

Summary of the 64th Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: 24-27 March 2026

With many countries calling for urgent action on climate change, the importance of the IPCC’s seventh assessment cycle in providing the best scientific evidence and data for decision makers at the local, country, regional, and global levels is overwhelming. As the cycle progresses, the importance of each IPCC session increases as fundamental decisions are needed to enable the production of the Seventh Assessment Report (AR7). But significant obstacles have emerged.

While many saw the agenda for the 64th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC-64) as a business meeting, the Panel was unable to avoid the contentious debates that have characterized every session in the seventh assessment cycle. While all Panel members have underscored the importance of agreeing on a timeline for the production of the AR7, the Panel has been unable to find common ground. Positions remained fixed at this meeting, and friction bled into consideration of a host of topics, from consideration of the IPCC’s Principles and Procedures to reactions to progress reports from the Secretariat, past IPCC sessions, and activities associated with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The timeline was not on the provisional agenda for this meeting, so some members with limited resources didn’t attend and others didn’t have a mandate to negotiate. Instead, the Panel focused on trying to identify a way forward that would allow this question to be resolved at IPCC-65. This will be a critical moment for resolution, as the next budget—scheduled for approval at IPCC-65—will need to incorporate information about anticipated workload and related requirements.

In addition to discussions of the timeline, the IPCC considered a review of its Principles and Procedures, a mandatory task which is supposed to take place every five years. Initial discussion in plenary indicated general agreement that the Principles and Procedures have been working well for the IPCC, but suggestions for targeted tweaks and enhancements gave way to calls for a comprehensive review that was not timebound. Ultimately, the Panel agreed to consider the review of the IPCC Principles and Procedures at future sessions, as appropriate.

Adding to the pressure on the IPCC is the state of its Trust Fund. As United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Executive

Director Inger Andersen noted in her address to the Panel, expenditures are exceeding contributions. If this pattern continues, the Trust Fund will soon be depleted. The timing of this situation is particularly difficult as the IPCC moves into the busiest and most difficult part of an assessment cycle. The pattern of contentious meetings may also increase costs, especially if the Panel requires late night sessions or extended days to conclude its work.

On Friday morning, the IPCC acknowledged the impending retirement of IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit, who has served in this role since 2016. IPCC Deputy Director Ermira Fida, on behalf of the Secretariat, thanked Secretary Mokssit, saying his leadership has “shaped who we are, how we work, and what we believe is possible.” World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Deputy Secretary-General Ko Barrett lauded Secretary Mokssit’s combination of intellect and wisdom. Many delegates, including

In this Issue

A Brief History of the IPCC	2
IPCC-64 Report.	3
Approval of the Draft Reports of the 61st, 62nd and 63rd Sessions.	4
Admission of Observer Organizations	4
Review of IPCC Principles and Procedures	5
Progress with the Timeline of AR7.	8
Matters Related to Other Activities.	10
Report of the IPCC Conflict of Interest Committee . . .	11
Progress Reports	11
Matters Related to UNFCCC and Other International Bodies	13
Place and Date for IPCC-65	14
Closing of the Session.	14
A Brief Analysis of IPCC-64	14
Upcoming Meetings	15
Glossary	15

governments, members of the Bureau, and observers, took the floor to express their appreciation for, and good wishes to, Secretary Mokssit.

IPCC-64 convened from 24–27 March 2026 in Bangkok, Thailand, with approximately 330 participants, including representatives of 106 member countries, as well as international organizations and civil society.

A Brief History of the IPCC

The IPCC was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to assess, in a comprehensive, objective, and transparent manner, the scientific, technical, and socio-economic information relevant to understanding human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and adaptation and mitigation options. The IPCC is an intergovernmental and scientific body with 195 member countries. It does not undertake new research or monitor climate-related data; rather, hundreds of scientists from around the world volunteer their time to conduct assessments of the state of climate change knowledge based on thousands of scientific papers published internationally, to provide a comprehensive summary of what is known about the drivers of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and how adaptation and mitigation can reduce those risks. IPCC reports are intended to be policy relevant but not policy prescriptive. The reports provide key input into international climate change negotiations and are intended to support governments at all levels.

The IPCC has three Working Groups (WGs):

- WGI addresses the physical science basis of climate change;
- WGII addresses climate change impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability; and
- WGIII addresses options for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and mitigating climate change.

Each WG has two Co-Chairs and seven Vice-Chairs, with the exception of WGII, which has eight Vice-Chairs.

The Co-Chairs guide the WGs in fulfilling their mandates with the assistance of Technical Support Units (TSUs). In addition, the IPCC has a Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI), also supported by a TSU, to oversee the IPCC National GHG Inventories Programme. The Programme aims to develop and refine an internationally agreed methodology and software for calculating and reporting national GHG emissions and removals and to encourage its use by parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The IPCC elects its Bureau for the duration of an assessment cycle, which includes preparation of an assessment report and any special and methodological reports and technical papers published during that period. The Bureau comprises climate change experts representing all regions and includes the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs, WG Co-Chairs and Vice-Chairs, and TFI Co-Chairs. The IPCC has a permanent Secretariat based in Geneva, Switzerland, hosted by the WMO.

In 2007, the Nobel Peace Prize was jointly awarded to the IPCC and former US Vice-President Al Gore for their work and efforts “to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations needed to counteract such change.”

IPCC Products

Since its inception, the Panel has prepared a series of comprehensive assessment reports and special reports that provide scientific information on climate change to the international community.

The IPCC has produced six assessment reports, which were completed in 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007, 2014, and 2023. The assessment reports are structured in four parts, three matching the purviews of the WGs and a fourth synthesizing their key findings. Each WG’s contribution consists of a comprehensive assessment report, a Technical Summary (TS), and a Summary for Policymakers (SPM). The report undergoes an exhaustive, three-stage review process by experts and governments consisting of a first review by experts, a second review by experts and governments, and a third review by governments. The SPM is then approved line-by-line in plenary by the respective WG and adopted by the Panel.

After the three WG reports are accepted and their SPMs are approved, a Synthesis Report is produced to integrate the key findings from the three WG reports and any other reports from that assessment cycle, with the Panel then undertaking a line-by-line approval of the SPM of the Synthesis Report.

The IPCC has also produced a range of special reports on climate change-related issues. The Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) included three special reports:

- Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5), which was approved by IPCC-48 in October 2018;
- Climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems (SRCCL), which was approved by IPCC-50 in August 2019; and
- Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (SROCC), which was approved by IPCC-51 in September 2019.

In addition, the IPCC produces methodology reports which provide guidelines to help countries report on GHG emissions. Good Practice Guidance reports were approved in 2000 and 2003, while the IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories were approved in 2006. A Refinement to the 2006 Guidelines on National GHG Inventories (2019 Refinement) was adopted at IPCC-49 in May 2019.

Seventh Assessment Cycle

In July 2023, IPCC-59 elected a new slate of leaders, including Jim Skea (UK) as Chair, to guide the Panel’s work during the seventh assessment cycle.

In January 2024, IPCC-60 took crucial decisions on its workplan for the coming years, including on the products and timelines for some of its outputs. However, the Panel was unable to reach consensus on key elements of the timeline for the cycle and agreed to continue deliberations on its strategic planning schedule during its next meeting.

During IPCC-61, the Panel agreed on the outlines for the Special Report on Cities and Climate Change, and a Methodology Report on Inventories for Short-lived Climate Forcers. The Panel was again unable to reach agreement on the strategic planning schedule.

IPCC-62 agreed on the outlines of the three Working Group reports, as well as a decision that enabled the AR7 author nomination process to begin; however, it did not reach agreement on

the AR7 workplan, including the timeline for the Working Groups' contributions.

At IPCC-63, the Panel reached agreement on the outline for a methodology report on carbon dioxide removal technologies, carbon capture utilization and storage. The Panel did not reach consensus on a workplan.

IPCC-64 Report

The 64th session of the IPCC opened on Tuesday, 24 March 2026. Raweewan Bhuridej, Permanent Secretary of Thailand's Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, described IPCC reports as cornerstones for policymaking at the global, regional, and local levels. Highlighting that the IPCC enhances understanding of the causes, impacts, and risks of climate change, she said scientific knowledge is indispensable for developing policies to protect lives and livelihoods from climate change. She underscored the importance of funding the IPCC, noting this in turn supports the UNFCCC's Global Stocktake and the international community's ability to assess its progress toward achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement.

IPCC Chair Jim Skea highlighted work completed to date in the seventh assessment cycle, noting, *inter alia*: the selection of all authors; the first joint Lead Author Meeting for Working Groups I, II and III held in December; the meeting of authors of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities in January; the expert review of the Methodology Report on Inventories for Short-lived Climate Forcers in February; and the upcoming meeting of authors for the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories in April.

Noting that the IPCC's workload will increase as the seventh assessment cycle progresses, Skea emphasized the importance of using IPCC-64 to consider ways of working and how IPCC business is conducted. He said the Panel should give the stipulated review of the IPCC's Principles and Procedures its full and undivided attention. He also underscored the importance of the state of the IPCC's finances, emphasizing that the IPCC's ability to deliver on its mandate depends on the sustainability of its Trust Fund. He added that the Trust Fund is a vital mechanism for supporting the participation of developing country governments and scientists.

Ko Barrett, WMO Deputy Secretary-General, lauded the "strong and steady" progress made in the seventh assessment cycle and efforts to strengthen gender, inclusivity, and diversity. She emphasized the importance of the session's planned review of IPCC's Principles and Procedures, underscoring that they ensure the Panel's rigor and integrity. Barrett emphasized that sustained and, where possible, increased financial support from governments will be essential to safeguard the Panel's work.

Inger Andersen, UNEP Executive Director, commended progress on the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities and the two methodology reports, and stressed the importance of ongoing work on gender and diversity. Andersen underscored the importance of the review of the IPCC's Principles and Procedures, saying they are a model followed by other science-policy bodies. Warning that expenditures from the Trust Fund have exceeded contributions over the past few years, she said a well-funded IPCC is needed to guide the world out of the climate emergency.

Stressing that the work of the IPCC is indispensable, Simon Stiell, UNFCCC Executive Secretary, emphasized its importance in guiding, informing, and shaping the global response to climate change. He said the rigor and objectivity of the IPCC's work is crucial for feeding into the Global Stocktake and climate policy making and emphasized the need to keep truth at the heart of climate cooperation and climate action.

Following these remarks, the IPCC moved to a closed session. Chair Skea outlined the working modalities for the session, emphasizing that IPCC meetings are guided by the highest ethical standards, underscoring the importance of respectful and inclusive dialogue, and encouraging all delegates to work together to reach consensus.

Chair Skea then invited the Panel to approve the provisional agenda ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 1, Rev. 2](#)).

Many countries expressed concern that the timeline for delivery of the AR7 was not on the provisional agenda. SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA, CHINA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SOUTH AFRICA, EGYPT, ALGERIA, VENEZUELA, and KENYA called for discussion of this issue during IPCC-64. SAUDI ARABIA, SOUTH AFRICA, and KENYA expressed concern about the impact of further delays on the IPCC's work. INDIA said their proposals for the timeline had been disregarded by the Executive Committee. BURUNDI supported adding the timeline to the agenda, highlighting the importance of flexibility for each country.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA supported the Bureau's proposed agenda but, noting that further delays on the timeline could jeopardize successful delivery of AR7, called for clear communication on the way forward with a view to reaching agreement on the timeline at the next session. NEPAL, supported by PANAMA, welcomed guidance on how the timeline issue could be advanced.

SWITZERLAND encouraged the Chair to facilitate informal consultations on this issue throughout the week, with the aim of identifying paths to convergence and consensus. BRAZIL and the UK requested clarification on the reasons for not including the issue on the provisional agenda and supported discussion on the way forward.

MALAYSIA supported constructive discussions with a view to reaching a balanced decision that reflects the interests of all IPCC members. TUNISIA underscored the importance of reaching consensus. The NETHERLANDS noted the absence of the issue from the provisional agenda meant some countries may not have a mandate to engage in formal negotiations.

Chair Skea explained he had not detected the flexibility among governments that would allow the Panel to reach a conclusion at this meeting, and new information was emerging on the timelines for the methodology and special reports that would inform the Panel's discussions of this issue. He proposed to conduct informal consultations to identify the basis for any flexibility and to open the subject under the agenda item "Any Other Business," with a view to identifying the path to a conclusion at IPCC-65. BELGIUM supported Chair Skea's proposal, saying in the absence of clarity on the flexibility of governments, they did not see the need for a formal agenda item.

INDIA opposed this proposal, saying a lack of flexibility was coming from members of the IPCC leadership and he was mystified by some governments' statements that they did not have a mandate for discussion of this issue.

SAUDI ARABIA insisted the issue be included on the agenda and said deferring it to IPCC-65 risked a scenario in which the budget would not be approved and further work would be delayed.

Noting the lack of consensus, Chair Skea proposed to move forward with other agenda items and return to the provisional agenda in the afternoon, following informal consultations over the lunch break.

NEW ZEALAND, GERMANY, LUXEMBOURG, COLOMBIA, SINGAPORE, TÜRKIYE, SWEDEN, FRANCE, PANAMA, NORWAY, FINLAND, CANADA, and IRELAND supported the Chair's proposal. NORWAY highlighted the importance of finding common ground and welcomed bilateral discussions.

INDIA opposed the Chair's proposal, saying the Panel cannot cherry pick issues if the agenda has not been approved. SAUDI ARABIA said it is not procedurally correct to disregard approval of the agenda and called for time to be added to the agenda for discussion of the timeline.

SOUTH AFRICA expressed concern that informal consultations may not be inclusive of all governments. KENYA concurred and called for immediately starting discussions on the timeline at IPCC-64. Saying failure was not an option, IPCC Vice-Chair Ladislaus Chang'a called for a break for informal consultations. Noting Chang'a's record of building consensus, Chair Skea invited him to convene a huddle.

On Tuesday afternoon, Chang'a reported that participants supported adding this item to the agenda. After a brief discussion, delegates formally agreed to add "Progress with the timeline of the AR7" to the agenda and to establish a contact group, to be co-chaired by Brazil and Canada, with a mandate to advise the Panel on progress with the timeline for the AR7.

With the addition of this new agenda item, the Panel adopted the agenda (IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 1, Rev.3, Add.1).

Approval of the Draft Reports of the 61st, 62nd and 63rd Sessions

On Wednesday afternoon, the Panel discussed approval of the draft reports of the 61st ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 4](#)), 62nd ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 5](#)) and 63rd sessions ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 8](#)) of the IPCC.

GERMANY, supported by BELGIUM, expressed concerns about lack of transparency in the draft reports, as they do not specify the names of speakers. FRANCE emphasized that lack of identification of country positions makes it difficult to understand what happened.

CHILE, supported by PANAMA, stated that "quantifiers" should not be used and added that the Panel has previously decided that the use of quantifiers would not become standard practice. PANAMA, supported by GERMANY, stated that the reports should be as factual as possible, using numbers of speakers and names of countries to create a clear record of proceedings.

The NETHERLANDS said there are ways to improve transparency, such as by better defining quantifying language, or by identifying the country that made each intervention. SWITZERLAND suggested looking at the methods used in other processes, such as the UNFCCC, to identify a solution.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA, said the draft report for IPCC-63 was an improvement and should be approved. SAUDI ARABIA opposed using numbers to indicate how many speakers supported or opposed a given position, noting that each member's view holds equal weight and importance, and suggested attributing each statement to either a developed or developing country speaker. INDIA added that verbatim transcripts would be acceptable, but they would be very long.

TÜRKIYE said the richness and diversity of discussions are not always reflected in the draft reports. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA and EGYPT emphasized that the reports should accurately reflect what occurred at the meetings.

Chair Skea invited IPCC Vice-Chair Diana Ürge-Vorsatz to convene a huddle to discuss guidance to be given to the Secretariat.

On Friday, Chair Skea noted that comments indicating that the quality of the report of the 63rd session was considered to be higher than those of the 61st and 62nd sessions. He proposed that the Panel adopt the report of the 63rd session.

GERMANY noted their openness to revisions to the report, especially regarding the presentation of diverging views and, citing lack of consensus in the room, opposed its adoption.

Citing the need for transparency, FRANCE requested that past and future reports include everything that has been said by all delegates. SAUDI ARABIA said this approach would be unacceptable and supported adoption of the reports of the 63rd and 62nd sessions. INDIA supported adoption of the reports without changes, emphasizing that because the IPCC works on the basis of consensus, it does not matter how many countries spoke for or against a position.

BELGIUM underscored that no one was asking to move away from consensus; rather, they were asking for transparency.

Chair Skea noted that, in the absence of consensus, the reports would be deferred to IPCC-65.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIV-6), the IPCC defers consideration of the draft reports of the 61st, 62nd, and 63rd sessions to its 65th session.

Admission of Observer Organizations

On Tuesday afternoon, Jennifer Lew Schneider, IPCC Legal Officer, introduced this agenda item ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 2](#)), noting there were 263 organizations with observer status to the IPCC and 20 new applications.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION asked whether observer organizations are required demonstrate that an element of their work relates to climate change. The Legal Officer confirmed that all organizations that apply for observer status are required to align with the intentions, goals, and mandate of the IPCC.

SAUDI ARABIA requested clarification on the continued listing of four pending applications held over from previous sessions, saying they should be dismissed. They also noted "differentiated treatment for certain organizations," saying this creates imbalance.

Chair Skea clarified that any consideration of the ways in which applicants are dealt with would fall under the review of principles and procedures and that the 20 applications did not include those that were pending.

The Panel approved the 20 new applications for observer status. This did not include the four pending applications.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIV-2), the Panel, *inter alia*, decides to grant the following organizations IPCC observer status, in accordance with the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations:

1. Abibinsroma Foundation
2. Association pour l'innovation et la recherche au service du climat (AirClimat)
3. Discover Model United Nations Foundation (DMUN)
4. Earth's Climate for Sustainable Development Foundation (EC4SDF)
5. HATOF Foundation
6. Mediterranean Youth Foundation for Development (MYF)
7. Out for Sustainability (Out4S)
8. Researchers' Desk
9. Rock Institute for Global Decarbonization Progress (RIGDP)
10. Silver Lining
11. Society of Entrepreneurs and Ecology (SEE)
12. United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)
13. Université Côte d'Azur
14. Verità Onlus – International Diplomacy (V.O.I.D.)
15. Association Congolaise pour le Développement Agricole - France (ACDA)
16. Alliance Internationale pour la Défense des Droits et des Libertés (AIDL)
17. California Institute of Technology (Caltech)
18. Fédération des Coopératives des Pays de Mayoko France (FECOPAM-France)
19. Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology (NUIST)
20. Partnership for Policy Integrity (PFPI)

Review of IPCC Principles and Procedures

On Tuesday afternoon, Jennifer Lew Schneider, IPCC Legal Officer, introduced this agenda item ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 6, Corr. 1](#)), explaining that the IPCC's Principles and Procedures must be reviewed at least every five years, but the previous review was delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. She noted the IPCC Chair, in collaboration with the Secretariat, had collected initial views on possible elements for consideration, with the aim of providing advice to the Panel on aspects of the principles that have been difficult to interpret or challenging to implement. She said the Executive Committee had been asked to provide input, and these views were compiled and presented to the Bureau at its 70th session for further input and prioritization.

Lew Schneider presented twelve topics prioritized by the Bureau: author selection criteria; responsibility for author selection; chapter scientists; scope of literature/Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge; selection criteria and responsibilities for review editors; terms of reference for the Chair, Vice Chairs, and Working Group Co-Chairs; terms of reference for Technical Support Units (TSUs); developing country engagement and broader finance concerns; carbon footprint and inclusivity; artificial intelligence (AI); copyright; and timing and guidance on conflict of interest.

Chair Skea underscored that the review of principles and procedures is a matter for the Panel and said running the issue by the Executive Committee and Bureau was not meant to preempt consideration of issues. He further noted that this Panel session does

not constitute a review but could establish how such a review could be conducted, if needed.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, supported by NORWAY, called for prioritizing elements that enhance inclusivity and have immediate applicability in the AR7 cycle.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for prioritizing selection of experts, emphasizing that government recommendations must be considered to ensure trust in the reports, and suggested discussing two or three issues at each session going forward.

SAUDI ARABIA emphasized that the document presents an unfiltered set of perspectives and is therefore premature, and the panel should agree on a member-driven process for review.

NORWAY said they were pleased with the process leading to the 12 prioritized areas and, while the IPCC's Principles and Procedures are serving the Panel well, consistency in a few areas could be improved.

INDIA: opposed a large-scale review, saying the IPCC had successfully produced six assessment reports; said some topics are simply suggestions that could be undertaken without substantive change; cited concern about areas in which representation and equity are not being promoted; and suggested the issue be sent back to the Bureau for further consideration before it is brought back to the Panel. Chair Skea clarified that this is a government-driven process and the Bureau's input was not intended to constrain the Panel's thinking.

GERMANY said more guidance would be useful in certain cases, such as election rules and use of AI, and suggested establishing a task group to conduct intersessional work. BRAZIL, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and many others supported the establishment of a task group to discuss the items to be reviewed.

SWEDEN, AUSTRIA, and CHINA stated that there was no need for major changes to the existing principles and procedures and that any changes should be limited, focused, and precise. CANADA, ITALY, and SOUTH AFRICA stated that improvements could also be achieved through better implementation and guidance.

The UK stated that the existing principles and procedures provide a strong foundation for the IPCC's work and, noting there is a considerable amount of work to be done in the next phase of the assessment cycle, it would be important to keep work on principles and procedures focused. ICELAND called for a pragmatic and constructive approach, supported undertaking an intersessional process, and said a review must not affect the timely delivery of AR7 reports. AUSTRALIA stated that the current process is operating reasonably well and that the review of principles and procedures should be targeted and completed within a set timeframe.

SWITZERLAND, supported by CHILE and IRAQ, stated that a realistic approach must be taken and called for using the Bureau's list as the basis for the Panel's work with a focus on items for which there is a prospect for reaching agreement.

DENMARK and TÜRKIYE supported the regular targeted and focused review of principles and procedures and, with REPUBLIC OF KOREA, CHINA, FRANCE, and AZERBAIJAN, supported focusing on the Bureau's list. SWEDEN and BELGIUM stated that topics on the Bureau's list that should be prioritized include the development of policies and protocols on copyright and conflict of interest. They stated that any intersessional work should have a clear mandate.

BRAZIL stressed the importance of addressing the development of policies and protocols on AI and with BELGIUM, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, and SAMOA, highlighted the importance of addressing topics including Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge in the assessment of literature.

NORTH MACEDONIA stressed the need for improvements in author selection and regional balance and the importance of ensuring transparency and consistency.

The NETHERLANDS, supported by LUXEMBOURG, cautioned against undertaking a major overhaul or review. Along with BELGIUM, they sought clarification on the rules for the election of Working Group Vice-Chairs, expressing concerns about how past processes unfolded.

JAPAN noted challenges in reaching consensus on some issues and stressed the need to allow the Bureau and Secretariat to be able to do their work effectively.

KENYA, supported by TANZANIA, stressed the need for inclusivity to ensure that important diverse knowledge sets are applied and structural disparities are addressed. KENYA questioned how issues that are not on the Bureau's list will be addressed.

NEPAL, SOUTH AFRICA, MOROCCO, INDONESIA, and SAMOA highlighted the need for a clear and inclusive review process. BRAZIL said the process must be inclusive, open-ended, and member driven.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA highlighted the need for resources to facilitate the engagement of countries with limited capacities and the need for a manageable and efficient process focusing on issues with a reasonable prospect for resolution.

SOUTH AFRICA stressed the need to ensure that sufficient time is provided to allow delegates to prepare for the review.

INDIA opposed timeframes for completion of the review, saying it should be open-ended, and said it was premature to create a task group before issues are identified and applicable reports are prepared. With SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA suggested the IPCC Secretariat prepare a report summarizing country views on the items to be reviewed.

Lew Schneider clarified, *inter alia*, that the IPCC's rules require that the principles and procedures be reviewed every five years, amendments take immediate effect, and the rules on elections are general in nature and do not have specific provisions focusing on the election of Working Group Vice-Chairs.

Noting several countries endorsed creation of an intersessional task group, Chair Skea proposed a huddle to consider a mandate for the group and to identify topics that could be discussed in plenary.

GERMANY supported this proposal.

INDIA opposed both aspects of the Chair's proposal and called for a more inclusive way forward. SAUDI ARABIA: opposed the proposal, noting there was no consensus to launch a task group; opposed using the document provided by the Secretariat as a basis for discussion; called for members to provide views on what should be reviewed and enhanced; and said the Secretariat should circulate the collected views for consideration at IPCC-65.

Chair Skea suggested the huddle could consider whether a task group should be formed at this stage and, in the spirit of inclusiveness, the Panel could move to the next stage of plenary discussion in which Panel members identify their priorities. IPCC Vice-Chair Ramón Pichs-Madruga convened the huddle.

On Wednesday morning, Pichs-Madruga said there was no opposition to a task group, but the timing of its creation and the sequence of the process was still in dispute.

INDIA said there was no consensus that issues should be prioritized and there was no agreement on the timing of the convening of a task group.

Lew Schneider clarified that the review could consider major or partial proposed amendments, changes to IPCC practices, or the creation of guidance to support the timely and robust delivery of the Panel's work.

LUXEMBOURG suggested the IPCC Legal Officer prepare guidance for the Panel identifying which items on the Bureau's list are the best candidates for amendment and which can be addressed through changes in practice or guidance.

Chair Skea stated that some items could be addressed through amendments or changes in practice/guidance, and there is not a rigid line between them. He stressed the need for inputs from members to determine how to proceed. Countries outlined their priorities for potential consideration under the review of the IPCC's Principles and Procedures.

Many members prioritized copyright, conflict of interest procedures, AI, and ensuring inclusivity by supporting the participation of developing and least developed countries and incorporating Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge.

Many said the principles and procedures are working well and supported a limited review that could be completed by IPCC-65, ahead of the report approval sessions starting in 2027. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, supported by BELGIUM, AUSTRALIA, and SAMOA, suggested starting the review at IPCC-64, working intersessionally, and using the prioritized list prepared by the Bureau as a starting point for discussions.

Several members, including the UK, SWEDEN, NEW ZEALAND, and ESTONIA, requested advice from the Legal Officer on which items could be addressed through guidance or other means that would not require the Panel's consideration.

SAUDI ARABIA prioritized, *inter alia*:

- avoiding overlaps with meetings in other processes;
- establishing defined timeframes for each IPCC report cycle based on the time needed for a sound assessment rather than external factors;
- ensuring full developing country participation in IPCC plenary sessions;
- ensuring more fulsome use of literature from the Global South, reflecting inputs and experience from all regions;
- improving the scheduling of meetings so that they are not held during religious holidays;
- requiring that invitations for workshops be approved by the Panel or the Bureau to ensure oversight and confidence;
- ensuring that workshops address the full applicable range of views and recommendations and reflect the consensus of experts;
- clarifying the role of government review;
- ensuring balance in sub-regional representation;
- ensuring proper coordination with UNFCCC processes;
- excluding military observers;
- requiring all IPCC decisions to be made by consensus, including procedural decisions; and
- setting fixed timelines for IPCC report cycles.

SAUDI ARABIA further stated that, under its policy for admitting observers, the IPCC should re-assess the procedural rights of the European Union to ensure a transparent and consistent approach for participation by all members. VENEZUELA noted rapid increases in the volume of scientific literature and expressed concern that shorter cycles will negatively affect developing countries. ALGERIA supported increasing delegation sizes of developing countries at approval sessions.

BURUNDI called for translating reports into several languages and organizing regional workshops.

MALAWI highlighted the importance of encouraging the participation of early career researchers consistently across working groups and increasing the representation of developing countries in approval sessions. NEPAL supported ensuring intra- and sub-regional balance in the selection of authors and encouraging the participation of early career researchers.

JAPAN, THE GAMBIA, and others supported consideration of procedures for virtual or hybrid meetings. SAUDI ARABIA emphasized that virtual participation cannot replicate in-person negotiations, brings risks of connectivity issues, and hybrid meetings may favor developed countries with the resources to travel, thereby reinforcing inequalities in participation.

The NETHERLANDS opposed proposals that would reduce the policy relevance of the IPCC or hamper decision-making by broadening a requirement for consensus. FRANCE underscored the importance of maintaining policy relevance.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed concern that the selection of authors for AR7 was unfair to their government and emphasized that AI should not be used by authors as an authoritative source of information. KENYA, BELGIUM, INDIA, and BRAZIL called for guidelines on the use of AI. IRAQ supported the introduction of AI, emphasizing its potential to save significant time.

JAPAN, KENYA, SAMOA, and FRANCE supported consideration of the status of chapter scientists. JAPAN said the opinions of coordinating lead authors should be prioritized in their selection.

Underscoring that a task group established after IPCC-65 would not have the opportunity to feed back into the plenary, SWITZERLAND, supported by SWEDEN, called attention to work done by the *ad hoc* group on lessons learned from the sixth assessment cycle ([IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9](#)), noting this includes a list of improvements and indicates when they could be addressed by adjusting the IPCC's Principles and Procedures.

Noting broad convergence on the creation of a task group, REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed that it be established at the end of IPCC-64 and report back at IPCC-65, working on the understanding that the 12 topics identified by the Bureau are not fixed.

NORWAY emphasized there is no discrepancy between tracking carbon footprint and inclusivity, suggested separating these discussions going forward, and said it is important to get the conflict-of-interest policy right.

SAUDI ARABIA and INDIA called for consideration of a comprehensive compilation of proposals at IPCC-65, and SAUDI ARABIA said this work should not be timebound. INDIA outlined its priorities, *inter alia*: no decisions should be taken without consensus; there should be no back-to-back review work for governments or overlaps with related meetings or major religious

holidays; and IPCC cycles should be seven years long for comprehensiveness and inclusivity.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for introducing wording to protect the independence of the IPCC and ensure it can act at its own pace. FRANCE emphasized this work needs to finish at IPCC-65.

Lew Schneider presented a table setting out the Bureau's 12 items proposed for review and identifying the suitability of addressing each by either amendment to the existing principle or through changes in practice or guidance. She suggested that changes in practice or guidance could address each, although the issue of conflict of interest would be effectively addressed by amendment. She noted it is for the Panel to determine what method, if any, is appropriate for addressing each item.

INDIA called for both the proposed items listed by the Bureau and those raised by members to be compiled and circulated by the Secretariat to the members in writing.

SAUDI ARABIA raised concerns that the table prepared by the Legal Officer only addressed, and thereby prioritized, the Bureau's items. They said all items identified by members also must be considered and moved forward in the same manner as the Bureau's items.

IPCC Chair Skea proposed the creation of a contact group to consider the way forward and, if there is agreement on a way forward, to address any issues that can be resolved quickly.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA, requested the Secretariat to prepare a list of the issues raised by members to be considered by the proposed contact group. Chair Skea agreed and asked members to promptly email their issues to the Secretariat. He asked Lydia Elewa (Egypt) and Frank McGovern (Ireland) to co-chair the contact group.

On Friday, McGovern reported the contact group discussions indicated existing principles and procedures are working well but regular reviews are essential. He said there was no agreement on whether to establish a task group or what the timing would be, with some preferring that a review be completed at IPCC-65 and others preferring that it begin during the next session and continue for a long time.

Chair Skea presented a draft decision produced by the contact group Co-Chairs, which, *inter alia*: states that the IPCC's Principles and Procedures are robust and have worked well; recognizes the importance and necessity of regular review; expresses thanks to the Bureau and Secretariat for their work in preparing for a review of the Principles and Procedures; and recognizes the value of the information and analysis contained in the Secretariat's report ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 6, Corr. 1, Add. 1](#)).

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA, said the draft decision lacked a clear process and could be misleading. INDIA underscored that the group had not reached agreement.

COLOMBIA suggested specifying that the review of principles and procedures had ended and would be considered again in 2031. SAUDI ARABIA opposed this suggestion, saying the review has just begun.

The contact group Co-Chairs presented a revised draft decision.

SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA, and KENYA opposed language indicating that the Principles and Procedures have worked well and are robust. GERMANY indicated that this language reflects statements made in plenary and reiterated that many amendments and improvements can be made by other means. INDIA opposed

this, saying if principles or procedures can be corrected by other means, they are not part of the review. SAUDI ARABIA underscored that the door is always open for review.

NORWAY observed that lack of consensus could be interpreted to mean that no amendments of the Principles and Procedures were appropriate and the Panel could consider the review complete.

Chair Skea noted the diversity of views and invited the Panel to consider a slightly revised version of the text. The Panel adopted the decision without further discussion.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIV-5), the IPCC, *inter alia*, notes the diversity of views expressed at the session, takes note of Document 6, Corr. 1, Add. 1, Rev. 1, and decides to consider the review of the IPCC Principles and Procedures at future sessions, as appropriate.

Progress with the Timeline of AR7

Following the decision to add the workplan to the agenda for this session, delegates convened in a contact group on Wednesday morning with a mandate to advise the Panel on progress with the timeline for AR7. The group was co-chaired by Pedro Ivo Ferraz da Silva (Brazil) and Chris Derksen (Canada).

On Wednesday afternoon, Derksen stated that no consensus had been reached regarding next steps. SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA, emphasized the urgent need to address the issue, noting the implications that failure to agree would have for approving the AR7 budget and activities in 2027, and the uncertainty this is creating.

On Thursday morning, following a meeting of the contact group on Wednesday evening, Ferraz da Silva and Derksen cited the need for further exchange of views. Working Group II Co-Chair Winston Chow said scientists are awaiting a clear signal from governments regarding the timeline under which they are to work. Chair Skea asked members to focus their interventions on suggestions on the process for the way forward and on specific ideas for the timeline.

SINGAPORE, supported by CANADA, NEPAL, CUBA, CHINA, TANZANIA, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, and MEXICO, reiterated that many members were not present or were unprepared to address this issue, as it was not on the provisional agenda. They proposed that members submit their views on the timeline to the Secretariat for circulation and that the Secretariat summarize the submissions and present an options report for discussion at IPCC-65.

SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, GERMANY, CUBA, TANZANIA, SAMOA, MEXICO, ZIMBABWE, and AZERBAIJAN expressed inclusivity concerns, noting that several countries were not attending the meeting. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA stated that inclusivity and capacity issues must be considered, noting that many small island developing states (SIDS) that were not present would likely have made interventions on the issue had they known that it would be on the agenda.

COOK ISLANDS, supported by DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, LUXEMBOURG, PALAU, AUSTRALIA, VANUATU, FINLAND, SAMOA, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, ITALY, BELIZE, CHILE, and PANAMA stated that the timeline presented by the Co-Chairs provided sufficient time for the review process and that, based on the current stage of the AR7 cycle, time is of the essence and further submissions from members should not be invited.

SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, CHILE, TÜRKIYE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, DENMARK, LUXEMBOURG, PALAU, AUSTRALIA, VANUATU, FINLAND, SAMOA, NEW

ZEALAND, NORWAY, AUSTRIA, and BELIZE stressed that the timeline process should be led by the Co-Chairs.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by BAHRAIN, BELARUS, YEMEN, and KENYA, stressed the need to move beyond general positions and discuss options without delay to avoid challenges in passing the IPCC budget, if the timeline is not agreed. They highlighted the need to address overlaps in scheduling, back-to-back reviews, inclusivity, capacity issues, procedural alignment with the UNFCCC process, and timeframes to allow for comprehensive inputs from developing countries. They proposed that the timeline envision the approval of WG reports in 2028 and 2029, which could provide sufficient intervals between IPCC sessions, time for developing countries to undertake their reviews, and inclusive engagement.

KENYA: emphasized that authors need time to absorb and address comments; said future proposals should factor in substantial time for reviews, no back-to-back reviews or approvals, and no overlaps with UNFCCC meetings; and called for further discussions at IPCC-64.

BELIZE emphasized they had shown flexibility by adding the timeline to the agenda of this session and expressed concern that further consideration would reflect only a handful of members' positions.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION supported looking at specific proposals, saying Saudi Arabia's was well thought out.

SOUTH AFRICA pointed to divergence on issues of inclusivity and the possibility of providing scientific input into the second Global Stocktake, and requested the Working Groups' Co-Chairs to prepare new options that bridge these different views.

HAITI underscored that developing countries and SIDS should not be left out of decision making due to lack of capacity.

PANAMA emphasized the importance of including all members in decision making and said discussions at IPCC-64 could not preclude future deliberations on this issue.

The NETHERLANDS emphasized that: never before has the timeline given rise to such heated and polarized debate; and delivery after the second Global Stocktake would significantly lower the policy relevance of AR7. They supported Singapore's proposal to review submissions before IPCC-65 and called for the Chair to carry out consultations to identify any flexibility in government positions.

The UK underscored the unprecedented nature of this situation and suggested requesting that countries explore options and flexibilities before IPCC-65 with a view to agreeing to the timeline at that session. The UK further highlighted the importance of building trust and reassuring members that everyone is working toward the same goal.

INDIA said points raised by developing country members during AR6 were not given serious thought, which led to difficulties in approvals. On potential alignment with the Global Stocktake, INDIA said even if AR7 were ready in 2027, no Working Group report in the next assessment cycle could be ready in time for the third Global Stocktake in 2033.

LIBYA said all viewpoints should be given the same weight and urged Panel members to understand the positions of developing countries.

ALGERIA, TANZANIA, and ZIMBABWE said the Panel must consider the capacity of developing countries, noting they must be given the necessary time to properly engage in the process.

CHAD noted the value of the IPCC's role in feeding into the Global Stocktake and the need to consider the capacity of least developed countries to review documents.

BELGIUM underscored that their delegation is required to undertake a complex coordination process to be able to intervene on an agenda item and requested that other Panel members respect this, supported Antigua and Barbuda's request for more information about what is planned for IPCC-65, and thanked the Netherlands and Singapore for their proposals on the way forward.

FRANCE underscored that they had demonstrated significant flexibility, including by accepting bridging proposals in previous sessions, and emphasized that the absence of several delegations, and particularly SIDS, makes discussions of this issue at IPCC-64 less inclusive. COLOMBIA stressed the need for climate action, the value of timely scientific information to support climate policy making, and the importance of inclusiveness.

NEPAL stressed the urgency of the issue, noting delays to the timeline create additional challenges, particularly for smaller delegations.

GUINEA expressed the need for better developing country engagement in the IPPC process.

CHINA stated that the IPCC's outputs benefit climate policy-making at multiple levels, including on domestic and the global, and that inputs to the Global Stocktake are not the only key output. They stated that the Co-Chairs and the Panel both have roles to play in setting the timeline.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA and PANAMA stressed the value of having the IPCC provide inputs to the Global Stocktake.

SAUDI ARABIA stated that the voices of the Panel must direct the setting of the timeline and that sufficient time must be incorporated in the timeline to address the growing complexity of the IPCC's work. They stated that the IPCC serves a broader mandate than just providing inputs to the Global Stocktake and that compressing the cycle to meet external timelines is improper.

INDIA queried why this issue was not included in the initial agenda, noting the Co-Chair's proposed timeline is not satisfactory to some members and that the Panel has the ultimate authority to address the issue. They supported the proposal for member submissions to be made to the Secretariat.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed the need to ensure that authors and editors have sufficient time to do good quality work and that inputs to the Global Stocktake are not the key to IPCC success.

BURUNDI cautioned against underestimating risks to scientific robustness, emphasizing that governments of vulnerable states may create adaptation strategies on the basis of data provided in IPCC reports.

NEPAL expressed trust in the IPCC's elected leadership. BANGLADESH expressed trust in the IPCC Chair and WG Co-Chairs and said it is very important that AR7 be optimized for use by the Global Stocktake.

HUNGARY underscored that extending deadlines does not increase inclusivity and uncertainty makes planning workloads difficult.

Following a short break for information consultations, Chair Skea proposed that the Panel entrust the Secretariat to develop an options paper, which would be circulated to governments for comments with a view to reaching a decision at IPCC-65.

INDIA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, preferred to establish a task group to produce a compilation of views and proposals on options for the timeline, which would provide the basis for further discussion at IPCC-65.

The NETHERLANDS preferred the Chair's proposal, saying there was not time to establish new processes.

Noting that more joined these approaches than separated them, Chair Skea invited IPCC Vice Chair Chang'a to convene a huddle for further discussion.

On Friday, Vice-Chair Chang'a reported the huddle had made some progress toward convergence. He presented a draft decision that would entrust the Chair and Secretariat to facilitate an exchange on the timeline with a view to reaching a decision at IPCC-65, including by overseeing a task group that would work intersessionally and report back to the Panel at its next session. The proposed task group would be open-ended, open to representatives of all member countries, chaired by the IPCC Chair and supported by the Secretariat, and have two co-facilitators and two rapporteurs.

INDIA, BRAZIL, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SAUDI ARABIA, KENYA, BELARUS, and CHINA supported the proposed decision, with SAUDI ARABIA, KENYA, and BRAZIL saying it provided a balanced and inclusive way forward.

PANAMA, CHILE, BELGIUM, the NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, COLOMBIA, SWEDEN, COOK ISLANDS, FRANCE, SWITZERLAND, and ITALY said they could not support the draft decision. PANAMA, ITALY, and COLOMBIA indicated the proposed decision did not reflect the discussions among members. FRANCE, COOK ISLANDS, and TÜRKIYE said there was no need for a task group. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, BELGIUM, the NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, SWEDEN, COOK ISLANDS, FINLAND, and SWITZERLAND suggested the Chair hold informal conversations with members with a view to come to a timeline agreement at IPCC-65.

The COOK ISLANDS, PANAMA, SWITZERLAND, and BELIZE said a timeline prepared by the Working Groups' Co-Chairs should be the basis of discussions.

Noting the lack of consensus, IPCC Chair Skea proposed eliminating the reference to the task group and deferring further consideration of the workplan to IPCC-65. A revised draft decision was presented on-screen for the plenary's consideration.

INDIA, LIBYA, and BAHRAIN opposed the second draft decision. INDIA said it would take away the rights of members to voice their views and emphasized that the Panel holds ultimate responsibility for the timeline. BAHRAIN said the timeline was not being treated with the level of urgency required.

LIBYA, ANGOLA, TANZANIA, VENEZUELA, BURUNDI, CUBA, GUINEA, KENYA, ALGERIA, TUNISIA, AZERBAIJAN, BOTSWANA, IRAQ, TURKMENISTAN, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and SAUDI ARABIA opposed the revised draft decision and supported the previous text.

HAITI supported the revised draft decision. AUSTRIA said it was not entirely convinced by the revised text but could compromise. GERMANY, the MALDIVES, and ESTONIA stated that the revised draft decision could be acceptable, but they preferred no text at all.

Citing lack of consensus, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, COOK ISLANDS, BELIZE, PALAU, SINGAPORE, ICELAND, COLOMBIA, the NETHERLANDS, NEPAL, UKRAINE, VANUATU, SAMOA, SWITZERLAND, and SWEDEN supported

moving forward without a decision text. AUSTRALIA said they could live with this and expressed strong support for timelines based on science and appreciation for the work of the Working Groups' Co-Chairs and TSUs.

NEPAL, supported by SWITZERLAND and SWEDEN, queried how long discussions could continue, noting that many delegates from developing countries would have to leave soon.

Some countries, including NEW ZEALAND, the UK, BELGIUM, and DENMARK expressed willingness to engage in discussions on the revised text, but in the absence of agreement, indicated that not adopting any text would also be acceptable.

Citing the importance of constructive engagement, SOUTH AFRICA suggested revisiting the Chair's original proposal to develop an options paper and invite intersessional submissions from governments. NIGERIA and REPUBLIC OF KOREA expressed concern about deferring the issue without intersessional work, saying the Panel risks repeating similar discussions at the next session.

CANADA supported deferring consideration to IPCC-65, noting with concern that there was little time left in the session and the Panel had heard "basically nothing" about the scientific work of the IPCC.

CHAD, the NETHERLANDS, and ITALY expressed support for informal consultations during the intersessional period.

INDIA suggested revising the second draft decision to specify that the IPCC Chair and Secretariat would conduct informal consultations intersessionally and invite members to submit their views on the proposed timeline.

Chair Skea proposed that members join a short huddle to discuss India's proposal, highlighting the need to conclude the session while all delegates were present.

Following the huddle, Chair Skea indicated that no agreement had been reached and closed the item without a decision.

Matters Related to Other Activities

Fundraising for the IPCC Trust Fund: On Thursday, the Secretariat presented this item ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 12, Rev. 1](#)), noting the IPCC relies on voluntary funding from member countries and organizations for its operations. He stated that in 2024 and 2025 expenditures from the IPCC Trust Fund exceeded contributions. He described three contribution scenarios in combination with three expenditure levels for the period 2026–2029 to illustrate a range of projected resource requirements. These included contribution scenarios where: 1) annual contributions equal projected annual expenditures; 2) annual contributions are the minimum required to sustain IPCC operations throughout AR7; and 3) contributions remain at the status quo level. He applied three expenditure levels to these contribution scenarios: 1) business-as-usual; 2) significant spending cuts resulting in partially virtual operations with reductions in multiple activities; and 3) severe spending cuts with fully virtual operations and the suspension of multiple activities. He stated that without a substantial increase in contributions, significant annual deficits will persist and jeopardize the completion of the AR7 cycle. He added that, based on the current trajectory, the IPCC's cash balance will be fully depleted by the end of 2028.

Noting the scenarios suggest a broader resource planning challenge, SAUDI ARABIA said the budget may benefit from consideration alongside the timeline. BAHRAIN stressed the

importance of preserving in-person meetings to ensure full participation and supported reviewing the timeline along with the budget.

JAPAN said the financial situation was alarming. REPUBLIC OF KOREA expressed concern about the financial deficit and announced that it would double its contribution to the Trust Fund this year.

FRANCE highlighted the need to reduce costs, including by exploring virtual meetings.

INDIA questioned the underlying assumptions about the projected workload, including the number of meetings in the scenarios.

GERMANY supported the conclusion that without new and increased contributions the cycle could continue as planned and suggested the Financial Task Team explore options to enhance contributions and reduce costs.

BELGIUM: supported efforts to broaden the IPCC's donor base; said efforts should focus on improving income and ensuring cost efficiency while ensuring deliverables are not compromised; suggested reducing procedural plenaries to one session per year; and supported holding either in-person or fully virtual meetings, saying hybrid meetings do not offer cost savings or inclusivity.

ALGERIA emphasized that in-person attendance is essential and said a virtual option should be available for those who cannot attend.

The NETHERLANDS suggested using the UN's scale of assessments as a guiding principle, noting it is internationally recognized and takes into account different financial capabilities. They emphasized that this would enhance transparency, which could lead to enhanced contributions.

The EUROPEAN UNION noted it is among the top three contributors to the Trust Fund, which signals its commitment to supporting IPCC activities while being an observer organization. They cautioned against assuming past contributors will continue to give the same amounts and invited the Secretariat to communicate more on this issue.

KENYA underlined that broad participation of developing countries is essential to the legitimacy of the process and encouraged efforts to maintain inclusivity.

NORWAY supported requests for the Secretariat and the Financial Task Team to prepare suggestions for consideration at IPCC-65, and said considerations could include suggestions for mobilizing member states, pros and cons for expanding the donor base beyond member states, and opportunities for savings.

The UK agreed that a Secretariat paper on options would be helpful and noted that they were reviewing their contribution.

Secretary Mokssit informed the plenary that Sweden has committed to increasing its contribution by 150% and encouraged all countries to contribute financially or host plenary sessions.

Pre-plenary Briefing Session at the 61st Session: On Thursday, the Secretariat presented an overview of this agenda item ([IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 3](#)), noting, *inter alia*, that in a survey on the pre-plenary session held immediately prior to IPCC-61, 96% of respondents said the Panel should consider holding similar briefings ahead of future IPCC sessions. He indicated that the cost of an in-person briefing is estimated to be CHF 530,000.

JAPAN, BOTSWANA, KENYA, and GERMANY emphasized the usefulness of the sessions.

FRANCE suggested holding future sessions remotely to keep costs to almost zero. REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested holding virtual briefings one or two weeks prior to plenary sessions. BELGIUM noted that if sessions are virtual, all time zones should be respected.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by EGYPT, said pre-plenary briefings should be open, inclusive, and in-person. KENYA encouraged a balanced approach, noting that virtual formats are not ideal for interaction.

The Secretariat took note of the comments, clarifying that the Panel had previously decided to hold briefings and just needed to determine the frequency and format. IPCC Secretary Mokssit stated that the Secretariat aims to ensure that the project is optimized and provides added value.

On Friday evening, the Panel continued discussions on this item and considered a draft decision.

IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a stated that pre-plenary briefing sessions are very useful for inclusivity and for enhancing active developing country participation in plenary.

JAPAN, SWITZERLAND, and BELGIUM stated that virtual participation in pre-plenary sessions should be prioritized and not be excluded. SWITZERLAND stated that if in-person sessions are held, they should not be detached from the plenary. The NETHERLANDS and SWITZERLAND stated that in-person sessions should be conditional on the availability of financial resources.

SAUDI ARABIA supported the draft decision, stating that it is a matter of equity and inclusivity and is important for developing countries. They stated that the sessions should be held in person and not virtually.

BRAZIL supported the draft decision, including its language on virtual participation and resource implications. KENYA stressed the value of the sessions; said the proposed text was balanced and considered resource implications; and said virtual formats would only entrench inequity.

SWITZERLAND, supported by the NETHERLANDS, and JAPAN, proposed rephrasing the text to allow the Secretariat to decide whether the sessions will be held virtually or in person.

The Panel adopted the revised text with this change.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIV-4), the Panel, *inter alia*, decides that pre-plenary briefing sessions should continue to be organized on a regular basis in conjunction with or prior to future sessions of the IPCC, taking into account logistical and resource implications.

Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change

Assessments: On Friday, the Panel considered the report of the Task Group (IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 7) and agreed on the structured workplan of TG-Data for the seventh assessment cycle, including its support to the Working Groups, coordination of the Data Distribution Centres, and work on data management guidance, archiving, outreach, and review of digital products.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIV-3), the Panel, *inter alia*:

- approves the structured workplan of TG-Data for the seventh assessment cycle, including its support to the Working Groups, coordination of the Data Distribution Centres, and work on data management guidance, archiving, outreach, and review of digital products; and

- encourages continued collaboration among TG-Data, the Working Groups, the TSUs, the Data Distribution Centre partners, and the Secretariat to support continuity, transparency, and long-term accessibility of IPCC data products across the seventh assessment cycle.

Report of the IPCC Conflict of Interest Committee

IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a, Chair of the Conflict of Interest Committee, reported that the Committee had met once since IPCC-63, on 26 February 2026 on the margins of the 70th session of the IPCC Bureau in Geneva. Chang'a said the Committee considered the 2025 updated forms submitted by all IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau members and no conflicts of interest were identified. The Committee also considered the annual reports of the Bureaux of the three Working Groups and the Task Force Bureau, and no conflicts of interest were identified.

The Panel took note of this report.

Progress Reports

Report by the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs: On Thursday, the Panel addressed Agenda Item 7.1 on the Report by the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs (IPCC-LXIV/INF. 8, Rev. 1).

IPCC Chair Skea reviewed the Chair's activities since IPCC-63, including attendance at Co-Chairs meetings, the third Lead Author Meeting for the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, and the joint first Lead Author Meeting for the reports of the Working Groups. He stated that he has engaged in efforts to enable AR7 author access to literature through agreements with publishing houses and institutions. He stated that he attended the IPCC Workshops on Engaging Diverse Knowledge Systems and on Methods of Assessment and various outreach activities, including attendance at the seventh meeting of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-7).

IPCC Vice-Chair Diana Üрге-Vorsatz stated that since IPCC-63 she attended Vice-Chair, Bureau, and expert meetings, served on the steering committee for the Methods of Assessment Workshop, participated at the 30th meeting of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP), and led the IPCC's Gender Action Team.

Chair Skea described the activities of Vice-Chairs Chang'a and Pichs-Madruga, including Chang'a's work on the IPCC Scholarship Programme and Conflict of Interest Committee and Pichs-Madruga's upcoming work on the Publications and Translations Committee.

The Panel took note of the report.

Report by the Secretariat: On Friday, Secretary Mokssit presented the Report by the IPCC Secretariat on its activities since IPCC-63. He highlighted the breadth of work carried out by the comparatively small Secretariat, including to implement the work associated with each of the Panel's decisions. Secretary Mokssit expressed appreciation for the Secretariat staff and noted, among other things, that work to develop certain information technology is carried out in-house, which yields high savings.

SAUDI ARABIA emphasized that the immense workload of the Secretariat will be compounded in the second part of the seventh assessment cycle and suggested this be factored into discussions on the timeline for the Working Group contributions to AR7.

Chang'a expressed appreciation for the hard work of the Secretariat and drew attention to the team's innovation and creativity.

Report by Working Group I: On Friday, Working Group I (WGI) Co-Chair Xiaoye Zhang introduced the WGI Progress Report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 2, Rev. 1](#)).

SAUDI ARABIA expressed concern about Annex I of the report, which reflects the proceedings of a World Climate Research Programme (WCRP)-IPCC co-sponsored workshop on “Earth system high impact events, tipping points and their consequences,” saying this was an unapproved workshop that bypassed the Panel in order to distribute prescriptive recommendations to authors without the Panel’s knowledge. Supported by INDIA, they requested deletion of the annex and expressed concern about scientific flaws related to the concept of tipping points.

WGI Co-Chair Zhang explained that: the workshop had been discussed with the Secretariat and was fully in line with IPCC regulations; the proceedings were included in the report for transparency; and when a mountain of evidence supports a topic, it should be included in IPCC work for comprehensiveness and inclusivity.

Chair Skea added that the IPCC Legal Officer had reviewed all documents to ensure the event was qualified for co-sponsorship and noted the inclusion of a reference to tipping points in the title does not imply endorsement.

SAUDI ARABIA requested clarification on the legal outcomes set for Working Group reports.

Noting a reference to the hiring of an AI officer by the TSU, KENYA asked if such roles will be standardized across TSUs.

BELGIUM opposed deletion of any annex to progress reports. FRANCE emphasized that while it did not favor what is said in the annex, they opposed its deletion.

Chair Skea noted the annex is a report of the workshop, and the information document is not presented for a decision.

SAUDI ARABIA said the meeting report is selective and said annexing the proceedings of the workshop would require line-by-line approval.

The IPCC Legal Officer confirmed progress reports are not IPCC products and do not imply the Panel’s endorsement.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA, insisted on deleting the annex, saying the discussions of tipping points has been contentious and the topic had not been approved by the Panel.

Chair Skea reiterated that governments were not being asked to approve the progress report, expert meetings do not need to be approved by the Panel, and deleting the annex would reduce transparency.

SAUDI ARABIA said it would be unable to take note of the report. Chair Skea indicated the Panel would move on without taking note.

Report by Working Group II: WGII Co-Chair Bart Van Den Hurk introduced the progress report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 10](#)) noting WGII has an AI officer and, with the other TSUs, has been working on support and guidance for AI use for the special report on climate change and cities.

SAUDI ARABIA requested deletion of a reference to the workshop on tipping points and high impact events in the context of reporting on the participation of Working Group II Bureau members in various events.

Chair Skea clarified the purpose of the reports is to provide transparency regarding working group activities, and said participation in a meeting is an honest and full description of

activities. He further noted there are scientific linkages among the WGs. Co-Chair Van Den Hurk said including this reference in the list is appropriate.

SINGAPORE announced they would host the plenary for approval of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities from 15–19 March 2027.

The Panel took note of the report.

Report by Working Group III: On Friday, WGIII Co-Chair Kate Calvin welcomed questions on the progress report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 9](#)).

SAUDI ARABIA objected to the presentation of joint lead author meetings as a model of interdisciplinarity and pragmatism, saying this approach: creates artificial alignment across Working Groups; could create pressure for synchronized drafting and review periods; and could compress timelines and complicate national coordination. They further noted that the text presents a co-sponsored workshop as an expert meeting and expressed concern that the outputs have been shared with the authors, which they said risks introducing materials that have not been endorsed by the Bureau.

SWITZERLAND expressed support for investing in common support for authors and asked how the WG Co-Chairs have assessed the value of joint lead author meetings. NORWAY expressed strong support for cross-WG collaboration and exchanges, saying this is a pillar of the IPCC’s work. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA supported the proposed mode of work. FRANCE said interdisciplinary exchanges have significant added value, authors have highlighted the benefits of this approach, and said the more synergies that can be found, the better.

INDIA said WGs are distinguished by different roles and holding joint lead author meetings runs the risk of overrunning their distinct approaches. They expressed concern that joint author meetings have been used to promote a “certain conception” of the AR7 workplan.

WGIII Co-Chair Calvin explained that: in cases where there are similar phrases or concepts across more than one report, the joint meetings give the authors the chance to interact; no more joint meetings are scheduled; and they are coordinating with other WGs on AI.

NEPAL expressed interest in hosting WGIII’s fourth lead author meeting.

The Panel took note of the WGIII report.

Report by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: On Friday, the Panel addressed Agenda Item 7.6 on the Report by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 1](#)).

TFI Co-Chair Takeshi Enoki briefly highlighted aspects in the TFI report describing the TFI’s recent activities, including work related to: the 2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Inventories for Short-lived Climate Forcers (SLCFs); the 2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CDR/CCUS) for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories; IPCC Inventory Software; the IPCC Emission Factor Database (EFDB); and other activities.

JAPAN noted the value of the IPCC Inventory Software and EFDB for enhanced transparency and expressed its continued support for the TFI’s work. JAPAN announced that they will host the upcoming 2027 IPCC plenary session at which the Methodology Report on CDR/CCUS will be considered.

The Panel took note of the TFI report.

Gender Action Team: On Thursday, IPCC Vice-Chair Ürges-Vorsatz presented the progress report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 13](#)), describing the outcomes of the IPCC's expert meeting on Gender, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity (GDEI), which was held in September 2025 in Geneva. She stated that fostering diversity among IPCC contributors is essential to building trust, consensus, and equitable participation. She set out key elements of inclusivity principles that were identified, including:

- respect for culture and diversity;
- psychological safety and dignity;
- addressing power and capacity imbalances;
- transparency and trust;
- well-being; and
- inclusive and transparent decision-making.

She noted that IPCC diversities include gender, geographic region and subregion, career stage, age, indigeneity, disability, and epistemologies and intellectual traditions. She reviewed the meeting's recommendations, including:

- structural mapping of underrepresented geographies and groups in IPCC processes;
- quantitative and qualitative key performance indicators to measure, monitor, guide, and report on progress in GDEI;
- ensuring diverse nominations, inclusive reviews, and broad engagement;
- ensuring equal opportunities to meaningfully contribute and have contributions valued;
- clear accountability mechanisms; and
- GDEI training.

She said a consultant has been retained and GDEI training for authors, the Bureau, TSUs, the Secretariat, and others has begun. She concluded by reviewing GDEI statistics reflecting gender, regional, and sub-regional representation within the IPCC.

JAPAN stressed the importance of the Gender Action Team's work and the need for a fair and comfortable writing environment for authors. CANADA highlighted the need for a mechanism to address GDEI complaints. BELGIUM stressed the need for key performance indicators. FRANCE stressed the need for data to address GDEI problems and the need for full participation of women. GERMANY stressed the need to prioritize the implementation of the expert meeting's recommendations.

PANAMA stressed the importance of meaningful opportunities to participate and proper regional representation, and suggested further statistics on gender balance and the different regions would be helpful. HUNGARY stressed the importance of inter-regional balance and representation in the IPCC.

PANAMA, INDIA, and SAUDI ARABIA stated that full regional balance still needs to be achieved, noting that 50-50 representation of authors between developed and developing countries does not reflect a representative balance given the significant size and number of developing countries. PALAU called for more statistics covering all sub-regions. TÜRKIYE called for assistance to members in underrepresented regions.

INDIA stressed the expert meeting report should be approved by the Panel before recommendations from the meeting are implemented and suggested further statistics on gender balance and the different regions would be helpful. HUNGARY stressed the importance of inter-regional balance.

The Panel took note of the report.

IPCC Scholarship Programme: On Friday, the Secretariat reported on the status of the scholarship programme ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 3](#)), noting that a voluntary contribution of CHF 2,330 was received in December 2025, and the Scholarship's Trust Fund balance as of 31 January 2026 was CHF 1,721,179.

The Secretariat further noted strategic partnerships with the University of Oxford, with which the IPCC is co-funding two doctoral studentships; and the World Academy of Sciences, which is organizing a Joint Climate Science Network, Mentorship, and Capacity Growth Workshop for early career scientists from developing countries, to be held in Trieste, Italy, from 5–7 May 2026.

The Secretariat reported that sustained funding remains a priority, there is high demand from developing countries, and the programme contributes directly to inclusivity and regional balance.

The Panel took note of the report.

Communication and Outreach Activities: On Friday, Andrej Mahecic, Head of IPCC Communications and Media Relations, presented the communications and outreach report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 5](#)), noting a steady flow of media queries about IPCC activities. He provided an overview of outreach events held since IPCC-63, including, among others, at UNFCCC COP 30, during UNEA-7, and ahead of the two co-located workshops on engaging diverse knowledge systems and on methods of assessment held in February 2026. He noted the IPCC's use of social media platforms, including X, Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and Bluesky, to raise awareness of the IPCC's scientific findings, ongoing activities, and opportunities for public engagement.

The Panel took note of the report.

Matters Related to UNFCCC and Other International Bodies

The Panel addressed this agenda item on Friday.

UNFCCC: Annett Möhner, UNFCCC Secretariat, briefly reviewed aspects of the UNFCCC's report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF. 6](#)) on recent activities in collaboration with the IPCC and other related activities. She described activities and outcomes from UNFCCC COP 30 including decisions on the Global Mutirão, procedural and logistical elements of the Global Stocktake process, and the Belém Gender Action Plan, as well as conclusions on research and systematic observation. She reviewed upcoming activities, including: the Research Dialogue at the upcoming UNFCCC Subsidiary Body meetings in June 2026; mapping of research gaps; collaboration with the IPCC on adaptation planning and related work; and dialogue on gender- and age-disaggregated data and gender analysis.

BELGIUM, the NETHERLANDS, FRANCE, and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA highlighted the policy relevance, value, and integrity of the IPCC's work and links to the UNFCCC. FINLAND commended the transparency that is being provided regarding activities of the IPCC and UNFCCC.

INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA expressed concerns that the report did not address all relevant activities and was inconsistent in its references to UNFCCC COP decisions and activities. They also raised concerns that the report's overview of planned activities includes activities that may not have been approved or mandated by the Panel, and cited a need for clarification regarding proposed work with the UNFCCC's Adaptation Committee. INDIA stated

that equity considerations must be addressed in the report. SAUDI ARABIA and INDIA opposed taking note of the report.

IPBES: Simone Schiele, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) Secretariat, outlined the contents of the IPBES report ([IPCC-LXIV/INF.4](#)), noting it highlights the outcomes of IPBES-12, which was held in February 2026 in Manchester, UK, and ongoing IPBES assessments and other work, including: the methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and nature's contributions to people; the methodological assessment of integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity; and the second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

SWITZERLAND, BELGIUM, COLOMBIA, and FRANCE stressed the value of collaboration with IPBES. SWITZERLAND noted they will be hosting a workshop on biodiversity and climate change in support of the second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services in Geneva. SAUDI ARABIA cited a need for transparency regarding collaborative activities and stressed that engagement must be separate and not interfere with the IPCC's approved projects.

The Panel took note of the IPBES report.

Place and Date for the 65th Plenary Session of the IPCC

IPCC-65 will take place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, during the second week of October 2026.

Closing of the Session

On Friday evening, Chair Skea noted the Panel had reinforced the importance of IPCC Principle 10, which states that the Panel, its Working Groups, and any Task Forces shall use all best endeavors to reach consensus. Chair Skea expressed the view that Panel members had shown the spirit of compromise and flexibility, and he commended the delegates and Bureau members for their work. Chair Skea gavelled the meeting to a close at 8:52 pm.

A Brief Analysis of IPCC-64

While many saw the agenda for the 64th meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC-64) as a business meeting, the Panel was not able to avoid the contentious debates that have characterized every session of the seventh assessment cycle thus far. "There is no easy topic here at IPCC-64," said IPCC Chair Jim Skea, as the Panel struggled to approve the meeting reports from the past three sessions.

The discussions on two key agenda items, which in the past have been routine, exemplify the challenges faced in the current cycle as many issues before the Panel have become linked to big picture themes that have polarized members. This, in the midst of a funding crunch in which, based on current financial contribution and expenditure levels, the IPCC Trust Fund is projected to be depleted by 2028, foretells increasingly difficult dynamics at the upcoming sessions of the seventh assessment cycle.

After a series of sessions in which Panel members have devoted hours to deliberations on critical issues with no progress toward consensus, the IPCC is facing a difficult second half of the cycle. Starting in 2027, the Panel is expected to undertake review and approvals of the reports that together, will comprise the seventh assessment report (AR7). This brief analysis examines some of these critical issues facing the IPCC.

Ensuring the Integrity and Effective Operation of the IPCC

The IPCC's work is guided by a framework of principles and procedures for its main activities. They set out the IPCC's role, organization, and procedures, with the aim of establishing comprehensiveness, objectivity, openness, and transparency in the IPCC's work. The principles outline the mandate and membership of the organization and describe how the organization works, while appendices to the principles define the process for preparing IPCC reports, managing finances, and holding Bureau elections. Principle 16 states that the principles shall be reviewed at least every five years and amended as appropriate. The last review, scheduled for 2020, was deferred due to challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic.

At IPCC-64, consideration of this mandated review turned into a lengthy debate over scope, content, and timing. Many governments want a targeted review and characterize this as an opportunity to address small frictions and gaps related to the IPCC's operation. Much of this could be done by the Secretariat through the provision of enhanced guidance to relevant actors and changes in practice. Other governments want to use the review to address significant and contested issues, such as broadening requirements for consensus-based decision making and setting rules for the length of assessment cycles.

A question raised in plenary was how this connects to the lessons learned document produced by the ad hoc group earlier in the cycle, following the conclusion of AR6. Switzerland felt the outputs of that group should inform discussion, if the review is to be broad. Others called for open-ended debate on some of the foundational aspects of the process, including Panel oversight and decision-making processes. The question is whether the scope of the review should be comprehensive and consider foundational or constitutive changes or whether only minor tweaks to the existing principles are necessary.

The first route would likely result in lengthy negotiations, with implications for the IPCC's operations and the timing of the AR7, while the latter would likely result more in a business-as-usual outcome. After much discussion, the Panel decided to consider the review of the IPCC Principles and Procedures at future sessions, as appropriate. Some countries saw lack of consensus as an indication that discussions on the issue are now complete, while others believe the review process has just begun.

The Timeline...Again

Discussions on the timeline of the AR7 were not on the Bureau's provisional agenda for IPCC-64, so some members with limited resources did not attend. Others who did attend did not have a mandate to move forward on this issue. However, some governments insisted on adding this issue to the agenda, indicating that they would not approve the meeting agenda or move forward with other work unless the Panel agreed to consider the timeline during IPCC-64.

Many developed countries and small island developing states (SIDS) want to see a timeline that will facilitate IPCC inputs to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's (UNFCCC) Global Stocktake in 2028, while many developing countries are calling for a lengthier timeline, which they say would allow authors, experts, and governments more time to prepare, assess, and review materials. Divisions on this issue have plagued the Panel since its 60th session, and several proposals have been put

forward with the aim of resolving the impasse. While all countries seem to agree on the urgency of finding a solution, a compromise that will be acceptable to all governments remains elusive. Tensions appear to be escalating, and several Panel members emphasized the need to build trust in order to resolve this issue.

The next session of the IPCC represents a crucial juncture for the Panel, as governments will have to approve a budget that will depend, in part, on the timeline for the Working Group contributions to the AR7. Several governments flagged this in their statements during IPCC-64, with some indicating that failure to approve the budget would have significant consequences for the effective functioning of the IPCC at a crucial point in its assessment cycle.

The Economics of Geopolitical Upheaval

The impacts of geopolitics on the UN have been making headlines for the past year, and much ink has been spilled about the organization's financial situation. The IPCC is not immune to the impacts of this turbulence, and during IPCC-64, several speakers emphasized that financial pressures are looming. The IPCC Trust Fund is likely to be depleted soon without new and larger financial contributions, expenditure cuts, or both. Limitations on resources at this point in the assessment cycle will be particularly challenging, as the IPCC's workload will increase as it undertakes review and approval of various elements of the AR7.

At IPCC-64, the Secretariat presented funding scenarios based on business-as-usual and scenarios where funding and expenditures are changed. The message was clear: if contributions do not increase, significant cuts in operations and more efficient meeting formats will need to be implemented. Possible ways forward include reduced activities and the greater use of virtual meetings, which run counter to the needs voiced by many countries for inclusivity, equity, and capacity. These pressures also risk amplifying the challenges the IPCC faces in other areas, including reaching consensus on the timeline for the Working Group contributions to the AR7.

Looking ahead to IPCC-65

Several delegates highlighted the need for compromise, bridge building, and rebuilding trust to enable the Panel to reach agreement on highly divisive issues. Intersessional work will play an important role in preparing Panel members for deliberations at IPCC-65 in October 2026, including the submission of proposals on the AR7 timeline and informal consultations with the Chair to identify points of convergence and possible flexibility on these key issues.

Without a change in dynamics, the IPCC's plenary decision-making process may become increasingly drawn out. While some matters can be deferred to later sessions, the Panel will have to find common ground on critical issues like the timeline, the budget, and ultimately approval of the reports that make up the AR7. As Vice Chair Ladislaus Chang'a said during IPCC-64, failure is not an option.

Upcoming Meetings

1st International First Conference on Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels: The conference will advance international cooperation on transitioning away from fossil fuel extraction, reinforcing the objectives of the Paris Agreement and aligning with the recent International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion, which confirmed that states have a legal obligation to protect the climate,

including by addressing fossil fuel production, licensing and subsidies. **dates:** 24–29 April 2026 **location:** Santa Marta, Colombia **www:** transitionawayconference.com

64th Sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies: The 64th sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) will consider a range of issues in preparation for the UN Climate Change Conference (COP 31) in November 2026. **dates:** 8–18 June 2026 **location:** Bonn, Germany **www:** unfccc.int/sb64

Montreal Protocol OEWG 48: The 48th meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer is expected to consider reports from its scientific bodies and discuss the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund. An extraordinary Meeting of the Parties will convene to elect representatives to the Implementation Committee. **dates:** 13-17 July 2026 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **www:** ozone.unep.org

UNCCD COP 17: Set to take place during the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists, the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD COP 17) will bring Parties together to build on efforts to promote the sustainable management, restoration, and conservation of rangelands while accelerating action against desertification, land degradation, and drought. **dates:** 17–28 August 2026 **location:** Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia **www:** unccdop17.org and unccd.int

IPCC-65: The 65th session of the IPCC will consider issues including its budget and the timeline for the contribution of the three Working Groups to AR7. **dates:** second week of October 2026 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **www:** ipcc.ch

For additional upcoming events, see: sdg.iisd.org

Glossary

AI	Artificial intelligence
AR7	Seventh Assessment Report
COP	Conference of the Parties
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
SIDS	Small island developing states
TFI	Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WG	Working Group
WMO	World Meteorological Organization