

**Table for consolidated comments**

**16 October 2018 (updated)**

Page No	Line No	Comment	Comments made by	Status of response	Remarks
1 – 5		(Support David’s comment) – edit this to < 1 side.	UK (J. Wardle)	Addressed	
4	26	Am a native English speaker, but have never heard the expression: “pulling of partner expertise” – perhaps “pooling of partner expertise” would be more accessible?	GEO (D. Cripe)	Addressed	
4	27	“WMO carries most of the weight...” is a rather one-sided perception, casting WMO as a martyr. From my observations WMO also strove to maintain full control over GFCS, by gladly accepting the “burden” of hosting it.	World Bank (D. Kull)	Addressed by changing the original formulation	
5	17	As a general rule, prefer “such as” throughout when illustrating by example, rather than “like” as in “like the European Commission” in this line, (like = comparison, not example)	GEO (D. Cripe)	Addressed	
5	23	Either “a user-centric ... approaches” or “a-user-centric ...approaches”	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed	
7	4	Throughout the paper there is a distinction (sometimes explicit, sometimes implicit, and sometimes misleading) as to what is meant by “GFCS implementation”. The intention, I believe, is that, on the balance, “GFCS implementation” refers to the implementation of the pillars and priority areas, whereas what much of the paper is addressing is the implementation of the GFCS governance, management and secretariat support functions”. This distinction needs to be clearly maintained throughout. Right from the start I suggest adding two new sentences at this line: “Throughout the document, “GFCS implementation” refers to the implementation of the GFCS	WMO (M. Dilley)	Addressed	

		pillars and priority areas as described in the GFCS implementation plan. In support of this, the document focuses mainly on the implementation of the GFCS governance, management and secretariat support functions.” N.B. Although some clarifications on this point are flagged below, many are not, and all usages of “GFCS implementation” and “implementation of the GFCS” should be examined and corrected, if necessary, for clarity.			
7	9	Emerging <u>and climate impacts</u>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not included	The use of emerging issues in the original formulation is considered to cover climate impacts
7	11	“Better joined up” – sounds a bit colloquial, would “Improved connections” or “Greater linkages” be a substitute?	GEO (D. Cripe)	Addressed	
7	11	strategic alignment, <u>scientific and operational</u>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Partially addressed	Operational coordination was included
7	24	hazards <u>and impacts</u> through better provision <u>of services and information on</u> climate	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	The text on the purpose of the GFCS is extracted from the original GFCS document “Climate Knowledge for Action”
7	24	Use <u>and application</u> of climate.....	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	Same as above
7	29	Infrastructure, <u>in a practical way</u>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	Same as above

7	33	Sensitive <u>and suffer</u> sectors.....	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	Same as above
8	8	<u>Establish a climate monitoring system</u> through which	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	Same as above
8	12-13	Please insert “, analysed” after “managed as this is something that would done within the monitoring part of that pillar.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Not addressed	The original text from the GFCS implementation plan document was used. It is assumed that “managed” includes analysis.
8	15	Providing <u>climate data and</u> an evidence	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	The original text from the GFCS implementation Plan was used
8	21-22	Are the phases described elsewhere in the document? If so please insert a reference.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed	Reference to the GFCS implementation plan were the phase are described was included.
9	3	FYI the Human Dynamics of Climate Change has a budget window of max. €23 million.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	Addressed	
9	8	“JPO” might be explicitly mentioned	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed	
9	33	2x “global”, please replace 2 <sup>nd</sup> by “national”	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed	
9	41	Can some more information be provided on the CST? A link, short description?	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed.	Link provided

9	43	Change “implementation of the GFCS” to read, “implementation of the GFCS governance and management functions”	WMO (M. Dilley)	Addressed	
9	47	“others”	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler. GEO (D: Cripe)	Addressed	
9	48	Change “communicate” to “communicate and, more importantly, effectively coordinate”	DWD (M. Dilley)	Addressed	
9	49	Append to the end of the sentence “, the effectiveness of the PAC having been limited in this regard.”	WMO (M. Dilley)	Addressed	
10		Include structure diagram in main body, rather than annex.	UK (J. Wardle)	Addressed	
10	2-7	It does not make sense to have two parallel governing bodies – the Intergovernmental Board on Climate Services (IBCS) and the World Meteorological Congress.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Not addressed	It’s not a parallel structure. The IBCS would not exist anymore. The WMO EC cannot replace the Executive Committee as this would maintain a purely WMO centric structure
10	5 - 7	Comment: It does not make sense to have two management parallel between the IBCS and the World Meteorological Congress	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not addressed	It’s not a parallel structure. The IBCS would not exist anymore. The WMO EC cannot replace the Executive Committee as this would maintain a purely WMO centric structure

10	16-17	Change to “must enable the following main proposed functions: 1) [...]”	WMO (M. Dilley)	addressed	
10	16-18	It is suggested to list functions line by line for better reading and finding.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	addressed	
10	18	There is a contradiction between function 4) as described on this line and p. 16, line 36, footnote 4. As stated here, the resource mobilization is for the GFCS management and governance functions exclusively. On p. 16 it is explicitly not for that and rather for implementation of the GFCS itself (i.e. the pillars and priority areas). I would say that it clearly is the role of the management and governance structures, supported by the Secretariat, to mobilize the resources necessary for them to perform their functions, as is stated here (see further comment on the corresponding lines on pp. 16-17, below.	WMO (M. Dilley)	addressed in management chapter	No change required in the Governance chapter Mina: I have added the word ‘only’, to explain that resource mobilization should be both for the GFCS office, AND in support of countries/regions
10	26-30	Intergovernmental bodies should have majority representation in order to ensure that the WMO objectives set out in its strategic plan are met.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Partly addressed	The GFCS objectives require a broader leadership, especially with respect to the priority areas.  The suggested Executive Committee is of interdisciplinary nature. WMO will be represented on different

					<p>levels. Representation of Member States could be enlarged with representatives from RAs and LDC/Small Island States. Furthermore, it remains to be said that WMO Congress keeps superior governance power in the Step 1 structure.</p> <p>Furthermore, is should be considered that the current membership in the Executive Committee has an intergovernmental majority (UN Agencies are also to be considered as intergovernmental)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

10	28	<p>Insert: “An important consideration is that many of the international organizations which are currently members of the GFCS PAC, such as the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme, and others are currently assisting a large number of countries to implement climate services. The changes proposed below would engage these organizations directly in the GFCS management and governance structures, with the twin aims of 1) increasing their support for the management and governance structures, and 2) strengthening the mechanisms for alignment of their efforts to support GFCS implementation.”</p>	WMO (M. Dilley)	addressed	
10	36	<p>Step 2) “extraordinary Congress most probably taking place in 2021” We recommend removing any mention of a 2021 Extraordinary Congress throughout this document because of the likelihood that the session will not take place due to cost implications, as well as needing more time to see if the IBCS replacement structure is working.</p>	USA (M. Muth)	Not addressed	<p>As there will most probably be an extraordinary Congress in 2021, at least Step 1 Governance should be implemented (see recommendations under section 6.6). Step 2 Governance structure could be delayed until Congress 19 in 2023.</p> <p>Of course, it would not make sense to organize an extraordinary congress only for GFCS matters.</p>

10	37	<p><del>extraordinary Congress most probably taking place 2021</del>  <u>Congress 19 in 2023</u>. Comment: We need to give more time for new management structure.</p>	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)	Not addressed	<p>As there will most probably be an extraordinary Congress in 2021, at least Step 1 Governance should be implemented (see recommendations under section 6.6). Step 2 Governance structure could be delayed until Congress 19 in 2023.</p> <p>Of course, it would not make sense to organize an extraordinary congress only for GFCS matters.</p>
11	8	<p><u>Given the importance of the organizations/institutions and the SMHN maybe, that the</u> World Meteorological Congress to establish an interdisciplinary, <u>a mixed Executive Committee</u></p>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	addressed	<p>The suggested Executive Committee would be an interdisciplinary Committee established by WMO Congress.</p>
11	8-9	<p>Although the Executive Committee should be made up of governmental and non-governmental organizations, decisions should be made by governmental organizations.</p>	RA III (G. Navarro)	Not addressed	<p>This would contradict the idea of a mixed</p>

					Executive Committee and would reinforce the status quo (non-governmental organizations only as observers as in PAC). However, potential legal issues of the suggested governance structure will still be clarified.
11	12	It would be good if the Executive Committee's regular programme was approved by the WMO Congress, including updates to the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) and the implementation plan.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Addressed	This would be done in the case of the Step 1 structure.
11	13-16	WMO congress with a strong role as supreme governing body of GFCS might only be feasible if in future it meets every 2 years (which is on the horizon).	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Addressed	
11	8-9 and 17ff	Comment: This new "GFCS EC" might easily be mixed up with the already existing EC of WMO. We suggest finding another name. Or is the idea to eventually combine both? Not recommended! It could also be considered to run the GFCS as a WMO (co-) sponsored programme with a steering committee. The partner would then be part of the SC.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Not addressed	The abbreviation EC is not used in the document. One could use the abbreviation ExCom for the GFCS Executive Committee. It is definitely not the idea to combine

					<p>the EC and the ExCom</p> <p>The solution with the co-sponsored programme could be a solution if there would not be a step 2 development. Furthermore, just to transform the GFCS in another programme, might not lead to the required increased visibility (also required for resource mobilization). Last but not least, the required high level representation might not be achieved with a programme structure.</p>
11	17	Executive Committee: The topic of the Executive Committee is the area that would benefit most from additional clarification. It may be useful to have a draft Terms of Reference available for initial reaction in Rome. The essential functions outlined on page 36 are a good start. There will likely be some pushback if	USA (M. Muth)	Partially addressed	The IBCS MC will request the WMO Secretary-General to develop the ToRs. The

		<p>we it appears that we are simply developing a new commission-like structure that will report to WMO Congress. If GFCS stays in the WMO, then the roles and responsibilities of the EC must also emphasize how it will add value to existing WMO structures, without duplicating it.</p> <p>Other areas we would appreciate more clarity on  What is meant by ‘high-level’ membership  Relationship with WMO Executive Council  Clarify what ‘decisions’ will be under the GFCS Executive Committee. For example, will the GFCS EC have decision making power of the GFCS Trust fund? It does not appear so based on this document, but that would be an area to be clear about.</p> <p>It might be useful if we have a discussion on if this new GFCS Executive Council should be presented and seen as a ‘decision/governance’ body versus a ‘high-level platform to generate cross-partner collaboration and improve climate services at regional/national levels’. The structure model could be similar, but the messaging and focus would influence how it is perceived by WMO technical bodies as well as partners. Being inclusive of many partners can be challenging, especially if ‘decisions’ are involved. More specificity of what exactly would be or not be ‘decided’ could be useful in generating interest for engagement and avoiding the legal obstacles for some partners. PAC input on this issue would be useful in advance of the IBCS MC.</p>			potential tasks of the Executive Committee have been slightly extended in Annex 5.
11	25	Replace “asks for” with “requires”	WMO (M. Dilley)	addressed	
11	28	It is suggested to add at the end “, which is not limited to NMHSs alone”	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	addressed	
11	30-40	The objectives and priorities of the GFCS should take priority over those of non-governmental organizations.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Not addressed	The attainment of the GFCS

					objectives and priorities is of as high relevance to non-governmental organizations
11	31	The executive committee will consist of high level representatives of organizations in order to ensure organizational ownership and to allow for efficient and effective decision-making. How often will the ExCom meet? High level representation might be in contradiction to frequent meetings.	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Addressed	Once per year (1 day meeting); see cost breakdown in Annex 5.
11	31	“high level representatives (executive level” Are there already some organizations with ‘high level’ representatives that have expressed interest in serving in this proposed EC? If so, that would be encouraging and could be useful to bring in others. Is ‘high level’ needed, or should we reach a step below (but above most of the existing PAC membership)	USA (M. Muth)	Partially addressed	As stated on page 12, lines 36-38: “High level representation is paramount in order to increase ownership and subsequent implementation of decisions of the represented organizations, and to allow for efficient and effective decision making in the Executive Committee.”  Before decision in principle regarding the establishment of

					the Executive Committee, it might not be appropriate to seek expressions of interest with high level representatives.
11	32	Comment: “High level representation” in the EC-GFCS very unlikely will be higher than that in WMO Cg.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	addressed	WMO Congress also has high-level representation (DG of NMHSs). For the ExCom it would also be the DG, SG of partner organizations. There is no participation on ministerial level being planned.
11	38	The issue for senior representation of other UN agencies on the Executive committee is also a formal procedural one – it would need to be checked whether they can (as opposed to be interested to) serve on a body that is answerable to the WMO Congress, even if highly motivated to do so.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Addressed	This legal issue needs to be further evaluated. One possibility could be that the Executive Committee works under the guidance of WMO Congress and has to report to but would not be formally

					accountable to the WMO Congress. The risk register encompasses legal matters. A legal check is foreseen (see risk register).
11	42	It is not clear <u>how</u> the members of the executive committee will be selected. How will interested parties present their candidacy? How will the Congress ensure a non-biased selection?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	addressed	The “mandatory member organizations” (e.g. representatives of pillars and priority areas, implementing organizations, regional representatives) would be pre-defined / listed in the ToR. See suggestions in the draft chapter. See p 13, lines 1-37.
11	42-43	“...and the election of the respective representatives would be done by World Meteorological Congress”. I disagree – while the Congress should select the Executive Committee member organizations, it is up to the elected organizations to determine who will represent them in this role.	World Bank (D. Kull)	addressed	Page 13, lines 2-3
12	1	Congress may decide that Chair of EC could be one of WMO Vice Presidents	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)	Not addressed	This would lead again to a WMO centric structure.

					The ExCom is not meant to reflect constituent bodies of WMO.
12	1	It is proposed to also consider having a Co-Chair with partly overlapping terms with the Chair. It should be considered to allow for a maximum of two terms for better continuity.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	1st part addressed	Two terms would mean eight years, which is a significant period in a body with high level representation.
12	4	A representative of UNFCCC is in our view essential.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	addressed	Listed under « others »
12 37-38	4-21 4-6	Within the framework of the GFCS, in order for climate services to contribute decision making and disaster risk reduction, it is essential that WMO global and regional centers and NMHSs, which practically carry out four of five pillars of GFCS (CSIS, Observation and Monitoring, Research, Modeling and Prediction, and Capacity Development), should promote their activities cooperatively with GFCS relevant programs and related organizations. The proposed committee is seemed to consist mainly from international organizations (pg.37, Annex 5); however, for the purpose of aforementioned cooperative GFCS implementation, representatives with technical expertise on climate services should be explicitly included in the Committee. In addition, taking into account the sound development of National Met Services, it is critically important to clearly illustrate what sort of benefits could be provided to the entire WMO Member states by this governance reform for the sake of obtaining WMO Members' approval in the next Congress.	Japan (Y. Mochizuki)	Partially addressed	The five pillars and priority areas of the GFCS are not limited to NMHSs, as sectoral climate services also need to be developed and are equally important to deliver on the vision of the GFCS. Therefore, shared responsibility needs to be attained –a mixed Executive Committee could ensure this. It remains to be

					said that WMO would be well represented in the structure of the Executive Committee (representing several pillars). Furthermore, presidents of RA would be represented in the Executive Committee.
12	4-22	As WMO still remains very important for GFCS regular provision of resources and other support (incl. location of GFCS Sec) there should be major WMO Member influence in the GFCS EC. It should be considered to base the GFCS EC at least on 50 % WMO Member representation (with balanced RA representation).	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Partially addressed	WMO Members have already a clear say via Congress. 50% participation of WMO member states is considered too high. Representation via the Presidents of the RA is suggested.
12	7	"UNESCO" GEO should be included, or at least considered.	USA (M. Muth)	Not addressed	The Earth Observation aspect would be covered by GCOS, WMO, WCRP, and NMHS. The Executive

					Committee should not become too big.
12	12	Append “(see Annex 5)”	WMO (M. Dilley)		?
12	13-18	<p>The definition and participation of regional entities should be determined by the Congress and should not depend on the priorities set out in the strategy and implementation plan or the specific contributions expected by the Committee at the regional level.</p> <p>One should consider the participation of one representative from each WMO regional association (nominated by the president of the respective regional association) and one representative from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)</p>	RA III (G. Navarro)	Partially addressed	<p>The GFCS Pillars and Priority Areas as well as the Priority Needs serve as references for the composition of the Executive Committee. Representation of RAs is foreseen at the highest level (president). Regarding IPCC: Representatives from WMO, WCRP and academia are considered for membership.</p>
12	15	<p>Following the possible dissolution of the PAC, should the European Commission continue to engage with the GFCS, this proposal would be very likely to entail a radical change to the current relationship between the GFCS and the European Commission. However, in order for this to be likely to succeed, the GFCS governance model would require a much stronger international political anchoring, such as the one mentioned under Alternative 2) [pp.13 line 12]</p>	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	Addressed?	<p>Already in the Step 1 structure, the EC would be represented in the Executive Committee.</p>

12	15	participation of the European Commission, <u>in particularly the Copernicus Climate Change program</u>	WMO RA VI vice-president (K.Radics)	Not addressed	We should not be too specific. The nomination of a member would be up to the EC.
12	21	Suggest adding 'Group on Earth Observations (GEO)' to the "Others" list.	GEO (D. Cripe)	Not addressed	The Earth Observation aspect would be covered by GCOS, WMO, WCRP, and NMHS. The Executive Committee should not become too big.
12	19-20	Representatives of least developed and developing countries, and transition economies should not be included, and representatives of the regional associations should represent the interest of these countries.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Not addressed	LDCs, developing countries and transition economies are groups most in need of climate services. Therefore, they should be given a direct voice.
12	23	<b>C. Working Groups</b> <u>It is suggested that in order to formalize the work groups, it should be premier for the said executive committee to know the areas it needs regarding technical and operational knowledge. In addition, who has the climate monitoring, climate data are the SMNHs. It precedes and is understood that to establish the working groups it is suggested that it be integrated with the Regional Associations or CCRs.</u>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	addressed	It will be up to the Executive Committee to establish WGs based on defined priorities (already in the draft text, see pages 13-14 lines 43-8)

12	23	<p>“Working Groups” The working groups is where much of the progress can be made, in terms of connecting technical expertise to specific needs. This is where the current IBCS/PAC structure was lacking significantly, in particular how it relates to WMO expertise and cross-pillar interaction.</p> <p>We understand that the WGs will be decided upon by the Executive Committee. However, it may useful to consider putting forward a few potential working groups topics at the onset for immediate EC consideration, based on input received in the past couple of years regarding needs and gaps. That would help give some concrete examples to this vague structure, and will help demonstrate immediate progress of a new structure – especially if there is already buy in. It can also help with progress in the four priority tasks for the GFCS Office as described in 7.2. For example:</p> <p>Monitoring and Reviewing, that could scopes out a ‘State of Climate Services’.</p> <p>Technical coordination and support, which could be a mechanism to enhance the awareness and utilization of work by CCL including the CSIS and standards.</p> <p>There also needs to be clarity on the WG goals. For example, would it be to provide recommendations or guidelines to the Executive Committee for their consideration? Or more along the lines of making progress at the working level on specific topics. Or it could be both?</p>	USA (M. Muth)	addressed	It will be up to the Executive Committee to establish working groups based on defined priorities (already in the draft text, see pages 13-14 lines 43-8)
12	24-35	The role of the working groups is not explained. Would they be advisory? Would they be implementing activities?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	addressed	It will be up to the Executive Committee to establish working groups based on defined priorities

					(already in the draft text, see pages 13-14 lines 43-8)
12	24-35	<p>To formalize the working groups, the Executive Committee needs to identify in which area it requires technical and operational know-how. Therefore, it should be borne in mind that it is the National Meteorological and Hydrological services (NMHSs) that are responsible for climate monitoring and climate data. As a result, the working groups need to be established with the joint consent of the regional associations and the regional climate centres (RCCs).</p> <p>In addition, members from developing countries need to be included in the working groups, which means that necessary funding has to be provided.</p>	RA III (G. Navarro)	Not addressed	All Executive Committee members will have an equal say in the establishment and composition of working groups based on defined priorities (already in the draft text, see pages 13-14 lines 43-8).
12	26	<p>Working Groups – appear to be high-level procedural committees – rather than operationally grounded task teams. They are likely to provide top down direction, but not directly output which results in capacity in country/regions – which is described as a new priority for GFCS. There is an assumption executive level participation will result in operational/technical engagement of working groups within the agencies at lower levels. This should not be taken for granted and risks repeating many of the challenges of the PAC – limiting ownership and delivery. It is recommended propositions for connecting high-level working groups with operational mechanisms which demonstrate value to agencies are further considered.</p> <p>For example, climate service tailoring and deployment see strong involvement of the academic and NGO community who are highly committed to user-applications. These key stakeholders remain missing from the proposed new GFCS, with</p>	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	addressed	Comment not fully understood. Academia, WCRP NGOs are considered as possible members of the ExCom. Furthermore, nothing prevents their participation in the working groups.

		the exception of the proposed global/regional platforms and partnering with the CSP (P13-37). Consideration of new mechanisms such as expert-application or training centers outside the WMO structures would help address the stated priority to enhance inclusion and partnership.			
12	34-35	Executive Committee members should be different from those of the working groups (formulate it as recommendation but it doesn't have to be mandatory)	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	addressed	
12	36	<p>The <b>lack of political anchoring</b> – although the formal political mechanisms that the GFCS is linked to are important, at least as important is the ability of the GFCS secretariat and wider partnership to communicate the relevance and impact of climate services, and the GFCS as a/the mechanism to deliver them, to any political process. If the GFCS can make this case, then political anchoring and active support, and the necessary (currently scarce) resources should flow.</p> <p>The UNSG and UNFCCC mechanisms are obviously highly relevant to the GFCS, and may have a higher political profile. However, if this would result in a removal or distancing from WMO, it is not clear that either offers an advantage in operational terms. Irrespective of its difficulties, the major selling point of the GFCS is the climate information and services – which seems close to the WMO mandate and capacities than to that, for example, of UNFCCC. Is there a way to get stronger political linkage, particularly to UNFCCC, without distancing from WMO?</p> <p><b>Lack of Technical Anchoring</b> –among other reasons, limited partner ownership in GFCS reflects dissatisfaction with experiences working with NMHS, availability of low-quality products and services, and limited access to reliable and useful climate information. This issue of course goes beyond GFCS, but</p>	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	addressed	<p>A higher political anchoring, must not lead to a distancing from WMO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WMO would still be strongly involved in the Executive Committee (representing several pillars of the GFCS.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, one might also consider the WMO Secretary General</p>

		there has been little creativity in approaching this problem – and more investment in current structures may not result in needed change.			becoming the UN SRSG
12 - 18		<p><b>Other comments</b></p> <p>On the composition of the Executive Committee: A risk is foreseen in limiting participation in the Executive Committee to those regional organizations with the strongest involvement in GFCS, which is not getting an increased baseline to regional involvement. It is noted that, except for lines 19-20, other items in the proposed composition refer exclusively to global bodies. As seen ahead in the document, implementation will be largely relied on regional and national levels. Towards a more seamless governance, and in line with the implementation, this gap should be avoided. Moreover, regional awareness and involvement should be promoted, towards the stated objective of Step 1 “Increase participation”. In this sense, 4-years terms for the participation of other regional organizations may also benefit the executive committee with improved dynamics. On this respect, agree with statement in Annex 5, pg.37, l. 45 to pg.38, l. 1</p> <p>Upon implementation of Step 2, attention should be paid to keep a proper link to WMO governance within the Executive Committee.</p>	RA III (G. Navarro)	addressed	<p>It is suggested to include RA presidents in the Executive Committee.</p> <p>In Annex 5, 3d, regional organizations are specifically listed.</p> <p>With regard to Step 2, the specificities will be elaborated by a TF mandated by the IBCS MC. WMO would remain a member of the Executive Committee</p>
13	2	Shouldn't the resolution be prepared by the Management Committee?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Partially addressed	The Management Committee would request the WMO Secretary-General to prepare the resolution(s).
13	4	It should be possible to express support to a potential Step 2	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	addressed	

		<p>without this necessarily indicating support to one of the two suggested alternatives (SRSG on Climate Services or link to the UNFCCC structure). As the report states, both options requires more in depth analysis. If the two alternatives are kept in the text as examples of models, the possibility to look at other models should be clearer.</p> <p>A tentative analysis of costs compared to the current highest governance level (the Congress) would also be needed.</p>			
13	6	Extraneous comma after colon.	GEO (D. Cripe)	addressed	
13	16	We believe the in depth analysis of the two alternative possible scenarios ought to be undertaken and considered. The GFCS must align itself fully with Article 7 of the Paris Agreement in order to become globally relevant.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	addressed	
13	16-17	The GFCS should remain part of the WMO structure, with the Congress as the governing body.	RA III (G. Navarro)	Addressed	In Step 1, this would be the case. Adopting Step 2 would entail a new governing body. Should a TF be mandated by the MC, options would be developed.
13	19-20	<b>extraordinary Congress</b>	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)	Not addressed	According to our information, an extraordinary congress in 2021 is planned anyway. Of course, it would not make sense to organize an

					extraordinary congress only for GFCS matters.
13	29-30	The regional presence should be mandatory and not just a supportive / consultative entity.	RA III (G. Navarro)	addressed	RA Presidents would be considered as members of the Executive Committee
14	6	<i>"make the appropriate selection and election of Committee members"</i> is a bit vague.	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Addressed	Page 16, line 25
14	10	Should it be the secretariat's role to make a transformation plan?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Addressed	Yes, see risk register in the Annex
14	17	<b>Other comments</b> The concept, its feasibility and potential risks of its implementation is not sufficiently analysed in the document to support this recommendation	RA III (G. Navarro)	addressed	Risk register developed, see Annex
14	21	Is it feasible/expedient that the WMO Secretary General evaluates the opportunity to remove the governance away from WMO? Shouldn't this be done by the Executive Committee? Or the Task force?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	addressed	A new task force would have to be established.
14	23	"UN- or UNFCCC-structure" There needs to be more clarity in this document on what the ultimate GOAL of embedding with the UN system (UNGA, UNFCCC) is, and why this was singled out as the most promising approach. If the goal is to secure more political awareness with the assumption that it will lead to more funding for GFCS, then it is important to note that previous experiences have not always resulted in more funding and that this can politicize the process. If the goal is to lessen the appearance of a very strong WMO/NMHS bias, which can influence interactions with other partners and private sector on the ground, then that should be stated. However, if removed from WMO then it comes with the trade-off of removing	USA (M. Muth)	Partially addressed	The document foresees that a specific TF be mandated by the MC to develop respective options.

		existing support. While this IBCS MC does not need an exhaustive discussion on this topic, it might be worth adding 'or other partnership structure' to not exclude other options outside of the UNGA or UNFCCC specifically, and to be prepared to talk about the pros/cons of alternate structures			
14	24	<del>extraordinary Congress</del>	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)		According to our information, an extraordinary congress in 2021 is planned anyway. Of course, it would not make sense to organize an extraordinary congress only for GFCS matters.
15	20	It is important to note that a number of members of the PAC are well placed as advisors and do not seek a more active role as part of the management of the GFCS.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	Noted, no change	No change made in document, as text already reflects the comment
15	35	The resource mobilization aspect should be clearer. It seems to be a recommendation that the secretariat should not implement project (based on footnote 4), but this is not explicitly written in the text. Will running costs for the secretariat be secured by other means?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Comment included on page 16, line 5	The following is added: <u>The current funding for operating the GFCS Secretariat/Office are very limited (see further details in the finance chapter), the recruitment</u>

					<p><u>to the new GFCS Secretariat/Office must bear in mind the important responsibility of securing sufficient funding for operation the office in both Step 1 and 2. It is not intended that WMO will bear the costs of the Office, but that external funding must be mobilized.</u></p>
16	26	<p>“regional levels” On this section: The external relations advisor is an appropriate and useful position to focus on, as long as it is NOT focused on fundraising. We suggest adding language to clarify that their focus is not resource mobilization, or at least specifying that it is not their primary role.</p> <p>Regional GFCS perspective was very helpful in Africa, which helped partners coordinate, etc. There is great potential for additional regional representation to support on the ground programming. We also support having these partnership experts in the RCCs regional centres, as it will be grounded in the experience of things that work and can help build capacity that is sustainable for when project funds are gone. There is also opportunity to expand the role of RCOFs as an existing stakeholder engagement platform, rather than trying to build new ones.</p>	USA (M. Muth)	Comment included	<p>The following is removed (<b>fund raising</b>), supporting the Director and the Governance structure to achieve resource mobilization targets (P4 level).</p> <p>The following is added: <u>This role will focus on building relationships with</u></p>

		. Challenge will be achieving the balance of regional/national and what the main GFCS office is focusing on.			<p><u>key partners, ensure regular communication and exchange with these, and ensure the information from partners to regional/national levels is shared in a regular and transparent manner</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p><u>The GFCS focuses on strengthening existing platforms, such as the Regional Climate Outlook Forums (RCOFs), rather than building new ones.</u></p>
16	Table	“Publish a state of climate services... “ These are concrete outputs that add value to existing climate services landscape and WMO community, as long as they are deliberate in what it would focus on.	USA (M. Muth)	Noted	No change made
16	Table	“State of Climate Services Evaluation Report” – This proposal sounds reasonable, and very well within the remit of the GFCS. As a new proposal, careful consideration would need to be given to how this would be achieved, given the challenges to recruit and establish monitoring and evaluation of GFCS. The	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Noted	No change made

		WMO mechanisms reflect provision of climate services as defined by the NMHS/WMO – but not the uptake and application in the GFCS priority areas.			
16	12	<u>Guide and</u> improve	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Agreed	Change is done
16	28-30	It is fundamental for the Secretariat to focus its attention on the needs of regional associations and countries' NMHSs.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
16	28-30	To delete text on secretariat. To keep its role as described in the Implementation plan	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)	Not incorporated	The GFCS has not been equipped to achieve the goals set out in the Implementation Plan. This is why the Midterm Review was initiated, and why the subsequent review process is now happening.
16	32	The priority tasks of the proposed new GFCS Secretariat should not be prescribed, and should be steered by the proposed Executive Committee.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	Noted	The following is added in second paragraph under 7.2: <u>It should be noted that these proposed tasks are guidance for the new Secretariat/Office while it is ultimately the Executive</u>

					<a href="#">Committee that decides the work of the GFCS Secretariat/Office</a>
16	36	<p>Under Resource Mobilization, change “Enables” to “Promote”.</p> <p>Under Resource Mobilization, change “Strengthen” to “Promote strengthening of”. WMO already has a contract with the Green Climate Fund to design the methodology for ensuring that there is a science based climate rationale for all GCF projects. The GFCS Secretariat can play a valuable role in upscaling and potentially enhancing this, both across its implementing partners and into proposals for projects funded from other sources.</p> <p>It would be good to switch the order of the first and second items under “Partnerships and inclusion” so that the one emphasizing coordination of initiatives appears first.</p> <p>In the “Technical coordination support” column, change the contents of the first row to read, “Facilitate and coordinate identification of capacity development needs for provision of climate services”</p>	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated	<p>Under Resource Mobilization; Change on row one is included. In light of comments from Brazil, new text is second row is as follows: <a href="#">Promotes, enables, articulates and facilitates countries’ and regions’ access to climate finance</a></p> <p>On partnership and inclusion; order is changed.</p> <p>On Technical coordination, in light of comments from Brazil, new text is as follows: <a href="#">Facilitate and coordinate identification of capacity</a></p>

				<p><a href="#"><u>development needs for provision of climate services, applications and climate information</u></a></p> <p>In addition, the following text is included in a footnote:</p> <p><a href="#"><u>WMO has a contract with the Green Climate Fund to design the methodology for ensuring that there is a science based climate rationale for all GCF projects. The GFC Secretariat can play a valuable role in upscaling and potentially enhancing this, both across its implementing partners and into proposals for projects funded</u></a></p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<a href="#">from other sources.</a>
16	36	<p><b>Technical coordination support</b> needs on <a href="#">applications and</a> climate information. development <a href="#">and methods</a> of standards for climate services.</p> <p><b>Resource mobilization</b> Enables, <a href="#">articulate and facilitate</a> countries</p>	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Incorporated	<p>See above, in answer to WMO/M Dilley.</p> <p>New text on Technical coordination support: <a href="#">See reply to next comment (from WMO)</a></p>
16-17	26-36	Capacity-building and the provision of resources should be included so that developing countries and their experts can actively participate in the GFCS.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
17	1	<p>In the “Technical coordination support” column, change “Offer tracking and advisory services and climate expertise to countries and regions” to “Track support to climate services implementation and promote advisory services to address areas where additional support is needed.” (For example, the GFCS Secretariat would not provide climate expertise directly, as that is WMO’s function. Similarly WHO would provide expertise on health-related services, etc.)</p> <p>In the “Technical coordination support” column, final row with text, prefix with “Identify unmet needs for additional standards” and append “through the appropriate standard-setting entities”. For example, WMO is an ISO standard setting body and sets standards on observing systems, operational data management and forecast systems, and other relevant matters through inter-governmental processes. Such standards would not be set by the Secretariat.</p>	WMO (M. Dilley)		
17	4-5	Move the sentence “ <i>The report recommends that in addition to</i>	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	

		<i>WMO also new, alternative hosts are considered for Step 2” to point 7.3 b)</i>			
17	4-5	As long as WMO pays directly and supports indirectly major parts of the GFCS Sec a GFCS Sec location outside WMO should not be considered. In addition, if the GFCS EC reports to the WMO Congress, it makes no sense to separate the office from WMO	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Noted, not incorporated	This is what the Congress will decide upon
17	19	more reliable <u>operational</u> products and enhanced interaction with users.	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not incorporated	This is a quote from the Implementation Plan
17	21	Replace “RCCs” with “WMO RCCs”	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated	
17	23	Replace “technical capacity” with “capacity to integrate technical expertise from GFCS partners”.	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated	
17	21 - 25	Comment: There is a need to implement and support the development of regional climate products so that RCCs can achieve their operational successes with better climate information for decision making. It is hoped that the GFCS can contribute in terms of consulting and financial support for operational technical training and for the development of new climate products.	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Noted/can be incorporated	
17	21-25	It is necessary to implement and support the development of regional climate products so that RCCs can achieve operational success through better climate information in order to enhance decision-making. It is hoped that the GFCS can contribute by providing advice and financial support for technical and operational capacity-building and the development of new climate products.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
17	25	Replace “specific skill sets” with “clearly defined functions, such	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated	

		as promoting integration of GFCS partner efforts,”			
17	22	“GFCS Experts” – it would be useful to specify or at least give indicative examples of the qualifications and criteria for being a GFCS Expert. Given investment streams to RCCs – such as the ACP - why would the Secretariat coordination roles need to be sent to the RCCs, when RCCs themselves could recruit or train their own personnel in these GFCS related competencies?	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Noted	
17	30	The connotations in this paragraph and throughout the report – continue to frame GFCS as a WMO programme and do little to indicate ownership by others. If the WMO PR is identified as the only voice of GFCS this shows no change.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Not incorporated	The comment is general.
17	31-34	Countries should have greater representation, not just as promoters of the GFCS.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
18	4	<i>“The three GFCS-experts currently deployed by NRC-NORCAP are considered part of the GFCS Secretariat/Office”. We suggest to add “, their costs are however not included in the secretariat budget as they are funded by external sources.”</i>	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	
18	17	Annex 1 does not provide an explanation of how positions will be funded.	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Not incorporated	Annex 1 relates to general funding streams. Might be an error regarding which annex it is referred to?
18	c	Annex 8 – shows two joint offices. Only one with WHO is mentioned in the text.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Incorporated	Updated text:  Currently, a joint WMO-WHO office and Global Water Partnership office is part of the GFCS structure.

					This joint offices, along with new joint offices in other sectors, may continue if funding allows.
18	28	<p>“3. ... Climate Services” Suggest adding language that the Technical Experts will work closely with technical bodies at WMO and regional activities of those technical bodies, as well as other relevant regional institutions. It is essentially to make a closer link to WMO technical expertise and activities, it is to remain under the WMO.</p>	USA (M. Muth)	Incorporated, with some amendments	<p>New text added: <u>The Technical Experts will work closely with technical bodies at WMO and regional activities of those technical bodies, as well as other relevant organisations and regional institutions.</u></p>
18	8	<p>This is a fair statement – however, the report overall neglects to describe how GFCS would interact with and draw upon the expertise from partners for core functions of the Secretariat or deployment of GFCS.</p>	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Noted	<p>Text added: The GFCS Secretariat/Office has to be able to rely on the expertise available from its partners. <u>The important collaboration with partners outside WMO will initially be secured in the new governance</u></p>

					<a href="#">structure and its working groups. In the longer term, the GFCS Office/Secretariat must develop a working method where input from partners to core function/areas is common practice.</a>
18	10	Clarity in language needed. "Recruitment to fill positions in the new secretariat". It seems there is only 1 new position to be recruited (reiterated as the only change P24.14) - an external relations officer, which still remains contingent on new resources. Yet, there is an implication in the text the current secretariat will be dissolved, and all positions re-defined and re-recruited. This seems problematic and risky - considering the WMO contractual status of current staff, and a high retention risk if the Secretariat is proposed to move locations/institutions in only 4 years' time.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Valid point, not incorporated	This is what the Congress will decide upon
18	25-31	Not clear for us why all positions need to be P4/P5. Please justify and/or modify the requested levels	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Noted	P-level designation removed in the text. An alternative table with revised cost/p-level is provided in Annex 7
18	27-28	The functions of these staff need to be more specifically defined and clearly aligned with the four GFCS management and governance functions itemized on p. 18, lines 17-18 and in the table on p 16-17. The mid-term review strongly highlighted the	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated.	New text under Three Technical Experts: <a href="#">One technical</a>

		<p>need for improved communication. There would clearly be a need for portfolio tracking and analysis. Someone would have to do the knowledge management and capacity development needs identification functions, etc. The National Frameworks for Climate Services emphasis is a good one.</p>			<p><u>expert will ensure overall coordination of GFCS implementation, including support to National Frameworks for Climate Services, and identify needs for capacity development. The second experts will engage in monitoring and evaluation, including portfolio tracking and analysis. The third expert will focus on communication, knowledge management.</u></p>
18	29	<p>It would be justifiable to have a senior P5 staff in the external relations role, however, it is not clear why a P5 is needed as a technical expert – more justification is needed to describe this role.</p>	<p>WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)</p>	<p>Incorporated</p>	<p>See comment from DWD (two levels above). P-levels removed, alternative table inserted in Annex 7</p>
18	29-	<p>The reason for including the climate and health officer while</p>	<p>Norad (A. Tveteraas)</p>	<p>Incorporated</p>	<p>The following text</p>

	30	not specifying the thematic focus for the other experts should be explained (we assume this is due to existing earmarked funding through projects, but this is not explained), since GFCS has 4 other priority areas (water, energy, food security and DRR)			is removed: b. Two at P4s level (includes the Joint WMO/WHO Climate and Health Officer)
18	33	Joint Offices – the activities and priorities of joint offices to demonstrate value of climate services in sectoral domains, reflect the priority tasks of GFCS at large to encourage user-engagement and climate service application – however these tasks/activities are quite distinct from the functions of a Secretariat. It is not clear how the secretariat benefits from having only one or two sectoral activities within a Secretariat and it can be questioned if this is the most effective location for such offices.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Incorporated	See comment above
18	37	Replace “priority area” with “priority task”, for consistency. Priority areas is water, food security etc.	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	
18	43	Comment: It needs to be pointed out that most RCCs are funded from voluntary contributions of their host organizations – which might be a weak construction.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Incorporated	New text added: <u>It should be noted that most RCCs are funded from voluntary contributions from host organizations, which entail some risk in terms of stability.</u>
19	4	This line gives a contradictory message to line 19.35. Alternative future hosts expressing interest to host GFCS, is different to facilitating moving the Secretariat. Furthermore – in reference to equal partnership among UN agencies and future hosts could express interest –it seems the	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Partially incorporated	Recommendation 2e, text changed as follows: <u>e. _____ to facilitate</u>

		UNFCCC and UN Secretariat have been pre-selected entities to host GFCS. It seems premature to propose such a scenario – when it is implied in the recommendations on p 14-21, that this avenue has not yet been explored with these entities, and the advantages/disadvantages of moving the secretariat or such structures have not been deliberated outside this task team.			<p><a href="#">expression of interest for alternative hosting of the GFCS Secretariat/Office from 2021.</a></p> <p>Regarding comments on preselected hosts: those interested in hosting GFCS can express so and be considered at Congress in 2021</p>
19	5	Will the new host take over the financial cost for the secretariat?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	<p>New text added: Thus, in addition to a renewal of Secretariat staff, this report suggests that alternative future hosts express their interest to host GFCS before the World Meteorological Congress in 2021. <a href="#">It should be noted that WMO as current host, contributed</a></p>

					<u>significant resources to fund GFCS staff, and that a similar arrangement might be expected from future hosts.</u>
19	6	Has the Task Force considered host arrangements based on a roving system?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Not incorporated	No
19	9	The future composition of the GFCS Secretariat should not be prescribed, and should await input by the proposed Executive Committee.	EC (D. de Gusmão-Sørensen)	Not incorporated	The decision of the location is proposed made by the Congress (not the executive Committee)
19	17	Is there no need for a technical expert on global level?  Considering the suggested tasks, wouldn't it also make sense to have a climate services communication expert as part of the secretariat?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Partially incorporated	First comment: There is. However, while experts may service both global, regional and national needs, it is suggested that they are physically based at regional levels to also provide additional capacity at these levels Second comment,

					<p>new text added under 'Minimum 4 technical experts':</p> <p><u><b>Minimum six experts to support, enable and develop National Frameworks on Climate Services as well as other national strategies relating to Climate Services, and support development of national/regional funding proposals. The experts should also be able to identify needs for capacity development. As in Step 1, one expert should be dedicated to monitoring and evaluation, including portfolio tracking</b></u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<u>and analysis, and one should be dedicated to communication and knowledge management. It is suggested that all the experts should be based with RCCs</u>
19	17	Minimum <del>four</del> <u>six</u> technical experts on climate services/meteorology. OSB. It is suggested six technical experts because part of the premier of each Regional Association have a technical expert, also that each Region have an RCC.	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Incorporated	
19	17	This relates to p 19.17 – where it seems the job of GFCS expert is described as “technical experts in climate services/meteorology to ensure the science/technical quality assurance”. However the tasks then described relate to processes, proposals, and not the delivery of climate services – so it seems expertise is more needed in “coordination and project management.” Why 4 experts in RCCs? There are more than 4 RCCs? And as noted above RCCs have funding streams to hire these competencies if it is within their remit. If GFCS really retains the vision of application – then application expertise is missing in the vision of delivering GFCS now.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Incorporated through the two comments above	
19	17-18	Delete “four technical experts on climate services/meteorology to ensure the science/technical quality assurance” This is not a function of the GFCS Office. WMO is full of such experts and provides them in support of GFCS implementation. Rather, these expanded functions need to match the functions of the GFCS office itself (see previous comment).	WMO (M. Dilley)	Incorporated	See new text in comment from NORAD

19	24	"... of the IBCS" Suggest adding an additional 'recommendation: 'to agree on 'Priority Tasks for GFCS Secretariat/Office'. This is so that there is agreement on WHAT the GFCS will do, which can then inform HOW it will do it.	USA (M. Muth)	Partially incorporated	Text in recommendation 2c is amended
19	26	"... management structure" How would the proposed changes impact existing project management obligations by GFCS Office Staff?	USA (M. Muth)	Noted	As per mid-term review, it is not recommended that the GFCS Secretariat/Office engages in project management. The 4 priority tasks for the new GFCS Secretariat/Office is presented in the Table in Chapter 7.2
19	26	<b>Other comments</b> Step 2 in Management reform is naturally linked to step 2 in Governance reform, and should be considered jointly (see comment page 14, line 17)	RA III (G. Navarro)	Noted	
19	31	Key functions in table p 16 vs. roles in new secretariat If partnership and inclusion is set out as a new priority task area – the lack of a communications officer would need to be addressed. P/22-14 notes the midterm review recommendation to increase awareness of the GFCS. A public relations officer is likely to be ineffective without sufficient support from a communications officer. P28-36 activities of posters/brochures can be developed by consultants but are not in themselves sufficient to increase awareness. The 30,000usd	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Incorporated, see answer to various other comments	A dedicated communications person is suggested Regarding second comment: It is correct that there is not sufficient staff, and a

		<p>budget proposed for the external relations also seems insufficient. This would only equal travel of one person to 5-7 meetings per year and no resources for communication materials or other mechanisms of promoting external relations.</p> <p>Furthermore there is little change in the modus operandi which would instil greater ownership in the activities of GFCS. There is little change in the new proposed roles [as described from the current roles] which are still insufficient to deliver on the 4 priority tasks. There are no new mechanisms outside dependence on the WMO regional structures, and partnering with the CSP to promote implementation. Little attention is given to how new structures will create demand and market for climate services, or provide technical expertise for application.</p>			<p>modest number of staff, especially in Step 1, which is intended to last until 2021, is proposed due to budget constraints.</p> <p>In step 2, which in theory could begin in 2021, it is now suggested six technical experts and a total of 11 staff positions, which is about a doubling of current staff.</p>
19	32-34	The role of regional associations at both the regional and global levels should be clarified. The representation and participation of regional associations and countries in the proposed new organizational chart, including the Executive Committee, also needs to be clarified.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
19	35	<del>2021</del> <u>2023</u>	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)	Not incorporated	Awaiting further discussion with Chapter leads
19	37	<p><b>Other comments</b></p> <p>The feasibility of funding a stronger Secretariat, as stated, is recognized in the document to be unclear. A number of assumptions are made in the proposed Step 2, which at this stage, do not seem to provide enough information to support a discussion by Congress.</p>	RA III (G. Navarro)	Noted	
19	38	It is not clear <u>who</u> will then recruit the new secretariat. A	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	New text added

		recruitment committee should probably be selected.			<p>at the end of Chapter 7.2:  <u>In order to facilitate the recruitment of new staff to the GFCS Office/secretariat, an experienced recruitment entity should take care of the advertising and short listing of candidates. Once done, an interview panel with representatives from 3-4 partner agencies, of which one should be WMO, will interview and select the candidates.</u></p>
19	39	How is this different from page 14 line 14?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Incorporated	<p>New text:  <u>to approve the recruitment entity and the interview committee that will manage the recruitment of</u></p>

					<a href="#">GFCS Office/Staff</a>
20	3	Replace “GFCS” with “GFCS governance and management functions”	WMO (M. Dilley)		
20	39	Prefix with “As originally conceived,”	WMO (M. Dilley)	accepted	Recommended change made to text
20	39-42	Also to build and support the capacities of developing countries. As it stands, the current proposed structure was created and will be governed by developed countries, either through international organizations financed by these countries or through their own organizations that will form part of the new proposed structure.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
21	31-32	Attempts to acquire resources to implement the GFCS at the national and regional levels must take into account national and regional development goals. Support should be provided to countries' NMHSs, and the GFCS should contribute to achieving such development goals.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
22	5	The GFCS should be a support mechanism and a channel that draws on international funding mechanisms to intermediate, facilitate and strengthen the approval of proposals submitted by RCCs to develop climate and climate change services.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
22	5	It is suggested that the GFCS be a support mechanism and channel to intermediate, facilitate and reinforce with the international funding agencies, approval of projects of development of climatic services and climate change, when submitting proposals by CCRs.	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)	Not accepted	What is being requested is not clear
22	19-20	Need to disentangle two things here. The implementation of the GFCS pillars and priority areas is perhaps overfunded. This is what the MTR is referring to when they say “Funding for climate services at all levels lacks coordination, leading to significant inefficiencies in the implementation of the GFCS.” This could be addressed by: 1) changing “GFCS” to “GFCS governance and management” in the sub-title and first sentence below, and 2) adding a short introductory paragraph:	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Changes made

		<p>“The 2014 GFCS Implementation Coordination Meeting identified that significant funding (USD 700m in only 17 countries) [check these figures] was already being programmed, with little/no coordination among the implementing entities. The Green Climate Fund currently estimates that their portfolio along now has USD 700m in the hydro-met systems needed to support climate services, yet recognizes that these investments remain uncoordinated and ad hoc. Investments in the GFCS governance and management structures are a means of addressing these inefficiencies.” Then replace “The” at the beginning of the sentence that currently begins on line 20 with “Additional” (also replacing “GFCS” in that sentence with “GFCS governance and management”). These changes set the stage for the discussion on “de-risking the GFCS implementation model” (the decentralized approach).</p>			
22	33-37	<p>Delete or change this bullet. It is untrue that the lack of funding for the compendium was in any way a constraint on overall GFCS implementation financing (see previous comment). What could be said is that the lack of coordination and alignment in climate services-related projects implemented with climate financing has led to many duplications and inefficiencies.</p>	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Bullet modified to take into account second part of the statement
22	45	<p>Add, “As stated previously, the third category involves alignment and leveraging of existing and planned programmes implemented by countries and/or international partners.”</p>	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Text added
23	14	<p>What is meant by this? It is suggested earlier in the report that PAC is dissolved. Shouldn’t it say Executive Committee?</p>	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Ambiguity recognized	Paragraph modified to reduce ambiguity
23	19-24	<p>Comment: Most of the additional parties external to WMO membership will be based on national grounds, i.e. steered by nationally based institutions and people. This mean that within NFCS outreach to those institutions and people is essential.</p>	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Not certain this position is supported by the	Final position on modification reserved

				Governance Section	
23	29-30	This is a bit unclear. Why is there an increase?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Ambiguity recognized	Further explanation provided noting that we are comparing the current actual cost of the IBCS which only requires partial support for participants as some participants are self-funded. The new model assumes all participants are funded.
24	11	It would be useful with an explanation of how the Trust Fund functions. How is it managed? Which donors are contributing to it?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	Some information on the Trust Fund is already in Section 5 – additional information is made available in Appendix 11
24	24	Is it realistic to assume that WMO can fund an additional position?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	It is a recommendation that the WMO will have to consider and make a determination on based on assessed risks

24	35-45	Should some mention be made here of increasing the number of GFCS regional offices?	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Relevant discussion provided
25	5	We suggest to change the heading to “Decentralizing the GFCS Implementation Model”	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	Heading name changed
25	10	“decentralization” should be “decentralized”	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Change made
25	13-16	Greater alignment and integration of priority areas and the sustainability of national and regional programmes are essential.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
25	33	This is an interesting argument that should be further elaborated. Could this also be valid when it comes to decentralized staff?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	It depends on what is meant by decentralized staff. In the model being presented in this chapter there is no movement of staff from a global or international centre ... here we are decentralizing responsibility but using local capacity
25	38	“There <del>is</del> exists ... programmes.”	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler)	Accepted	Change made
26	18-19	This sentence at the end of a very strong section does not seem to adequately conclude what the section implies. I suggest replacing it with, “By promoting communication, coordination and alignment across this large and growing portfolio the GFCS	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Recommended change made to the document

		governance and management functions described above have the potential to create enormous value-added. That there is a gap in this regard is already recognized by both GFCS partners as well as climate financing entities. Additional incremental financing for addressing it through the GFCS governance and management functions, if properly articulated, should prove to be a very attractive investment.”			
26	20	<p>Section 8.4 – Financing Mechanisms: maybe during my overly fast reading of the document I missed references to this, but I am missing a more focus discussion on “leveraging”. I think we all agree that the GFCS should not try to manage all CS investments, but rather influence, advocate for and where possible coordinate them (i.e. leverage). A key role of the Secretariat would be to monitor CS activities, including keeping track of investments through different channels – I believe this is referenced in the doc (for example though the proposed annual state of CS report).</p> <p>The question eventually arises, and I do not think it is yet addressed (perhaps this report is premature, but still it needs to be considered): what investment qualifies as being GFCS “tagged”? Who decides? Should GFCS pursue an additional OECD CRS marker like UNISDR did for DRR (see for example: <a href="http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC/STAT(2017)26&amp;docLanguage=En">http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC/STAT(2017)26&amp;docLanguage=En</a> In an effort to raise publicity and advocacy should GFCS accept all self-“tagged” contributions to CS, or should GFCS provide some kind of filtering/quality assurance service?</p> <p>This is increasingly important as we are observing that the new massive grant climate funding (i.e. the GCF) is incentivizing “proposal factories” that churn out copy/pasted projects of dubious quality...and often targeted to ensure continued financing of certain organizations and agencies (who are often</p>	World Bank (D. Kull)	Accepted	<p>The leveraging discussion as well as areas for leveraging was placed in the appendix in an effort to reduce the size of the paragraph. It can be brought into the main chapter.</p> <p>Text included to address GFCS projects etc.</p> <p>I believe your last point is very valid and suggests that funding agencies such as GCF possibly submits proposals to the GFCS to get the at least the Contributing</p>

		over-stepping their mandate and expertise in pursuit of funds) rather than truly benefiting the targeted country/region.			Project status before project or programme approval. This would also address programme coordination and alignment. Under the decentralize model the proposal would be sent to the region national entities for review as they would know what is occurring at the regional/national levels.
26	21-...	Comment: probably most of the funding has been used within projects with limited duration and little emphasis for long-term continuity. In order to develop permanent capacities for providing climate services longer-term engagement and funding for such engagement over many years (>>5) needs to be made available.	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler	agreed	Sentence added
26	25	Source?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	Reference added
26	29	Source? Is this the WB study?	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	Reference added
26	46	Please insert "... experience in mobilizing ..."	DWD (S. Rösner, T. Fuchs, G. Adrian, K. Eichler	Not accepted	Does not add value to the sentence

27	24	We're missing an analysis of how GFCS can avoid "competing" with its partners and rather that co-design of proposals and projects with GFCS can be a "quality stamp".	Norad (A. Tveteraas)	Accepted	Statements have been included in the document to address this point
27	46	"Co-design, co-submission and co-implementation" The GFCS needs to be careful when talking about co-implementation with partners. While the GFCS should certainly be at the table with other implementers, the GFCS should also remain within their specific mandate/role with a focus on coordination.	USA (M. Muth)	Agreed	No change made to the text
28	4-48	In practice, there are currently not enough funds from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change aimed at strengthening climate services in general. WMO and the new structure should therefore analyse the potential of these funds and this issue should be discussed at the Conference of the Parties so that the aims of the GFCS and national climate services are included as priorities for these funds.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
28	5	"the following recommendations are provided"	GEO (D. Cripe)	Accepted	Change made
28	9	Add "Clear articulation, as a joint statement by GFCS stakeholders, to financing sources, of the huge potential value-added to be obtained through adequate financing of the GFCS governance and management functions through the leveraging effect those functions will have on the overall global portfolio of projects supporting GFCS implementation."	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Text added
28	17	"sustained" What if both options are not achievable? We need to be honest, and consider a 'zero growth' option for sustaining the GFCS core functions. If additional Trust Fund resources are not obtained, then specific mention of what would NOT happen might be useful.	USA (M. Muth)	Accepted	This has been addressed to some degree in the decentralization process of the report. If zero growth to the budget for the

					GFCS Office occurs, coupled with the declining trend in the GFCS Trust Fund, the GRCS would have to operate with a smaller staff. This would limit its effectiveness. This would mean that regional and national actors would have to take on greater responsibility for the implementation of the GFCS at regional and national levels.
28	19	“participation of delegates to the 2019 IBCS meeting” This full IBCS meeting will not be taking place, and all references need to be removed from these documents.	USA (M. Muth)	Accepted	Text has been struck-out but there will have to an official statement on this matter
28	24	Add (as a final bullet to the preceding bullet list): “Prospective members of the Executive Committee consider making financial and human resource (secondment) contributions in support of the GFCS Office, as a material demonstration of their commitment to the GFCS as well as a quid pro quo for their increased influence on GFCS governance processes.”	WMO (M. Dilley)	Accepted	Most of the statement added but making a broader appeal to all members

29	13	Improved monitoring and reporting – remains a recommendation – yet recommendations do not indicate how this will happen.	WHO (J. Shumake Guillemot, D. Campbell-Lendrum)	Accepted	See modification to the text as well as the discussion in the 8.4 that notes that the PAC and WMO RAs can support monitoring and evaluation
30	1-15	Recommendations should be updated based on the input/recommendations of the countries and regional associations consulted.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
30	7	“The GFCS is needed to provide a credible, integrative and unique platform...”	GEO (D. Cripe)		
32	1	I suggest replacing “the way to” with “History of”	WMO (M. Dilley)		
32	33-37	On the one hand: “It was seen that the framework’s implementation could be quicker through the engagement of many UN mechanisms”; but on the other “timely decisions from many intergovernmental processes involved” is seen as a challenge. Contradictory?	GEO (D. Cripe)		
35	11	“The GFCS Mid-term review reveals dissatisfaction...”	GEO (D. Cripe)		
35	13	“there is a need for a governance structure leading to less duplication...”	GEO (D. Cripe)		
36	21-30	No explicit mention of Congress having authority to take decisions – should there be?	GEO (D. Cripe)		
36	27	procedures and study and scientific research, operational technical for the production of climate information and provision of climate services;	Brazil (F. de Assis Diniz)		
36	27	develop approve	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)		

36	33	To delete text – oversight of the work of the GFCS Secretariat is Secretary General responsibility	Russian Federation (A. Zaytsev)		
36	41	“to <b>identify</b> priorities for implementation <b>of projects and initiatives</b> at global, regional...”	GEO (D. Cripe)		
40	1	Supervision by UNFCC/COP is more viable on a national level, as climate services are coordinated partly also by UNFCC/COP focal points (besides NHMSs)	WMO RA VI vice-president (K.Radics)		
41		See comments on pp. 18-19 above. The specific functions of the “technical experts” should be identified.	WMO (M. Dilley)		
48		Retitle Annex 11 “Resources for GFCS Implementation”	WMO (M. Dilley)		

### General comments

Comment	Comment sent by	Status of response	Remarks
The GFCS must be held in WMO organization considering the relevant impact of it in the 3 core value of the institution: weather, climate and water.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
Its mandatory to define the appropriate governance mechanism to make sure that the benefit of GFCS will be in accordance to WMO Regional Associations and in the end to SMHN interest.	RA III (G. Navarro)		
Information useful for the MC to make a well informed decision: Need to collate the key risks, with their mitigating actions including milestones and accountabilities for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall level, e.g. PRs don’t support proposals at Congress; ability to deliver transformational change.</li> <li>- Governance level, e.g. Legal implications from changes</li> <li>- Management, e.g. Secretariat resources to implement changes</li> <li>- Financial, e.g. WMO funding decreases</li> </ul>	UK (J. Wardle)		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The impact on current activities, e.g. impact on planned milestones and resourcing.</li> </ul>			
<p>Table showing financial changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Current budget allocation</li> </ul> <p>Future budget allocation – Collate info from Annexes 1 (expanded to include more info on use of budget), 5 and 7, in addition to other sources.</p>	UK (J. Wardle)		
<p>For consideration by the MC for next steps:</p> <p>Need for a transitional plan to be produced which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Engagement plan,</li> <li>- Milestones and timescales of key outcomes / actions, in the run up to the Ext-Congress.</li> <li>- Monitoring and evaluating mechanism.</li> </ul>	UK (J. Wardle)		
<p>The UNDP/CIRDA team endorses the comments from the WB.</p> <p>In addition, we note that the document is limited in its recognition of the linkage between the GFCS and the increasing need to cooperate with the private sector generally, and with private weather services more specifically. The document candidly acknowledges the limited and declining influence of the Partners Advisory Committee, the one forum for private sector participation. The PAC is described as having no meaningful influence on the management and governance of the GFCS. In contrast, representatives of the WMO have increasingly acknowledged the importance of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in support of weather and climate services, and toward that end the WMO 18th Congress next year will include policy decisions on PPPs and the Global Weather Enterprise. See, e.g., Presentation of Dimitar Ivanov, Executive Assistant to the WMO SG on PPPs, Feb. 21, 2018, US AID webinar, "African Demand for Weather and Climate Services, and Business Models for Private Sector Engagement" (available online: <a href="https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/african-demand-weather-and-climate-services-and-business-models-private-sector-engagement">https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/african-demand-weather-and-climate-services-and-business-models-private-sector-engagement</a>); and</p>	UNDP/CIRDA (P. Gremillet)		

<p>Alan Thorpe, "The Weather Enterprise: a Global Public-Private Partnership," WMO Bulletin n° : Vol 65 (2) - 2016, (online: <a href="https://public.wmo.int/en/resources/bulletin/weather-enterprise-global-public-private-partnership">https://public.wmo.int/en/resources/bulletin/weather-enterprise-global-public-private-partnership</a>).</p> <p>Given the budgetary challenges facing the GFCS, and the increasing role of the private sector in the delivery of weather and climate services, it would seem logical to connect the movement toward the GWE with efforts to enhance the status of the GFCS.</p>			
<p>Increasing GFCS political relevance  Limited political relevance was identified as one of the main weakness of GFCS. Therefore, the GFCS reform should more explicitly consider the following:</p> <p>1.1. GFCS role towards strengthening policies and commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· NDCs: What is GFCS value proposition on NDCs, how can GFCS contribute to NDCs? Could GFCS become a partner of the NDC partnership, potentially with a special financial window on provision of climate information services to strengthen NDCs?</li> <li>· NAPs: What is GFCS value proposition on NAPs, what is the entry point of GFCS for NAP support? How could GFCS tap into NAP readiness window?</li> <li>· UNFCCC: UNFCCC should be use as a political leverage to promote the work of GFCS, meaning taking advantage of WMO relationship with UNFCCC. Aiming at institutionally anchoring GFCS to the already complicated and bureaucratic structure of the UNFCCC could end up in further diminishing the relevance of GFCS by letting it get lost into the mist and complexity of the climate negotiations. Lessons from relevant climate related initiatives that are well positioned in the climate agenda such as the pricing carbon coalition or the NDC partnership show us that they have been</li> </ul>	<p>WMO Office of Development Partnerships (DPO)  (L. Santamaria, M. Replik)</p>		

<p>strategic in using the UNFCCC only as an outreach platform without getting into its bureaucratic complexities.</p> <p>1.2. GFCS role on projects and climate information investments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· MDBs: what are the entry points for GFCS with MDBs as the main providers of climate finance? Can we position GFCS through the Alliance for hydromet development as climate information service provider to MDBs, linked to the envisioned MDB alliance commitment?</li> <li>· GCF: in the draft WMO-GCF MoU we are aiming to position the GFCS as a vehicle for aligning GCF investments to strengthen climate services for adaptation and the systems needed to support such services, sharing good practices and tracking collective results.</li> </ul>			
<p>GFCS resource mobilization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Report and recommendations have a very narrow focus related to resource mobilization. While there is a need for some cash for the Secretariat, the big money is out there (400_ billion dollars climate finance on an annual basis). In other words, GFCS needs to position itself vis-à-vis those who put the money on the table – see point 1.2 above.</li> </ul>	<p>WMO Office of Development Partnerships (DPO) (L. Santamaria, M. Replik)</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>I believe the discussion in Appendix 11 addresses much of this.</p>
<p>GFCS and Alliance for hydromet development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· We will position GFCS as a centrepiece of the Alliance for hydromet development. Let's ensure that we closely collaborate on this.</li> </ul>	<p>WMO Office of Development Partnerships (DPO) (L. Santamaria, M. Replik)</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>No change to text required</p>

---