WMO

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

UNEP

IPCC WGII
Fourth Assessment Report
Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability

Government and Expert Review of Second Order Draft

Specific Comments

GOVERNMENT REVIEW COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Author responses - December 2006

Discussion of Government 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 Govt 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 *GOVERNMENT* Review Comments

Chapter-Comment	Batch	From Page	From Line	To Page	To line	Comments	Notes of the writing team
G-intro-1	A	0				This chapter might consider using a diagram such as Figure 11.1 to illustrate the scope of the report. (Government of Finland)	This was considered but not incorporated into the introduction
G-intro-2	A	2	13		19	Questions 1 and 4 are very similar. Please describe how they differ, and why they are both central questions. It would be best to rephrase them, so that their differences are clear. (Government of USA)	Text has been removed
G-intro-3	A	5	2		2	Table 1.2 (Country by Region for WG2 AR4). Europe listing does not include the State of Vatican City. Add it. (Government of USA)	Done