

11 March 2008

ENGLISH/RUSSIAN ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Twenty-eighth session

Bonn, 4–13 June 2008

Item 12 of the provisional agenda

Cooperation with relevant international organizations

Views on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Submissions from Parties

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice, at its twenty-seventh session, invited Parties to submit, by 15 February 2008, their views on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change for compilation into a miscellaneous document.
2. The secretariat has received nine such submissions. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced* in the languages in which they were received and without formal editing.

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. CHINA (Submission received 22 February 2008).....	3
2. INDIA (Submission received 14 February 2008).....	5
3. INDONESIA (Submission received 14 February 2008).....	6
4. RUSSIAN FEDERATION (Submission received 21 February 2008).....	9
5. SAUDI ARABIA (Submission received 18 February 2008).....	12
6. SLOVENIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES* (Submission received 15 February 2008).....	14
7. SRI LANKA (Submission received 15 February 2008).....	17
8. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Submission received 16 February 2008).....	18
9. UZBEKISTAN (Submission received 15 February 2008).....	19

* This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine.

China's Views on IPCC Fourth Assessment Report

The 27th session of Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) invited Parties to submit to the Secretariat their views on the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Ref. FCCC/SBSTA/2007/L.20/Rev.1). China welcomes this opportunity and submits its views on this issue. China's views are as follows:

China welcomes the publication of AR4, appreciates the experts and participants of IPCC for their great efforts in preparing the AR4. China attaches great importance to government review in the preparation of IPCC reports. AR4 is a comprehensive assessment report based on the current understanding of climate change, which provides the international community with useful scientific information.

It should be highlighted that the AR4:

- Indicates that the historic accumulated emissions and the current high per capita emissions from developed countries are decisive for the global warming, and climate change has severe impacts on the sustainable development of developing countries;
- Requires the incorporation of response to climate change into sustainable development strategies with more emphasis on adaptation;
- Proposes to increase investment and technology transfer, and to promote the capacity-building in the developing countries to respond to climate change;

However, there are still a lot of inadequacies in the IPCC AR4, which include the following:

- Large uncertainties still remain in climate models and climate impacts, as well as implications of different GHGs stabilization levels for different sectors and regions, etc.;
- The emission reduction costs incurred to and barriers confronted by developing countries are underestimated, and the effectiveness of adaptation measures is insufficiently estimated;
- Most of the observational facts and data, and conclusions are from developed countries, and inadequacies exist in global representation of data and research;

- Like in the previous 3 assessment reports, in AR4 most of the research assessed came from developed countries, and the participation of scientists from the developing countries are far from sufficient, with even less research findings from these countries.

It is therefore suggested that the following areas be further strengthened:

- Contributions of nature factors and those of anthropogenic factors to the global change should be distinguished;
- Monitoring and simulation of climatic extremes;
- Impacts of regional climate change;
- Quantitative assessment on the economic costs of mitigation and adaptation, especially in the developing countries;
- While recognizing the urgency for taking mitigation and adaptation actions, more emphasis should be placed on the feasibility, long-term nature of measures and mechanism in response to climate change, and on demands for poverty alleviation, equity and development needs of developing countries;
- Enhanced incorporation of the scientific research findings from developing countries, and wider coverage of regional targeted research and assessment.
- IPCC should be encouraged to make assessment on climate change in longer time frames and across wider regions by integrating the conclusions from its previous 4 assessment reports;
- Greater supports to developing countries for their capacity building on research and study on climate change, including climate system observation.

PAPER NO. 2: INDIA

Government of India Submission on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

The Government of India takes this opportunity to express its appreciation to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate change for the Fourth Assessment Report and the Synthesis Report, which provides the latest assessment of scientific understanding of Climate Change, impacts, vulnerability and adaptation and mitigation of Climate Change. We note with concern that the information pertaining to impacts and vulnerability in the aforesaid assessment on projected Climate Change in developing countries is rather limited.

The IPCC should consider preparation of a special report on the published literature pertaining to developing countries region-wise e.g. Asia – South Asia, South-East Asia, Africa and so on. The limitations of the findings reported for the regions where inadequate information is available and uncertainties should be clearly recognized in the consideration of the issues pertaining to impacts and vulnerability to Climate Change. It is suggested that a special session in the workshop on impacts and vulnerability of developing countries to projected Climate Change should be included.

In so far as participation of IPCC experts in the proposed workshop in 2008 is concerned, adequate representation of developing countries' experts should be ensured. The workshop should aim at bringing out the information gaps in so far as it relates to the developing countries including recommendation how to fulfill the information gaps by collaborative research and systematic observations and studies. We believe that the proposed workshop can definitely contribute to exchange of relevant information among the parties. Further the workshop should also examine the gaps in availability of data and knowledge at the regional levels especially with reference to developing countries.

Indonesia's Submission Regarding Decision-/CP.13 on IPCC AR4 (Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

Overall Review

Indonesia considers IPCC AR4 as a useful document for national directive on climate related development. Indonesia encourages further compilation and publication of future Assessment Report of IPCC and to include more participation of scientists from developing countries and to include more examples of governmental policy from the developing countries. Although there is less examples of adaptive and mitigation measures from Indonesia, nonetheless, there are a lot of lessons from experiences of other countries that are useful for best practice of climate related issues on development planning and structure.

Public education and social awareness building are also critical issues for climate change. The future IPCC report better to include demographic awareness and problems in raising the public concern of this issue. Global awareness statistics is very helpful with this regards. Along with this awareness issue, statistics on how people change in their behavior and attitude with regards to climate change is also valuable. Other important issues are the governmental policy statistics and how adaptive the people toward the issue of climate change.

In some occasions, the use of terminology for probability, certainty level and significant level is ambiguous. Those terminologies should be transferred into more meaningful terms that are widely accepted in the laymen level.

Major issue related to the small island state and low lying countries include the carbon sink capability of the coastal area up to the ZEE point. Many small island state and low lying countries experience the impact of the sea level rise and they have no fund to adapt to the situation. One way to help is by including the calculation of their coastal sink for carbon from, mostly, biological processes. This includes the sea grass, coral reef and mangrove. Further nutrient enrichment will also multiply the ocean sink factor further. For the future IPCC report, calculations of marine biota as well as other possible carbon sink processes such as upwelling and ocean over turning will be important in the global carbon budget. The calculation will combine the work of Working Group I, II and III together on the issue of adaptation and mitigation processes.

Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis

Recognizing the important use of climate modeling for long term assessment of the impact of climate change for the past, present and future changes, the use of global climate model for atmosphere (AGCM) and for ocean (OGCM) has been widely accepted. However, for an archipelagic country such as Indonesia, the use of global climate models does not certainly apply quite well due to distribution of small islands. Those small islands are very important for the heat budget and tropical convective system. In fact, using global climate model in this part of the world would miss many of important features that mainly contribute to the small islands role. In IPCC AR4, the use of regional climate model has also been recognize and studied (Chapter 11). However, there are few studies on the results of the regional climate assessment for the maritime continent region that uses a regional climate model. For the future IPCC AR5, long term climate simulation will still use global climate model. IPCC shall encourage better regional representation of small island countries such as the maritime continent and, with regards to the advancement of computer capability, shall encourage a higher resolution global climate up to resolutions finer than half degree. With such a resolution, at least most of major islands from the maritime continent will be adequately represented.

Assessment in Chapter 8 on Climate models and their evaluation states the analyses on different time scale global phenomena such as decadal, interannual and intraseasonal phenomena. Although do not address comprehensively the impact upon the Maritime Continent, there are some important insight to start understanding the impact on the regional scale. However, in Chapter 3 on Observations:

Atmospheric Surface and Climate change, similar phenomena have not been addressed yet. It is important to discuss in similar fashion on both chapter especially on the regional impact of multi scale regional climate phenomena that occur and affecting the tropics.

Even for a large country such as Indonesia, the kind of information we required are still at district level or around 1000 km². The climate policy for each district level could differ greatly from one to the others. This small scale use of climate information is pretty much related to the scale of irrigation system at the similar level and groups of farmer. For the future IPCC report, we put high expectation on the experience from other parties (countries) on the use of climate information at global and regional level down to the district level. The best practice of similar experience in that sense will be highly valuable for us and other who has similar experience in assessing the result of IPCC climate model for their respective regions.

Regarding issue of biogeochemistry: the tropics shall receive the least increase of sea surface temperature. The impact of increase of sea surface temperature will increase the dilutive capability of carbon in the upper ocean, thus will increase the potency of ocean as carbon source not as carbon sink. Further assessment on the impact of temperature change on the marine carbon uptake is importance especially for the maritime continent that lies in the tropics, where the critical values is almost reached. Changing in marine biogeochemistry shall have impact on ocean pH or acidity and ocean conductivity. The impact of both on, especially the Indonesian throughflow will be important for future climate of the maritime continent.

The changing variability of the Indonesian throughflow due to the impact of climate change from the physical processes itself is not known yet. The throughflow is part of the global conveyor belt, which is important as the climate regulation of the whole globe. Knowledge of such a change will help to understand the future climate. For that purpose, a high resolution of ocean climate model is required to study adequately the impact of global climate change.

Working Group II: Impact, Adaptation and Vulnerability

On the Freshwater issue (Chapter 3), lot of examples has been described without references to certain countries or mentioned clearly from developed countries. Further impact of climate change especially on less fresh water shall have impact on biogeochemical composition of the fresh water. How resilience are the regions of the world to the changing biogeochemical composition after the impact of climate change? Further issue on freshwater include the virtual fresh water trade among countries and how the trade barrier are included in the process. Issues on river basin conflict among countries shall also be highlighted in the future assessment report.

When dealing with many issues of the adaptation strategy, we face with a question whether the impact of climate change is irreversible already and there is no turning back for the environment after few changes. In simpler sentence, is there a limit for environment due to climate change. This question may apply to many sector such as land use and cover change, agriculture impact on fresh water, coastal fishery due to heavy load of nutrient fluxes and health sector that is related to climate borne diseases. The future IPCC assessment report shall address more over this challenging issue in many part of the world.

Future IPCC report shall include variety of stories on implementations of many adaptation programs funded by multilateral fund. Success stories of such experience will help and encourage developing country in planning a better adaptation program through various sectors. Examples from the forestry and marine sectors will be highly valuable for the maritime continent. In fact there is less information on the adaptive program on marine fishery and marine transportation has been assessed. Furthermore, figure on how the distribution of adaptation program and fund during the last decade will important for future assistance. At last, the figure of global existing and projected carbon trading is interesting as well.

Working Group III: Mitigation of Climate Change

IPCC AR4 has many studies on the policy change and adaptation due to climate change impact on transportation, energy, household and related sectors (agriculture, industry, forestry and waste). In light of those findings, which are focuses mainly on developed countries and some developing countries, there is a need to encourage further contribution on similar experience from other developing and least developed countries. Country such as Indonesia has many experiences especially from sectoral problems to be shared in the future IPCC AR5. Important points from Indonesia include the policy in energy, forestry, agriculture and marine resource sectors.

On the policy instrument in climate mitigation there are several impact studies on CO₂ taxes to economic development in the developed countries. Similar implication of such a study at regional level is very much important and will help our assessment on similar policy implementation at national level. The policy instrument is expected to give incentive for private sector and could be used for higher income through cleaner and efficient production (Go green program). Transferring information on the private sector experience will be highly valuable for private company in the developing countries.

In the next IPCC report, new finding on man made carbon capture shall be emphasized to explain advance in carbon capture technology for point and diffuse sources. Many researches have reported progress on small scale carbon capture for use at small utility such as artificial tree, carbon capture bio reactor and ocean bio pumping. Although small in scale, for world wide use, this technology promises good use of a small scale carbon mitigation technology.

For the energy sector, expectation of changing energy supply shall include sharp decrease in demand due to sharp increase of energy price from fossil fuel and coals. In the meantime alternative energies become more competitive than ever. Changing in the global energy sector shall include such rapid change in the energy sector and how to adapt with new energy policy. The future challenge is to provide energy from food supply that is, seemingly, renewable. Impact of climate change on the battle of energy and food sectors becomes much more important in the future IPCC assessment report. Global outlook and adaptation strategy with examples from many countries will be very useful for developing countries, especially in highly populated countries.

ПРЕДСТАВЛЕНИЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ В ОТНОШЕНИИ ЧЕТВЕРТОГО ДОКЛАДА МГЭИК ОБ ОЦЕНКАХ

Российская Федерация, используя предоставленную возможность, направляет свои мнения в отношении Четвертого доклада МГЭИК об оценках.

Вышедший в свет в 2007 году Четвертый доклад МГЭИК об оценках (ДО-4) вызвал большой научный и общественный интерес. Характеризуя этот доклад в целом, следует отметить, что это - значительный успех МГЭИК, которая систематизировала и проанализировала весьма значительный объем новой информации.

В подготовке отчетов трех рабочих групп МГЭИК принимали участие более тысячи ученых различных специальностей, спектр рассмотренных в контексте изменения климата проблем очень широк.

Рабочая группа I в своей части ДО-4 указала, что наблюдаемые изменения климата в 20 и начале 21 века с большой степенью вероятности были вызваны двумя факторами – естественной изменчивостью климатической системы и антропогенным воздействием. Однако, наблюдаемое в 20 веке в среднем потепление на суше и в океане, т.е. на всех континентах кроме Антарктиды (вследствие недостаточного количества данных), не может быть удовлетворительно объяснено лишь естественными колебаниями климата. Таким образом, обнаружено наличие антропогенного сигнала в потеплении в глобальном и континентальном масштабах в 20 веке. В получении этого вывода решающую роль сыграли климатические данные, представляемые национальными гидрометеорологическими службами, и новые возможности их анализа, обусловленные улучшением качества математических моделей климата. Дополнительные данные наблюдений позволили расширить понимание об изменении климата и уменьшить многие неопределенности. Рабочая группа I впервые рассмотрела сценарии антропогенного воздействия на климатическую систему, связанные с определенными мерами по ограничению глобальных антропогенных эмиссий парниковых газов. Напомним, что ранее МГЭИК рассматривались лишь сценарии эмиссии, ассоциированные с различными путями развития мирового хозяйства без учета целевых мер по ограничению эмиссий.

Рабочая группа II впервые представила свидетельства того, что в физических и биологических системах наблюдаются изменения в том направлении, которое теоретически ожидалось при потеплении. Более чем в 89% случаев, направление наблюдаемых изменений оказались именно такими, какими они должны быть при потеплении. Весьма маловероятно, что эти изменения связаны лишь с естественной изменчивостью температуры или же параметров самих систем. Эти заключения были сделаны на основании анализа 29 000 рядов данных из 75 исследований. Глобальная оценка этих данных, характеризующих период с 1970 г., показала, что в наблюдаемых изменениях физических и биологических систем присутствует определенный антропогенный компонент. Следует специально

отметить главу 19 вклада Рабочей группы II ДО-4, в которой систематизирована информация о ключевых уязвимых элементах климатической системы, реакции которых на изменение климата могут быть использованы для определения предельно-допустимых уровней концентрации парниковых газов в атмосфере. Эта фундаментальная климатологическая проблема имеет важное прикладное значение в связи со статьей 2 РКИК ООН.

Однако, создается впечатление, что авторы связывают все наблюдаемые последствия изменения климата исключительно с антропогенным влиянием (забывая о естественной составляющей). В контексте проблем, рассматриваемых Рабочей группой II, этот вопрос может показаться несущественным, но лишь на первый взгляд. В действительности же очень важно разобраться в том, что же является первопричиной происходящих изменений природной среды, поскольку без этого невозможно понять, в какой степени мы можем на них воздействовать, а следовательно и предотвращать те или иные неблагоприятные последствия.

Кроме этого, по нашему мнению, баланс положительных и негативных последствий изменения климата в отчете Рабочей группы II явно нарушен. Нельзя безоговорочно согласиться с тезисом о том, что антропогенное потепление – абсолютное зло, с которым надо бороться. Многие положительные последствия, которые хорошо известны, уже имеют место и, вероятно, будут оставаться таковыми и в обозримом будущем. В ДО-4 они либо не указаны, либо упомянуты с комментариями о том, что с течением времени эти последствия утратят свой позитивный смысл. В качестве примера можно рассмотреть последствия изменения климата для России. Многие из них будут (и уже сейчас являются) крайне благоприятными. Среди них увеличение водных ресурсов, улучшение агроклиматического потенциала, сокращение затрат на отопление, уменьшение суровости климата с положительным влиянием на здоровье населения. Все это осталось за рамками ДО-4. Обращает на себя внимание то, что вклад Рабочей группы II не отражает двойственный характер прогнозируемых сезонных изменений речного стока, в зависимости от того, преобладает ли в речном бассейне круглогодичное дождевое питание, или же (как это имеет место на большинстве Российских реках) существует продолжительный зимний ледовый период, характеризующийся низким уровнем стока. В Резюме для политиков (вклад Рабочей группы II) говорится лишь о прогнозируемом уменьшении минимального стока рек с дождевым питанием, для которых минимум стока приходится на конец летнего периода. Вывод, следующий из этого утверждения, состоит в том, что усилится неравномерность распределения стока по сезонам, что будет иметь неблагоприятные последствия. Это справедливо лишь для рек умеренных и южных регионов, но не для большинства рек России, где минимальный сток, приходящийся на зимний период, значительно вырос за последние 20 лет и продолжает увеличиваться. Результатом является уменьшение сезонной изменчивости стока, что является благоприятным фактором. Создается впечатление, что нежелание признавать наличие положительных последствий в данном случае привело к явно

неверному и неполному, с точки зрения российских гидрологов, описанию процессов формирования стока.

Рабочая группа III в своей части доклада проанализировала возможности сокращения антропогенных эмиссий парниковых газов в атмосферу. В частности были рассмотрены некоторые сценарии сокращения выбросов парниковых газов, которые приводят к стабилизации их концентраций в атмосфере уже в XXI веке. Эти меры приводят к ограничению роста глобальной температуры с существенным запаздыванием по отношению к моменту стабилизации концентраций парниковых газов, а в полной мере процесс стабилизации температуры занимает несколько столетий. Эта часть ДО-4 имеет ряд недостатков:

- при расчетах траекторий концентраций парниковых газов и глобальной температуры при тех или иных программах ограничения эмиссий иногда использовались не модели, используемые Рабочей группой I, а упрощенные схемы вычислений;

- теоретические основы стоимостных оценок от реализации программ ограничения концентрации парниковых газов не совсем ясны;

- в ряде случаев при представлении прикладного материала, имеющего отношение к будущим мерам в рамках РКИК ООН по возможному дальнейшему ограничению антропогенных выбросов парниковых газов в атмосферу, Рабочая группа III формулирует свои заключения в «рекомендательной» форме, что не соответствует задачам и принципам работы МГЭИК. Следует подчеркнуть, что этот недостаток фигурирует в предварительных документах, в то время как в Синтезирующем докладе и Резюме для лиц, принимающих решения (тщательно рассмотренных на пленарных заседаниях МГЭИК) их нет.

На предстоящей 28-ой сессии МГЭИК будут обсуждаться вопросы будущего МГЭИК. Российская Федерация полагает целесообразным рекомендовать МГЭИК пересмотреть некоторые процедурные вопросы, касающиеся подготовки, принятия и дальнейшего распространения докладов МГЭИК. Каждый из материалов МГЭИК имеет вполне определенный самостоятельный статус, предназначенный для различного использования. В этой связи и во избежание разнообразной (в том числе противоречивой) интерпретации содержания и выводов докладов МГЭИК об оценках, представляется крайне важным разработать соответствующую официальную процедуру МГЭИК.

В целом, ДО-4 безусловно является очень полезным обзором современных исследований по многим аспектам климатических изменений. Ключевые неопределенности, обозначенные в нем, должны послужить толчком к развитию новых направлений мировой науки в области климата.

В заключение, хотелось бы с удовлетворением отметить активную работу российских ученых в качестве авторов ДО-4, в особенности, в Рабочих группах I и II.

PAPER NO. 5: SAUDI ARABIA

SUBMISSION BY SAUDI ARABIA

February 14, 2008

Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change

The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice, at its twenty seventh session, invited Parties to submit under document FCCC/SBSTA/2007/L.20/ Rev.1, paragraph 4, by 15 February 2008, their views on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change for compilation into a miscellaneous document.

VIEWS

In general, the Fourth Assessment Report provides assessment of the current level of understanding with most issues related to the science of climate change, impacts, vulnerability, adaptation, and mitigation.

The reports of Working Groups I, II, and III are comprehensive and cover all aspects related to climate change. However, it is our view that the work of the IPCC is becoming more selective in the sense that it is not providing the full reflection of the view in the literature.

The work of the IPCC can be policy relevant, but is not supposed to be policy descriptive. If different views on a particular issue are not represented and reflected accurately then the balance can shift one way or another and that can have substantial influence on the understanding that the reader can get. Such concerns are exacerbated when dealing with some of the critical documents produced like summaries for policy makers, which are significant documents for officials that need to make decision which are fully informed.

The Fourth Assessment Report makes a lot of expert judgments that are not fully explained by providing a traceable account of the steps used to arrive at estimates of uncertainty or confidence for key findings. It appears that there were tendencies for writing groups to converge on an expressed view and become overconfident in it.

Views in some cases appear to be anchored on previous versions or perceptions to a greater extent than is justified. There are some disappointing cases where the hard and authenticated work of lead authors, based on peer reviewed published papers, was discarded or changed because it did not support the views of coordinating lead authors or technical support units. Such actions have great consequences of reducing the integrity of the final outcome.

The Fourth Assessment Report is supposed to use neutral language and avoid value laden statements, (A10% chance of dying is interpreted more negatively than a 90% chance of surviving). However this general rule was not properly followed in the most sensitive parts of the report. For example “approximately 20-30% of species assessed so far are *likely* to be at increased risk of extinction”; this is a statement that made it to the summary for policy makers of the synthesis report, which is like the

summary of summaries, even though it is a *medium confidence* statement that is not neutral and have a negative interpretation. The summaries are full of other similar examples.

The summaries for policy makers sometimes break the balance that they are suppose to maintain in terms of the issues that are selected to go in the summaries and the length of their coverage. For example, there is a lengthy coverage of Ocean Acidification in the summary for policy makers of the synthesis report, even though the issue is not well studied and addressed in the report as a whole. On the other hand, there are other important findings that are well covered and documented in the underlying reports but never found their way to the summary reports.

CONCERNS

In July 2005, the IPCC issued very clear and specific “Guidance Notes for Lead Authors of the Fourth Assessment Report” on how to address critical and sensitive issues that are related to uncertainty, confidence, expert judgment, and the use of appropriate and neutral statements and calibrated language to describe the findings. Unfortunately, there are numerous places where these guidelines were not followed.

This fact had led some of the most important aspects of the report and in particular of the summaries to be drift from being scientific or impartial, and thus swaying away from the spirit of the IPCC being a scientific body. The summaries focused on the most alarming statements on the possible adverse impacts from climate change.

WAY FORWARD

SBSTA agenda item on IPCC should be closed. Issues related to IPCC may be considers, as appropriate, by all agenda items under SBSTA and SBI to further the implantation of the Convention and the Protocol.

PAPER NO. 6: SLOVENIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
AND ITS MEMBER STATES

**SUBMISSION BY SLOVENIA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN
COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES**

This submission is supported by Croatia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Ukraine and Turkey

Ljubljana, 14 February 2008

**Subject: Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
Views on the Fourth Assessment Report**

Slovenia, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, welcomes this opportunity to outline its views on the use of the IPCC in the work of the Convention and its related bodies.

1. Introduction

Decision -CP/13 firmly recognised the importance of the IPCC and its Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) for the work of the UNFCCC. Parties recognised that the AR4 *represents the most comprehensive and authoritative assessment of climate change to date*, and Parties were urged to *make use of the information contained in the Fourth Assessment Report in our discussions under all relevant agenda items, including those pertaining to the negotiations on future action on climate change*.

As agreed in Bali, it is essential for the Parties to make comprehensive use of the evidence in the AR4 related to the risks of climate change and the options for addressing them as presented in the AR4 and to ensure that such evidence is used to help the Parties in their deliberations under all aspects of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. We believe that such consideration will be greatly helped by the agreement to hold a workshop, which we suggest is best held earlier rather than later in 2008. We consider the workshop in more detail below.

2. Overall view of the AR4 – implications for action

There is now very clear evidence, presented in the AR4, that humankind is contributing to significant changes in the climate system and that such changes are already adversely affecting the natural world and human communities. It is also clear that, if we do not act to reduce emissions substantially and quickly, global temperatures will rise significantly during this century leading to widespread damage and disruption.

It is also clear from the IPCC that the current levels of commitment to emission reduction will do little to address the risks of climate change. We are pleased to note that the Bali Action Plan recognises the urgency and scale of the task, but it will be important to draw out from the IPCC the details of what is required to avoid dangerous climate change and how this might be achieved. We recognise that the window of opportunity for doing so is closing and that without comprehensive and concerted action we will be committing the world to a high-risk future.

The EU has consistently indicated that it will be necessary to keep the global temperature rise to below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels to avoid dangerous climate change. We believe that this is a limit that is strongly supported by the evidence in the AR4. To meet such a goal global, emissions will need to peak within the next 10-15 years and be reduced to very low levels, well below half of levels in 2000 by the middle of the twenty-first century. We would welcome a wide-ranging discussion on this issue at the workshop, including a consideration of the implications for mitigation actions and their feasibility as it would provide an essential background to our work under the Bali Action Plan.

The IPCC provides a wealth of data on how we can manage the risks of climate change through adaptation and mitigation. It will be important for the workshop to consider the implications for its work relative to these two issues, under the headings of technology, policies and measures, international agreements, and flexible mechanisms, with a view to understanding the opportunities and challenges that we face in addressing climate change.

3. Use of AR4 in the work of the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol

In Bali we agreed that the AR4 should be used as a platform for further political and analytic discussions under all the agenda items of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. We believe it is an important general principle to build the response to climate change on the evidence in AR4. It provides a rich and reliable source of material to guide our considerations on future action, setting of goals in the near and long term, developing processes to operationalise agreements, and improve methodologies and the knowledge-base.

In particular, we suggest that consideration of the following agenda items would benefit significantly from information from the AR4:

- Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWGLCA), considering a shared vision and short-term commitments and actions
- Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG)
- Review of the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to its Article 9
- Technology Cooperation, in particular the work of the EGTT
- Adaptation
- Reducing emissions from Deforestation
- Enhancement of sinks
- Treatment of HFCs
- Nairobi Work Programme
- Reporting and Monitoring
- Research and Systematic Observation
- Mitigation.

4. Expectation for the workshop

We would welcome a free and frank discussion on the implications of the IPCC AR4. We will all be generally familiar with the report's contents so little time will be required to review its main conclusions. The value of the workshop will come from open discussion between the Parties striving to step beyond the usual "presentation and Q+A" setting. We suggest that the workshop be organised to allow in-depth discussion on the following:

- a) A shared vision for future action, including long-term principles and stabilisation goals, of relevance to the Bali Action Plan;
- b) Opportunities for and limits to adaptation;
- c) Opportunities for and barriers to mitigation;
- d) Further work which the UNFCCC may require from the IPCC.

In terms of organisation of the workshop, we suggest that 2 days are set aside to allow for in-depth discussions and that an informal atmosphere conducive to open discussion should be sought. We would suggest that discussions should be arranged around facilitated break-out groups to maximise participation and that we should aim for practical conclusions, which can help the Parties in the consideration of the subject at COP 14. We would suggest that the AR4 lead authors play a full part to facilitate our discussions.

5. Conclusions

The EU believes this workshop provides a very useful opportunity to make sure that the AR4 is used fully to help the Parties in their considerations under the various UNFCCC bodies and look forward to a cordial and informative meeting with all Parties.

PAPER NO. 7: SRI LANKA

Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Views on the 4th Assessment Report (Reference FCCC/SBSTA/2007/L.20/Rev.1)

Sri Lanka agrees with the conclusions made by the Chair, SBSTA in the Fourth Assessment Report on IPCC.

We strongly support the request made by SBSTA to the Secretariat to have a workshop with the relevant experts. However, we would like to request SBSTA to consider holding not a single workshop, but several workshops on regional basis. Such Regional workshops will enable experts to concentrate on the issues and recommendations indicated in the AR4 under the region concerned.

We would like to request SBSTA and the Secretariat to establish a methodology to facilitate research and development in line with the AR4 recommendations.

PAPER NO. 8: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**Submission of the United States
FCCC/SBSTA/2008**

**Views on issues related to Agenda Item 7: Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental
Panel on Climate Change
15 February 2008**

The U.S. welcomes the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report and believes that it represents a significant advance in the state of understanding of the science and impacts of climate change. We encourage and expect the findings to be incorporated into the considerations of on-going SBSTA agenda items; we also look to IPCC reports to guide us as we consider the Bali Action Plan.

At COP-13, the SBSTA requested the Secretariat, under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA, to be prepared to organize a workshop—with the participation of IPCC experts and subject to availability of resources—to facilitate the exchange of information among Parties about the content of the AR4. The United States believes that it would be useful for such a workshop to focus on how countries might use relevant information provided by Working Group III in their consideration of low-cost mitigation activities. In particular, such a discussion could focus on the practical policies, measures, and instruments that the IPCC report found to be environmentally effective and cost effective. The workshop would allow for the facilitation of information and discussion in an informal setting.

Мнение Республики Узбекистан относительно Четвертого Оценочного Доклада

Четвертый оценочный доклад (ОД 4) - это продукт высокопрофессиональной экспертизы и тщательных усилий нескольких тысяч передовых ученых и рецензентов из более чем ста тридцати стран. Особое значение в ОД 4 было придано вопросам устойчивого развития и интегрированного подхода в оценке научных, технических и социально-экономических аспектов изменения климата.

Продолжая работу по оценке изменения климата с точки зрения естественных наук, начатую в прошлых оценочных докладах, Рабочая группа I (РГ I) в своем докладе раздвинула границы понимания происходящих процессов и дала возможность снизить некоторые неопределенности. Разработка ряда сценариев эмиссии была выделена в отдельную главу, послужившую основой для дальнейших оценок воздействия изменения климата и выработки мер реагирования Рабочими группами II и III. Признавая возрастающую важность осознания изменения климата, еще одна глава была специально посвящена пониманию и объяснению этого феномена. Инновационным элементом доклада РГ I явилась секция «Вопросы и Ответы», представившая популярное объяснение процессов изменения климата, экстремальных погодных явлений, палеоклимата, антропогенного вклада в изменение климата и т.д.

Доклад РГ II касался вопросов воздействия глобального потепления и путей снижения уязвимости к изменению климата и сопутствующих рисков. Наряду с кругом традиционно освящаемых вопросов, таких как методы оценки, сектора и регионы, в докладе РГ II были раскрыты темы регионального воздействия и адаптационных стратегий, а также устойчивого развития в его связи с мерами адаптации и смягчения. Кроме того, доклад рассмотрел четыре конкретных случая, затрагивающих все его главы и привлечших широкое внимание международной общественности, а именно воздействие тепловой волны в Европе в 2003 году, воздействие изменения климата на коралловые рифы, уязвимость мегадельт и компетентность стран в вопросах адаптации к изменению климата.

Доклад РГ III представил анализ затрат и эффективности различных мер по смягчению климата. Как никогда ранее, он затронул вопросы устойчивого развития, детально описав политику и инструменты смягчения изменения климата, а также рассмотрев смягчение с точки зрения межсекторального видения и увязав его с устойчивым развитием. Однако экономические оценки рассматриваемых мер смягчения оказались недостаточными, хотя интерес к данному вопросу был невиданно высок. По нашему мнению, это очень важная область вопросов, которую следует подробно рассмотреть в будущем, Пятом оценочном докладе.

Синтетический доклад ОД 4 также несет важную функцию, подытоживая выводы всех рабочих групп в форме ориентированного на политику документа. Являясь тридцати страничным конспектом ОД 4, Синтетический доклад передает основную сущность его содержания и, без сомнения, будет способствовать быстрому росту осознания и распространения научных знаний, повышению интереса политиков и ученых и внесет вклад в формирование понимания широкой публикой причинно-следственных связей изменения климата.

В целом можно сказать, что ОД 4 уделил огромное внимание интеграции устойчивого развития и взаимосвязи между смягчением и адаптацией. Особое значение было придано региональному развитию, вопросам неопределенности и риска, технологиям, а также связи изменения климата и воды. Объединенные усилия ученых представили правительствам стран основу для разработки мер, касающихся борьбы с изменением климата. Еще одним немаловажным достижением Четвертого оценочного доклада стало четкое подтверждение прямой взаимосвязи между человеческой деятельностью и потеплением климатической системы Земли.

(TRANSLATION AS SUBMITTED)

Views of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the Fourth Assessment Report

The Fourth Assessment Report is a product of highly professional expertise, careful efforts and diligence of several thousand world leading scientists and reviewers from over 130 countries. The very high recognition of the AR4 was granted to the issues of sustainable development and integrated approach to assessment of scientific, technical and socio-economical aspects of climate change.

Following on from the previous Working Group I assessments, the report of the AR4 on physical science of climate change has broadened the understanding of the current processes and enabled reduction of many uncertainties. The development of a range of emission scenarios was specified in a separate chapter, providing a basis for further assessment of climate change effects and development of responding options by the Working Groups II and III. Recognizing the incremental importance of climate change awareness another special chapter was dedicated to understanding and attributing of climate change. An innovation element of the report - the Frequently Asked Questions section has presented popular explanations on climate change processes, extreme events, paleoclimate, anthropogenic contribution to climate change, etc.

The Working Group II report described the impact of global warming and the ways to reduce vulnerability to, and risks of climate change. Along with the traditionally established topics, such as new assessment methods, sectors and regions, it paid a special attention to regional impacts and adaptation strategies, as well as sustainable development and its interrelation with adaptation and mitigation options. The report also considered four cross-chapter case studies, namely the impact of the European 2003 heatwave, climate change impact on coral reefs, vulnerability of megadeltas and indigenous knowledge for adaptation to climate change, which are of high international importance and interest.

The Working Group III report presented cost-benefit analysis of different options to mitigate climate change. It also addressed the sustainable development more than ever before: described in detail the policies and instruments for climate change mitigation, considered mitigation from a cross-sectoral perspective and connected climate change mitigation with the sustainable development. However, the economic assessment of the mitigation options seemed to be not quite sufficient, while the interest to these issues was unprecedented. This, in our judgment, is an important area that should be addressed in details in the Fifth Assessment Report.

The Synthesis Report plays the very important role, summarizing conclusions of all Working Groups and compiling them as a policy relevant document. Being a 30-page compendium it provides the essence of the AR4 content and would for sure facilitate the rapid increase of awareness and expansion of scientific knowledge, enhance the interest of policy makers and scientists and contribute to formation of understanding of climate change cause-effect relations by the general public.

The Fourth Assessment Report, in general, paid a great attention to the integration of climate change with sustainable development and the inter-relationships between mitigation and adaptation. Specific attention was given to regional issues, uncertainty and risk, technology, climate change and water. The consolidated efforts of scientists provided a basis for governments to consider their option for moving forward in addressing the challenge of climate change. Another main achievement of the Fourth Assessment Report was an unequivocal confirmation that the warming of the Earth climate system is directly linked to human activity.