considerations of the SROCC outline; however, the Panel’s consideration of the two outlines appeared balanced—something several delegations sought to ensure. Technical summaries were added to both outlines, as well as references to linkages to relevant institutions and policy contexts. For example, the SRCCL outline recognizes the complementarity of efforts by the IPCC and other relevant institutions, including IPBES, the UNCCD and the FAO, while linkages with the Paris Agreement, the SDGs and the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction feature in the SROCC outline.

Another addition made to both outlines in parallel was a reference to “vulnerability assessments, adaptation limits and residual risks,” which aimed to accommodate concerns raised by Saint Lucia and other small island developing states (SIDS) over the need to address loss and damage. They argued that addressing loss and damage is a “matter of survival,” and that the concept is not covered by “limits to adaptation.” The carefully crafted wording was the result of a compromise struck between the SIDS and several developed countries, who initially opposed any reference to “loss and damage,” contending that the term is political, not scientific. While the new formulation is not politically loaded, some questioned the addition of “residual risks,” arguing that a determination of the residual character of risks needs to be science-based.

With the SRs slated for adoption in September 2019, the Panel’s agreement on the outlines marked the beginning of a rigorous production process, beginning with a call for nominations for Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and review editors due in April 2017. Once the two author teams have been selected, they will meet several times over the course of the next three years to work on their respective SRs. Prior to being accepted and approved by the Panel, the SRs, along with their accompanying summaries for policymakers, will be subjected to several rounds of expert and government review. Now that

the Panel has agreed to robust outlines that combine scientific expertise and policymakers’ requirements, the authors, once chosen, will have a solid basis to work from.

### **MORE CLOUDS?**

Another major issue requiring the Panel’s immediate attention was the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget. It is no secret that contributions to the IPCC have been steadily declining since 2008 in amount as well as in the number of funders. For years, the US has been the main supporter of the Panel, contributing over CHF 43 million to the IPCC’s budget since its inception. In fact, the US is one of only 23 donor countries to make a contribution to the IPCC in 2016, which, at nearly CHF 2 million, is the largest national contribution and is six times greater than the second highest one. However, the uncertainty about how far the Trump Administration is prepared to go in eliminating or cutting back funding for international climate processes was a hovering cloud, albeit unspoken, as the Panel discussed funding and its resource mobilization strategy.

In an effort to broaden its funding base and secure additional funding, the Panel prepared a resource mobilization strategy, which proposes exploring the possibility of establishing partnerships with UN agencies, funds and programmes, international financial institutions such as the World Bank, regional development banks, regional economic and political unions, civil society and philanthropic foundations, as well as the for-profit business sector. While the need for new donors is undeniable, a number of European countries expressed concern over compromising the Panel’s independence, impartiality and integrity by accepting funding from anyone other than governments. Similar concerns were raised over earmarked funds. A number of developing countries saw no contradiction in accepting funds from a diverse pool of donors, maintaining that “the door should be wide open to all who want to do good.”

Various other ideas for raising funds were floated around, including crowdfunding and following the example of the Green Climate Fund in turning to cities and subnational entities for support. Switzerland proposed following the UN Environment voluntary indicative scale of contributions (VISC) used for its Environmental Fund. Under the VISC, Member States are requested to contribute at least to the level of the UN assessed scale, those contributing at or above the UN scale are requested to at least maintain their level of contribution and those contributing below their highest levels are encouraged to return to those funding levels. Using the VISC would put the US contribution at 22% of the total, which is half of their current contribution levels of nearly 45%. However, even this may be the best-case scenario. It may be more likely that the US contribution will look more like the “empty purse” the Swiss delegate alluded to when he said: “we can turn the purse in all directions but if it’s empty, it’s empty.” Using the VISC might not be politically feasible, either. Politics does cast a shadow over IPCC deliberations, no matter how much IPCC scientists may lament this, as, for example, was the case with IPCC-45’s discussions on loss and damage. Those developing countries calling for maintaining “donor” countries’ contributions may be reluctant to embrace the idea of everyone contributing their “fair share.”

So does this dark cloud have a silver lining? To address numerous funding-related concerns, IPCC-45 established an *Ad Hoc* Task Group on the financial stability of the IPCC (ATG-Finance) and developed its terms of reference. The task group will propose funding options to IPCC-46 aimed at providing predictable, sustainable and adequate means for smooth implementation of the IPCC’s programme of work. The ATG-

Finance will consider options for increasing contributions from governments, explore ways to mobilize additional resources from UN organizations, and provide guidance on the eligibility of other potential donors, including the private sector. Many saw this as a positive first step towards overcome funding shortfalls.

### **THERE IS HOPE FOR US AGAINST ALL OUR REGRET**

While the skies at IPCC-45 were somewhat overcast due to funding concerns, hope did prevail in the opinion of many attending the meeting. There is no doubt that strained financial resources will put the IPCC's adaptability, along with its ability to deliver AR6 products in a timely fashion, to the test. Meeting current and future financial challenges will require creative thinking and exploring a range of different options. In this regard, the IPCC has demonstrated its flexibility and openness to consider various possibilities, although whether it can emerge from the funding crisis without compromising its integrity remains to be seen.

## **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**3rd Sustainable Energy for All Forum:** The 3rd Sustainable Energy for All Forum (SEforALL) will convene in New York from 3-5 April 2017, under the theme: "Going further, faster - together." High-level representatives from government, business, civil society and international organizations will gather to broker new partnerships and ideas, spur investment and drive action towards sustainable energy, while sharing stories from across the world of how they are making progress towards realizing Sustainable Development Goal 7 (affordable and clean energy). **dates:** 3-5 April 2017 **location:** Brooklyn, New York, US **contact:** SEforALL Secretariat **phone:** +43-676-846-727-200 **email:** Info@SEforALL.org **www:** <http://seforallforum.org/> or <http://se4all.org/>

**Africa Renewable Energy Leaders' Summit:** The sessions scheduled to take place during this two-day Summit include: the importance of community-centric mini grids in energy access; developing a regulatory framework to drive renewable energy development in East Africa; the African renewable energy initiative, and unlocking the potential of Africa's energy future; attracting capital to develop renewable energy projects; harnessing solar power potential in Sub-Saharan Africa; exploiting the full potential of hydropower prospects in East Africa; wind power, geothermal, biomass and hybrid projects; and energy efficiency and renewables development. **dates:** 4-5 April 2017 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** <http://www.africanrenewables Summit.com/>

**16th Meeting of the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF):** The GCF Board is expected to address, *inter alia*: matters related to guidance from the COP; readiness and preparatory support; matters related to funding proposals; status of Secretariat staffing; status of resources; update on the GCF risk management framework; matters related to accreditation; and the revised terms of reference for the Independent Redress Mechanism. **dates:** 4-6 April 2017 **location:** Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea **contact:** GCF Secretariat **phone:** +82-32-458-6059 **fax:** +82-32-458-6094 **email:** [info@gcfund.org](mailto:info@gcfund.org) **www:** <http://www.greenclimate.fund/home>

**20th CCAC Working Group and Science-Policy Dialogue:** The Science-Policy Dialogue, convening on 25 April, will focus on metrics for black carbon and other pollutants, black carbon inventories, and how to include short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs) in the nationally determined contributions. On 26-27 April, the 20th meeting of the Climate & Clean Air

Coalition (CCAC) Working Group will provide the opportunity to discuss: preparation of new actions and commitments for the Coalition's next High Level Assembly in late 2017; Coalition initiatives ready for scaling up; a follow up on commitments made in the Marrakech Communiqué; and consideration of new funding proposals. The meetings are being organized by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment and the CCAC. The meetings are open only to CCAC Partners, which currently include 51 countries, 16 intergovernmental organizations and 45 non-governmental organizations. **dates:** 25-27 April 2017 **location:** Santiago, Chile **contact:** James Morris, UNEP **email:** [James.Morris@unep.org](mailto:James.Morris@unep.org) **www:** <http://ccacoalition.org/>

**IPCC Expert Meeting on Mitigation, Sustainability and Climate Stabilization Scenarios:** The aims of the WGIII expert meeting include developing a dialogue between different research communities, stimulating interdisciplinary research activity that can lead to literature for the AR6, and engaging with experts and stakeholders concerned with mitigation. **dates:** 26-28 April 2017 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** [IPCC-Sec@wmo.int](mailto:IPCC-Sec@wmo.int) **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

**Scoping of the IPCC AR6:** During this meeting, members will discuss the outline of the AR6. **dates:** 1-5 May 2017 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** [IPCC-Sec@wmo.int](mailto:IPCC-Sec@wmo.int) **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

**46th Session of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies (SBs):** The 46th meetings of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the third part of the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement will convene. **dates:** 8-18 May 2017 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** <http://unfccc.int/>

**52nd Meeting of the GEF Council:** The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council meets twice a year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas of biodiversity, climate change mitigation, chemicals and waste, international waters, land degradation and sustainable forest management, and in the GEF's integrated approach programmes on sustainable cities, taking deforestation out of commodity chains, and sustainability and resilience for food security in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Council also provides guidance to the GEF Secretariat and agencies. The May GEF Council meeting will be preceded by a consultation with civil society organizations at the same location. The meetings of the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund are expected to convene as well. **dates:** 22-25 May 2017 **location:** Washington DC, US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** [secretariat@thegef.org](mailto:secretariat@thegef.org) **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/council-meetings/gef-52nd-council-meeting>

**2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction:** This conference will focus on how to reduce loss of life and economic losses from disasters caused by manmade and natural hazards. The conference aims to encourage countries and others to go beyond disaster management to address risks that lead to greater losses from disasters, including poverty, unplanned urbanization, environmental degradation and poor risk governance. The GPDRR, which was established in 2007 and takes place every two years, provides the opportunity for exchanging information, discussing the latest developments and

knowledge, and building partnerships across sectors. **dates:** 22-26 May 2017 **location:** Cancun, Mexico **contact:** Connie Brown, UNISDR **phone:** +41-22-91-78908 or **contact:** Elena Dokhlik, UNISDR **phone:** +41-22-91-78861 **fax:** +41-22-91-78964 **email:** globalplatform@un.org **www:** <http://www.unisdr.org/conferences/2017/globalplatform/en>

**Second Lead Author Meeting for SR 15:** Organized by Working Group I (WGI), the Second Lead Author Meeting will develop the Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C and Related GHG Emission Pathways, the approval of which is planned for the IPCC-48 in September 2018. **dates:** 5-9 June 2017 **location:** Exeter, United Kingdom **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

**High-Level UN Conference to Support the Implementation of SDG 14 (UN Ocean Conference):** The high-level UN Conference to Support the Implementation of SDG 14 (Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development) will be co-hosted by the Governments of Fiji and Sweden, and will coincide with World Oceans Day 2017, on 8 June. The overarching theme of the Conference is "Our oceans, our future: partnering for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14." **dates:** 5-9 June 2017 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Permanent Missions of Fiji and Sweden **phone:** +1-212-687-4130 (Fiji); +1-212-583-2500 (Sweden) **www:** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/oceans/SDG14Conference>

**3rd European Climate Change Adaptation Conference:** The European Climate Change Adaptation Conference (ECCA) 2017 will be organized around the theme "Our Climate Ready Future." The Conference aims to inspire and enable people to work together to discover and deliver positive climate adaptation solutions that can strengthen society, revitalize local economies and enhance the environment. It will bring together representatives from business, industry, NGOs, local government and communities to share knowledge, ideas and experience with leading researchers and policymakers. On Thursday and Friday, excursions to showcase a range of inspiring adaptation projects and cultural sites across the region will be offered. **dates:** 5-9 June 2017 **location:** Glasgow, Scotland, UK **contact:** ECCA 2017 **www:** <http://ecca2017.eu/conference/>

**First Lead Author Meeting on the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:** This meeting will discuss the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories. **dates:** 7-14 June 2017 **location:** Bilbao, Spain **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

**G20 Summit:** The G20 Summit under the German Presidency will be held on 7-8 July in Hamburg, Germany. The 20 Heads of State and Government and top-level representatives of international organizations will gather under the theme: "Shaping an interconnected world." A main concern of the Presidency is to make progress on realizing the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on climate change. **dates:** 7-8 July 2017 **location:** Hamburg, Germany **www:** <https://www.g20.org/Webs/G20/EN/>

**Montreal Protocol OEWG 39:** The 39th Session of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer will be preceded by a workshop on safety standards relevant to the use of low-global warming potential alternatives to hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), to be held on 10 July, and the 58th meeting of the Implementation

Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol, to be held on 9 July. **dates:** 11-14 July 2017 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851/3611 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozone.info@unep.org **www:** <http://ozone.unep.org/en/meetings>

**46th Session of the IPCC:** The IPCC will meet to discuss, *inter alia*, the outcome from the AR6 scoping meeting, including the outlines for the AR6 WG reports, and the programme and budget. The 54th Session of the IPCC Bureau will meet prior to IPCC-46. **dates:** 6-10 September 2017 (TBC) **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

For additional meetings, see: <http://sdg.iisd.org/>

## GLOSSARY

AR5	Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC
AR6	Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC
ATF-TGICA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Task Force on the Future of the TGICA
ATG-Finance	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Task Group on the Financial Stability of the IPCC
COI	Conflict of Interest
COP	Conference of the Parties
ExComm	Executive Committee of the IPCC
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN
FiTT	Financial Task Team
GHG	Greenhouse gases
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SLCFs	Short-lived climate forcers
SPM	Summary for Policymakers
SR	Special report
SR15	Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C
SRCCCL	Climate Change and Land: A Special Report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems
SROCC	Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate
SSC	Scientific Steering Committee
SYR	Synthesis Report
TFI	Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
TGICA	Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impact and Climate Analysis
ToR	Terms of Reference
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNCCD	UN Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WG	Working Group
WMO	World Meteorological Organization