



Outcomes document: Eighth call of the Ad hoc Global Assessment Dialogue

On 26th May 2022 the participants of the Ad hoc Global Assessment Dialogue (AGAD) met to discuss the following agenda:

1. Discussion on the concept note on modelling practices across assessments and next steps
2. Potential for synergies in harmonizing peer review processes, including a presentation of the Review Editors Analytical Database (READ) tool built for GEO-6, and its evolution
3. AOB

On these agenda items the participants decided:

- To create an AGAD subgroup formed by modelling and scenarios specialists to explore potential collaboration in this area and produce a modelling and scenario paper, guided by the concept note prepared by UNEP;
- To invite CEDARE to the next meeting to continue the discussion on digitalization of peer-review processes;
- GEO team to circulate an email on a potential hybrid meeting of the AGAD on the side of COP27 and the possibility of organizing a side event at COP27 to inform Member States of the AGAD's work.

Meeting summary

1. Round of introductions
 - Since in every call there are new participants, it was decided to add an agenda item on introductions for future AGAD meetings.
2. Discussion on the concept note on modelling practices across assessments and next steps
 - The GEO team presented the modelling and scenarios concept note, the importance of discussing how to build collaboration in the area of scenarios and modelling practices, and then asked some questions to the AGAD about how we could create these synergies.
 - The participants are invited to provide further comments or questions on the concept note.
 - The AGAD participants provided an overview of their current work on scenarios and models.
 - a. IPCC:

- IPCC highlighted the importance of the work from CMIP6 which is the domain of Working Group (WG) 1. However, there is also heavy use of scenarios and modelling in WG3 through their integrated assessment models.
 - IPCC plenary made an active decision to not create its own scenarios and models, but instead assess scenarios and models produced by the scientific community.
 - From the WG3 domain, an organization called the Integrated Assessment Modelling Consortium (IAMC) was created to pursue scientific understanding of issues associated with integrated assessment modelling and analysis.
 - Regarding the sharing of information, IPCC has a task group called Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments (TG-Data) that has adopted four principles, namely: findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reuse of digital data. These are now being applied to all the Summaries for Policymakers and some of the Technical Summaries to make sure all the data is available. For example, all CMIP6 data is downloadable as well as a database of 1200 scenarios from the integrated assessment models collected by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). In addition, the latest WG3 report included an annex on the scenario and modelling methodology which helped to educate fellow modellers and policymakers.
 - During the next assessment cycle, a research community called the International Committee of New Integrated Climate Change Assessment Scenarios (ICONICS), is organizing a meeting at the International Institute for Applied System Analysis (IIASA) in the 3rd week of June to discuss how they would share or enhance knowledge transmission of the shared socioeconomic pathways (SSPs).
 - There is little appetite from this community to work outside SSP2 (middle-of-the-road scenarios). SSP2 accounted for 97% of their focus.
 - The IPCC scenario experts have agreed to address two issues in a future meeting to be held on scenarios which would take place in the first quarter of next year:
 - 1) The architecture of the scenarios that IPCC might use in the next cycle. Currently, the architecture of scenarios is far too difficult for policymakers to understand.
 - 2) To improve the understanding of modellers of who they work for (for IPCC or their research projects)
 - It was suggested that from each of the assessment bodies participating in the AGAD, at least one expert should attend the IPCC expert meeting, taking place next year.
- b. IPBES:
- IPBES's task force on scenario and modelling focuses on catalysing development on nature sensing and multiscale scenarios.
 - The IPBES's task force mainly works on quantitative scenarios to support their assessments taking biodiversity into account (while most scenarios focus mainly on climate).
 - This Task Force resulted in the development of the Nature Futures Framework (NFF) which is a tool for developing positive scenarios. This framework helped to recognize the multitude of perspectives and world views on how we relate to nature. It also helped to include social variables such as indigenous knowledge. This framework is not making scenarios itself but is defining a framework of what needs to be taken into account.

c. IRP

- IRP's assessment body's situation is different from IPCC's as there are no models outside IRP that look at the use of natural resources and projections into the future.
- Both OECD and IRP reports first made projections for the material demand of the global economy until 2060. To bridge that gap, IRP decided to create a multimodel framework. Since then, they have extended the groups of modellers within this framework to include a multi-sector, multi-region economic model with a lot of technology detail in energy and heavy industry sectors, while integrating the GLOBIOM model (Global Biosphere Management Model) of IIASA, and the IMAGE framework.
- IRP is looking at how they can model acid-rich infrastructure systems using stock-and-flow model approaches which are technology-based.

There are similarities and overlap across the different global assessment bodies (IPCC, IPBES, IRP) which also include IMAGE, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), and IIASA modelling groups. While there are different scenarios storylines, the underlying modelling structure is one and the same across the different assessments. This is the same for UNCCD, which is using the IMAGE modelling framework.

This shows that most groups are using similar modelling teams, following consistent storylines, and focusing on one basic baseline scenario (SSP2).

With the upcoming GRO, IRP will be next in line for producing more comprehensive scenarios which may provide an update on what was delivered by IPCC's AR6 and from recent reports from IPBES.

d. WWQA

- The World Water Quality Alliance have recently begun working on their water quality models.
 - Regarding scenarios, they have adopted and work from IPCC's shared socioeconomic pathways (SSP) storylines. Particularly they work under SSP1, 2 and 5 (Sustainable development, middle-of-the-road development, and fossil fuel development), and have labelled them as 'light' scenarios. Given the WWQA's early stages, they look forward to working on more comprehensive scenarios when further funding is available.
 - While using these pathways, they have quantified their own data for inputs, such as sanitation. Additionally, they also use much of the IMAGE model outputs for agriculture.
- UNEP proposed to the AGAD the possibility of creating a specialized working subgroup to identify modelling and scenario commonalities to improve data sharing, optimize investment, improve available 'live' information, enhance communication and improve knowledge transmission of scenarios and modelling. This would mean focal points would need to be identified who are responsible for modelling and scenario development of each assessment to participate in subgroup meetings.

3. The meeting proceeded with a presentation on the potential for synergies in harmonizing peer review processes, including a presentation of the Review Editors Analytical Databased (READ) tool built for GEO-6 and its evolution
 - Colleagues from the Center For Environment & Development For The Arab Region & Europe (CEDARE) presented the READ tool which was used for GEO-6 and the plans to update it to support the GEO-7 process.
 - The aim is to digitize the role of reviewers, review editors and moderators.
 - It was pointed out that it is important to ensure that reviewers should refer to line numbers and not only pages when providing their review comments.
 - The presentation and additional info prepared by the CEDARE colleagues can be found [here](#).
 - It was decided that, in the next AGAD meeting, an agenda item will be dedicated to continuing the discussion on the READ and peer-review processes.

4. AOB: possible face to face meeting in COP 27
 - The GEO team will share a proposal for a potential COP 27 side event focused on the role of AGAD in strengthening the science-policy interface.
 - There may also be a possibility for an in-person/hybrid meeting of the AGAD, since many participants may already be in Egypt during that time.

Participants

CBD	
Kieran Mooney	Secretariat
CEDARE	
Ahmed Abdelrehim	Regional Programme Manager
Mayar Sabet	Regional Programme Specialist
GEO	
Pierre Henri Boileau	Head, GEO programme
Franklin Odhiambo	GEO team
Adele Roccato	GEO team
Ignacio Sanchez Diaz	GEO team
Sharif Shawky	GEO team
Human Development Report	
Eduardo Calvo	Human Development Report Secretariat (UNDP)
Heriberto Tapia	Human Development Report Secretariat (UNDP)
IPBES	
Marie Stenseke	MEP Co-chair
IPCC	
Jim Skea	Co-Chair of Working Group III
IRP/Global Resources Outlook (GRO)	
Rebecca Nohl	Representing Janez Potočnik
Beatriz Vidal	EEA – GRO 2023
Michael Obersteiner	Environmental Change Institute at Oxford University
Heinz Schandl	CSIRO, Australia’s National Science Agency
UNCCD/GLO	
Anna Luise	UNCCD Science Policy interface
UNEP Making Peace with Nature Report	
Rachel Kosse	UNEP Secretariat
UNEP GWMO	
Monika MacDevette	UNEP Secretariat

World Water Quality Alliance (WWQA)	
Nina Raasakka	Coordinator of the WWQA
Nynke Hofstra	Wageningen University

Apologies

GCO II	
Tessa Goverse	Chemicals, Waste and Air Quality Programme Coordinator at UNEP
CBD	
Jillian Campbell	Head of Monitoring, Review and Reporting at UN CBD
David Cooper	Deputy Executive Secretary
GSDR	
Stephanie Rambler	GSDR Coordinator
Imme Scholtz	GSDR 2023 Co-Chair
John Agard	GSDR 2023 Co-Chair
GWMO II	
Daniel Ternald	Coordinator of the GWMO
Aditi Ramola	ISWA - Co-Chair
IPBES	
Anne Larigauderie	Executive Secretary
Simone Schiele	Head of Work Programme, IPBES secretariat
IPCC	
Ermira Fida	Deputy Secretary
Andrej Mehecic	Head of Comms and Media relationship
Valérie Masson-Delmotte	Co-Chair of Working Group I
Hans-Otto Pörtner	Co-Chair of Working Group II
Debra Roberts	Co-Chair of Working Group II
Priyadarshi Shukla	Co-Chair of Working Group III
Kiyoto Tanabe	Co-Chair of the TFI
Panmao Zhai	Co-Chair of Working Group I
IRP /Global Resources Outlook (GRO)	
Ainhoa Carpintero	
Rogero	GRO Secretariat
Peder Jensen	Lead Author of GRO
Rebecca Nohl	SistemiQ
Hala Razian	GRO Secretariat
Janez Potocnik	Co-chair of the GRO
Merlyn Van Voore	Head of Secretariat
Beatriz Vidal	Lead Author
Human Development Report	
Pedro Conceicao	Director, Human Development Report Office
Science-Policy Panel on Sound Management Chemical and Waste	
Kevin Helps	Coordinator
UNCCD/GLO	
Sasha Alexander	Head, Global Land Outlook
Nicole Barger	UNCCD Science-policy interface co-chair
Barron Joseph Orr	Lead Scientist, UNCCD
Graham Von Maltitz	UNCCD Science-Policy interface
UNEP's Chief Scientist Office	
Jason Jabbour	Chief Scientist Office