**WG III AR6 SUMMARY FOR POLICYMAKERS**

**TSU DRAFT 5 JUNE 2020 - EXPLANATORY NOTES**

Following the WG III CLA/Bureau meeting held on 13 May 2020, the WG III Technical Support Unit (TSU) has been working on a revised version of the Summary for Policymakers (SPM), attempting to craft an overall SPM narrative that builds on the views expressed at the meeting. The WG III Co-chairs and Andy Reisinger, one of the WG III Vice-chairs, have participated in this process. The resulting document is attached. The purpose of this note is: a) to set out what the TSU was trying to achieve; b) to explain the intended narrative and contribution of the individual sections; and c) to identify next steps, which will be CLA/chapter led.

**The Aim of the SPM Revision**

The principal aim was to create a document which, however incomplete, looked and felt like an IPCC SPM. We wanted to create a sense that the train has now left the station and that we are working towards a product that we would be proud to send to governments. We are sending you a clean document organised in the intended format, broken down into bolded headline statements followed by a set of sub-statements. The draft follows the overall structure previously agreed, though some topics (e.g. feasibility, just transition) have been moved between sections.

These are the changes that the TSU has made:

1. It has as far as possible included the statements previously offered by chapters or extracted from chapter executive summaries, but these have been amalgamated in some cases to eliminate overlap and in a very few cases dropped if they are tangential to the narrative.
2. Some generic statements that lacked specificity have been removed.
3. The statements have been re-organised to fit the narrative.
4. Some judgements have been made as to whether statements previously offered by chapters are high-level statements or next level sub-statements.
5. Some text editing has taken place, focusing on clarity of message and the elimination of more obvious policy prescription.
6. Some headline statements have been drafted from scratch based on chapter material where the offered statements were more of a “sub-statement” nature.
7. Some placeholder statements have been added to fill out the narrative.
8. Where the inclusion of “exhibits” (tables/figures) is “obvious”, we have included figures from FOD chapters. Otherwise we have put in placeholders.
9. A lead chapter to take each headline statement (and the associated sub-statements) through to the next stage has been identified.
10. Placeholders have been added for confidence statements - currently this is a gap and we hope to make progress on this during the next iteration.

In addition, each section is preceded by brief explanatory text - for our own internal purposes as an author team. The italicised text summarises the content; the normal text explains the content and the narrative flow.

**SPM NARRATIVE**

The overall flow of the SPM does not follow the chapter structure of the report nor is it structured around sectors/systems. This means that sectors and topics may appear at more than one point in the SPM depending on whether the perspective is retrospective (Section B), or prospective (C/D/E). The prospective view may also depend on whether response options are being considered in a techno-economic sense (Section C) or in the sense of the policies, institutions and social context that will enable the options to be implemented (Section E). An SPM must be a tightly drafted document. This means that there is no opportunity to introduce a topic briefly and then follow up with more details in later sections

**FORMAT OF THE SPM**

Length matters. An SPM that starts out at 9000 words could take 50-60 hours to agree with governments. So every extra 100 words adds 40 minutes to the approval session. Complex figures take a long time to approve and governments have explicitly and forcefully expressed their dislike of them in a recent IPCC plenary. WG III has no precedent for including “conceptual” figures in its SPMs, though these do appear in Chapters and Technical Summaries.

It will be helpful if policy prescriptive language, often non-intended, can be avoided. Usually, a policy-prescriptive statement can be re-formulated to make it factual, often by using “if-then” type language. A short Annex shows three examples of possible re-drafting.

All statements will require a confidence level statement which may apply to an individual sentence, or to an entire paragraph whichever is appropriate. Placeholder statements - (*xxx confidence*) - have been added as a reminder. All headline statements and sub-statements will need a line of sight back to the chapter sections - e.g. {3.4; 5.6; 9.8} by the time we submit.

We are aiming for an SPM that has about 9,000 words (10 IPCC pages) and up to 10 exhibits. Each headline statement should ideally have 2-5 sub-statements associated with it. Guideline length would be 75-150 words for headline and 50-100 for sub-statements. On average, a headline statement plus associated sub-statements could run to 300 words giving space for ~30 headline statements in all. The following table shows how the current draft measures up against these guidelines.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Headline statements** | **Sub-statements** | **Words** | **Exhibits** |
| 1. Introduction | N/A | N/A | 390 | 0 |
| 1. Where we are now | 8 | 38 | 2299 | 5 |
| 1. System transformations | 12 | 49 | 3638 | 3 |
| 1. Adaptation and SD | 4 | 22 | 1393 | 1 |
| 1. Strengthening the response | 5 | 27 | 1496 | 2 |
| **TOTAL** | **29** | **136** | **9216** | **11** |

**NEXT STEPS**

At this point, the TSU would like to hand the text back to the chapters for the next iteration. We have proposed a chapter to manage each headline statement with input from other chapters to deal with sub-statements as necessary. We would like each chapter to check whether they are comfortable with their allocations and inform us quickly if not.

We would ask chapters to work on the statements they have been assigned, aligning them with chapter content, refining language and making provisional assessments of confidence level and line-of-sight to underlying chapters. The current TSU draft shows the format. We recommend that authors follow the overall narrative of the draft SPM but acknowledge that some alterations may be necessary.

We hope to get some revised text by 22 June so that the TSU can re-compile a full text for consideration at the next CLA/Bureau meeting in early July. This is one step forward in an iterative process. Further stages will still be needed as chapters mature. From July onwards, we should devote greater attention to detailed drafting and choice of words.

**Annex: Suggestions on how to deal with policy prescription**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Before** | **After** |
| “Transitions towards a low carbon future will need to just and fair so that action do not exacerbate national and international inequalities.” | “Transitions towards a low carbon future that are consistent with principles of justice and equity do not exacerbate inequalities at the national or international level” |
| “Appropriate frameworks are needed to weigh the choices available and must take account of strong sectoral and regional differences, and take account of issues including equity and governance on appropriate scales” | “Frameworks for weighing available choices can take account of strong sectoral and regional differences, as well as equity and governance”  *Appropriate is a meaningless word; no-one advocates using an inappropriate framework* |
| “In order to close the emissions gap of more than xx GtCO2 by 2030, renewable energy supply needs to be scaled up by a factor of yy-yy compared to today” | “In pathways that close the emissions gap of more than xx GtCO2 by 2030, renewable energy supply is scaled up by a factor of yy-yy compared to today” |