

## **Chairperson's Comments**

**R. Odingo**

## **CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS**

**Prof. R. Odingo**

IPCCWG3 Co-vice-chair

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will not read the rapporteur's report. It will be available in the published version. I would like to take the opportunity to say a few things which I have been itching to say, by way of summarizing. The session which I chaired had three papers, one by Prof. Weyant, who was the convener of the chapter of the Second Assessment on integrated assessment modeling; Professor Morita; and Professor Sathaye. Professor Weyant talked about the overview of recent research results of integrated assessment models, Professor Morita talked about the gaps between the models, particularly, and what the developing countries are doing. Finally, Professor Sathaye also talked about integrated assessment modeling in developing countries, and we had a very lively discussion, which I will not try to reproduce, although the rapporteur, Rosalyn Taplin from Australia has really made a very good job of it. I'll leave you to read that.

What I want to do in the five minutes I have been given is just to go back by way of summarizing, what we really think we have achieved. This meeting has been very important and there are questions that we need to ask ourselves, and all those that are doing integrated assessment models will have to ask themselves several questions. 'What is there to integrate?'

We will need to integrate, and first and foremost, to understand climate, the global climate. And there has been a lot done by the global modeling, GCMs, and so on. So we are getting somewhere as far as understanding where the global climate is concerned. We can use that material for integrating. But what I said at the opening of my session is that it is not a question of just lumping together different disciplines, but being able to communicate within and across disciplines. And so those that are going to use climate information in their models, really want to make quite sure that they understand the climate information that they are talking about, or are trying to integrate into their models. And they also are aware of the gaps. For example, within the IPCC we have realized that the GCMs only tell us part of the story, and you will be aware that the next stage of the work before the Third Assessment Report commences is to now move on to regional climate information; and even where possible, where you have a country as big as China, it is not enough just to talk about regional climate information, but even about national climate information.

And you will have noticed that the Chinese people, like the participant who has just spoken a few minutes ago, want to do their own modeling of the climate of China, because China is almost continental size. China and India need that kind of treatment. Therefore those who are going to do integrated assessment modeling are going to have to face that issue. That is, what have we learned from global climate modeling, what do we need, what information do we need from regional climate modeling and even from national climate modeling, before we go forward?

Secondly, on the issue of what in economics to put into the models. I am not an expert in this area, but I believe that there is a certain amount of confusion. There are those who love cost benefit analysis. There are those who realize that they need to put a lot of economics of decision-making and uncertainty into the model. And there is this whole problem of global versus regional economics. The OECD economics versus the rest of the world. And this area which is still problematic -- the economics of international trade. There is a lot that has to be sorted out before it is incorporated into the model.

As I sat there listening, quite often I was very keen to comment that: this model could be better if it had information on international trade and the problems of international trade.

Then there is this area which was rather well handled, not in my session, but in subsequent sessions, on the social and cultural issues. How to quantify them? How to quantify the liking for XYZ in country X? How do you quantify them? How do you quantify what Dr. Nishioka talked about? The politics of doing things by consensus. It is very difficult. And one needs to be very careful about how you approach it and how you put it into integrated assessment models.

The last point I want to raise is the issue of data problems. I think we agreed that when you do integrated assessment modeling you need inter-comparison of data, and you find that, as far as developing countries are concerned, there is a real shortage of some of the data which you need to put into this model. As we all know with computing what you put in is what you get. So if the data is inferior, you'll get inferior results. We need to be extremely careful about that.

And last but not least, how to interpret the models. Yesterday when I raised the issue, I was a bit uncomfortable with those who want to jump from the models straight to the decision makers, even before they have digested the models themselves. I think the modeling groups will have to be very careful to go stage by stage and to wait, even though they may be itching to give their results to the decision makers, to check and to cross-check that their models are really sensible before they go to the decision makers.

So how to interpret the models, first in the global, second in the regional, and third in the national context, is extremely important, and I hope that the last three days will not have been wasted if we remember how to take care of that.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.