

Our ref.: 5347-14/IPCC/AR5

Annex(es): 1

To designated IPCC Focal Points and
Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs)
(if no focal point has been designated)

COPY

Geneva, 27 November 2014

Sir/Madam,

I wish to bring to your attention to two errors found in the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) of the Working Group I (WGI) Contribution to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, *Climate Change 2014: The Physical Science Basis*. These were discovered after approval and acceptance of the Synthesis Report the 40th Session of the IPCC in Copenhagen, October 2014.

The errors, which require correction, are listed in **Annex 1** to this letter.

Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work, ANNEX 3 - *IPCC Protocol for addressing possible errors in the IPCC Assessment reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports and Methodology Reports* (referred to below as "Error Protocol"), lays down the procedures to address alleged errors in the SPM of a Working Group Contribution (see Error Protocol Section 2, Step 5A). If Co-chairs and relevant Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) agree that there is an error, they construct an error statement and submit to the WG Bureau for approval. The Co-Chairs of WGI have informed us that this step has been concluded.

The Error Protocol further stipulates: "*Following WG or TF Bureau approval, the proposed erratum is submitted to the Panel for approval. To allow for rapid response, the Panel may delegate this approval step to the Executive Committee, which can decide that the erratum be posted on the IPCC and WG or TF websites, or can decide to defer to the next session of the IPCC Bureau or of the Panel.*"

The immediate correction of the errors described in Annex 1 would be highly desirable before the Twentieth Session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UNFCCC in Lima (1-12 December 2014). Consistent with the Error Protocol, we suggest using the option foreseen for rapid response and in particular to submit the corrigendum, as constructed by the WGI Co-Chairs and CLAs and approved by the WGI Bureau, to the IPCC Executive Committee for approval.

The SPM in its final form including copyedits and the correction of these errors would be made available for download from the WGI and IPCC web sites together with a notice in the form of an erratum stating that the errors have been corrected.

I sincerely hope that you agree with the proposed way forward, which will enable us to distribute a fully accurate version of the WGI SPM. Unless we hear any objections by **Tuesday 2 December 2014, 10:00 a.m.** CET Geneva time, we will proceed as suggested.

A copy of this letter is being sent for information to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Permanent Representatives from your country to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'R Christ', is positioned below the closing 'Yours sincerely,'.

(Renate Christ)
Secretary of the IPCC

WGI ERRATA (21 Novembre 2014)**WGI Summary for Policymakers (SPM)**

In the text below, red highlights the two corrections the text to be corrected, yellow marks the corrected text.

1. WGI SPM Section E.1, Bullet 4.

In the SPM, the conclusion that warming is “*more likely than not* to exceed 2°C for RCP4.5” is given “*high confidence*”. The level of confidence, however, should be given as “*medium confidence*”, consistent with the underlying Chapter 12 assessment and the Technical Summary.

E.1 Bullet 4 Approved/Published:

- Warming is *likely* to exceed 2°C for RCP6.0 and RCP8.5 (*high confidence*), *more likely than not* to exceed 2°C for RCP4.5 (*high confidence*), but *unlikely* to exceed 2°C for RCP2.6 (*medium confidence*).

E.1 Bullet 4 Corrected:

- Warming is *likely* to exceed 2°C for RCP6.0 and RCP8.5 (*high confidence*), *more likely than not* to exceed 2°C for RCP4.5 (*medium confidence*), but *unlikely* to exceed 2°C for RCP2.6 (*medium confidence*).

2. WGI SPM Section E.8, Bullet 6

The conclusions regarding long-term sea level rise need to be clarified to avoid misinterpretation of the GHG levels (in CO₂-equivalent rather than CO₂) and the relation to the RCP8.5.

E.8 Bullet 6 Approved/Published:

- For a radiative forcing that corresponds to a CO₂ concentration that is above 700 ppm but below 1500 ppm, as in the scenario RCP8.5, the projected rise is 1 m to more than 3 m (*medium confidence*). {13.5}

E.8 Bullet 6 Corrected:

- For a radiative forcing that corresponds to a CO₂-equivalent concentration (in 2100) that is above 700 ppm, but below 1500 ppm as in the scenario RCP8.5, the projected rise is 1 m to more than 3 m (*medium confidence*). {13.5}