



**IPCC Synthesis Report  
Fourth Assessment Report**

***Comments on the Final Government Draft***

**GOVERNMENT and ORGANIZATION COMMENTS  
– INTRODUCTION (all batches to 7 November 2007) –**

**November 7, 2007**



# INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE



**IPCC Synthesis Report - Fourth Assessment Report (Batch A and B – November 7, 2007)**

Topic - Batch - Comment	Page	Line	To Page	To Line	Comment
Intro-A -1	0	0			The introduction is well-written and concise. (Government of Argentina)
Intro-A -2	1	1	3	32	In keeping with the U.S. Government general comment on how the SPM will be read as a standalone document, move the discussion about uncertainties and their definitions to an SPM annex (presumably exempt from the IPCC page count algorithm as are the figures and tables). Use the recovered Introduction space to provide brief, general information for the uninitiated reader about what the 4AR is and how the WGs are structured and the focus for each. Then, as called for in the Plenary Approved Outline (PAO), “set the context in terms of issues of relevance to policy, taking into account robust new findings and mentioning major gaps in existing knowledge” and to “highlight new findings since the TAR and uncertainties.” The current introduction does not provide the framework for the synthesis report as specified in the PAO. (Government of United States of America)
Intro-A -3	1	7	1	7	Rewrite line “relationships between ... effect.....other ” as ....., its range of probable effect.....” (Government of India)
Intro-A -4	1	9	1	18	Maybe clearer presented as bullet points for each topic (International Energy Agency)
Intro-A -5	1	10	1	10	Minor editorial comment: Topic; the "t" in capital letter (Government of Spain)
Intro-A -6	1	13	1	13	Rewrite “topics.... effects on..” as likely effects on (Government of India)
Intro-A -7	1	19	1	19	Rewrite “A major ....of impacts ....As likely impacts (Government of India)
Intro-A -8	2	1	2	1	Figure. Suggestion: Exchange "socio-cultural ideals" for "socio-cultural preferences" (Government of Sweden)
Intro-A -9	2	1			Figure I.1: bottom box in the middle: may 'Socio-cultural ideals' be replaced by 'Socio-cultural goals'? (Government of Belgium)
Intro-A -10	2	1			Fig I.1 Ocean acidification missing from the climate change box. (Government of United Kingdom)
Intro-A -11	2	2			Figure I.1. This looks like a new version of Figure SPM-1 of the SPM of the TAR Synthesis Report. I liked that figure a lot, but I do not like Figure I.1. The main reason is that the different boxes are connected by too many lines. The message seems to be that "everything is connected to everything else", which is somehow an obvious message that doesn't tell one much. Moreover, why aren't the boxes on Mitigation and Adaptation part of the "Socio-economic development" box? In other words, the old TAR Figure SPM-1 identified fluxes and highlighted important information, whereas the new Figure I.1 makes no choice about what the important cause-effect connections are and ends up being rather poor of significance. I

**IPCC Synthesis Report - Fourth Assessment Report (Batch A and B – November 7, 2007)**

Topic - Batch - Comment	Page	Line	To Page	To Line	Comment
					would like to point at Figure 1 on page xxii of the new GEO4 of the UNEP ( <a href="http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/index.asp">http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/index.asp</a> ) for a possible alternative graphical approach to the same issues. (Government of Switzerland)
Intro-A -12	2	11	2	11	Add the following text “ a diversity of approaches to deal with uncertainty... (Government of India)
Intro-A -13	3	9	3	13	Delete text “; low confidence about 2 out of 10; and very low confidence less than 1 out of 10”. The categories "low confidence" and "very low confidence" are neither applied in any of the statements throughout the synthesis report, nor seem the given definitions to be scientifically meaningful. If there is a "chance of a finding being correct" is only "1 out of 10", then there is a 90% confidence in the inverse being true. (Government of Germany)
Intro-A -14	3	9	3	13	Confidence level' should (is) also be based on 'statistical analysis' as in line 15, same page. (Government of Switzerland)
Intro-A -15	3	11	3	13	for enhanced clarity add "- xxx out of yyy cases", e.g "very high confidence - at least 9 out of 10 cases" etc. (Government of Germany)
Intro-A -16	3	11	3	13	Need to clarify what is meant by the scale of confidence levels since it is not a probability as a ‘# out of 10’ but a ranking as a ‘# on a scale of 1 to 10’: very high confidence at least 9 on a scale of 1 to 10; high confidence about 8 on a scale of 1 to 10; medium confidence on a scale of 1 to 10; low confidence about 2 on a scale of 1 to 10; and very low confidence less than 1 on a scale of 1 to 10. (Government of United States of America)
Intro-A -17	3	22	3	23	I suppose, by 'likelihood' one means 'P-values' (or 'level of significance'), used in 'hypothesis testing' whereas 'confidence' is as in 'confidence intervals'. Actually, these are related to each other. Lines 22-23 are not clear. (Government of Switzerland)
Intro-A -18	3	31	3	31	It would be more accurate to say that 5% of the values lie below the interval and 5% above it, if this is the case (see footnote 1). (Government of France)