

Summary of the 63rd Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: 27–30 October 2025

After several contentious meetings that overran their scheduled time, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) aimed to make substantial progress on core work at its 63rd session. The results of the meeting were mixed, however; while the Panel notched important wins, deliberations on both procedural and substantive issues were lengthy, difficult, and not always fruitful.

The Panel's priority was to reach agreement on the workplan for the seventh assessment report (AR7). Positions on both sides remained entrenched, despite the presentation of a compromise proposal with longer timelines than in earlier versions. While many want to set a timeline that ensures delivery of key reports—including the three reports of the Working Groups—in time for the 2028 Global Stocktake under the Paris Agreement, others want a timeline that will give governments more time to review the reports prior to their approval. Governments in both camps have cited the need to strengthen inclusivity, particularly of authors and government representatives from developing countries. Significant discussion in plenary, contact groups, and huddles failed to yield consensus and the Panel, once again, agreed to a measure that would allow work to continue in 2026, as indicated in the approved budget.

While the timeline will be taken up again at IPCC-64, there was significant frustration and a lack of optimism on the ability to find common ground on this issue.

The Panel also continued discussions on scoping of the methodology report on carbon dioxide (CO₂) removal technologies, carbon capture utilization and storage, another agenda item on which agreement was not reached at IPCC-62. Despite consensus on the first five proposed volumes and part of Volume 6, delegates continued to express reservations on the inclusion of a volume on the direct removal of CO₂ from waterbodies, citing concerns about the effectiveness, scalability, legality, and environmental impacts of these technologies. In contrast to the workplan discussions, delegates were able to reach a compromise on the outline, hinging on agreement to hold an expert meeting on alkalinity enhancement and direct ocean capture, to be co-organized by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and the three IPCC Working Groups.

In addition to these agenda items, the Panel considered budgetary matters, progress reports, a report from the Conflict of Interest Committee, matters related to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), and the admission of observer organizations. The Panel also agreed to convene an expert meeting on regional climate information and a new interactive atlas.

IPCC-63 convened from 27-30 October 2025 in Lima, Peru, with approximately 300 participants, including representatives of 89 member countries as well as international organizations and civil society.

In this Issue

A Brief History of the IPCC	2
IPCC-63 Report.	3
Approval of the Draft Reports of the 61st and 62nd Sessions	3
IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget	3
Admission of Observer Organizations	5
Workplan of the IPCC Seventh Assessment Report	5
Scoping of the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage	8
Matters Related to Other Activities.	9
Report of the IPCC Conflict of Interest Committee ...	10
Progress Reports	10
Matters Related to UNFCCC and Other International Bodies	12
Proposals for Expert Meetings and Workshops for the Seventh Assessment Cycle	12
Place and Date for the 64th Plenary Session of the IPCC	13
Closing of the Session.	13
A Brief Analysis of IPCC-63	14
Upcoming Meetings	15
Glossary	15

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 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 (the “underlying 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.

Sixth Assessment Cycle

The sixth assessment cycle began with the election of the Bureau members in 2015 at IPCC-42. In 2016, IPCC-43 agreed to undertake three special reports during the AR6 cycle (SRCCL, SROCC, and, in response to an invitation from the 21st session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, SR1.5) and the 2019 Refinement. The Panel also agreed that a Special Report on Climate Change and Cities would be prepared as part of the seventh assessment cycle.

Between IPCC-44 and 47 (2016-2018), the Panel adopted outlines for the three Special Reports and the 2019 Refinement, as well as the chapter outlines for the three WG contributions to AR6. During this period, the Panel also discussed a proposal to consider short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs). The Panel agreed to establish a Task Group on Gender and draft terms of reference for a task group on the organization of future work of the IPCC in light of the Global Stocktake (GST) under the Paris Agreement.

In October 2018, IPCC-48 accepted SR1.5 and its TS and approved its SPM, which concluded that limiting global average temperature rise to 1.5°C was still possible but would require “unprecedented” transitions in all aspects of society.

In 2019, the Panel adopted the Overview Chapter of the 2019 Refinement and accepted the underlying report at IPCC-49, accepted the SRCCL and its TS, and approved its SPM at IPCC-50, and accepted the SROCC and its TS and approved its SPM at IPCC-51. The Panel also adopted decisions on the terms of reference for the Task Group on Gender and on a methodological report on SLCFs to be completed during the AR7 cycle.

In February 2020, just prior to the COVID-19 pandemic shutdown, IPCC-52 adopted the outline for the AR6 synthesis

report, containing an introduction and three sections: current status and trends; long-term climate and development futures; and near-term responses in a changing climate. The Panel also adopted the IPCC Gender Policy and Implementation Plan, which, among other things, established a Gender Action Team.

At IPCC-54, which took place virtually in August 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Panel accepted the WGI contribution to AR6, entitled “Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis,” and approved its SPM. At IPCC-55, which took place virtually in February 2022, the Panel accepted the WGII contribution to AR6, entitled “Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability” and approved its SPM. At IPCC-56, which took place virtually in March-April 2022, the Panel accepted the WGIII contribution to AR6, entitled “Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change,” and approved its SPM. Following a significant delay in the production of the Synthesis Report of the Sixth Assessment Report, its adoption was deferred to IPCC-58. IPCC-57 instead dealt with matters including the size, structure, and composition of the IPCC Bureau, as well as actions to strengthen gender equality and equity in internal operations.

In March 2023, IPCC-58 adopted the Synthesis Report of the Sixth Assessment Report and approved its SPM. This meeting concluded the IPCC’s sixth assessment cycle.

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 methodological report on SLCF. 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.

IPCC-63 Report

On Monday, 27 October 2025, IPCC Chair Jim Skea and IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit welcomed delegates to the 63rd session of the IPCC. In opening remarks, Hugo de Zela, Peru’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, called on the IPCC to act with a sense of urgency and responsibility. He emphasized that the Panel’s work is enriched by increased participation of scientists from Peru, Latin America, and the Global South.

Raquel Hilianova Soto Torres, Peru’s Deputy Minister of Strategic Development of Natural Resources, discussed the economic impacts of climate change in Latin America and highlighted the important role of the IPCC in providing rigorous scientific evidence.

Martin Krause, Director, Climate Change Division, UNEP, highlighted UNEP’s work to strengthen science and evidence-based policymaking, underscored the urgency of translating IPCC science

into decisive action, and said UNEP looks forward to the Panel’s contribution to the second GST.

Celeste Saulo, Secretary-General, WMO, urged delegates to agree on the timeline for the Seventh Assessment Report (AR7) and emphasized that timely delivery is essential to guide ambition ahead of the second GST.

Simon Stiell, Executive Secretary, UNFCCC, said the IPCC’s work, including on equity, is vital for informing the 2028 GST and next-generation nationally determined contributions and national action plans. He said the world is currently at an inflection point where the science of climate change is increasingly questioned or “outright rejected,” and said science must remain the foundation of climate action.

Chair Skea outlined progress made over the first two years of the seventh assessment cycle, including on author selection and efforts related to inclusivity. He emphasized that a decision on the workplan for the cycle was IPCC-63’s priority and called for greater predictable multi-year funding to ensure the continuity of work.

Chair Skea then formally opened IPCC-63, which met in a closed session for the remainder of its deliberations. The Panel adopted the agenda ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 1, Rev. 1](#)) without amendment.

Approval of the Draft Reports of the 61st and 62nd Sessions

Chair Skea introduced the meeting reports from IPCC-61 and 62 on Thursday, reminding delegates that there had been no consensus on the IPCC-61 report at the Panel’s last session. He said the Secretariat had conducted an analysis of meeting reports produced in the fifth assessment cycle and found there is precedent for a variety of approaches to drafting meeting reports.

Draft Report of the 61st session: Chair Skea invited the Panel to approve the draft report of IPCC-61 ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 3](#)).

Noting the report contains “quantifiers” indicating general support, SAUDI ARABIA said it could not approve it. FRANCE said quantifiers were used incorrectly and objected to the report’s structure, saying it is difficult to see who put forward what opinion.

GERMANY, supported by FRANCE and BELGIUM, suggested clearly attributing statements to specific countries. CHILE concurred, calling for reports to clearly identify members to ensure transparency, and said they could not endorse the report as presented. SAUDI ARABIA objected to naming Panel members in meeting reports.

ARGENTINA noted one of its interventions was missing and objected to a reference to “general support” for cooperation between IPBES and IPCC.

Chair Skea suggested deferring further consideration of the report to IPCC-64, and the Panel agreed.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-8), the Panel defers the approval of the draft report of IPCC-61 to IPCC-64.

Draft Report of the 62nd session: Citing errors in the report and lack of clarity, FRANCE, supported by BELGIUM, said they could not accept the draft report ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc.9](#)) report as it stands.

Chair Skea suggested the Secretariat consult with delegates regarding the style and drafting of the report. The Panel agreed to defer further consideration of the report to IPCC-64.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-9), the Panel defers the approval of the draft report of IPCC-62 to IPCC-64.

IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget

Budget for the years 2025, 2026, 2027 and 2028: On Monday, the Secretariat presented the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget for 2025-2028 ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 2, Rev. 1](#)). On income and

expenditure, he noted a 2025 shortfall of CHF 1.7 million, but also acknowledged many in-kind contributions such as hosting TSUs, data distribution centers, meetings, workshops, and the Secretariat.

FRANCE, NORWAY, TÜRKIYE, the UK, INDIA, GHANA, ITALY, LUXEMBOURG, GERMANY, and CHINA reminded the Secretariat of in-kind contributions they had made, which had been omitted from the 2025 list. JAPAN urged use of actual expenditure figures when estimating future budgets, for accuracy.

SWITZERLAND urged realistic, time-specific budgets, querying a 300% increase in cost for WMO administrative support between 2025 and 2026.

Chair Skea said the Financial Task Team (FiTT) would meet throughout the week.

On Thursday afternoon, Patricia Nying'uro (Kenya) and Alannah Pentony (Australia), Co-Chairs of the FiTT presented the draft decision on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget for the years 2025, 2026, 2027, and 2028.

SAUDI ARABIA requested deletion of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft decisions wherein the Panel would take note of the forecast and indicative budgets, arguing they would pre-judge the timeline discussions.

GERMANY queried whether this request was in line with paragraph 11 of the IPCC Financial Procedures, stating that the Panel "shall note the forecast and indicative budget for subsequent years," and requested that the Secretariat consult with the legal officer.

Chair Skea proposed to delete paragraphs 4 and 5 but include the relevant annexes. GERMANY, supported by NORWAY, repeated the request to consult the legal officer.

INDIA argued that, given the uncertainties over the issue of timelines, "noting" the indicative and forecast budgets would be premature. He suggested instead to "note the presentation" of these budgets. DENMARK recalled that the decision text reflected what was agreed at IPCC-62 and opposed changing the text as presented.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested noting instead the need to consider the budget for 2027 and 2028 at the next session.

SAUDI ARABIA supported the suggestion of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and further queried whether the proposed expert meeting on alkalinity would be reflected in the 2026 budget line.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, reiterating concerns on micromanagement, noted the drastic compromise on the workplan and favored adopting the decision as proposed, in line with common practice.

Regarding the proposed expert meeting on alkalinity, Chair Skea clarified that no dates or number of participants were specified in the relevant decision, and that a proposal would need to be brought forward at IPCC-64 prior to bringing it into a budget. He noted that the 2026 budget could be adjusted at that time. He also shared the advice of IPCC's Legal Officer that the Panel should "note" the two years' budgets, but this does not require consensus because it is part of the financial procedures.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, accepted the explanation by the Legal Officer but requested the addition of text clarifying that taking note of these budgets would be without prejudice to ongoing discussions on the workplan for AR7.

Chair Skea agreed to take that into consideration.

ITALY, supported by the UK, noted that the original text was consistent with all decisions from the past decade and cautioned against micromanaging and reinterpreting the principles and procedures.

Chair Skea, following consultation with the FiTT Co-Chairs, suggested adding a caveat, as requested by Saudi Arabia, that taking note would be "without prejudice to approval of future budgets."

NEPAL queried whether this would set a new precedent. The UK queried the implications of adding such a caveat.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION recalled that Saudi Arabia had requested that the caveat refer specifically to the decision on the timelines not to the budget more broadly.

AUSTRALIA echoed the UK's question and suggested that the caveat could be incorporated in a footnote or the meeting report instead.

CHILE echoed the comments from Nepal on precedent and stressed the importance of following the IPCC's rules and procedures.

INDIA suggested referencing activities and decisions and refuted the suggestion that this discussion constituted micromanagement.

SAUDI ARABIA noted this session has already set new precedent given the lack of approval of a workplan and also stressed that not every decision taken is micromanagement.

NORWAY noted the language on prejudice was "awkward," and IRELAND said the additional text was "stating the obvious," but both said they could accept it as long as no further detail was added.

DENMARK, indicating their preference to retain the decision text as originally formulated, queried the implication of the proposed additional language on compliance with the rules and procedures.

LUXEMBOURG recalled that the Legal Officer stated no consensus was required and that the annexes already address the concerns. They expressed their preference to go forward without the additional text, but in the spirit of compromise could agree to the revision.

COOK ISLANDS, with VANUATU, objected to the revisions, urged the Panel to follow its rules and procedures, and noted that the concerns of Saudi Arabia were already reflected in the annexes and could be included in the meeting report.

CANADA opposed adding language on AR7 timelines.

Chair Skea noted that it would be without precedent for a final budget to be exactly the same as an indicative budget and clarified there was precedent for adding notes to decisions from IPCC-62. He paused discussion on this item to allow time for the FiTT Co-Chairs to develop a new proposal.

The Panel took up this topic again on Thursday evening. Following consultations among Co-Chairs on language options, the FiTT Co-Chairs proposed to add a footnote making clear that the noting of the forecast and indicative budgets is done without prejudice to the approval of future activities that will impact the budget.

The Panel agreed to the revised decision.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-5), the Panel, *inter alia*:

- approves the revised budget for 2025, as contained in Annex 1;
- approves the proposed budget for 2026, as contained in Annex 2;
- notes the forecast budget for 2027, as contained in Annex 3;
- notes the indicative budget for 2028, as contained in Annex 4;
- notes with concern the significantly reduced cash balance of the IPCC Trust Fund and the accelerating decline in the level of annual voluntary contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund, and therefore invites member countries to make their annual voluntary contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund and, if possible, to increase their annual voluntary contributions;

- notes the proposal of the WMO for funding of an additional CHF 300,000 per year from the IPCC Trust Fund related to a portion of WMO administrative support services previously provided as an in-kind contribution to the IPCC, notes with concern the deteriorating financial situation of the IPCC Trust Fund, and therefore decides to defer the decision on the WMO proposal to IPCC-65;
- decides to continue preparing the budget of the IPCC Trust Fund using the standard costs, bearing in mind that expenditures may be lower than the budget;
- requests the Secretariat to provide detailed information in the budget document presented to the Panel;
- requests the Secretariat to provide the Panel with interim statements of expenditure covering the first six months of a given year, as well as the projection of expenditure for the rest of the given year;
- requests the Secretariat to provide information on major activities and related costs covered by the Communications budget;
- recalls decision IPCC-LX-10, para 27, requesting the Secretariat to produce a strategic human resources plan, notes the progress and requests to present it for review and consideration to IPCC-65;
- requests the FiTT to meet virtually intersessionally to conduct informal discussions regarding relevant FiTT decisions and matters, for consideration at the FiTT at the next plenary session;
- noting the delay in the scientific editing for the 6th Assessment Cycle, requests the Secretariat to optimize the utilization of funds related to scientific editing services for the 6th Assessment Cycle by focusing on the Summaries for Policymakers and Glossaries, and requests the Secretariat to ensure scientific editing and translation is completed for relevant products related to upcoming reports within one year of completion of each report; and
- recalls Decision IPCC-XLVII-4, para 2, and requests the Secretariat to provide a report at IPCC-64 on the pre-plenary briefing session organized during IPCC-61, including budgetary implications, with a view to informing the Panel's decision on holding similar pre-plenary briefings in future sessions.

Audit of the 2024 financial statements: The Secretariat introduced the information document outlining the audit of financial statements for the 2024 financial year ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.4](#)), stating that, as in past years, the external auditor has issued a “clean audit report.” The Panel took note of the report.

Admission of Observer Organizations

On Wednesday evening, Jennifer Lew Schneider, Legal Officer, IPCC Secretariat, reported via pre-recorded video on the admission of observer organizations ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc.5](#)), noting that 20 organizations had requested observer status, in addition to the Minamata Convention on Mercury. She also outlined the conclusion of the review of IPCC observer organizations, affirming that the Secretariat continues to review and maintain observer organization information to ensure accuracy.

KENYA noted an error in the acronym for the Science for Africa Foundation, hosted in Nairobi. Chair Skea said this would be corrected.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-3), the Panel:

- takes note of the conclusion of the review of IPCC observer organizations; and

- grants 20 organizations IPCC observer status, in accordance with the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations.

Workplan of the IPCC Seventh Assessment Report (AR7)

On Monday, Chair Skea opened deliberations on the Workplan of the IPCC Seventh Assessment Report ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 10](#)). This document outlines the outcome of IPCC-62, matters for consideration by IPCC-63, and a workplan for each Working Group (WG), including the schedule and budget for their contributions to AR7, progress since IPCC-62, and remaining milestones.

Ermira Fida, IPCC Deputy Executive Secretary, reminded delegates that IPCC-62 agreed on the outlines for the three WG reports, to initiate work including author selection, and to defer further consideration of the workplan to this meeting. Chair Skea added the Panel should agree on the full workplan for each WG, rather than approving these year by year.

IPCC Vice-Chair Ladislaus Chang^a emphasized that IPCC-62 had progressed toward convergence and called for continuing this trajectory during IPCC-63.

WGI Co-Chair Robert Vautard noted that uncertainty regarding schedules is stressful for AR7 authors and scientists wishing to submit articles for assessment. He said the proposed schedule considered at IPCC-62 was based on AR6's timeline and has been followed so far, with approval sessions planned for: WGI in May 2028; WGII in June 2028; and WGIII in July 2028. He said work will continue even if IPCC-63 does not reach a decision on the timeline.

WGIII Co-Chair Joy Pereira commented that while two short intervals would not leave enough time for authors to do a comprehensive assessment, an extended timeline risks their disengagement and could undermine inclusivity efforts.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA said agreement on the timeline is typically procedural and not negotiated by governments, supported the proposed workplan, and noted a cycle length of about 6.5 years maintains scientific rigor and is consistent with AR5 and AR6. He further emphasized that inclusivity and representation are essential to the credibility and effectiveness of the IPCC.

NEPAL urged delegates to support the previously presented workplan and favored having all WG reports delivered in the first half of 2028.

COMOROS underscored the importance of inclusive participation and called for timely deliberations that allow smaller delegations to contribute throughout a meeting.

IRELAND and JAMAICA supported the workplan. JAMAICA said an agreed workplan is imperative for planning and security and opposed detailed negotiations of each milestone. CHILE said the proposed workplan guarantees the integrity of the AR7 process.

INDIA requested confirmation that the document being discussed was not a workplan and the Panel did not intend to proceed on a year-by-year basis. He expressed puzzlement at the “insistence that a longer timeline is discouraging for underrepresented regions,” saying this was not his country's experience. Describing a realistic timeline as “a great equalizer,” KENYA said a compressed timeline does not favor authors from developing countries and back-to-back reviews create substantial burdens for focal points.

SAUDI ARABIA called for ensuring inclusivity, avoiding unreasonable pressure on authors, and maintaining the comprehensiveness and balance of the IPCC process and products.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed solidarity with India, Saudi Arabia, and Kenya, saying the proposed timelines are very compressed and could have a negative impact on objectivity.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested several measures to address inclusivity concerns, including providing capacity-building and making greater use of grey literature. With FRANCE, he urged approval of the workplan at IPCC-63 to ensure AR7 can inform the 2028 GST.

SOUTH AFRICA cautioned that it would be challenging to support the “highly compressed and overloaded” timeline, given practical limitations in developing countries with limited human resources. CHINA expressed concern about the timeline, saying more time is needed to ensure a meaningful contribution by authors. He also reported significant organizational challenges in coordinating government reviews. LIBYA highlighted challenges the proposed timeline presents for developing countries. ALGERIA called for sufficient time for authors and governments to evaluate the reports under the best conditions to ensure quality.

TÜRKIYE supported the proposed workplan, noting that the public and scientific communities are waiting for a decision. VANUATU stressed that delaying the reports would deprive countries of crucial scientific information ahead of key international meetings.

BELGIUM said the current lack of a decision on the workplan is unfair to author teams and creates uncertainty regarding literature cut-off dates. He also expressed discomfort with the level of “micromanagement” occurring.

SWITZERLAND supported the proposed schedule to safeguard inclusivity, scientific rigor and relevance. He suggested that IPCC-64 could establish a task force on inclusivity to strengthen it systematically.

PERU called for strengthening intraregional and gender balance, and a decision on the workplan at IPCC-63.

The BAHAMAS emphasized that despite challenges they face, given their small scientific community, they remain committed to supporting the workplan as originally proposed.

THE GAMBIA emphasized the need to align AR7 with the 2028 GST and to inform next-generation nationally determined contributions. AUSTRALIA strongly supported ensuring that AR7 feeds into the 2028 GST, noting that IPCC reports enable countries with limited domestic climate science capacity to participate in international meetings.

GRENADA and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA commented that the proposed workplan was no more rushed than that of AR6. NORWAY said the proposed workplan follows all IPCC principles, urged considering small island developing states’ (SIDS) pleas, and noted scientists are already working to meet the literature cut-off date.

BURUNDI said extending the time available for national consultations and data collection is essential. SWEDEN said a prolonged timeline would put pressure on authors because it would entail more literature. With FRANCE, she noted ongoing work by the Panel to improve inclusivity.

The Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC) stressed that time is evaporating for achieving a sustainable future for all.

Chair Skea remarked that these disagreements are unprecedented so early in an assessment cycle. Winston Chow, for the WG Co-Chairs, thanked delegates for acknowledging their efforts to strengthen inclusivity, said the proposed schedule represented a good balance, and said extending the timeline would harm inclusivity.

INDIA lamented that “several concrete suggestions for changing the timeline” had received no response. He said: the GST is extraneous to the IPCC; there is no IPCC rule on meeting a GST deadline; and AR6 reached no consensus in discussions on this. He suggested keeping the literature cutoff date but making the timeline more flexible.

Chair Skea clarified that the workplan was proposed by the Co-Chairs and was not endorsed by the Bureau.

MONACO urged participants to accommodate change, including the increasing external demands on the IPCC.

Chair Skea established a contact group, co-facilitated by Brazil and Denmark, to work in parallel with the contact group on the proposal for the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage.

On Tuesday evening, WGI Co-Chair Xiaoye Zhang and WGII Co-Chair Bart Van den Hurk presented a revised timeline proposal taking into account the deliberations from the contact group. Key changes, concentrated at the end of the cycle to address government concerns while limiting impact on authors, included: extending expert and government review periods to accommodate an intentional overlap in the WGII and WGIII schedules; ensuring sufficient time between final government distribution and review and approval; and ensuring a gap of two months between WG report approval sessions.

KENYA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, GHANA, SAUDI ARABIA and INDIA requested to defer discussion on this matter to Wednesday morning to allow time to review the paper.

On Wednesday, WGIII Co-Chair Joy Pereira re-introduced the revised proposal.

CHILE, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, PERU, URUGUAY, COLOMBIA, MALAYSIA, COSTA RICA, NEW ZEALAND, TÜRKIYE, AUSTRIA, and LATVIA indicated the revised timeline was an acceptable compromise.

NEPAL emphasized that the timeline ensures integrity, quality, and inclusivity and cautioned that the lack of agreement does not send a good signal to the outside world. They reiterated concern about the plenary sessions running overtime, which leaves least developed countries (LDCs) behind.

SAUDI ARABIA and INDIA cautioned that the revised timeline did not address their concerns regarding back-to-back reviews and overlaps and proposed longer timelines for AR7, with completion of the reports in 2029. KENYA stressed the revised timeline still involves years of back-to-back IPCC work, expressing particular concern about the compressed time for the WGII report, which contains the most chapters.

PALAU stressed that progress and inclusivity are not mutually exclusive and that AR7 needs to be prepared in a timely manner to inform key discussions that will take place in 2028. They agreed that the revised timeline was a reasonable compromise. BELIZE noted their preference for the original timeline but expressed willingness to accept the revised schedule. They objected to governments’ attempts to micromanage the schedule.

CHINA suggested the revised timeline could put pressure on developing countries. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION emphasized that aligning the IPCC’s work with the UNFCCC would impact the Panel’s work and send a negative signal to the world.

SOUTH AFRICA expressed concern that the revised timeline would negatively affect inclusivity, robustness, quality, and geographical representativeness of the science. GHANA emphasized

the need to avoid overlaps with Conference of the Parties (COP) sessions, major international meetings, and public holidays.

SWITZERLAND emphasized that national realities should not dictate a global schedule and, in the spirit of compromise, supported the revised timeline. Lamenting the “extraordinarily lengthy” process to agree the timeline, the UK supported the revised timeline, noting it was exercising significant flexibility.

SWEDEN underscored that extending the timeline would be detrimental to countries with limited resources and expressed concerns about government efforts to micromanage the workplan.

JAMAICA asked all countries to respect the compromises made for the revised timeline and questioned why a few countries continued to challenge its legitimacy.

Emphasizing that participation challenges are amplified for SIDS, VANUATU supported the compromise reflected in the revised timeline.

IRELAND noted the special relationship IPCC has with UNFCCC and said they could accept the revised timeline.

After requesting the Panel to observe a moment of silence for the victims of Hurricane Melissa, SÃO TOMÉ AND PRÍNCIPE emphasized that a longer AR7 cycle would put additional strain on their government and supported the revised timeline. NAURU underscored the importance of the IPCC’s work for their island and people, calling on delegates to consider the revised timeline. Citing the intensifying impacts of climate change, COOK ISLANDS called the revised timeline a good compromise, saying they cannot afford to extend the wait for IPCC’s critical reports. NEW ZEALAND urged countries to agree to the revised timeline.

INDIA, TUNISIA, MOROCCO, JORDAN, VENEZUELA, TURKMENISTAN, LIBYA, ALGERIA, and ZIMBABWE underscored that the compressed timeline would hinder meaningful participation of developing countries.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA stressed the importance of completing AR7 by 2028, given the IPCC’s relevance for the GST, and said untimeliness would damage countries’ national policy work. He noted AR1 through AR5 followed a four-to-six-year cycle. AUSTRALIA questioned whether there had been overlaps between WGs and with the UNFCCC in prior cycles.

HUNGARY urged trusting the Co-Chairs rather than micromanaging the process. They requested more information on the revised timeline’s impact on authors.

BELGIUM observed that delegates are only one part of the IPCC machine, and noted Vanuatu’s and other small delegations’ acceptance of this timeline.

FRANCE requested clarification on the implications of the extended timeline for authors, who would benefit, and whether the proposal would assure the integrity of AR7. The UK, FINLAND, and TÜRKIYE requested the Co-Chairs’ reactions on the benefits and feasibility of the compromise proposal for the authors.

ITALY said the compromise proposal aligned with IPCC’s principles. She suggested parallel efforts on peer-to-peer support and coordination to enable all government experts to contribute.

HAITI aligned with Jamaica and other SIDS in hoping the compromise timeline could be adopted quickly. He cautioned that documents to be assessed double in number with each cycle.

FINLAND noted its small size and limited resources while still supporting the Co-Chairs’ compromise.

LUXEMBOURG, supported by CANADA, said: this timeline follows IPCC’s rules and procedures more closely than AR6 did; an extension would reduce inclusivity of authors; and expressed opposition to any further lengthening of the cycle.

THE GAMBIA cautioned that a longer timeline would weaken climate ambition and financing for developing countries and cause the IPCC to lose trust, legitimacy, and relevance.

DENMARK added that some overlaps improve inclusivity, integrity, and quality. ICELAND said the compromise timeline would maintain AR7’s relevance for the GST, for IPCC’s credibility and usefulness.

GRENADA said the revised timeline was “a compromise of a compromise” but noted the majority of countries across regions and development levels supported it. He said it ensured scientific integrity, workload feasibility, and many dimensions of inclusivity.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed either using the outcomes of the completed WG reports in the GST or suggesting postponement of the GST during COP 30. With SAUDI ARABIA, he stressed that science should drive politics. SAUDI ARABIA asked how a shorter cycle would serve quality and comprehensiveness, noting the undesirability of attending a COP while conducting two reviews.

Vice-Chair Chang’s summarized issues needing to be addressed, including: back-to-back reviews; overlapping WG reports; overlaps with the UNFCCC; and the shortness of review periods, urging flexibility on the revised version. He said failure should not be an option.

The contact group met in the afternoon. Chair Skea reopened discussion on the AR7 workplan on Wednesday evening. Contact group Co-Facilitator Pedro Ivo Ferraz da Silva (Brazil) reported that the contact group co-facilitators had responded to the questions and comments made in plenary, and presented a comparison of statistics on the timeline of report production in AR6. He reported no movement.

Chair Skea cautioned that IPCC-63 might default to the only option that will move AR7 forward, calling it the “worst option” in everyone’s opinion: moving incrementally year by year. NEPAL said this would harm IPCC’s legitimacy.

Chair Skea appealed for ideas and original thinking. Vice-Chair Chang’s called for proposals for a bridging solution to achieve consensus and, supported by INDIA and SOUTH AFRICA, suggested the contact group continue its work.

KENYA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, said the group had agreed on provision of a “visualization” of the proposed workplan to support discussion.

LUXEMBOURG, NEW ZEALAND, the UK, and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA opposed micromanaging the process. With NEPAL, CHILE, and TÜRKIYE, they preferred continuing discussions in plenary rather than returning to the contact group. The UK, LUXEMBOURG, and CHILE suggested undertaking bilateral discussions on this issue while plenary continued.

INDIA said a contact group was the only means to move ahead.

CANADA, supported by LUXEMBOURG, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, NEPAL, the UK, and NEW ZEALAND, expressed concern regarding micromanagement and said new visuals on the timeline were not needed. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said requesting further visuals did not constitute micromanagement.

Co-Facilitators Ferraz da Silva and Tina Christensen (Denmark) noted that the contact group had deepened understandings of respective positions, but said no further progress could be made without the requested visual.

Later on Wednesday evening, WGI Co-Chair Vautard presented a visual representation of the timeline for the Special Report on Cities and the reports of WGI, II, and III, including the first order draft review, second order draft review, final government review, and Panel approval for each output. He noted that first order draft reviews of WG II and III overlapped to allow experts to see both drafts at once.

KENYA reiterated concern about overlapping reviews. SAUDI ARABIA cited several concerns, including overlaps and back-to-back reviews, and called for further discussion in the contact group. SOUTH AFRICA said the proposed gaps were “grossly insufficient” and agreed with previous speakers’ concerns. ALGERIA opposed overlaps and called for further revision of the workplan.

INDIA said the visualization reflected many of their concerns, including overlaps with UNFCCC meetings, and emphasized that governments are responsible for the entire timeline. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said the visualization was an excellent starting point and noted concerns about overlaps with UNFCCC meetings and national holidays.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, supported by HAITI, NORWAY, and GERMANY, cautioned that the visualization had drawn the Panel into procedural micromanagement, said avoiding any overlap with work events is infeasible, and expressed concern that some interventions appear to aim more at delay than progress. NORWAY supported the revised timeline, reminding the Panel it is already a compromise.

NEPAL, GRENADA, and SAMOA opposed further micromanagement and supported the proposed workplan. The UK supported the workplan, noting the Co-Chairs and TSUs have the full picture for designing an efficient and effective work programme.

CHINA said the proposed workplan was unsatisfactory and the cycle should continue to the second half of 2029.

SWITZERLAND emphasized that the overlap between WGs II and III was intentional, said the visualization was not progressing discussions, and called for looking into other options.

Emphasizing that working to find a common denominator is not micromanaging, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said it would consider a plan to deliver the Synthesis Report (SYR) prior to December 2029 if it accounts for resource limitations and all concerns raised.

KENYA expressed frustration that the visualization was creating confusion, saying it was a different representation of the same information and called for continuing discussions.

HAITI called for discussing this matter at IPCC-64.

SWEDEN reminded the Panel that the compromise had extended the timeline and said they were unwilling to accept further extensions. AUSTRALIA emphasized that many countries had already compromised on the timeline.

SAUDI ARABIA underscored the importance of inclusiveness and equity.

Chair Skea observed that, as a former Working Group Co-Chair, he struggled to see why consecutive and slightly overlapping reviews are a problem. He further noted that: paragraph 15 of the Principles Governing IPCC Work states that the scheduling of sessions of the Panel, its WGs, and Task Forces shall be coordinated, to the extent possible, with other related international meetings;

the SYR has yet to be scoped but the decision states it would be delivered “by,” not “in,” late 2029; and using time ranges could provide a basis for compromise.

On Thursday morning, indicating he was not overflowing with optimism, Chair Skea proposed a huddle to explore whether there was a basis for consensus on the timeline, facilitated by Vice-Chair Chang’a. In the early afternoon, Vice Chair Chang’a reported some willingness in the huddle to consider a time-range approach as a means to reach consensus. The contact group reconvened.

On Thursday evening, Co-Facilitator Christensen reported that no consensus was reached on a way forward in the contact group. Chair Skea proposed to allow WGs to continue their activities in 2026 and to defer decisions on the rest of the workplan to future sessions. The Panel agreed with this proposal.

NEPAL, while appreciating the efforts of the Chair and Co-Facilitators, expressed his extreme frustration with the inability of the panel to decide on a timeline.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-7), the Panel:

- invites Working Groups to continue their work as indicated by the 2026 budget, as contained in the Decision IPCC-LXIII-5, by convening their second lead author meetings, as well as the third Working Group I lead author meeting in 2026; and
- defers further consideration of the workplan for the preparation of the Working Group contributions to AR7 to future sessions.

Scoping of the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage

On Monday, TFI Co-Chair Takeshi Enoki, introduced the document ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc.8](#)) on the outline of and workplan for the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage (CCUS) (MR-CDR). He said discussions during IPCC-63 would focus on the Table of Contents, particularly the proposed Volume 7 on the direct removal of CO₂ from waterbodies. He recalled the two options put forward at IPCC-62 to address concerns with this volume. He also highlighted revisions to the workplan and budget to ensure alignment with the mandate to produce the report by 2027.

PALAU, BELGIUM, FRANCE, SWITZERLAND, AUSTRIA, GERMANY, and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA opposed the inclusion of a seventh volume, citing concerns related to the effectiveness, scalability, legality and environmental impacts of marine CDR. Some proposed that the Panel adopt the outline for Volumes 1-6, with the possibility of adding to these volumes later.

SAUDI ARABIA emphasized that all expert-recognized CDR and CCUS technologies, including marine-based technologies, must be considered and called for agreement on an outline that encompasses the full spectrum of these technologies.

CHINA called for concluding deliberations on the outline at IPCC-63.

BRAZIL identified areas needing improvement, including on appropriate carbon action under tropical conditions, the role of durable bio-based materials as long-term carbon reservoirs, and bioenergy with CCS, but agreed on advancing based on IPCC-62’s areas of consensus. SPAIN and DENMARK also supported resuming negotiations as left by IPCC-62.

After consulting with the Secretariat, Chair Skea proposed that a contact group develop an outline of the methodology report by consensus, taking account of the apparent consensus on the scope of Volumes 1-6 as proposed by the TFI and discussed at IPCC-62.

He stressed the importance of deciding which technologies to cover. The Panel agreed to establish a contact group, to be co-facilitated by Merve Güreş (Türkiye) and Chris Derksen (Canada).

The topic was taken up again on Thursday afternoon, following significant discussion within the contact group. Chair Skea presented the revised outline for the MR-CDR, removing the controversial Volume 7 and the draft decision that included a commitment to hold an expert meeting on alkalinity and direct ocean capture co-organized by TFI and the three Working Groups. The Panel adopted the decision.

BELGIUM welcomed the decision, stating the inclusion of marine CDR would have sent the wrong signal, and requested that the Chair and Bureau reflect on the fact that the IPCC has no mandate to look beyond methodologies.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-6), the Panel agrees:

- to prepare a Methodology Report with the title “2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Additional guidance)”;
- on the Terms of Reference for the production of the Methodology Report;
- that the budget for production of the Methodology Report is as contained in Decision IPCC-LXIII-5 on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget;
- to hold an Expert Meeting on alkalinity enhancement and direct ocean capture co-organized by the TFI and the three IPCC Working Groups; and
- to update and add, as needed, to the “2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Additional guidance)” during the eighth assessment cycle.

Matters Related to Other Activities

Financial implications and estimated travel-related GHG emissions of holding physical, virtual, and hybrid meetings: The Secretariat introduced the report on this matter ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 6](#)) on Tuesday, explaining it compared costs and GHG emissions of three categories of meetings that had been held in-person, in hybrid format, and virtually, including select lead author meetings, Bureau meetings, and outreach events. Across all three categories the costs and GHG emissions were estimated to be high for in-person meetings and zero for virtual meetings, but the Secretariat noted there is some cost for virtual meetings. The Secretariat invited the Panel to provide guidance on the way forward.

SAUDI ARABIA emphasized the report did not acknowledge the importance of in-person participation of developing countries and cited connectivity and other issues that affect engagement.

NORWAY, SWITZERLAND, GERMANY, LUXEMBOURG, SWEDEN, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, UKRAINE, AUSTRALIA, and BELGIUM emphasized the importance of transparency on the IPCC’s GHG emissions. NORWAY supported further work by the Secretariat to provide information on the IPCC’s Tier 2 emissions. LUXEMBOURG requested that emissions associated with each meeting be recorded.

HUNGARY, JAPAN, HAITI, and the NETHERLANDS highlighted the importance of some in-person meetings. SWITZERLAND noted that different meetings serve different purposes and asked the Secretariat to consider different formats and options for accommodating both cycle and business agenda items.

Many Panel members cited the importance of equitable participation of all delegates. Some, including TÜRKIYE, NEW ZEALAND, KENYA, UKRAINE, UGANDA, ZIMBABWE, ALGERIA, HAITI, and TANZANIA, cited barriers such as connectivity and time zone differences. GHANA queried whether analysis had been conducted on the comparative effectiveness of virtual and in-person meetings and underscored the importance of inclusivity.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA called for careful evaluation of the value of virtual, hybrid, and in-person meetings, particularly for developing countries.

TÜRKIYE, PERU, and INDIA favored in-person meetings.

SOUTH AFRICA said people are more focused during in-person meetings, virtual sessions in AR6 were excruciatingly demanding, and virtual meetings will affect inclusivity and representation.

SWEDEN noted that hybrid meetings allow more delegates to participate in meetings.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA noted the likelihood of persistent structural issues and the need to reduce costs,

and said hybrid meetings could enhance transparency and the inclusiveness of sessions.

AUSTRALIA said virtual meetings have both benefits and costs that affect inclusivity, noting that virtual meetings allow people with ill health to participate.

IPCC Vice Chair Diana Ürge-Vorsatz said time zones are a major challenge, as are the health implications of keeping people up overnight throughout a meeting. She also noted benefits of virtual meetings for people with disabilities and those with caring responsibilities and noted that some authors choose to refrain from flying to minimize their carbon footprints. She emphasized that hybrid meetings will undoubtedly increase inclusivity.

Chair Skea suggested deferring further discussion of the issue to a future session and invited the Panel to take note of the analysis contained in the report.

SAUDI ARABIA proposed adding text acknowledging the importance of in-person participation for developing countries in any future work. The NETHERLANDS opposed this addition on procedural grounds.

To avoid prolonging deliberations, Chair Skea proposed ending the discussion without reaching a formal conclusion on the agenda item. There were no objections to this suggestion.

Cost implications of extending additional Trust Fund support for developing country and country with economy in transition participation in Panel sessions, in particular approval sessions, to increase their participation: The Secretariat introduced this item ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc. 7](#)), which stems from Decision IPCC-LX-10 to explore the cost implications of additional Trust Fund support for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. He presented two scenarios: the first extending support from one to two delegates for the seven approval sessions in this cycle and the second extending support for all nine IPCC sessions in the cycle.

CHILE, KENYA, SOUTH AFRICA, BURUNDI, BRAZIL, PERU, VENEZUELA, GHANA, COMOROS, SAUDI ARABIA, ALGERIA, INDIA, GRENADA, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, THE GAMBIA, MOROCCO, the BAHAMAS, UGANDA, TUNISIA, COSTA RICA, and TANZANIA favored scenario 2.

CHILE called for considering this issue within the context of ongoing discussions on the AR7 timeline.

KENYA said the two parallel contact group meetings at IPCC-63 show the need to support two delegates at all sessions.

SOUTH AFRICA noted support needed at the national level.

GERMANY, supported by BELGIUM, CANADA, and others, called for expanding support to two delegates for approval sessions (scenario 1), and requested that the FiTT consider how to free Trust Fund resources for this.

The UK added that approval sessions require more specialist expertise.

LUXEMBOURG and SWITZERLAND, noting they were one-person delegations, asked how to cover the additional cost of support for all IPCC sessions. SWITZERLAND urged tying expanded support to efficiency-increasing measures, such as back-to-back meetings, parallel sessions, more hybrid and virtual meetings, and efforts to broaden the donor base.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA preferred prioritizing support for the WGIII TSU, expert meetings, and authors, and expanding the use of hybrid meetings. BELGIUM, PERU, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, and the BAHAMAS emphasized the need to ensure full participation in decision-making when IPCC sessions overrun their scheduled length.

At Chair Skea's invitation, Secretary Mokssit noted implications of expanding the size of supported delegations, including for the Secretariat's work and the size of meeting rooms. He suggested taking a case-by-case approach.

Chair Skea said the Secretariat would prepare a decision document taking into consideration the comments made, financial capacity, and workload.

On Wednesday evening, the Secretariat presented a proposal to defer discussion to a future plenary session, no later than the plenary preceding the first approval session of the seventh assessment cycle.

KENYA queried whether this decision excluded the possibility of extending support beyond approval sessions (scenario 2) and requested a more specific date for the deferred discussion.

Secretary Mokssit suggested revising the decision to specify that the discussion would take place no later than IPCC-65 and, in response to a request from TOGO, said the Secretariat would keep the Panel apprised on resource mobilization.

Chair Skea confirmed this would not preclude discussion on support beyond approval sessions.

The BAHAMAS agreed with the revision.

KENYA queried the rationale for the selection of IPCC-65.

Chair Skea clarified that the revised decision text did not preclude discussion on this matter at the sixty-fourth session, rather it sets a deadline of IPCC-65.

TÜRKIYE suggested the reference to "future plenary session" was unnecessary, but Chair Skea noted its removal would mean the sentence would lose meaning. The Panel adopted the decision.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-4), the Panel took note of Document IPCC-LXIII/Doc.7 and of the views expressed at the session and decided to defer this discussion to a future plenary session but no later than IPCC-65.

Report of the IPCC Conflict of Interest Committee

On Tuesday, IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a reported that no conflicts of interest had been identified by the IPCC Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee in its review of the annual reports of the three WGs and the TF1. He reported one possible conflict of interest raised with respect to a Bureau member who had received an award and said the COI Committee advised the recipient on mitigation measures to avoid a perceived conflict of interest.

SWITZERLAND, supported by GERMANY, KENYA, BELGIUM, CHILE, TÜRKIYE, HUNGARY, and NEPAL, suggested the COI disclosure form be completed by candidates at the time of nomination for future cycles rather than after selection.

GERMANY, supported by BELGIUM, requested that the COI Committee provide a written report to the Panel in a timely manner, as dictated in the Committee's terms of reference. The UK requested further information on the resource and decision-making implications of providing COI forms prior to nomination.

Chair Skea clarified that Switzerland's proposed change would require a decision by the Panel to change the COI policy and suggested further discussion on this could be undertaken at IPCC-64. Vice-Chair Chang'a said that the Committee would make efforts to provide written reports in a timely manner and agreed with Chair Skea's suggestion to defer discussion.

SWITZERLAND said they would like to see a document with options ahead of the next Panel meeting.

Chair Skea suggested putting the issue of COI forms submission on the agenda of the next Bureau meeting with a view to provide the Panel with a paper prior to the next Panel session. INDIA objected, stating it would be "premature" for the Bureau to produce a draft document with proposed changes before broader discussion by the Panel.

Vice Chair Chang'a noted the possibility to discuss the interpretation of relevant sections in the COI policy that would be relevant to Switzerland's request. Chair Skea clarified that if this item is dealt with at the next session, a document would be prepared.

The Panel took note of the oral report.

Progress Reports

IPCC Chair and Vice Chairs: Chair Skea introduced the report of the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.8](#)), citing considerable success in securing access to literature for developing country authors. Chair Skea also reported on the workshops on diverse knowledge systems and methods of assessment will be held in February 2026 at the University of Reading, United Kingdom.

Vice-Chair Chang'a noted the work of the COI Committee and IPCC Scholarship Programme, citing comprehensive engagement on outreach with various stakeholders with the aim of strengthening inclusivity.

Vice-Chair Ürges-Vorsatz highlighted the September expert meeting on gender, diversity, equity and inclusivity (GDEI), which was co-hosted by WMO and Canada, with 114 total participants joining in-person and online. Noting a report on the meeting will be presented at IPCC-64, she said the workshop addressed, *inter alia*, how we understand GDEI in the IPCC context, inclusivity in science, how to create conditions for increased inclusivity and equity in the IPCC's work, and best practices of other UN organizations and assessment.

FINLAND thanked Chair Skea for his visit earlier in 2025 and said his message conveying both urgency and that solutions exist was "well heard" at the national level.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed disappointment that only one author from his country was selected for each working group, saying this has elements of discrimination and is counterproductive and unacceptable.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA registered concern that IPCC-62 ran significantly over time, resulting in decisions being taken when few delegations were present, and said IPCC-63 decisions should reflect the views of all members, including SIDS.

AZERBAIJAN called for increasing outreach meetings with young scientists and climate activists from his region, noting they are sometimes left behind.

SOUTH AFRICA asked about efforts to address gender imbalance and representation of local communities.

NEPAL requested that the Secretariat address logistical challenges faced by LDCs in participating in IPCC meetings.

SWITZERLAND inquired about plans to expand access to smaller publishers and expressed appreciation for cooperation with IPBES.

The Vice-Chairs underscored the need to provide more gender-balanced and diversity of nominations and strengthen support for the IPCC Scholarship Programme to bolster the inclusivity of author selection and youth engagement. Chair Skea highlighted the participation of IPBES in IPCC-62, noting larger publishers allow access to a larger number of publications. The Panel took note of the report.

Secretariat: IPCC Secretary Mokssit reported on the Secretariat's activities between February and September 2025 ([IPCC-LXIII/INF. 10](#)). Work highlighted included: meeting preparations; outreach; nominations processes; documentation; legal agreements; new Secretariat-designed digital tools; and resource mobilization, including outreach for developing country contributors. He said challenges include expenditures far exceeding income and lack of an AR7 timeline.

BELGIUM encouraged the Secretariat to: publish documents four weeks before IPCC sessions; make session reports available immediately after meetings; and announce early and clear meeting dates and venues.

Responding to BELGIUM, Mokssit said the Secretariat is in process of selecting an independent consultant on human resources.

Delegates took note of the Secretariat's report.

WGI: WGI Co-Chairs Xiaoye Zhang and Robert Vautard introduced the progress report for Working Group I (WGI) ([IPCC-LXIII/INF. 11](#)), highlighting efforts on inclusive author selection, preparations for the first joint Lead Author Meeting (LAM-1) in December 2025, and a planned Cross-Working Group Expert Meeting on Earth System High Impact Events, Tipping Points and Their Consequences, co-sponsored by the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP).

FRANCE said they were pleased to host the joint LAM-1 and the expert meeting. JAPAN expressed support for the expert meeting.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA and INDIA voiced concern regarding the approval procedure for the Expert Meeting, citing the decision at IPCC-62 to defer discussions on this to IPCC-63, and saying no information regarding the workshop had been shared with Focal Points.

BURUNDI and GRENADA called on WGI to continue its efforts to improve inclusivity.

WGI Co-Chair Vautard explained that the expert meeting had no resource implications for the IPCC, and the timing will ensure it can feed into the joint LAM-1.

Chair Skea clarified that the scope of the meeting is narrower than that presented at IPCC-62 and within the domain of the WCRP.

The Panel took note of the report.

WGII: WGII Co-Chair Bart van den Hurk introduced the WGII progress report ([IPCC-LXIII/INF. 6](#)), noting efforts to improve diversity and inclusivity. Regarding the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, WGII Co-Chair Winston Chow said six Chapter

Scientists were selected from over 1,320 applications. He reported the outcomes of LAM-1 and LAM-2 and announced LAM-3 in January 2026.

Regarding AR7, he reported on the WGII author selection process, noting 249 experts from 91 countries chosen to serve as Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs), Lead Authors (LAs) and Review Editors (REs).

Van den Hurk reported establishment of a Scientific Steering Committee, including members from all three WG Bureaus, and summarized the cross-WG process for selecting IPCC Task Group on Data (TG-Data) members.

During the discussion, van den Hurk agreed with KENYA on greater intra-regional balance and transparency in author selection. He agreed with INDIA that IPCC representatives giving scientific presentations should maintain a scientific role, not advocate a specific position.

Responding to Climate Action Network International, he said WGII will produce technical guidelines on climate change adaptation.

WGIII: WGIII Co-Chair Katherine Calvin presented the WGIII progress report ([IPCC-LXIII/INF. 9](#)), highlighting, *inter alia*, that the group received over 1,200 nominations and selected 222 experts. She said 52% of the selected authors are from developing countries, 40% are female, and 59% are new to the IPCC.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA lauded the WGIII Co-Chairs' work to improve inclusivity, including unprecedented outreach activities.

NORTH MACEDONIA reiterated the need to ensure intra-regional balance in selection of experts and, supported by LATVIA and UKRAINE, said the southeast European subregion remains significantly unrepresented.

JAPAN commended the tireless efforts by Co-Chairs and TSUs for all three Groups, as well as the IPCC Chair's efforts to enhance access to scientific journals.

UKRAINE, supported by LIBYA, expressed concern that the terms "Global South" and "Global North" exclude many countries, including Ukraine, and called for more precision in the future.

BRAZIL recognized the progress toward achieving gender balance in the author selection, highlighted the importance of contributions from local communities, and, while appreciating the work done to improve access to journal articles, he noted the high concentration of journals in a handful of publishers, most of which are in the Global North.

SWITZERLAND proposed that the COI disclosure form be completed by candidates at the time of nomination rather than after selection.

AUSTRALIA emphasized the need to avoid a situation in which Indigenous Knowledge is being assessed without Indigenous participation.

CHILE said all decisions should be science-based.

GRENADA said strengthening gender balance and providing a space for new authors can only strengthen the quality of IPCC products.

FWCC underscored that inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and local communities strengthens solutions and builds community resilience.

Chair Skea noted the process of author selection is extremely difficult, and said issues such as conflict of interest and intra-regional balance could only be addressed by looking at IPCC procedures.

The Panel took note of the progress report.

TFI: TFI Co-Chair Takeshi Enoki introduced the document containing relevant information ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.1](#)), highlighting activities undertaken to develop relevant methodology reports and promote the dissemination of information relating to IPCC guidelines, inventory methods, and practices.

JAPAN expressed appreciation for progress made on the uptake of the IPCC inventory software.

NORWAY encouraged the Co-Chairs of the TFI and relevant WGs to enhance cross-WG collaboration.

TOGO requested that TFI increase the number of awareness-raising and capacity-building meetings, particularly for LDCs.

Co-Chair Enoki highlighted annual meetings that provide different regions the opportunity to give feedback on the inventory software and Emission Factor Database (EFDB). Chair Skea congratulated the WGs and TFI Co-Chairs on the degree of collaboration and progress on diversity of author teams.

The Panel took note of the report.

TG-Data: Mxolisi Shongwe, IPCC Secretariat, presented the document ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.5](#)) regarding the selection of members of the Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments (TG-Data), noting a total of 195 nominations, with a final selection of 20 TG-Data members.

The Panel took note of the report.

Gender Action Team: Vice-Chair Ürges-Vorsatz reported on Gender Action Team (GAT) activities since IPCC-62 ([IPCC-LXIII/Inf.12](#)). She reported that the Expert Meeting on Gender, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity (GDEI) produced recommendations for all the different actors involved in IPCC work and cross-cutting recommendations on meetings and metrics. She said the GAT: is procuring DEI trainers; reviewing gender and intersectionality statistics and working to embed DEI in author and expert selection processes; reviewing legal guidance on integrating gender considerations; requesting broader diversity data; and has produced documents, now under review, on complaint processes.

The Panel took note of the report.

IPCC Scholarship Programme: Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Chair of the Board of Trustees of the IPCC Scholarship Programme, introduced the document ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.7, Rev.1](#)), highlighting that 177 applications were received for the eighth round of scholarship awards. On the status of resources in the Scholarship Trust Fund, he noted that, to date, no funds had been received in 2025.

KENYA, supported by TANZANIA, SOUTH AFRICA, GHANA, and ZIMBABWE, voiced concern about the lack of funds received in 2025 and called on IPCC leadership to assist with resource mobilization.

AZERBAIJAN suggested engaging foundations or private sector companies in resource mobilization efforts. Chair Van Ypersele clarified that scholarships will be awarded next year thanks to ongoing partnerships with two foundations and said engagement with the private sector should not inhibit the IPCC's independence. WGI Vice-Chair Edwin Aldrian expressed appreciation for the Scholarship Programme.

The Panel took note of the report.

Communication and Outreach Activities: Andrej Mahecic, IPCC Head of Communications and Media Relations, reported on the communications and outreach activities that have taken place since IPCC-62 ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.2](#)). Mahecic highlighted work related to key international forums and high-impact outreach activities that advanced public engagement and supported

development of AR7, including by amplifying calls for nominations of experts to serve as authors. He outlined the IPCC's social media engagement and noted that since IPCC-62, 2.2 million users engaged with the IPCC's website.

The Panel took note of the report.

Matters Related to UNFCCC and Other International Bodies

This agenda item was taken up on Tuesday. Annett Moehner, UNFCCC Secretariat, presented the report ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.13](#)) detailing activities undertaken by the UNFCCC in collaboration with the IPCC, as well as other activities relevant to the work of the IPCC. The Panel took note of the UNFCCC report.

Luthando Dziba, IPBES Executive Secretary, presented the report ([IPCC-LXIII/INF.3](#)) on current IPBES work relevant to the IPCC, including the invitation to co-sponsor a workshop on biodiversity and climate change in the second half of 2026.

BELGIUM and NORWAY encouraged the IPCC to consider co-sponsoring the workshop. This was supported by SWITZERLAND, which will serve as host. LUXEMBOURG, BRAZIL, FRANCE, TÜRKIYE, JAPAN, and SOUTH AFRICA expressed support for collaboration between IPBES and the IPCC. NEW ZEALAND and AUSTRALIA emphasized that cooperation with IPBES offers potential to share learning on Indigenous and local knowledge.

INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA cautioned that collaboration between the two bodies must be cognizant of the differences in processes, methodologies, and mandates. ARGENTINA voiced concern about the financial implications of cooperation with IPBES.

Chair Skea noted significant interest in the room and said he would bring the invitation from IPBES to the next meeting of the IPCC Bureau for consideration and guidance.

The Panel took note of the IPBES report.

Proposals for Expert Meetings and Workshops for the Seventh Assessment Cycle

Chair Skea opened this agenda item for discussion on Tuesday. WGI Co-Chair Vautard and WGII Co-Chair Van den Hurk presented the proposal for an Expert Meeting on Regional Climate Information and Atlas to take place between April and June 2026 ([IPCC-LXIII/Doc.4](#)). They explained the purpose of the meeting is to support the transition from conceptual design to technical implementation of the AR7 WGI and WGII Interactive Atlases. They highlighted the proposed participation of 60 experts with gender, regional, and expertise balance, and said a host country is still being sought.

PORTUGAL praised the upgrading of these tools, which will help to improve information available for scientists and practitioners.

JAPAN emphasized that this expert meeting provides a good opportunity to fill atlas-specific knowledge gaps in the author teams and favored a virtual meeting format for cost efficiency.

CHILE queried options for the timing of the Expert Meeting, as it coincides with the WGI and WGII LAM-2 meetings.

DENMARK supported the proposal, noting there are many good examples of similar atlases and the need to reflect existing expertise in the selection of meeting participants.

ITALY highlighted the importance of ensuring that development of the atlases is adequately resourced. She suggested this be evaluated as part of the expert meeting.

SWITZERLAND suggested that the scope be as broad as possible when selecting experts for the meeting and welcomed the collaboration between the WGs.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA welcomed the proposal but sought clarification on the mid- to long-term planning of expert meetings to be held in the seventh assessment cycle, noting that an expert meeting on science communication was included in the trust fund budget, but implementation is postponed each year.

GHANA noted this meeting would enhance evidence-based decision making, including to prepare for climate vulnerability and other extreme events.

SAMOA welcomed the proposal and stressed that AR7 must provide regionally relevant information for all geographies, including SIDS.

Co-Chairs Vautard and Van den Hurk emphasized that participant selection will consider representation, and the meeting will allow for participation of external experts with relevant expertise on similar products. They expressed openness to discussing timing with LAM-2 but noted the need for a proposal on venue.

The Panel approved, subject to agreement on the budget, the proposed expert meeting.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXIII-2), the Panel decides to approve the proposal for an Expert Meeting on Regional Climate Information and Atlas, as contained in [IPCC-LXIII/Doc.4](#).

Place and Date for the 64th Plenary Session of the IPCC

On Thursday, Secretary Mokssit announced that IPCC-64 will be held 24–27 March 2026 in Bangkok, Thailand.

Closing of the Session

In closing remarks, Chair Skea encouraged delegates to focus on the positives from IPCC-63, including agreement on the MR-CDR and the activities scheduled for 2026. He lamented that as a Category Five hurricane swept through the Caribbean, IPCC-63 was deliberating on pronouns and footnotes. He expressed frustration as a scientist that sometimes the scale of the global challenges being faced are disproportionate to the procedural reality of IPCC discussions. He thanked everyone who made the meeting possible and enabled it to achieve a level of consensus.

Secretary Mokssit expressed his appreciation to the Peruvian hosts, assistants, and volunteers and everyone who provided support for the meeting.

Many delegates took the floor to express their appreciation to all who contributed to the meeting and for the progress achieved, while also expressing regret at the lack of a decision on the AR7 timeline.

GERMANY urged the Chair to give more priority to other agenda items, including inclusivity, at IPCC-64 and to deliver AR7 in a timely manner.

FRANCE said the agreed decision on the MR-CDR shows that compromise is possible, and finishing IPCC-63 on time shows it is possible to abide by timelines so all delegates participate on an equal footing.

BELGIUM said the lack of decision on the AR7 timeline sends a deeply unfortunate signal to the authors and the outside world, asked everyone to consider the implications, and called for moving beyond the impasse.

NORWAY thanked the Chair and all the Co-Chairs for preserving the integrity of the process, expressing trust in their work and in the joint work of the IPCC in coming years.

CHINA said science must be held paramount to solve the difficulties faced at the recent and present plenaries. They asked all members to continue to share views on issues of common interest.

INDIA opined that many concerns and analyses were not considered and urged members to submit ideas for overcoming differences on the timeline to Co-Chairs before IPCC-64.

DENMARK said the rejection of a “perfectly normal timeline” was disheartening, “only some countries have rejected the timelines again and again,” and tackling climate change requires the IPCC to be policy relevant. He urged a decision at IPCC-64 to have all three WG reports in time for the GST.

SWITZERLAND urged reflection on how observers’ voices are heard and integrated, cautioned that delays cause IPCC assessments to lose their relevance for policymakers, and underscored that inclusivity and timeliness must go hand-in-hand, because without relevance the IPCC loses its voice.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA warned that IPCC-63 had departed from science and engaged in politics and expressed worry that the lack of consensus on the workplan and footnoting of the budget decision “set a precedent for a road we don’t want to go down.”

The UK thanked the TSUs for their hard work on the schedule and asked that everyone consider the workplan so agreement can be reached at IPCC-64.

SAUDI ARABIA looked forward to welcoming WGII’s lead authors at LAM-2 in Riyadh and said all three WGs need sufficient time for authors to prepare meaningfully, with no overlaps or back-to-back reviews.

SWEDEN expressed deep regret that the timeline could not be agreed despite countries’ efforts to be flexible.

VANUATU said failure to agree on the timeline was a disservice to the world and called for a solutions-oriented approach in future sessions.

NEPAL expressed concern about the ongoing delay to the workplan and the risk this poses to delivery of AR7, including its contribution to the GST.

NEW ZEALAND emphasized that the proposed timeline is not a compressed schedule and called on other Panel members to base future discussions on factually correct statements.

HUNGARY emphasized that climate change will not wait for the IPCC to approve a timeline.

GHANA remained hopeful that consensus on the workplan could be reached at IPCC-64.

KENYA emphasized that forcing the IPCC into the GST process at all costs has become a great impediment and said they expect ambitious climate action from developed countries.

SOUTH AFRICA said they feel they were not sufficiently heard, even after raising numerous concerns and providing concrete proposals for the timeline.

GRENADA appreciated progress on the methodology report, as well as advancement of inclusivity and gender balance in the IPCC’s work.

BRAZIL commended approval of the outline for the methodology report, noted the consequences of failure to approve the timeline for authors and others, and expressed confidence that the Panel can overcome divergences, in the spirit of multilateralism.

Saying the IPCC is a global cornerstone of climate science, CANADA encouraged the Panel to seek compromise solutions.

ICELAND underscored that agreement on the outline of the methodology report demonstrates the Panel’s ability to find common ground, stressing that the IPCC does not have time to argue about timelines and must avoid falling into the trap of micromanagement.

MONACO highlighted the importance of inclusivity and respecting gender.

TÜRKIYE emphasized that open and respectful dialogue demonstrates members' shared commitment to scientific knowledge and the IPCC process.

AUSTRALIA appreciated hearing from a wider range of voices during IPCC-63, emphasizing that SIDS face the biggest challenges to participation and the biggest impacts of climate change.

BELIZE lamented that the Panel was unable to find agreement on the timeline, despite moving from compromise to compromise, and expressed worry about what this means for the integrity of IPCC's process going forward.

ALGERIA said they are optimistic about future work and ensuring quality is maintained. IRELAND underscored the significant progress made during IPCC-63 and looked forward to agreeing on the timeline at the next session.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION hoped Panel members would demonstrate willingness to compromise in the future, saying lack of flexibility led to the failure to agree on the workplan.

The EU emphasized that climate change can only be addressed through international cooperation based on the best available science.

FWCC asked what stops us from doing everything we can to act while we can and expressed hope that the IPCC finds the courage to lead even if others around us fail.

Chair Skea again highlighted the achievements of the session, including agreement on the outline for the methodology report and the expert meeting on the interactive atlas, emphasized that the Panel has a way forward for the coming year, and said work will advance. He thanked the Panel for their efforts to achieve consensus and closed the session at 7:53 pm.

A Brief Analysis of IPCC-63

As Hurricane Melissa—an Atlantic hurricane of unprecedented strength—devastated Caribbean countries including Jamaica, Haiti, Cuba, and the Bahamas, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) engaged in fraught deliberations, not about science, but about the timeline for delivery of its crucial reports. Deep divisions on the Panel's workplan and other procedural issues have plagued the IPCC during the first two years of its seventh assessment cycle. Issues that were once routine have become deeply controversial and time-consuming. While work on the Seventh Assessment Report (AR7) is progressing, many members expressed serious concern about the trajectory of the Panel's work and its ability to deliver reports fast enough to meet the needs of policymakers who are already dealing with the consequences of rapidly intensifying climate change.

This brief analysis of the 63rd session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC-63) reflects on these concerns and considers key outcomes of the session, including its most significant challenges and successes.

"The trouble is you think you have time"

The key objective of this meeting was to reach agreement on a workplan for the IPCC's seventh assessment report (AR7). Two years into its seventh assessment cycle, the Panel has spent countless hours and many sleepless nights on this issue without reaching agreement. Critically, the workplan includes the timeline for the three Working Group Reports, which many delegates want to deliver in time for the second Global Stocktake (GST) under the Paris Agreement, scheduled for 2028. In addition to taking stock of progress individual countries have made in addressing the

challenges of climate change, the second GST is expected to offer technical information that can be integrated into science-based national policies related to adaptation, mitigation, and finance.

This protracted debate is lopsided, with a majority of Panel members preferring a "standard" timeline that would align with the GST. Proponents of this approach cite the IPCC's mandate to prepare a comprehensive review and recommendations related to the state of the science on climate change, its social and economic impacts, and potential response strategies. Throughout IPCC-63, as well as at previous Panel sessions, many governments—notably including small island developing states (SIDS)—have repeatedly emphasized that IPCC's scientific input is vital to their national policymaking and have called for timely delivery of these reports. They also note that as climate impacts intensify around the world, demands for input from the IPCC are growing more urgent.

A smaller, but growing, number of Panel members strongly prefer a longer timeline that will give governments more time to review the reports prior to their approval. Many of these members have expressed concerns about the limited capacity of many governments, particularly in developing countries, to manage reviews of draft IPCC reports that are consecutive or overlapping. They also emphasize that the IPCC should not be under pressure to align with the GST or other international processes.

Notably, members on both sides of this issue cite the need to strengthen inclusivity in the IPCC's work. While those who want a longer timeline argue this is essential for effective participation of all governments, many others argue that extending the timeline creates additional hurdles for author participation, as it requires a longer time commitment for this prestigious but voluntary work. By the end of the session, the Panel was yet again unable to reach consensus on the timeline for the production of AR7; this issue will be forwarded to IPCC-64 for further deliberations.

The debate about the timeline is unprecedented in the history of the IPCC; in both the fifth and sixth cycles, the workplan, which included the timeline, was agreed with little difficulty. The lengthy debates and detailed scrutiny of the timeline in this cycle have caused many IPCC-63 delegates to express concern that the IPCC Bureau is being micromanaged by governments, to the detriment of the IPCC's work. This issue also reflects growing tensions within the Panel, as delegates expressed increasing frustration with what they see as inflexible positions. This is further illustrated by the Panel's inability to approve routine work, including two previous meeting reports. References made in this session to disrespectful interactions among delegates are atypical in the IPCC context and raise concerns that trust—the basis for compromise and flexibility—may be dwindling in some parts of the IPCC.

The impact of Hurricane Melissa on Caribbean countries was not lost on delegates. IPCC Chair Jim Skea expressed frustration that the IPCC was belaboring small points as people suffered the impacts of a Category Five hurricane. The delegate from Antigua and Barbuda summed up these concerns: "We have departed from the science and are engaging in a lot of politics. ... We ask that this mode of work doesn't become precedent. Our communities are depending on us."

Hard Won and Welcome Success

While the Panel could not find common ground on the workplan, they did achieve consensus on a second key issue: the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage (MR-CDR). At IPCC-62, there was general consensus on the title, terms of reference, and

the contents of Volumes 1 through 5 along with part of Volume 6. At IPCC-63, delegates debated a proposal for a Volume 7 on direct removal of carbon dioxide from waterbodies. The debate centered around whether and how to include assessment of marine CDR technologies, and which ones to include. Marine technologies include CDR from water in desalination plants or wastewater treatment plants, which are closed systems, but also alkalinity enhancement of waterbodies, which is open. Research on the latter is ongoing, as scientists consider the implications of using this technology in the open ocean versus limiting it to coastal areas.

During IPCC-63, the point of contention was whether methodologies for measuring and assessing the impacts of various carbon dioxide removal technologies that have not been proven environmentally safe should be developed by the IPCC. While it appears to some that assessment should be limited to those technologies that are environmentally safe, others argue it is not the responsibility of a Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) methodology report to make that judgment; technologies are already being used and the mandate of the IPCC is to give guidance and set standards for accurate, robust, and comparable data collection on these technologies, rather than allow fragmented and unverified approaches to become widespread. They argue that the IPCC should be “technology neutral.”

Ultimately consensus was achieved on the outline of the MR-CDR through a compromise provision in which the Panel decides to hold an Expert Meeting on alkalinity enhancement and direct ocean capture. While one participant called this a victory for the ocean, others argued that the TFI does not, in any case, encourage use of any particular policy or technology, or even assess its strengths or weaknesses. However, given that research is already underway on enhancing alkalinity in the open ocean, a question remains about whether a call for an expert meeting with no specification of date or budget will be able to accommodate the seemingly urgent need to develop a methodology for its assessment.

Looking Ahead

Given the experience of the last three IPCC sessions, IPCC-64 may need to grapple with what is potentially a “new normal” of protracted deliberations on procedural matters. This dynamic, compounded by increasingly entrenched positions that make compromise difficult, risks detracting from the core and urgent scientific issues the IPCC was established to address.

Despite these challenges, work is progressing. Authors have been selected, and the joint Lead Author Meeting will take place in December 2025. Looking ahead, the question for the Panel will be how governments can continue to facilitate the work of these independent scientists, despite the political pressures that are shaping their deliberations.

Upcoming Meetings

Montreal Protocol MOP37: The 37th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP37) will discuss issues related to implementing the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. **dates:** 3-7 November 2025 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** ozone.unep.org/meetings/thirty-seventh-meeting-parties

2025 UN Climate Change Conference: This event will include the 30th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 30), the 20th meeting of the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 20), and the seventh meeting of the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA

7). The 63rd sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 63) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 63) will also meet. **dates:** 10-21 November 2025 **location:** Belém, Brazil **www:** unfccc.int/cop30

OECP-7 and UNEA-7: The seventh session of the Open-ended Committee of Permanent Representatives (OECP-7) and the seventh session of the UN Environment Assembly (UNEA-7) will meet back-to-back. UNEA-7 will convene on the theme “Advancing sustainable solutions for a resilient planet.” **dates:** 1-5 and 8-12 December 2025 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** unep.org/environmentalassembly/unea7

UNCCD CRIC 23: The twenty-third session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC 23) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) will discuss progress on the implementation of voluntary land degradation neutrality (LDN) targets and efforts to strengthen targeted capacity building. **dates:** 1-5 December 2025 **location:** Panama City, Panama **www:** unccd.int/cric23

12th session of the IPBES Plenary: IPBES 12 will consider interlinkages among biodiversity, water, food, and health as well as transformative change. This IPBES Plenary will be preceded by a Stakeholder Day on 2 February 2026. **dates:** 3-8 February 2026 **location:** Manchester, UK **www:** ipbes.net/events/ipbes-12-plenary

1st meeting of the ISP-CWP Plenary: The first session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution will review scientific findings, adopt key reports, and guide the Panel’s work programme. **dates:** 2-6 February 2026 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **www:** unep.org/isp-cwp/plenary

IPCC-64: During the 64th session of the IPCC, delegates will advance work related to the seventh assessment cycle. **dates:** 24-27 March 2026 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **www:** ipcc.ch

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

Glossary

AR	Assessment Report
COI	Conflict of Interest
FiTT	Financial Task Team
FWCC	Friends World Committee for Consultation
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GST	Global Stocktake
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LAM	Lead Author Meeting
MR-CDR	Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage
SYR	Synthesis Report
TFI	Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
TG-Data	Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WG	Working Group
WMO	World Meteorological Organization