



**IPCC WGII
Fourth Assessment Report
Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability
*Government and Expert Review of Second Order Draft***

Specific Comments

EXPERT REVIEW COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Author responses – December 2006

Discussion of expert review comments and record keeping

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT:

- AUTHORS BEGIN WORK ON THE COMMENTS IMMEDIATELY. SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS NEED TO BE SEPARATED FROM NON-SUBSTANTIVE, AND THE TWO SHOULD BE TREATED DIFFERENTLY
- CONTACT IS MADE BETWEEN AUTHORS AND THEIR REVIEW EDITORS IN AUGUST

Substantive comments

- The chapter writing team should discuss all substantive expert review comments, by email and/or at Cape Town.
- Substantive comments require full and proper consideration. The *Principles Governing IPCC Work* state that:
 - genuine controversies should be reflected adequately in the text of the Report and
 - it is the role of the Review Editors to advise the lead authors on how to handle contentious/controversial issues
- You must record the outcome of these discussions in this document, under the column 'Notes of the Writing Team'.

Non-substantive comments

- For non-substantive comments, a very brief entry should be made in the column 'Notes of the Writing Team'. The following terms are acceptable:
 - Addressed
 - Not applicable
 - Text removed
 - A tick to denote a comment has been addressed (somewhere on the document this should be stated)

General

- The record should be kept in this document, ideally electronically.
- The document becomes part of the traceable account of the Working Group II Fourth Assessment. When completed to the satisfaction of the Review Editors, a copy should be returned to the TSU by the **8th December 2006**.

IPCC WGII AR4 SOD *EXPERT* Review Comments

Chapter-Comment	Batch	From Page	From Line	To Page	To line	Comments	Notes of the writing team
E-intro-1	A	0				As said the last year, I do not agree with some affirmations that are stated in the draft. As an example, it is not scientific to affirm that 'climate change can affect sustainability'. SUSTAINABILITY is an economical term and absolutely depends of the price of the product. Extraction of carbon or the sugar beet is sustainable merely according the price of the ton to sell and its relation to the costs of extraction or production. I do not see any relationship with climatic change; perhaps a warmer Planet could need less carbon! Or perhaps not.... (Juan F. Gallardo Lancho, CSIC)	In WGII sustainability has the same definition as 'sustainable development' which is: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". In this context our use of sustainability is correct.
E-intro-2	A	4	9	4	21	Although I am aware that the terms to describe confidence have been the subject of extensive discussions, I am somewhat troubled by the description used here. It seems odd to make 'major statements in the Technical Summary' (or anywhere for that matter) when the degree of confidence in the statement being correct is 5 or less (i.e. medium confidence to very low confidence). To make a 'major statement' and then assign medium confidence to it seems to be saying that the statement might be correct or it might be incorrect! Even more strange is to make a major statement and then assign a low or very low confidence to it, which seems to be saying that the major statement that was just made is probably incorrect (i.e. has just a 2 out of 10 or less than 1 out of 10 chance in being correct)! Perhaps I'm missing something, but I'd have thought this would give any climate change skeptic a wonderful opportunity to belittle much of what is said in these reports. I'd of thought that a major statement should only be a major statement when the authors are more confident that it is correct than incorrect. Perhaps I've totally misunderstood, in which case the text describing confidence levels might need to be explained more clearly. (Paul Beggs, Macquarie University)	The vast majority of statements (>80%) in the Technical Summary have a confidence rating of high and above. Medium confidence is valid for some major statements where the relationship between climate change and e.g., an impact is clear but modelling studies are few and therefore based on relatively few studies it would be inappropriate to assign a high confidence level.
E-intro-3	A	4	16	4	36	Do these descriptions of confidence and likelihood just apply to the Technical Summary (as stated in lines 18 and 26) or to the whole report? I would have thought it should be the latter. For example, the Executive Summary for each of the chapters also refers to confidence level. (Paul Beggs, Macquarie University)	This is correct; the confidence and likelihood descriptions apply to the whole report. Owing to an oversight this correction has not been made, but can be made before the publication of the report.
E-intro-4	A	6	6	6	11	(The same also in SPM, p. 21., line 8-13) The definition of Climate Change as a sum of natural and anthropogene causes is not consistent with up to present understand of Climate Change nature. The natural climate forming factors (astronomic, terrestrial and circulation) cause Climate Changes and Climate Variability existing there during the all Earth history. Climate Change is only the supplement caused by changing atmospheric greenhouse effect due to human activities. Future climate changes represent a sum of natural Climate Changes and	This is an IPCC definition

IPCC WGII AR4 SOD *EXPERT* Review Comments

Chapter- Comment	Batch	From Page	From Line	To Page	To line	Comments	Notes of the writing team
						anthropogenically induced Climate Change. The presented definition in SPM and INTRO is not acceptable for me and I think so that also for many climatologists. (Milan Lapin, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University)	