See other coverage from 61st Session of the IPCC (IPCC-61):
Daily reports +
Highlights and Images +

Share this page:
Twitter Facebook

Summary report, 27 July – 2 August 2024

61st Session of the IPCC (IPCC-61)

PDF Version Jump to Analysis Subscribe

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has been sounding the alarm on climate change for over three decades, putting out regular, comprehensive assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and adaptation and mitigation options. The IPCC's assessment reports and special reports have also shaped critical moments of international climate collaboration under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

As the IPCC embarks on its seventh assessment cycle, its responsibilities are front and center. At its 61st session, delegates had to, in the words of IPCC Chair Jim Skea, "lay down the critically important building blocks" for the seventh assessment (AR7) cycle. Key tasks included reaching agreement on the outlines for a Special Report on Cities and Climate Change and a methodological report on short-lived climate forcers, as well as advancing work on the Strategic Planning Schedule for the entire seventh assessment cycle.

As many had expected, discussions were complex, with delegates sharing diverse and sometimes opposing views and priorities on key issues. Reconciling these preferences required intensive discussions and, in some cases, multiple rounds of revisions, but the Panel successfully reached consensus on the outlines of the two reports. The Panel had more difficulty finding a path to agreement on the Strategic Planning Schedule, however, and decided to defer further consideration to its next meeting. This decision disappointed many but is in line with the Principles and Procedures of the IPCC, as well as past practice.

With this agreement, the IPCC was able to conclude its meeting on schedule, a meaningful achievement that ensured that all delegations—particularly small delegations from developing countries, many of whom have missed out crucial discussions that took place when previous sessions significantly concluded late—were able to participate in full. Ending the meeting on schedule was an explicit goal of IPCC Chair Jim Skea, and it was an important step toward ensuring that the IPCC's work is inclusive.

Calls for significant improvements in inclusivity threaded through the IPCC's deliberations over the week, informing delegates' perspectives on a wide range of issues from fundamentals—such as ensuring access to visas for experts and delegates—to high-level questions related to the timeline for delivery of the IPCC's outputs for the seventh assessment cycle. While there was a clear consensus that enhancing inclusivity is a priority for the Panel, discussions revealed different perspectives on how best to achieve this crucial objective.

IPCC-61 convened in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 27 July – 2 August 2024, with close to 400 participants. A pre-plenary briefing for delegates was held on 26 July.

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, open, 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 States. It does not undertake new research or monitor climate-related data; rather, hundreds of scientists from all over the world volunteer their time to conduct assessments of the state of climate change knowledge based on peer reviewed and internationally available scientific and technical literature. 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), supported by a TSU, to oversee the IPCC National GHG Inventories Programme. The Programme aims to develop and refine an internationally agreed methodology and software for calculating and reporting national GHG emissions and removals and to encourage its use by parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The IPCC elects its Bureau for the duration of a full assessment cycle, which includes preparation of an assessment report and any special and methodological reports and technical papers published during that period. The Bureau is composed of 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 comprises 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 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) cycle 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 (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 during the AR6 cycle. The Panel also agreed that a Special Report on Climate Change and Cities would be prepared as part of the seventh assessment report (AR7) 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 under the Paris Agreement.

In October 2018, IPCC-48 accepted the 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 not able 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.

IPCC-61 Report

On Saturday, 27 July, IPCC Chair Jim Skea and IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit welcomed delegates to IPCC-61.

In opening remarks, Petar Dimitrov, Minister of Environment and Water, Bulgaria, emphasized the crucial role of science in informing climate policies and highlighted the recent scientific conference on climate risks in the Black Sea Region organized by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, in which Chair Skea participated.

Chair Skea said this session must "lay down the critically important building blocks" for the seventh assessment (AR7) cycle, stressing its agenda is "complex and testing." He outlined the various documents to be reviewed, highlighting the implications of the strategic planning schedule for inclusivity and calling for delegates to demonstrate a "constructive, solution-oriented, and respectful spirit."

Abdulla Al Mandous, President, World Meteorological Organization (WMO), emphasized that we stand at a "pivotal moment in human history," with the WMO State of the Global Climate 2023 report showing that records were broken for several metrics, including GHG levels, surface temperatures, ocean heat and acidification, and sea level rise. Stressing the importance of early warning systems, he said "cities are the engines of our world but are vulnerable," and called for "concrete action" to "save our cities and our planet."

Vassil Terziev, Mayor of Sofia, welcomed meeting participants to his city, pointing to Sofia's deep commitment to green and sustainable development and its ambition to achieve net-zero emissions by 2030. He highlighted the work of the Gate Institute at Sofia University and the complexity of adaptation in a constantly changing climate, especially for cities. Saying "we're all connected, and everything matters," Terziev noted that growth and environmental protection should go hand in hand and emphasized his trust in science to address challenges ahead.

Nevyana Miteva, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Bulgaria, said her country is on the way to climate neutrality, and stressed the importance of carbon reductions, offsetting, and international cooperation. Noting that no country should "need to choose between fighting poverty and saving the planet," she highlighted the importance of scientific findings on sustainable paths and called for the IPCC's warning messages to be loud and clear.

UNEP Deputy Executive Director Elizabeth Mrema underscored the AR7 cycle reports as critical inputs to the second Global Stocktake (GST-2) under the UNFCCC, drawing attention to the importance of the process for adequate data and analysis. She recalled the 28th meeting of the UNFCCC Conference of the ' (COP 28) invitation to consider how best to align with the UNFCCC and called for relevant and timely IPCC outcomes. Mrema also commended the IPCC for its methodological work on SLCF, given their importance for nationally determined contributions (NDCs) under the UNFCCC's Paris Agreement, and for its cross-working group collaboration.

Youssef Nassef, Director of Adaptation, UNFCCC, said the IPCC's reasoned predictions have made it clear that every degree of warming matters, and the Panel's insights have been invaluable as the UNFCCC seeks to set up conditions among all that leave no one behind. Emphasizing that "delay is the greatest enemy," because the cost of inaction is only getting worse, he encouraged the Panel to successfully conclude its strategic planning during this session.

Before formally opening the session, Chair Skea called for a spirit of compromise, warning that going beyond the session's allotted time will disproportionately impact small delegations who cannot extend their stays. Chair Skea then introduced the provisional agenda (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 1), which was adopted.

Approval of the Draft Report of the 60th Session

On Saturday, Chair Skea introduced the Draft Report of the 60th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-LXI/Doc 11. Rev. 1). SAUDI ARABIA and INDIA objected to language that "singles out" countries, as well as terms such as "many" and "multiple," which they argued are not neutral and imply minority and majority views. SAUDI ARABIA noted this language is "vague" and deviates from established standards. INDIA emphasized that these terms are not appropriate for a process based on consensus. CHINA indicated that the meeting report should better reflect the concerns of developing countries. Chair Skea suggested that delegations with concerns approach the Secretariat directly.

On Friday, IPCC Secretary Mokssit presented an amended draft report, which had been revised to remove qualifiers such as "many," "most," or "few."

CHILE asked whether it was past practice to use such terms, stressing he was "uncomfortable" breaking with precedent. The US said the original document was more faithful to the discussions and said these revisions should not set any precedent for future reports, including the report of IPCC-61.

Chair Skea asked CHILE for flexibility and said the US request would be noted in the meeting report.

DENMARK, FRANCE, GERMANY, IRELAND, ITALY, NORWAY, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, and the UK, echoed the concerns expressed by CHILE and the US, and stressed they would like their discomfort to be placed on record. GERMANY said reports from other meetings, including those of the UN Environment Assembly, use such qualifiers, which are useful to reflect the center of gravity of views during the negotiations.

INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA objected to there being a record of the US request. INDIA said that he asked for the report to be revised "not based on precedent, but on principle" and that, "if it is a consensus we are seeking, then terms such as 'many,' or 'few,' do not assess the process." SAUDI ARABIA said reinstating such qualifiers would represent a "slippery slope" as many issues are "not binary," and discussions are "dynamic."

CHILE reiterated his request for a clarification on past practice. Jennifer Lew Schneider, IPCC Legal Officer, said the terminology in the original report indeed represented past practice.

Chair Skea said the purpose of this agenda item was to approve the IPCC-60 Report, "not to draft reports of future meetings." He asked for delegations to adopt the report as amended, with the understanding that the IPCC-61 Report would reflect all the views expressed in this exchange.

The Panel then adopted the revised report.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-8), the Panel approved the report of the 60th Session of the IPCC, as contained in document IPCC-LXI/Doc. 11, Rev. 2.

Admission of Observer Organizations

On Saturday, Chair Skea introduced requests for IPCC observer status (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 3 Rev. 1). IPCC Legal Officer Lew Schneider said 12 organizations had requested status: the Bureau international des poids et mesures; Children and Youth International; Save the Climate; the Central American Commission on Environment and Development; the International Society of City and Regional Planners; the International Organization for Standardization; the Woodwell Climate Research Centre; the Wellcome Trust; the West African Science Service Centre on Climate Change and Adapted Land Use; the Human Rights and Environment Improvement Centre; the Degrees Initiatives; and the Coalition Climat pour la Biodiversité et le Développement.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested including obligations for observers, such as organizing outreach activities on an annual basis. Lew Schneider explained such a change would need to be addressed under a review of the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations. SOUTH AFRICA requested updates on four other organizations with pending observer status. Lew Schneider and Chair Skea said there had not been progress on these reviews since the last meeting. The Panel accepted the requests.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI- 2), the Panel decides to grant the organizations outlined in document IPCC-LXI/Doc. 3, Rev.1 IPCC observer status, in accordance with the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations.

Seventh Assessment Report (AR7) Products

Outline of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities: On Saturday morning, Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, IPCC Vice-Chair and Chair of Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) for the Scoping of the Special Report on Cities, presented the work of the committee (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 2 and IPCC-LXI/INF. 1). She underscored the inclusive, diverse, and rigorous scoping process for the report, which included a record number of 1,293 nominations from 92 governments, 31 observer organizations, and 20 IPCC Bureau members. Saying the outline was the outcome of "real co-creation" between governments, urban practitioners, and experts, Ürge-Vorsatz highlighted balanced regional and gender participation and a focus on developing an actionable and policy-relevant outline. WGII Co-Chairs Winston Chow and Bart van den Hurk emphasized the need for attention in the report to the diversity of cities.

Ürge-Vorsatz explained the proposed outline included five chapters and a glossary, with Chapter 1 on context; Chapter 2 on trends, challenges, and opportunities; Chapter 3 on actions and solutions to reduce urban risks and emissions; Chapter 4 on how to facilitate and accelerate change; and Chapter 5 on solutions by city types and regions.

SAUDI ARABIA called for: contextualizing the report through the lens of differentiation between developed and developing countries and regions; emphasizing "just transitions" and flexibility for developing countries; addressing synergies and trade-offs with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and considering competing priorities for developing countries; and reflecting diverse urban experiences and challenges. She also noted that adaptation is crucial for developing countries and should be addressed at length.

INDIA said the outline required further work and expressed concern about imposing typologies and methods for classification of cities rather than allowing them to emerge naturally from the literature.

ITALY congratulated the SSC for the steps taken to strengthen participation and called on the IPCC to endorse and trust the work of the SSC, refining the bullets if necessary but not disrupting the outcome of the scoping meeting.

IRELAND welcomed the inclusion of practitioners in the scoping meeting and stressed the need for their involvement in the overall development of this report. The UK expressed appreciation for the highly inclusive process for developing the outline and said it could accept the outline and accompanying narrative.

Emphasizing that cities are critical in addressing the climate crisis, the US called for a concise, user-friendly report that can support city-level decision-makers, adding the Special Report should not be a broad assessment of urban issues.

TIMOR-LESTE noted: differentiation between urban and rural is not applicable in many least developed countries (LDCs), as large parts of their populations live in informal settlements around cities; loss and damage should be included in all chapters; and the role of cities in achieving the 1.5°C goal should be emphasized. MALAWI, with SOUTH AFRICA, asked what defines a city in the proposed outline, noting the usual urban-rural differentiation is not applicable in some contexts. JAPAN expressed interest in rural-urban interconnections, pointing to the former's importance for food security.

Noting that a dozen countries were waiting to intervene, Chair Skea highlighted a question-and-answer session scheduled for the lunch break. He said the substance of the interventions justified establishing a contact group, which would meet on Sunday to discuss differentiation among types of cities and the treatment of adaptation and mitigation in the chapters. GERMANY opposed limiting the mandate of the group to these two issues.

Chair Skea informed the Panel that, following consultations, the mandate of the contact group would be expanded to include "other matters." Delegates then resumed discussion of this issue after the lunch break. Many countries supported the outline as presented. SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS welcomed the proposed outline and hoped the report will help get the world on a pathway to 1.5°C.

NORWAY stressed the need to develop cities for the wellbeing of their inhabitants, called for striking a balance between mitigation and adaptation while focusing on how cities can reduce emissions and achieve net zero, and said extensive use of case studies can capture diversity among cities. He said his delegation could support small amendments to the outline but cautioned against deviating too far from what the experts provided.

LUXEMBOURG supported the outline as presented, called for being clear about what is defined as a city, and supported a cross-WG approach.

GERMANY called for developing clear chapter titles during IPCC-61 and showing how urban action can secure a livable and sustainable future. FRANCE said the report should be short and readable, with titles that can be easily understood by readers without scientific backgrounds, and called for adding concepts such as circularity, food security, and food waste in cities, as well as a reference to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

Emphasizing the importance of producing a report that is actionable, DENMARK said the report should contain relevant information for policymakers and practitioners in different types of city settings and the best available science on adaptation and mitigation, including ways to reduce cities' GHG emissions.

BRAZIL called for inclusion of references to observed economic impacts and the best possible estimate for the costs of inaction, saying this would be important for political decision-making, as well as preventative relocation of vulnerable populations and emergency relocation strategies in the case of extreme weather events.

CHINA called for including more case studies and references to methods and tools, as well as stressing lack of capacity in developing countries. ARGENTINA called for clearly explaining discrepancies in capacity between developing and developed countries, including in terms of funding. ALGERIA underscored the importance of addressing poverty, regional differentiation in development, and synergies and trade-offs with sustainable development.

Many countries, including BURUNDI, MALAYSIA, and KENYA, called for balanced consideration of adaptation and mitigation. SWITZERLAND supported addressing mitigation and adaptation jointly, saying this will allow identification of synergies and trade-offs, and opposed alterations to the proposed structure.

Highlighting the policy relevance of the outline and title, SWEDEN said it trusted the work done by experts and practitioners. The NETHERLANDS welcomed the outline and said the involvement of practitioners guarantees the report will be actionable.

Saying they were pleased to see consideration of socio-economic aspects, BELGIUM called for the involvement of experts from the social sciences and humanities and for strengthening elements on outreach and education.

BURUNDI highlighted the importance of city mapping, identification of high-risk areas, and, with KENYA and MAURITIUS, early warning systems. MAURITIUS called for attention to disaster preparedness and risk mapping.

Underscoring the threats climate change poses to its food and water security, IRAQ emphasized the importance of adaptation.

Noting that every city is unique, INDONESIA called for attention to typologies of cities and the impacts of climate change on cities' microclimates.

MALAYSIA called for alignment with UNFCCC narratives, particularly low-carbon development and climate-resilient development, given existing regional and other initiatives. With CONGO, he also stressed the importance of education and awareness.

CHILE emphasized the importance of addressing Nature-based Solutions (NbS) and the cost of inaction, and, with BRAZIL, called for consideration of maladaptation.

KENYA welcomed a focus on typologies and proposed incorporating aspects of sustainable development and poverty alleviation, especially in rapidly urbanizing areas in the Global South. She also stressed the importance of case studies and references to best practices that consider different capacities.

CONGO called for addressing human health impacts, including risks associated with genetic mutations and new diseases, given the population density of urban areas.

UKRAINE said cities devastated by war should be incorporated into the typology. SOUTH AFRICA called for the consideration of "historical impacts" on land tenure and use and, with NIGERIA, supported emphasizing early warning systems.

SPAIN underscored advocating for multilevel governance in Chapter 5 and called for highlighting the importance of health systems in cities.

On Sunday, delegates discussed the outline in a contact group. On Monday afternoon, SSC Co-Chair Ürge-Vorsatz introduced a revised chapter outline, describing how the SSC worked in three groups to incorporate feedback from the plenary and contact group. These addressed, respectively: how to best differentiate city types; how to balance adaptation and mitigation across the

report and integrate notions of sustainable development; and all other comments. WGII Co-Chairs Chow and van den Hurk then took delegates through the revised document, with Co-Chair van den Hurk highlighting, *inter alia*, that a reference to "city typologies" was replaced by a "framing of multi-dimensional urban characteristics" in Chapter 1, and the addition of "context-specific" adaptation and mitigation levels in Chapter 3. Co-Chair Chow noted the addition of a reference to both "rural and urban systems," and various efforts to put adaptation and mitigation on equal footing.

SAUDI ARABIA recommended, *inter alia*:

- instead of focusing on climate risks, using the framing chapter to address why cities matter in the context of sustainable development;
- moving a reference to climate resilience in development to Chapter 3;
- referencing competing priorities or synergies and trade-offs;
- emphasizing equity in the context of scenario development;
- adding adaptation to references to mitigation;
- adding abatement and removal technologies to discussion of mitigation options;
- providing policymakers with holistic cost-benefit measures by adding the costs of action to discussions of the costs of inaction;
- referencing "just transitions";
- removing references to targets; and
- ensuring that issues addressed should be general in nature and relatable to all stakeholders.

Many countries said they were satisfied with the additions and the outline as it stood, and TÜRKIYE, along with LUXEMBOURG, SINGAPORE, DENMARK, the NETHERLANDS, and SWEDEN, underscored the importance of trusting the SSC's process. Emphasizing that further amendments "can and should be kept to a minimum," GERMANY cautioned against micromanaging and thus jeopardizing the current balance of the outline.

Many countries requested further references to early warning systems. KENYA, supported by ALGERIA, BARBADOS, BOTSWANA, BURKINA FASO, CUBA, DENMARK, EGYPT, FRANCE, GUINEA, INDIA, ITALY, LIBYA, MALAWI, MALAYSIA, SENEGAL, SOUTH AFRICA, SWEDEN, and ZAMBIA, said early warning systems should feature in a standalone section among solutions in Chapter 5. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA called for including guidelines on best practices for early warning systems.

ALGERIA requested inclusion of a reference to the consequences of desertification on displacement. GUINEA and SINGAPORE asked for coastal cities to be mentioned. BARBADOS stressed the important cultural and social roles played by cities should be addressed in Chapter 1.

BURKINA FASO, KENYA, and BOTSWANA supported a greater balance between mitigation and adaptation.

While saying the balance between adaptation and mitigation was much improved in the revised outline, INDIA questioned the shift from "loss and damage" to "losses and damages," noting IPCC precedents for use of the latter terminology are limited to one document, the AR6 WGII SPM. EGYPT, INDIA, INDONESIA, TIMOR-LESTE, and SOUTH AFRICA preferred the use of loss and damage in the singular. INDIA also asked whether references to development levels referred to cities or countries and requested clarification on the meaning of a new reference to "cost of inaction," saying it should go hand-in-hand with a reference to the "cost of action."

UKRAINE reiterated that a roadmap for rebuilding destroyed cities should be included and suggested inverting the order of Chapters 3 and 4 to improve narrative flow. The US lamented redundancy in the document, asking that, *inter alia*, chapter titles and goals be refined for clarity, and policy-prescriptive words be avoided in Chapter 2.

The US, SWITZERLAND, and BELGIUM asked for references to the SDGs to be reinstated. KENYA cautioned the SDGs have a shorter time horizon than "sustainable development." ITALY, supported by DENMARK and JAPAN, queried the addition of a reference to equity in Chapter 2, preferring references to sustainable development across regions, and suggested adding "and cascading" to "compounding risks."

NORWAY and SWEDEN highlighted the role of consumption-based emissions, recalling that one of the key findings of AR6 was that urban-based emissions are reduced only when emissions beyond city boundaries are addressed and, supported by NORTH MACEDONIA, proposed including the potential of demand-side measures and economic incentives. Supported by ITALY, NORWAY also questioned the deletion of a reference to air pollution from the framing chapter.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, BELIZE, HAITI, KIRIBATI, and MALAWI stressed the need for the report to be relevant for small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs and called for inclusion of case studies in Chapter 5. HAITI also called for: consideration of tourism and the interaction of marine ecosystems and urban areas; addressing implementation barriers faced by cities; and cities in context of global efforts on 1.5°C.

EGYPT supported a specific focus on megacities, KENYA and MEXICO on peri-urban cities, and IRAQ on World Heritage Sites.

The UK questioned a reference to "development status" in the revised version, preferring "diversity of development." She also stressed the need to refer to cities in the global context in Chapter 5 and, with ITALY and FRANCE, called for clarity regarding past, current, and future trends.

BELGIUM, DENMARK, FRANCE, LUXEMBOURG, MALAYSIA, SWEDEN, and SWITZERLAND, opposed by SAUDI ARABIA, supported adding references to circularity. AZERBAIJAN, supported by BELGIUM, called for a reference to gender issues.

SOUTH AFRICA supported inclusion of equity in Chapter 2, especially regarding scenarios. He also suggested replacing NbS with "urban NbS" and including ecosystem-based adaptation.

BURUNDI supported referencing low-carbon and resilient cities and highlighted the importance of urban green space, urban planning, public transport, community engagement, and capacity building, education, training, and awareness.

BELGIUM stressed the importance of looking at differences within cities, suggesting this be used as a cross-chapter concept.

CONGO queried the deletion of the term "typologies," called for maintaining references to NbS, and suggested emphasizing the term "long-term emissions strategy," saying a majority of African countries have committed to national strategies toward long-term reductions. MOZAMBIQUE called for a more solutions-oriented report, a detailed discussion of city typologies "so no city is left behind," and suggestions of available funding schemes to help LDCs adapt to climate change.

KIRIBATI emphasized the importance of defining cities to include all types of geographic settings, underscored the need to consider the critical capacity challenges SIDS and LDCs face with regard to waste and pollution, and called for being more explicit about local and global solutions and targets.

HAITI and GREECE called for referencing tourism as an additional health risk and burden for cities. GREECE requested adding a reference to forest fires.

C40 CITIES, also on behalf of the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy, called for the Special Report to account for the "rich diversity" of both formal and informal human settlements, and pointed to connections with Innovate4Cities.

SAVE THE CHILDREN INTERNATIONAL emphasized the need for intersectional approaches and disaggregated data. INUIT CIRCUMPOLAR COUNCIL expressed concern about gaps in the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and experts in the process.

SSC Chair Ürge-Vorsatz said the SSC would consider the comments, stressing the Panel will have further opportunities to review the authors' work and that case studies would not be used to shame countries. WGII Co-Chair Van den Hurk underscored that chapter outlines are solely indicative.

On Tuesday evening, SSC Chair Ürge-Vorsatz introduced a revised outline (CRP.2) incorporating comments from the Panel. She assured delegates that all requests were contained or implied in the outline. The Co-Chairs of the three WGs took turns explaining the revisions, highlighting, *inter alia:*

- balanced treatment of mitigation and adaptation;
- a reference to "losses and damages" as in the AR6 Glossary;
- SDGs being included under "sustainable development and climate resilience";
- interconnection between global and local context and between rural and urban systems;
- sea-level rise as an example of a slow-onset driver to highlight coastal issues;
- changes in vulnerability and exposure across systems and sectors to include tourism;
- costs and benefits of action instead of just cost of inaction;
- "common and context specific" mitigation and adaptation;
- demand-side mitigation measures;
- circularity;
- disaster risk reduction;
- ecosystem-based adaptation;
- health systems;
- early warning systems;
- characteristics of and within cities;
- positive examples and best practices; decarbonization; and
- finance and financial instruments.

After Chair Skea suggested going through comments chapter by chapter, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, ARGENTINA, BAHAMAS, BELARUS, CONGO, CUBA, DENMARK, FINLAND, FRANCE, GERMANY, HAITI, ICELAND, ITALY, KIRIBATI, LUXEMBOURG, MALAYSIA, MEXICO, the NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, PERU, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SINGAPORE, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TIMOR-LESTE, TÜRKIYE, the UK, and UKRAINE said they were willing to accept the revised outline. Many stressed this was in the spirit of compromise, as some of their requests had not been reflected.

GERMANY cited the heavy agenda ahead and urged flexibility. The UK made a plea to trust the experts involved in the scoping process. BELGIUM said they preferred the original version of the outline as it was closer to the outcome of the scoping meeting, but that they were ready to accept this new version as a compromise.

BARBADOS, HAITI, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, and TIMOR-LESTE said they trusted the final report would include special consideration of SIDS' circumstances. TIMOR-LESTE asked where the links between marine ecosystems and cities would be addressed.

SAUDI ARABIA, with ALGERIA, INDIA, IRAQ, KENYA, and SOUTH AFRICA, called for discussing the outline chapter by chapter, with SAUDI ARABIA emphasizing it was worthwhile to "perfect" the outline of the seventh assessment cycle's only special report.

KENYA, supported by INDIA and ALGERIA, called for improvements in the way adaptation was addressed throughout the outline and removal of a reference to "maladaptation." She asked for a bullet on best practices to be less "mitigation-centric" and for inclusion of "losses and damages" in a bullet on vulnerability, impacts, and risks.

INDIA requested removal of "cities as hotspots," saying this phrase provided a "ready-made narrative" to authors and called for the list of assessment methodologies to be non-exhaustive.

MALAWI asked for "planned and unplanned relocations" in Chapter 2 be qualified as "climate induced." CHAD highlighted the importance of reflecting the special circumstances of LDCs, as they are most affected by climate change. BENIN commended the incorporation of early-warning systems and said sea-level rise is a crucial issue for coastal cities.

SAUDI ARABIA emphasized, *inter alia*: target setting falls within the jurisdiction of individual nations and the IPCC could not deliver specific and nuanced targets for cities; net zero is a country-level objective and cities lack the authority to establish net zero goals; and the outline must talk about synergies and trade-offs with the SDGs.

LIBYA said the outline should be improved and called for looking at it in detail.

CONFLICT AND ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATORY underscored the need to acknowledge that military conflict is driving up global emissions. FRIENDS WORLD COMMITTEE FOR CONSULTATION (FWCC) said the outline is inspiring and hoped that when report authors focus on costs and benefits of action and inaction, they will consider that people are already dying from our failure to transform.

Noting that a wide range of countries had acknowledged the receptiveness of the SSC to comments that have come in two rounds of revisions, Chair Skea appealed for countries to show flexibility and asked whether they could accept the outline as presented.

KENYA emphasized they had provided specific comments that are important and inclusive of points from different countries, including from the Global South, and urged the Panel to see that those points are included.

INDIA reiterated their request to give specific comments on the draft. SAUDI ARABIA emphasized the need to continue deliberations, saying the Panel had concluded two agenda items on Tuesday and time was on their side.

The US, supported by HAITI, cautioned that while many countries had indicated their willingness to accept the draft as is, all countries may have specific concerns or improvements, and said opening discussion on the bullets would require much longer engagement with the draft.

DENMARK emphasized that further editing the text would not be an easy task, and noted they also had comments that were not reflected.

INDIA preferred reducing the narratives proposed to authors within chapters, opposed references to transformation and maladaptation, called for deleting "strong" from a reference to risk reduction and references to social tipping points, and said references to decarbonized cities are very "mitigation-centric."

Expressing concern that the Panel had arrived "at a troublesome crossroads," the NETHERLANDS said her delegation had shown considerable restraint and would need to reconsider if the outline were to be opened for comments.

SAUDI ARABIA said she did not see a convincing reason as to why delegates should be rushed into closing the discussion. She called for, *inter alia:* including references to synergies, trade-offs and competing priorities; bringing back a reference to historical socio-economic trends; replacing a reference to integration with "linking" mitigation and adaptation; and referencing means of implementation, including capacity building and technology transfer.

KENYA emphasized that she did not appreciate the "pressure exerted on us to rush this report" and urged everyone to understand her delegation's perspective.

NORWAY emphasized that the SSC had done a tremendous job and should be proud. Noting that the Panel and SSC were hearing the same interventions they had heard earlier, he said his delegation was ready to move forward.

Chair Skea noted the situation was indeed at a crossroads, given the difficulty of opening only a few non-consensual issues without risking an unraveling, and invited the SSC to confer on whether the issues expressed could be somehow incorporated without unacceptable implications.

Recalling that the issues raised had been heard before and responded to by the SSC, the US: opposed removing a reference to climate-resilient development, decarbonization, and mitigation case studies, in order to ensure consideration of all kinds of cities; noted references to losses and damages appear four times in the five-chapter outline; and said targets set by cities for themselves are already an area of rich scientific research. With TÜRKIYE, she said if the text were opened, they would reconsider their compromise position.

Members of the SSC stressed the draft outline was already the result of intensive consultations and represented "an extremely careful balance" that incorporates delegations' guidance while remaining true to the scientific advice, warning that the issues proposed could compromise it. WGI Co-Chair Robert Vautard said they had reached a point where they would either go in circles or alter the experts' outline. Recalling that this is a scoping document providing direction to authors, WGI Co-Chair Zhang said that "nothing is perfect." WGII Co-Chair van den Hurk said there is "a lot of room for authors to pick up countries' concerns."

SAUDI ARABIA reiterated her objection to city targets, suggesting it be replaced with a word such as "plans," while INDIA argued for removal of, *inter alia*, transformative adaptation, maladaptation, decarbonized cities, and tipping points. KENYA reiterated her call for revisions to a "very mitigation-centered" outline. IRAQ requested accounting for impacts on archeological sites and suggested referring to economic and response measures.

Chair Skea proposed to have the SSC further consider whether and how the issues might be addressed in a way that would not disturb the delicate balance, including, for example, by providing guidance to authors.

On Thursday morning, SSC Chair Ürge-Vorsatz presented a revised outline (CRP.3), explaining that the committee had considered the remaining questions from a small number of delegations and understood that they were best addressed by clarifications, of which only a few warranted minor edits of a word or two to make sure the text was sufficiently clear to authors. WGII Co-Chairs van den Hurk and Chow outlined the SSC's clarifications and edits to the outline. Noting that losses and damages will play a prominent role in many case studies, synergies and trade-offs are already covered in various places, and some topics suggested for removal are common terminology, Chow detailed a list of specific edits that included clarifying that cities exist along a spectrum of development.

SSC Chair Ürge-Vorsatz requested delegates to respect the fruit of this co-production and consider the outline for acceptance as presented.

Many countries, including AUSTRALIA, AZERBAIJAN, BAHAMAS, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, CANADA, CHILE, CHINA, CUBA, DENMARK, FINLAND, FRANCE, GERMANY, HAITI, HUNGARY, ICELAND, ITALY, JAPAN, KIRIBATI, LUXEMBOURG, MALAYSIA, MONACO, the NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, PORTUGAL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, ROMANIA, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SPAIN, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TÜRKIYE, the UK, UKRAINE, and the US, expressed willingness to accept the draft as presented, with many strongly opposing further changes. FRANCE underscored that the new version only takes into account comments from some delegations but said they could accept the new version to avoid further delay. The NETHERLANDS said they were surprised to see an adjusted version of the outline, given strong requests from many not to make further adjustments.

While describing the version as much improved, INDIA: called for removing references to social tipping points; reiterated their serious concerns with the concept of maladaptation; noted that "low-carbon development" remains in Chapter 4; and queried why losses and damages were not included in Chapter 5. INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA again called for reviewing the outline chapter by chapter.

KENYA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, expressed appreciation for the SSC's work but said the revisions had not reflected their concerns and the outline was not balanced. Emphasizing that the adaptation gap is widening, KENYA, with ALGERIA, SOUTH AFRICA, BURUNDI, GUINEA, and NIGERIA, called for referencing losses and damages in Chapter 5 and striking references to maladaptation and transformative adaptation.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, underscored that referencing "net zero targets adopted by cities" was unacceptable, saying these targets are for countries and, noting that long summaries are not helpful to practitioners, suggested establishing indicative limits of 50 pages per chapter. CANADA, ITALY, LUXEMBOURG, SWEDEN, and UKRAINE pointed to examples of cities in their countries that had adopted net-zero targets.

The US expressed deepened confidence that the SSC will take up government comments in the report. She emphasized that: adaptation cycles are a well-established concept; maladaptation is a concern also in developed countries with high development in vulnerable areas; and losses and damages are widely covered in the outline. Noting that objections raised have been heard numerous times, along with arguments for why they are not supported, she called for moving forward and supported the outline as presented.

Recalling the indicative nature of the outline, many countries, including CANADA, CHILE, ITALY, MALAYSIA, NORWAY, the UK, and the US, expressed concern with being prescriptive to science and spending excessive time on issues that will be mentioned by the authors in any case if found to be relevant. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA said he participated in the scoping meeting as an expert and urged the Panel to trust the experts.

FINLAND, DENMARK, the NETHERLANDS, and SWEDEN also pointed to cases of maladaptation in developed countries.

TIMOR-LESTE, supported by the US and the NETHERLANDS, urged delegations to reach a compromise in time for the end of the meeting, noting his delegation consists of a single person.

INDIA said expressions such as "avoiding maladaptation" were prescriptive and, supported by SAUDI ARABIA and KENYA, expressed concern with other delegations' "refusal to engage" with their concerns.

CHINA, supported by ITALY, the UK, and the NETHERLANDS, suggested the divergent views be conveyed to the authors by the SSC so they can be fully taken into account. INDIA, KENYA, and SAUDI ARABIA expressed concern with this proposal. INDIA questioned how this would comply with the rules of procedure. ITALY cautioned against negotiating language in a note to authors.

ALGERIA suggested, and the Panel agreed to, a huddle to address these issues facilitated by IPCC Vice-Chair Ramón Pichs-Madruga. On Thursday evening, Pichs-Madruga reported progress had been achieved, including on: changing a reference to maladaptation to "maladaptive practices"; changing net zero to "the role of cities in achieving targets"; and including a reference to losses and damages in Chapter 5 alongside vulnerability, impacts, and risks. He noted remaining issues related to social tipping points and the concerns of one delegation with tipping points in general. Discussions resumed in the huddle.

On Friday morning, IPCC Vice-Chair Pichs-Madruga reported on the huddle's work, praising the flexibility shown by delegations and highlighting that agreement had been reached on tipping points. He noted that in Chapter 2, a reference to "unprecedented tipping points" now read "unprecedented situations," and in Chapter 4, the reference to tipping points remained and was now preceded by "the likelihood of."

On Friday afternoon, the Panel approved draft decision which included the time schedule for the production of the Special Report and the budget for its production.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-5), the Panel agreed on: the outline of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, as contained in the annex to the decision document (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 2, Rev. 1); the time schedule for the production of the Special Report; the budget for the production of the Special Report is as contained in Decision IPCC-LX-10 on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget.

Outline of the Methodology Report on Short-Lived Climate Forcers (SLCFs): On Saturday, Takeshi Enoki, Co-Chair of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI), presented an overview of the TFI's work on the outline (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 6). He highlighted a change in the proposed title, which describes the Report as a supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories rather than a standalone report. He underscored, however, that the report does not replace or refine the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and should be used in conjunction with them. He explained that the report's format would also follow that of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, with an overview volume and four sectoral volumes. He also noted there was no agreement among experts on whether to include particulate matter (PM) 2.5 emissions as SLCF species, as these include secondary aerosols that are out of the scope of the report.

The EU asked for research and innovation gaps to be mentioned in the report, to identify where more research efforts should be financed.

INDIA expressed concern about the title change, noting that linkages to the 2006 Guidelines "creates a whole new set of obligations and commitments through other channels" and called for a change back to a standalone report. He also called for reconsideration of references to "interlinkages with air pollution and health" in the introduction of Volume 1, and for greater consistency in guidelines to experts on whether to include PM 2.5 emissions.

Several countries asked for clarifications, including FRANCE and IRELAND, on the involvement of WGI in the methodology report. An informal exchange on the outline, co-chaired by Shanea Young (Belize) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), took place on Sunday.

On Monday, Young and McGovern offered an update on the informal exchange, noting the discussions highlighted: the importance of contributions from WGI and WGIII; most wanted a neutral document to estimate SLCFs applicable to various countries and contexts; and some issues remained to be refined in the document. TFI Co-Chair Enoki said remaining "big issues" included the overall report format and which species to address.

INDIA objected to the Co-Chairs reporting back on the informal exchange of views, saying an informal exchange has no legal status. Chair Skea, supported by the CHILE, DENMARK, the NETHERLANDS, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, UKRAINE and others, underscored it was important to inform plenary, particularly since smaller delegations may have been unable to participate in the informal exchange.

GERMANY, JAPAN, LUXEMBOURG, NORWAY, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, and others expressed support for the outline as presented.

ALGERIA, AZERBAIJAN, CHINA, INDIA, IRAQ, and SAUDI ARABIA called for removing PM 2.5 and hydrogen from the report, arguing that the literature supporting their inclusion is not robust enough. BELGIUM, CANADA, CHILE, DENMARK, GERMANY, LUXEMBOURG, NORWAY, SWEDEN, and the US supported including both PM 2.5 and hydrogen, with CANADA recalling the methodology report is intended to help countries estimate emissions for which there is enough evidence of climate impact, and cautioning against waiting and then finding we lack historical data.

Speaking in favor of the inclusion of PM 2.5, CANADA, CHILE, MOROCCO, SPAIN, SWEDEN, and SWITZERLAND noted that measurements would assist in assessing sectoral contributions to climate change and would be useful for verification and transparency. PORTUGAL suggested using more precise terminology, instead of PM 2.5, to resolve the lack of consensus on whether all particles fall under the scope of the report.

On hydrogen, BELGIUM, CANADA, the NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, the UK, and the US noted there is sufficient scientific basis for its inclusion and that hydrogen has already been included in previous IPCC reports. The US highlighted new literature on hydrogen, while BELGIUM drew attention to the increasing role of hydrogen in the energy transition and the shipping industry.

CHILE recalled that it is not the responsibility of the Panel to assess the literature and, with BELGIUM and others, called for trust in the experts to decide whether there is consensus in the literature and to decide what is sufficient.

SAUDI ARABIA objected to the tiered approach and decision trees mentioned in the report. Co-Chair Enoki responded that selection of the tiers to be used is at the discretion of the reporting countries. NEW ZEALAND, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, and CANADA noted that the use of tiers, selected on a voluntary basis, is entirely consistent with current reporting practice.

CHINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed the voluntary nature of the methodology, with CHINA emphasizing the need to consider different capacities and national circumstances.

INDIA said that reference to air pollution and health in the introduction to the report is out of place in a methodology report, arguing that "climate change and air pollution are not coterminous," and requested clarification on the non-inclusion of sulfate aerosols. EGYPT supported distinguishing between air pollution and climate change, while NIGERIA preferred to include all sources and address air pollution and climate change in an integrated manner.

On the title of the report, INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA called for having the methodology report as a standalone document, while DENMARK, GERMANY, SPAIN, and MOROCCO expressed support for including it as supplement to the 2006 Guidelines.

SWEDEN asked for clarification on whether fires would be considered a source of SLCFs in the report. Co-Chair Enoki confirmed they would.

FWCC and UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS stressed the importance of including PM 2.5, citing respectively the risk of forests switching from sinks to sources, and the strong anthropogenic component of forest fires and the need for methodological guidance on their emissions.

Discussions on the methodology report continued in a contact group, which was followed by a huddle on PM 2.5 after the afternoon plenary on Monday.

On Tuesday morning, IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a updated the plenary on the outcome of the Monday evening huddle, highlighting constructive but inconclusive discussions. Chair Skea identified the pending issues as: the title and status of the report; reference to interlinkages between air pollution and health in the introduction to Volume I (General Guidance); and inclusion of PM 2.5 and hydrogen. Taking up the title, he invited the UNFCCC Secretariat to provide clarification on the status of the report in that process.

The UNFCCC Secretariat explained that it is up to UNFCCC parties to determine to what extent they would like to use the SLCF methodology report, recalling that while the modalities for Biennial Transparency reporting stipulate that parties shall use the 2006 Guidelines, this report does not fall under the

Guidelines and would therefore not be mandatory. She also noted that, as per UNFCCC decisions, parties are only encouraged to use the wetlands supplement, so regardless of the title agreed to by IPCC, parties would need to decide whether to use it for reporting under the UNFCCC.

TFI Co-Chair Enoki proposed as a revised title "2027 Supplementary Methodology to the IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories: Short-lived Climate Forcers," noting this removed reference to the 2006 Guidelines but still ensures consistency and clarity with the principles. The US, DENMARK, and SWITZERLAND spoke in favor of this proposal, but it was opposed by INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA.

Chair Skea then suggested using a minimal version of the main title in accordance with the document for this agenda item (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 6). INDIA, SAUDI ARABIA, and ALGERIA agreed to this proposal, but the NETHERLANDS, supported by DENMARK, SWITZERLAND, BELGIUM, NORWAY, and the UK, preferred adding a subtitle that would keep the reference to a supplement to the 2006 Guidelines for context and structure. Recalling that it is up to UNFCCC to decide on its use, BRAZIL found both versions acceptable, with a slight preference for the shorter one.

Saying that "not all TFI products have been supplements" to guidelines, WGIII Vice-Chair Eduardo Calvo drew attention to two IPCC good practice guidance reports (on uncertainty management and on land use, land-use change and forestry) that were applied with the revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, reiterating that it is up to the UNFCCC parties to decide on their fate or applicability.

After further consultation, TFI Co-Chair Enoki suggested as a subtitle "Supplement to IPCC national GHG inventory guidance." The NETHERLANDS reiterated that the subtitle should include a reference to the 2006 IPCC national inventory guidelines.

Saying that with this report the IPCC is crossing a boundary in regard to the role of primary and secondary substances, particulate matters, and the role of precursors, INDIA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, proposed as a subtitle, "Guidance to national GHG inventory." CHINA called for focusing on areas of convergence and suggested "IPCC supplementary methodology report on SLCF," without subtitles.

Consultations continued in a small huddle during lunch, convened by IPCC Vice-Chair Pichs-Madruga.

On the issue of interlinkages with air pollution and health, Chair Skea proposed, and the Panel agreed, to remove the reference from the introduction, given the lack of consensus. The US said this was a missed opportunity on a very important issue but said it was acceptable, in the spirit of compromise.

On PM 2.5, Chair Skea invited IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a to present informally proposed text for paragraph 4 of Annex 1, indicating that this work aims to cover all IPCC inventory sectors "with categories where the science is assessed to be robust enough to provide guidance for a Tier 1 methodological approach and have a relative contribution to the global/regional emissions of the species, species assessed and potentially covered by the new Methodology Report will be NOx, CO, NMVOCs, SO2, NH3, {H2}, BC and OC, as well as emissions of primary particulate matter relevant for (direct and indirect) radiative balance, as appropriate."

Chair Skea emphasized the focus of the present discussion should be on particulate matter, and the text should be considered "without prejudice" to any discussions the Panel would have later about other species.

The US emphasized that the phrase "climatologically relevant" can cover all species and is more relevant than "radiative balance."

SAUDI ARABIA opposed focusing on only one species, insisted on making progress by discussing all species, and said he had "pretty strong views" with a sound scientific basis on particulate matter and hydrogen.

CHILE called for a technical correction, saying there is no direct and indirect radiative balance. The UK suggested replacing "radiative balance" with "climate relevant," which would allow deletion of "direct and indirect." INDIA supported leaving radiative balance and removing direct and indirect.

Following a huddle during the lunch break, Vice-Chair Chang'a reported "some tentative agreement" for text in paragraph 4 but said it would be necessary to address the issue of hydrogen. On the Terms of Reference (Scope), he presented revised text that omits hydrogen and simplifies "emissions of primary particulate matter relevant for (direct and indirect) radiative balance" to "primary particulate matter relevant for radiative forcing."

Chang'a reported that, in the instructions to authors (paragraph 46), the text would state, "For BC/OC emissions, authors should provide guidance, including on techniques of measurement, and all variables used to derive emission factors." He then listed three options for a footnote:

- Option 1 indicated that hydrogen "is within the scope to explore basis for future methodological development of a Tier 1 method for estimating" hydrogen emissions;
- Option 2 indicated that "further SLCFs will be studied in this AR7 by Working Groups for future methodological guidance"; and
- Option 3 indicated that "given the different views and noting SLCFs useful for future methodological guidance will be further studied in AR7…for this report H2 is within the scope to explore basis for future methodological development of a Tier 1 method for estimating H2 emissions…."

Chang'a reported that delegates had been unable to agree on an option.

CHILE expressed concern that removing something included by the authors of a scoping document sets "a very dangerous precedent," saying he was open to reducing the prominence of hydrogen and encouraging delegates to find a compromise. The UK emphasized that the IPCC convenes scoping meetings to "gather the best scientific advice," and that participating experts concluded there is enough information to include hydrogen. CANADA said it was "troubling" that government delegates were seeking to overrule the advice of the experts they nominated to provide an outline. WGI Co-Chair Vautard and WGI Vice-Chair Sonia Seneviratne underscored that the scoping meeting experts unanimously decided the literature was sufficient to include hydrogen, and that assessing the science was outside the mandate of the Panel.

Many countries, including ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, ARGENTINA, AUSTRALIA, BAHAMAS, BRAZIL, CANADA, CHILE, DENMARK, the EU, GERMANY, ITALY, NORWAY, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TÜRKIYE, the UK, and URUGUAY, urged the Panel to trust the experts who participated in the scoping meeting.

SWEDEN, NORWAY, and DENMARK said hydrogen should be included in the list as suggested by the authors, but they could consider Option 1 as a compromise. Reminding delegates their role is not to assess the science, SWITZERLAND said incorporating hydrogen ensures comprehensive guidance at the national level and supported Option 1. CANADA said Option 1 is "an extreme compromise for a lot of governments" but at least it retains the spirit of the advice from the scoping meeting.

JAPAN and URUGUAY expressed support for Option 1.

Many delegates supported Option 2, including ALGERIA, BURUNDI, COMOROS, CONGO, EGYPT, INDIA, IRAQ, KENYA, LIBYA, MOROCCO, NICARAGUA, NIGERIA, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SAUDI ARABIA, SOUTH AFRICA, SYRIA, UGANDA, VENEZUELA, and ZAMBIA. SAUDI ARABIA said it is not scientifically well established that hydrogen is a forcer, and that Option 2 is a compromise.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said the IPCC does not need to rush if there are doubts, and the WGs will evaluate additional species such as hydrogen and particulate matter. KENYA said there is little data on hydrogen available in her region. IRAQ said the report should be based on credible scientific sources. CHINA said it is premature to include hydrogen in the methodology report based on current understandings.

Some countries, including AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, the EU, GERMANY, ICELAND, KIRIBATI, LUXEMBOURG, MEXICO, MONACO, NEW ZEALAND, PERU, the UK, and the US preferred Option 1 but said they could also consider Option 3. The US, supported by GERMANY, said the debate over whether hydrogen is a climate forcer was resolved in AR6, and, with NEW ZEALAND and BRAZIL, that there is sufficient literature supporting that hydrogen is a relevant climate forcer.

AZERBAIJAN supported Option 3.

A huddle on this matter took place after the end of plenary on Tuesday. On Wednesday morning, Chair Skea urged delegates to pick up the pace of negotiations, noting the Panel was past the mid-point in the process. IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a reported that Tuesday night's huddle had not been able to generate a consensus and that bilateral discussions were needed.

On Thursday evening, Chang'a reported the resolution of most issues, and continued discussion on a possible annex addressing hydrogen. The huddle resumed its discussions.

On Friday morning, Chang'a provided an update on Thursday's huddle, noting he was "pleased" to report an agreement had been reached. On hydrogen, he said delegates agreed on a footnote "taking note" that hydrogen "has not yet been well assessed as a climate forcer by IPCC WGI," but that H2 emissions relevant for radiative forcing are to be considered by the authors in an appendix entitled "Basis for future methodological development."

Noting the Panel had also agreed to a title change and the deletion of "interlinkages with air pollution and health," Chair Skea asked the TFI to consolidate all changes in one document for review by the Panel.

On Friday afternoon, Chair Skea introduced the draft decision. The panel adopted the decision without comment.

Final Decision: In the final decision (IPCC-LXI-7), the Panel decided, *inter alia*:

- to prepare a Methodology Report with the following title "2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Inventories for Short-lived Climate Forcers";
- to agree on the Terms of Reference for the production of a Methodology Report as contained in Annex 1, the Table of Contents as contained in Annex 2, the Instructions to Experts and Authors as contained in Annex 3, and the workplan as contained in Annex 4, with each annex attached to the decision; and
- the budget for the production of the Methodology Report is as contained in Decision IPCC-LX-10 on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget.

Strategic Planning Schedule for the Seventh Assessment Cycle

Chair Skea introduced the IPCC Co-Chairs' proposed schedule for AR7 (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 10) on Wednesday morning, noting it takes into consideration comments raised during IPCC-60, as requested in Decision IPCC-LX-9. He noted that the 67th session of the Bureau discussed an initial plan developed by WG and TFI Co-Chairs, which the IPCC Bureau reviewed to ensure there were no more than two consecutive weeks of overlap in government reviews.

WGIII Co-Chair Katherine Calvin stressed the proposed schedule responds to two themes that emerged from IPCC-60, namely the cycle's length, and the need to consider inclusivity. She noted the total duration for AR7 would be 6.5 years, similar to AR5 and AR6, and the proposed schedule ensures there are no more than three consecutive weeks of overlap in government review.

WGIII Co-Chair Joy Pereira stressed the Bureau is committed to AR7 products being inclusive in terms of author representation and literature assessment. She pointed to document IPCC-LXI/INF. 15 on improving inclusivity in AR7 and outlined several planned activities to ensure inclusivity, including: networking activities that enhance equality and inclusivity; considering outcomes from the Gender, Diversity, and Inclusivity Expert Meeting; dedicated author training sessions; and monitoring and evaluation of inclusivity practices through surveys and discussions in Bureau meetings throughout the cycle.

Several countries, including ALGERIA, BURUNDI, CHINA, CONGO, INDIA, JORDAN, KENYA, LIBYA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SAUDI ARABIA, SOUTH AFRICA, and VENEZUELA, objected to the timeline, saying more time for literature and government reviews is necessary for robust, rigorous scientific outputs, and to ensure greater inclusivity.

INDIA said there was "no justification" for several products to be produced in the last months of AR7, leaving little room for discussion. SAUDI ARABIA called the schedule "unprecedented," stressing AR4 and AR5, which had similar timeframes, did not include a Special Report.

KENYA, supported by INDIA and SOUTH AFRICA, underscored the need for adaptation to be addressed appropriately in AR7 and emphasized that an assessment of AR6 showed that there were "major" gaps for the African region and disproportionate reliance on "Western" literature. With CONGO, she warned that the "short time" between AR7 scoping meetings and the first author meetings may not be sufficient to identify and rectify literature gaps for the region.

SOUTH AFRICA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, opposed adapting the schedule to feed into "a single process," namely GST-2, suggesting this would not make the IPCC more "policy-relevant," but rather more "policy-prescriptive."

SAUDI ARABIA drew attention to a broader audience, beyond the UNFCCC, saying no one can deny the inclusivity, objectivity and independence of the IPCC's process. She also expressed concern that the proposed timeline would lead to incomplete science and would be a disservice to the world.

Citing insufficient attention to adaptation and vulnerability in the first GST, ZAMBIA called for the WGII report to be prioritized and ready to provide input to GST-2. He added that the current schedule may not account for the constraints of some delegations. COMOROS called for more flexibility with the schedule. CHINA underscored the need to ensure sufficient time to assess the literature and review the work. BELARUS said the schedule did not give enough time for economies in transition to participate meaningfully.

INDIA said its analysis of the proposed timeline in comparison with those of AR5 and AR6 shows that AR7 is not on track to provide robust, rigorous scientific products, and opposed speeding up research due to other intergovernmental processes.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, ARGENTINA, AUSTRALIA, BAHAMAS, BARBADOS, BELARUS, BELGIUM, BELIZE, BRAZIL, CANADA, CHAD, CHILE, DENMARK, the EU, FINLAND, FRANCE, GERMANY, HAITI, HUNGARY, ICELAND, IRELAND, ITALY, JAPAN, KIRIBATI, LATVIA, LUXEMBOURG, MALAWI, MONACO, NIGERIA, NORWAY, PERU, POLAND, PORTUGAL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, ROMANIA, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SAINT LUCIA, SINGAPORE, SPAIN, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TIMOR-LESTE, TÜRKIYE, the UK, UKRAINE, URUGUAY, the US, and ZIMBABWE supported the schedule as proposed, with many underscoring the importance of feeding into GST-2.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS stressed that the absence of "crucial" IPCC input into GST-2 would mean the IPCC would lose policy relevance and underscored the vital importance of IPCC's inputs for SIDS. She said the schedule is "neither compressed nor rushed," and, while this timeline is shorter than AR6's, AR6 included three Special Reports, while AR7 only includes one. PORTUGAL underscored "we are in a climate emergency" and it would be beneficial for everyone to ensure political decision-makers have scientific information in time for action.

GERMANY expressed surprise that some consider the timeline to be rushed or unprecedented and, with BARBADOS and POLAND, said it is of utmost importance that all WG contributions be available for GST-2. GERMANY further noted the publication dates could have been earlier in the timeline.

BELIZE, supported by the US, the NETHERLANDS, and the UK, said IPCC reports need to be ready for the Bonn Climate Change Conference in 2028, thus earlier than planned in the schedule. She also emphasized an inclusive cycle is only meaningful if it can feed into the GST.

TIMOR-LESTE underscored the IPCC is an important source of information for policymakers, noted that LDCs in particular do not have sufficient scientific power to carry out this research, and requested the timeline to be fully aligned with the UNFCCC process. The BAHAMAS said those who reside in SIDS are "painfully aware" of the effects of climate change and "gone is the time when we could drag our feet."

Saying the proposed timeline was not rushed in any way, DENMARK said many policy processes are "screaming" for timely information. Supported by UKRAINE, he said there is a huge reputational risk if the IPCC does not deliver when they know it is possible to produce all three WG reports within the standard timeline proposed by the Bureau.

LUXEMBOURG said the proposed schedule would help the IPCC remain policy relevant while ensuring the Panel's trademark robustness and, noting the proposal includes contingency time, encouraged the Co-Chairs to deliver all products as early as possible.

FRANCE emphasized the time allocated for review is less restrictive than in AR6.

FINLAND underscored that "if we want science-based policymaking, the faster we have the next report, the faster policymakers are able to take science-based policy action."

MALAWI, SAINT LUCIA, KIRIBATI, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, and others underscored the critical importance of timely reports from SIDS and LDCs, with SAINT LUCIA saying that "in the face of a crisis, the normal mode of operation changes—and this is clearly a crisis for SIDS."

Cautioning against an "irreparable reputational risk" to the IPCC, given unprecedented climate conditions, ITALY expressed full trust in the Bureau's work, pointed to technical discussions well under way, and expressed openness to trying to shorten the timeline by a few months.

SWITZERLAND recalled the 1998 IPCC mandate to provide timely assessments at both international and national levels and stressed the importance of comprehensive adaptation and mitigation advice for national policymaking needs. He also suggested an earlier scheduling of the first Lead Authors meeting.

SWEDEN noted that prolonging the cycle would not be inclusive, since it would impact authors' participation, and said an earlier delivery would be possible given that AR7 includes only one Special Report. Similarly, the US, with KIRIBATI, cited feedback from authors that a longer cycle would be less inclusive, as sustaining engagement throughout is challenging. Agreeing that a more stringent AR7 schedule is possible, KIRIBATI called for the need to explore every option to ensure the three WG reports are prepared on time and questioned the sequencing of WG reports.

Several countries, including BELGIUM, BELIZE, BRAZIL, DENMARK, HUNGARY, PERU ROMANIA, and the UK, stressed that inclusivity concerns could be addressed in ways other than an extended timeline, including continuous support of the authors' work and monitoring of the process. DENMARK said scientific cooperation between developed and developing countries is "picking up" and would eventually make its way to AR7. AUSTRALIA underscored their commitment to the inclusion of Indigenous and local knowledge. GERMANY proposed the decision text on the schedule include references to ongoing efforts to promote inclusivity.

JAPAN suggested exploring online meetings for author training sessions and other possible adjustments to the schedule, including a possible additional input at the GST. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by SOUTH AFRICA, asked for clarification on the literature cutoff date.

BRAZIL supported the proposed schedule, noting it represents a compromise between two issues faced by developing countries: the need to address the "special burden" placed on them to ensure they can contribute equitably, and the need for timely science in a context of a climate emergency that disproportionately affects them. He stressed the disparity in scientific capabilities is "fundamental" to the question of inclusivity, but "this will not be solved within AR7." NIGERIA welcomed the strategic plan as presented, and emphasized the need for regional participation and representation, as well as comprehensive and inclusive scientific information.

INDIA underscored that producing the best science needs time, haste leads to shoddy work and retracted publications, and as the basis for adequate climate action has already been laid down, the Panel should stay with the process of science and research.

CHILE said he had been in contact with two organizations that facilitate research and reported that one, the World Climate Research Programme, has designed a publication fast track to ensure results will be available in accordance with the proposed timeline, and the second, FutureEarth, supports the timeline and insists on the importance of publication of the three WG reports in time for GST-2. He refuted the notion that the workload is too heavy for the authors, as different people write and review the various reports, and suggested that IPCC could facilitate structured expert dialogues to support national focal points in collecting feedback from experts in their countries. SOUTH AFRICA, supported by INDIA, objected, noting circumstances for focal points differ widely according to context and that the entire workload sometimes depends on just one person.

HAITI emphasized the AR7 could be both inclusive and timely with sufficient support to developing countries and urged the Bureau to focus on enhancing the participation of SIDS and LDCs, calling for completing it all before June 2028 to properly inform the GST.

CUBA requested further consideration of the schedule and suggested allowing for regular revisions to possibly extend it. HUNGARY emphasized that a prolonged process is not the solution to inclusivity.

WGI Vice-Chair Aïda Diongue-Niang drew attention to greatly enhanced efforts and plans to increase inclusivity in the AR7, including through training and better access to scientific literature, and pointed to complications of lengthened engagement for some scientists from developing countries. She stressed the inclusivity challenges mentioned are structural and thus have to be addressed structurally, adding that "the solution to structural problems is not a slight extension of the schedule."

The US called for "trusting the Co-Chairs" in coming up with a feasible and inclusive timeline and asked for them to respond to remaining questions on inclusivity in the literature review, including on the cutoff date, as a step forward.

KENYA emphasized that her delegation's interventions are based on national perspectives and lived experiences, and not on fears but on actual facts. She called for a timeline that allows authors to address comments from governments in an inclusive and exhaustive way.

TIMOR-LESTE suggested linking discussions of gaps in capacity for vulnerable countries to discussion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme and, supported by CHAD, reiterated the need to publish all WG reports before the start of GST-2, as achieving 1.5°C is critical.

SWITZERLAND quoted several points about inclusivity from document IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9 on the outcomes and considerations of the Ad-hoc Group on Lessons Learned considered by the Panel the previous day, highlighted the irony of the "missed opportunity" to discuss them in that context only to encounter them in the next agenda item, and said the conversation on improving inclusivity has to continue.

ALGERIA called for doing justice to scientific communities from developing countries by giving them more flexibility.

Describing climate change as a "here and now" problem in the Arctic, ARCTIC MONITORING AND ASSESSEMENT PROGRAMME highlighted its readiness to support the IPCC's work by nominating its expert scientists and Indigenous Knowledge holders.

Underscoring that the climate emergency is happening faster and is worse than expected, CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK INTERNATIONAL called on the IPCC to deliver something scientifically authoritative "well in time" for GST-2.

In response to the comments on the strategic plan, WGIII Co-Chair Pereira clarified, *inter alia*: a longer timeline is more difficult to handle and increases the burden on authors; IPCC timelines cannot be perfectly aligned to those of the external research community; the volume of literature increases with every cycle; and inclusion is not a function of time alone but is about deliberate efforts to counter longstanding inequalities. She outlined a number of approaches that will be adopted to enhance inclusivity, including providing more guidance and training for authors.

On the literature, WGI Co-Chair Vautard estimated there is probably already the same amount available for WGI as was available for the whole AR6 cycle, said emerging literature is being actively produced, and reassured the Russian Federation that WGI has actively contributed to the planning and is comfortable with the timeline, which will be slightly better than that of AR6 if the schedule is respected.

WGI Co-Chair Zhang drew attention to the fact that AR7 has to be completed by May 2029 to allow for the selection of a new Bureau at the end of 2029, which means that WG assessments must be completed in 2028. He stressed that the proposed timeline is not rushed, that it can be done "comfortably" in similar times to AR5 and AR6, and that keeping to it also helps maintain momentum, adding that "procrastination does not make inclusiveness happen."

WGII Co-Chair Chow said they had taken a lot of time to ensure the proposed schedule was realistic and stated readiness to carry on the work in an inclusive, robust, and policy-relevant manner. He also pointed to the large and substantial body of literature for the guidelines on adaptation, including on policy planning and evaluation, with more coming from developing regions as a result of attention to the UNFCCC global goal on adaptation.

WGII Co-Chair van den Hurk highlighted numerous activities addressing inclusivity, as noted in document IPCC-LXI/INF. 15, and ongoing work exploring expert meetings and additional funding.

WGIII Co-Chair Calvin addressed review overlaps in the proposed schedule, clarifying that there was no overlap in government reviews of WG reports. She also noted that the schedule was based on past practice and attention to ensuring holidays.

In response to a question from the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, Co-Chair Calvin said the literature cut-off date for the WGII report was January 2028, and February 2028 for WGIII.

Chair Skea highlighted consensus on the importance of policy relevance, inclusivity, and continuous improvement, and noted the challenge of translating it all into a specific schedule. He summarized discussions, pointing to the Co-Chairs' endorsement of the schedule. He noted that preferences generally fell into three groups, namely a shorter timeline; a longer one; and the proposed one. He invited delegations to explore the possibility of consensus in an evening contact group.

A short exchange ensued regarding the mandate of the contact group, with LUXEMBOURG, supported by GERMANY, FRANCE, the US, and SWITZERLAND, and opposed by INDIA, KENYA, and SAUDI ARABIA, suggesting also to explore concerns beyond the timeline, including inclusivity. Co-Chair Skea said that if issues are relevant for the primary objective, they should be included.

On Thursday morning, Contact Group Co-Chair Fabrice Lambert (Chile) reported that the group met on Wednesday evening, discussing proposals in favor of both shortening and lengthening the schedule's timeline and how to strengthen inclusivity in the process. He underscored that while no consensus had been reached, an eventual consensus was possible.

On Thursday evening, Chair Skea noted how difficult it had been to find a solution that satisfied all delegations, even after all the time spent on this issue at IPCC-60 and 61. He therefore proposed to postpone a decision on the timeline until after the AR7 scoping meeting in December 2024, saying this is in alignment with Annex A, paragraph 4.1, of the IPCC Principles and Procedures. In order to do so, he suggested the Secretariat draft a decision whereby the Panel would: present this as a Chair's initiative; take note of IPCC-LXI/Doc.10; and agree on the strategic planning schedule based on the outcome of the scoping meeting, in accordance with IPCC Principles and Procedures.

SAUDI ARABIA noted that the strategic planning document had not been fully agreed by the Bureau and preferred that it be not presented as such. In response to a question by INDIA on whether the timeline would be an input to the scoping meeting, Chair Skea proposed the timeline would not go into the scoping meeting as an input. He said the scoping meeting would start from zero and recalled that the meeting is in the hands of the WG Co-Chairs.

A first draft of the decision was presented to the Panel by IPCC Deputy Secretary Emira Fida on Friday afternoon. Several questions were raised, including by SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA, LUXEMBOURG, and the UK, regarding clarity and alignment with Appendix A, paragraph 4.1, of the Principles and Procedures.

In response to a comment by SAUDI ARABIA objecting to reference to Doc.10, given that it was not agreed by all members of the Bureau, Chair Skea noted that the document was presented under the authority of the IPCC Chair.

INDONESIA recalled a previous request for the decision to include reference to the Methodology Report on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies and Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage.

The Secretariat returned to redrafting and presented a revised version to the Panel. The revised draft was adopted as presented.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS asked that her disappointment with the delay implied by this decision be recorded. She stressed the importance of inclusivity and emphasized that it is critical to enhance contributions from SIDS in the process and address knowledge gaps and representativeness. Expressing her full trust in the elected Bureau to undertake concrete steps in this regard, she underscored "there is no time to delay."

HUNGARY and GERMANY also expressed disappointment, with HUNGARY calling for a constructive approach at the next meeting to avoid further delays. GERMANY said it was ironic that the Panel had missed the opportunity to take

GERMANY said it was ironic that the Panel had missed the opportunity to take up lessons learned, including identifying concrete options to enhance inclusivity, and called for timely IPCC input to the GST to make sure developing country perspectives are adequately represented.

INDIA also expressed disappointment, stressing concern for inclusion of the scientific community from developing countries, and hoped that the time required for their participation would be granted. Saying "we have no climate scientists who deny climate change," he added they "will not shy from asking that the process allows for time for participation of all."

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-9), the Panel:

- notes the document IPCC-LXI/Doc. 10 submitted by the IPCC Chair and document IPCC-LXI/INF. 15 prepared by the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups and TFI;
- recalls Decision IPCC-LX-9 and in accordance with paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A of the Principles governing the work of the IPCC, will agree at its 62nd session on the scope, outline, and the work plan including schedule and budget; and
- notes Decision IPCC-LXI-5 on the Outline of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities and Decision IPCC-LXI-7 on the Outline of the 2027 IPCC Methodology Report on Inventories for Short-Lived Climate Forcers.

Options for Expert Meetings and Workshops for the Seventh Assessment Cycle

On Friday morning, WGI Co-Chair Zhang introduced the options for expert meetings and workshops for the Seventh Assessment Cyle (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 7), highlighting the need for cross-working group collaboration. He noted two expert meetings were held in July 2024: one on carbon dioxide removal technology and carbon capture and storage, and a second on land use emissions. He added that a workshop on gender and diversity action would be held later in 2024.

WGI Co-Chair Vautard outlined proposed expert meetings that would be held before the first quarter of 2026, including on: adaptation guidelines, metrics and indicators, to be led by WGII; high-impact events and tipping points, to be led by WGI; and novel approaches to assessing knowledge on climate change and society's response, which would be led by the IPCC Chair. Co-Chair Vautard noted an additional document on the proposed expert meeting on high-impact events and tipping points (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 7. Add.1), explaining that this would be led by WGI but with contributions from all WGs. He noted: high-impact events and tipping points can have large-scale consequences but remain associated with large uncertainties; literature on this topic is growing; there is a wide range of views on this topic; and the topic was addressed separately and to varying extents by each working group in AR6, indicating the need for more coordination. He explained this proposed expert meeting would include 60 participants, be held before the first Lead Author Meeting of AR7, and will receive in-kind and financial support from the World Climate Research Programme.

Co-Chair Vautard further noted the document lists other possible topics for expert meetings and workshops, including: health and climate change; regional climate information; Earth observation data accessibility; science communication; scenarios, equity and sustainable development; and overshoot.

While seeing merit in all three proposed expert meetings, the US opposed adding costs to the budget without consideration by the Financial Task Team (FiTT) and said discussions could be held at the next IPCC meeting. NORWAY, the NETHERLANDS, and the UK also called for careful consideration of budgetary implications.

Several countries, including TÜRKIYE, LUXEMBOURG, and DENMARK expressed support for agreeing to the expert group meetings as presented. JAPAN supported "in general" expert meetings and workshops, and particularly on data and overshoot, but called for clarification on the selection of topics as priority areas.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA, with INDIA, suggested this issue should be considered after the AR7 scoping meeting.

On the expert meeting on high-impact events and tipping points, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, CANADA, CHILE, FRANCE, ITALY, the NETHERLANDS, SOUTH AFRICA, SPAIN, SWEDEN, and UKRAINE, expressed their support, with some recalling support for a special report on tipping points at IPCC-60. UKRAINE called tipping points "the elephant in the room."

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION supported an expert meeting on tipping points focused on climate systems but requested clarification on tipping points related to economic systems.

INDIA opposed an expert meeting on tipping points, stressing it spans too many topics and describing the various physical and social tipping points listed cited as "incoherent." SAUDI ARABIA also opposed it, noting this topic will be discussed in WGI.

SWITZERLAND noted the expert meeting on tipping points would also be helpful for the Special Report on cities and suggested combining the proposed work on Earth observation data with the expert meeting on tipping points. Emphasizing that expert meetings are tools that speak to inclusivity, a point supported by KENYA, MALAWI, SOUTH AFRICA, and ZIMBABWE, SWITZERLAND highlighted the importance of Indigenous Knowledge and local communities, and suggested collaborating with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) to learn from their experience in this matter.

On the expert meeting on novel approaches to assessing knowledge on climate change and society's response, ARGENTINA, AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, CHILE, CUBA, FINLAND, FRANCE, ITALY, the NETHERLANDS, SPAIN, and SWEDEN expressed their support, with many countries stressing in particular the importance of Indigenous Knowledge and collaboration with IPBES in this regard. FINLAND described best practices in connecting Indigenous Knowledge with science, noting the establishment of the Sámi Climate Council in Finland which is tasked with bringing the knowledge base of the Sámi people into the climate policy. CANADA called for including Indigenous Knowledge that does not always neatly fit with the boundaries of "Western science" and for the wide involvement of Indigenous Peoples in the meeting.

While agreeing the IPCC can learn from IPBES on this matter, GERMANY noted it is essential to operate within the Principles and Procedures to maintain the scientific rigor of the reports and questioned whether other forms of knowledge and knowledge systems beyond traditional IPCC literature are covered.

INDIA objected to the meeting as framed, saying too many different types of knowledge were included, and suggested a meeting focused on artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning be organized during AR7 instead.

On adaptation guidelines, metrics, and indicators, TIMOR-LESTE, along with ARGENTINA, CHILE, FRANCE, INDIA, SOUTH AFRICA, SYRIA, and URUGUAY, emphasized the need for an expert meeting on this topic. Several countries, including KENYA and SAUDI ARABIA, said adaptation should be a priority in this cycle.

NORWAY, INDIA, and DENMARK noted the expert group meeting on science communication has already been agreed upon.

On broader issues of inclusivity, many countries, including MEXICO, URUGUAY, and VENEZUELA, underscored the need to organize the meetings in a manner that is inclusive of developing countries. TIMOR-LESTE underscored the need to consider the special circumstances of SIDS and LDCs, who have limited access to experts. With the UK, he also called for workshops for national focal points on science communication and suggested including experts on communication skills from agriculture or other areas since LDCs and SIDS do not have many experts on communication of climate change. Similarly, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS cautioned against overburdening the cycle with too many meetings and stressed inclusivity as critically important for SIDS.

In response to these concerns, ITALY proposed considering "innovative means" to include assessments from all regions, such as holding regional forums and including grey literature and non-English literature.

KENYA suggested holding workshops instead of expert meetings, or a combination of the two, saying workshops will allow national focal points to select experts they think are relevant, while holding only expert meetings could compromise diversity. ALGERIA similarly favored workshops rather than expert meetings on adaptation metrics and indicators.

LUXEMBOURG supported the proposed expert meetings and said an expert meeting is more appropriate than a workshop on adaptation indicators, as the work is technical.

FRANCE, supported by ITALY, called for prioritizing: overshoot, health and climate change, science communication, and with BELGIUM, accessibility of data for climate studies.

KENYA emphasized the importance of Earth observation for "data scarce" regions and supported a meeting on this topic.

CONGO underscored the impacts of climate change on forests, saying this should be a priority for the IPCC; expressed concern about using AI in the IPCC's work, underscoring that not all research is online; and, supported by KENYA, proposed organizing sub-regional meetings to gather all experts on a topic such as adaptation, which would yield lists of scientific reports and lists of priorities that are all encompassing.

SAUDI ARABIA said the IPCC and its science are supposed to influence policy, and not the other way around, and proposed that inclusivity and capacity meetings be held.

The CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW (CIEL) underscored the clash between the physical science of climate change and economic models underpinning mitigation pathways that lock us into fossil fuel-dependent economies, and expressed concern that an expert meeting on tipping points or overshoot might provide the opportunity to advance highly speculative and risky technologies such as solar geoengineering, which may have harmful impacts on people and ecosystems.

FWCC lamented that accredited observers to the IPCC are not able to nominate experts to attend expert meetings, expressed serious concern about speculative technologies that pose novel risks to humanity and nature, and asked all delegates to return home with more courage, compassion, and honesty.

INUIT CIRCUMPOLAR COUNCIL underscored the importance of terminology and representation of Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous knowledge in IPCC meetings and, calling for advancing a "nothing about us without us" approach, hoped to see the IPCC engage directly with Indigenous Peoples.

Noting concerns raised by some delegates about budgetary provisions for these meetings, Chair Skea requested the IPCC Secretariat to clarify the rules. Secretary Mokssit confirmed that the procedurally correct action is to wait until the FiTT convenes, which will be in February 2025.

Following consultations, Chair Skea introduced a decision that invites the WGs and TFI Bureaux and the IPCC Chair to bring forward proposals on expert meetings and workshops at IPCC-62 and future sessions, taking into account the views expressed at IPCC-61 regarding IPCC-LXI/Doc. 7.

SAUDI ARABIA proposed removing a reference to Doc. 7, saying it is already inferred. The proposal was opposed by SWITZERLAND, KENYA, and the NETHERLANDS, who stressed the importance of maintaining the concrete proposals in Doc. 7 as a basis for discussions at IPCC-62.

The Secretariat explained that it is normal practice to refer to the relevant documents at the top of the decision text. Chair Skea noted that a decision would not alter the course of future meetings.

SAUDI ARABIA said it could accept the decision as presented, and it was adopted by the Panel.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-6), the Panel "invited the Bureaux of the Working Groups/TFI and the IPCC Chair to bring forward proposals for Expert Meetings and Workshops at IPCC-62 and future IPCC sessions, in line with Appendix A, paragraph 7.1 of the IPCC Principles and Procedures, taking into account the views expressed by Member governments at IPCC-61 regarding Doc. 7."

Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned from the Sixth Assessment Cycle

On Saturday afternoon, Debra Roberts (South Africa) and Brittany Croll (US), Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL), introduced the document presenting the group's outcomes and considerations (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9). Noting the IPCC is constantly learning from past work, Roberts explained the AGLL's mandate and said intersessional work since IPCC-60 included five virtual meetings, with the participation of 69 members representing 38 countries.

Croll introduced a table listing the topics discussed by the AGLL, saying it does not indicate any preference or endorsement by AGLL. She explained that nuanced and divergent views were expressed throughout the discussions. She also noted the levels of effort that would be required to address the items listed vary significantly, and some have resource implications. Croll invited the panel to treat this as a resource document and advise on the way forward.

Chair Skea emphasized that the table presents a set of topics on which the panel may wish to take action now or later and is not a list of agreed actions.

SAUDI ARABIA requested clarification about how the document could be used, noting while the meetings had been very useful, her delegation was not particularly supportive of some of the lessons learned and could not agree to use the document in its current form.

Describing many of the recommendations as "really good," CHILE highlighted concerns about references to using gray literature in the next report, suggesting that training may be needed, and noted that one recommendation related to the nationality and location of scientists was problematic.

INDIA expressed gratitude to the Co-Chairs of the AGLL for facilitating a useful exchange but said there was no convergence of views and questioned the meaning of a "resource document."

BENIN made several recommendations for improving the document, including highlighting the specific options for actions by the IPCC.

Many countries, including AZERBAIJAN, BURUNDI, DENMARK, the UK, and the US welcomed the document as a useful resource for further consideration by the Panel.

LUXEMBOURG, with GERMANY, the UK, the US and others, suggested having the WGs, Bureau, and others address, in their regular progress reports, how the lessons learned are being addressed. LUXEMBOURG also proposed taking up issues affecting IPCC Principles and Procedures when these are taken up by the Panel.

Noting many issues can be addressed at the managerial level by the Bureau, TSUs, Secretariat, and others, GERMANY, with the UK, SWEDEN, and AUSTRALIA, called for having the Secretariat follow up with identification of which issues need to be taken up by the Panel.

BELGIUM, supported by SWITZERLAND and the NETHERLANDS, proposed retaining the issue as a standing agenda item to allow for assessing progress, and for having a plan to address improvements, including possible action by the Panel. SWITZERLAND also stressed the importance of following up with a decision-making process and, with the NETHERLANDS, emphasized this should not be an end point. ITALY, CANADA, NORWAY, and NEW ZEALAND expressed support for regular updates by the Secretariat.

SOUTH AFRICA questioned its value as a standing item and preferred using the document as an information document to be taken up as needed.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA and JAPAN called for prioritizing measures that require immediate attention, with JAPAN highlighting the need for better support to author teams.

TÜRKIYE suggested creating a monitoring mechanism for lessons learned. TOGO called for the document to classify suggestions by Working Group.

CIEL encouraged the Panel to ensure that Indigenous Knowledge has space and consideration throughout AR7.

SOUTH AFRICA, supported by INDIA, KENYA, NEW ZEALAND, and SYRIA, proposed to change the name of the document, suggesting "exchange of views" as an option. SAUDI ARABIA proposed to use "information note" or "exchange note."

INDIA, supported by IRAQ and SAUDI ARABIA, also said that, due to a lack of consensus, any action-oriented wording such as the Panel "taking note" of the document was not acceptable, and stressed the need for a greater package of information collected in the process to be made available to those interested.

In response to the interventions, AGLL Co-Chairs Roberts and Croll said a "full package" of information collected during the preparation of the document will be made available to the Panel in some form. They also noted the document is not binding and the term "resource document" was meant to reflect this.

SAUDI ARABIA, supported by INDIA and SOUTH AFRICA, reiterated that conceiving the document as a point of reference would be problematic.

GERMANY, supported by SWITZERLAND, LUXEMBOURG, and DENMARK, stressed the document should remain a reference, noting the Panel can object to elements from the progress reports at any point.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS called for finding ways forward on this matter and underscored the need to end IPCC sessions on time, stressing it is a matter of inclusivity as small delegations are not able to participate in "overtime."

Noting "consensus on the lack of consensus" regarding the document contents, but enough potential for agreement to take the issue forward, Chair Skea proposed having the Co-Chairs work with the legal team on language that could be brought back to plenary after consultation with delegations.

On Tuesday morning, AGLL Co-Chairs Roberts and Croll presented the draft decision (IPCC-LXI-3), noting it sought to offer "bridging text" between divergent views.

ALGERIA, BRAZIL, CHINA, EGYPT, GUINEA, INDIA, IRAQ, ITALY, LIBYA, MOROCCO, NIGERIA, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, SAUDI ARABIA, SOUTH AFRICA, SYRIA, TIMOR-LESTE, URUGUAY, VENEZUELA, and others expressed support for the proposed decision.

While not opposing the adoption of the draft, several countries expressed disappointment in its lack of ambition. SWITZERLAND, supported by BELGIUM, CANADA, ESTONIA, FRANCE, ICELAND, LUXEMBOURG, SWEDEN, and the UK, called for referring to the "report" rather than the "work" of the AGLL and for clarity on ways this work will be carried forward throughout AR7.

SWEDEN, supported by FRANCE, suggested referring to a "report that does not reflect Panel consensus." CANADA, supported by ICELAND, NORWAY, FINLAND, and HAITI, proposed adding action-oriented language such as "acted on" to guide future use of the document. GERMANY, supported by ARGENTINA, CHILE, MONACO, TÜRKIYE, and the US, lamented no mechanism for reviewing progress was specified, further noting the text does not reflect the Panel's "readiness to adapt to the changing context" in which it is operating. UKRAINE added that "we ask the rest of the world to change rapidly, but, as an institution, we repeat the status quo."

With several interventions stressing the need for the Panel to move to other pressing items, NEW ZEALAND, supported by the UK, suggested the meeting report capture that some countries called for a future mechanism for reporting back on progress.

The AGLL Co-Chairs then responded that they heard the "desire to keep the IPCC as a learning organization," stressing the text represents a "delicate compromise." Chair Skea said the IPCC-61 meeting report would reflect the concerns many delegations expressed. SAUDI ARABIA noted their wish that the meeting report would "reflect the accurate deliberation."

Decision IPCC-LXI-3 was adopted by the Panel.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-3), the Panel "appreciates and takes note of the work of the AGLL but also notes that this work does not reflect Panel consensus, and the topics are indicative, not exhaustive." It adds that the topics may be further discussed during the AR7 as appropriate.

Resource Mobilization

On Friday, Secretary Mokssit reported on the financial situation in the IPCC Trust Fund (IPCC-LXI/INF. 5). He noted a "healthy" cash balance of CHF 25 million, projected to close at slightly less than CHF 30 million at the end of the year. Thanking countries who provided both direct and in-kind contributions, including recent IPCC Plenary hosts Türkiye and Bulgaria, he appealed to all to "put their name" on the list of contributors to ensure the sustainability of the Fund, in light of an intense AR7 cycle.

SOUTH AFRICA drew attention to their contribution in 2023, which was not displayed in the table.

Noting its position as a host of the IPCC Secretariat, SWITZERLAND asked about the fundraising strategy for how to reach the ambitious target, calling for a plan with specific action, timelines, and responsibilities. He suggested that the Secretariat look at other processes when developing this plan, including UNEP, and explore different pathways. Mokssit assured the Panel the Secretariat wastes no time in appealing to Permanent Missions in Geneva and highlighted the need to avoid confusion between contributing to the UNFCCC and the IPCC.

Chair Skea joined the appeal to keep in mind the sustainability of funds, noted collaboration with the Board of Trustees for the Scholarship Fund, and said this could be brought within the scope of progress reports.

The Panel took note of the document.

Matters Related to other IPCC Activities

Terms of Reference of the IPCC Publication Committee: On Thursday evening, IPCC Legal Officer Lew Schneider introduced the draft Terms of Reference of the IPCC Publication Committee (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 4), underscoring these were prepared by the Bureau in response to a request by the Panel at IPCC-60. She noted the Committee will be established for the duration of the assessment cycle to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Panel and Bureau with regard to publications, translations, and access to literature, as well as to advise the IPCC Secretariat on areas such as management of citation data and options for enhancing access to literature for IPCC authors. She said the Committee's nine members would be nominated by their respective Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs, taking into account overall gender and regional representation.

BELGIUM called for language on efforts to increase broad access to the literature for IPCC authors to be more actionable, saying this is critical to enhancing the inclusiveness of the IPCC process. He also asked for the addition of a bullet point enabling the Committee to consider proposals to revise IPCC copyright policy, which, he stressed, does not currently allow some elements from IPCC reports such as captions to be translated and thus hinders outreach in languages other than English. SAUDI ARABIA opposed this addition, arguing such changes should be put before the Panel. Chair Skea suggested this amendment would fall within the remit of the Bureau and Panel, rather than the Publications Committee.

SAUDI ARABIA requested an amendment to a sentence suggesting the Terms of Reference "enhance" IPCC Principles and Procedures, requesting for these to be "in line" instead.

GERMANY said the text should note Committee members are appointed, not nominated, as nominations imply an election procedure.

On Friday afternoon, IPCC Legal Officer Lew Schneider presented a revised version of the Terms of Reference for the IPCC Publication Committee (IPCC-LXI-Doc. 4 Rev. 1). She said changes reflected comments from delegations, with the proposal by BELGIUM on changes to the copyright policy reflected as new language under Purpose and Scope, on "proposals for applying IPCC copyright policy to facilitate the outreach about IPCC products, notably in other languages than English."

SAUDI ARABIA asked for clarification on whether this addition would imply a modification to the IPCC copyright policy. Lew Schneider responded that it does not, as the added bullet proposes to "apply" the policy to facilitate outreach but does not imply a change to the policy itself.

BELGIUM explained that, while their original intent was to propose to revise and update the copyright policy to facilitate the outreach in other languages than English, they were "convinced" by the Secretariat that it was possible to both keep the copyright as it is while accommodating their request. The NETHERLANDS reiterated their hope to see the copyright policy changed. Chair Skea said this was outside of the scope of the present report.

GERMANY requested adding language indicating that efforts to expand access to literature would be "contingent on the availability of funds."

TÜRKIYE suggested the Publications Committee report to the Bureau twice a year instead of annually.

After SAUDI ARABIA asked for time to have an offline conversation on the question of copyright with interested delegations, the NETHERLANDS requested to add this to the agenda for a future meeting, before the publication of IPCC reports. Chair Skea agreed.

After further revisions, the IPCC Legal Officer introduced an updated document.

SAUDI ARABIA questioned a reference to outreach, saying this is handled by another committee or unit and, supported by INDIA, suggested the committee should report to the Panel as well as the Bureau.

BELGIUM called for reverting to the previous version of the bullet, saying it would not result in a revision of the copyright policy.

GERMANY noted that the Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments (TG Data) reports "through the bureau" to the Panel.

Noting that flexibility is commonly called for but less often offered, Chair Skea asked how delegates would like to deal with this.

BELGIUM said they have already shown flexibility and would not block evolution of the document, with the clear understanding that the copyright policy would be open for updating and revision, and this would be on the agenda of the next meeting.

Chair Skea said that this comment would be recorded in the meeting report and asked the Secretariat to delete the bullet. SAUDI ARABIA said he did not understand the concern and questioned adding the item to the next agenda without consensus to do so.

Chair Skea clarified that the question about agenda items is not within the scope of the decision. He further suggested that the Panel follow TG Data's model, saying the Publications Committee would report through the Bureau, and, where appropriate, the Committee could report to the Panel. Delegates agreed to approve the Terms of Reference as amended.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-11), the Panel agreed to the Terms of Reference of the IPCC Publication Committee, as contained in Annex 1 to the decision.

IPCC Scholarship Programme: On Tuesday morning, the IPCC Secretariat introduced the report on activities undertaken under the IPCC Scholarship Programme (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 8), noting the balance in the scholarship trust fund is just over CHF 1.6 million. He further reported that the Board of Trustees (BOT) would like to establish the position of Chair. He said the Panel is invited to approve the amendment of the Trust Deed and decide how the BOT Chair should be appointed, as well as to take note of the report and provide guidance as appropriate.

Chair Skea noted that the BOT had informally selected Jean-Pascal van Ypersele (Belgium) as its Chair. Speaking on behalf of the BOT, van Ypersele reported that the BOT had met via teleconference four times and had set initial goals of making the most of existing resources in the IPCC Scholarship Fund, expanding and diversifying funding sources, and finding additional funding for chapter scientists contributing to the seventh assessment cycle. He said they hope to significantly increase the number of scholarships and activities during this cycle.

The US, with JAPAN, BELGIUM, UKRAINE and FRANCE, supported the election of the Chair by the BOT at their inaugural teleconference, and said the electee should be presented to and endorsed by the IPCC. She further suggested that the Chair should serve a term of four years and could be reappointed for a second term.

GERMANY supported establishing the role of a Chair, noting it would be useful to have terms of reference to define the role and its functions and, noting this a very small BOT, and said she hoped BOT members could agree among themselves who would serve as Chair and inform the Panel. She also welcomed the work on scholarships, called for greater transparency around grants, and suggested the heavy workload associated with the administration and management of the programme potentially be shifted from the IPCC Secretariat by partnering with an organization already doing this work.

FRANCE, with CONGO, asked for clarification on reported difficulties in awarding the scholarship to delegates from African countries, an issue the Secretariat responded they were working on.

IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a ensured the Panel that donations to the Scholarship Fund were put to good use, pointing to the results of a survey conducted among 39 past scholarship recipients. The Panel then accepted the amendment of the Trust Deed on the establishment of the position of Chair, with Chair Skea noting a majority indicated the BOT Chair should be elected by the Board.

Report of the IPCC Conflict of Interest Committee

Report by the COI Subcommittee on the Revision of the COI Disclosure Form: On Friday, IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a, on behalf of members of the Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee, provided a report (IPCC-LXI/Doc. 5) on the COI Committee's activities. He said the sub-committee conferred five times in the period since IPCC-60 and proposed edits to the COI disclosure form for greater clarity and readability, to make it easier for individuals to complete and for the COI Committee to make an informed decision on a potential conflict of interest. These edits would include allowing the reporting of financial interests that might represent or give rise to a conflict of interest, or the perception of a conflict of interest.

SAUDI ARABIA said the changes were unnecessary and sometimes created confusion. She cited as an example the section on employment and consulting, saying the revised version "mixes" commercial appointments with other forms of employment. The US also expressed concern about the inclusion of "governmental or non-governmental" appointments in this section and highlighted some copy-editing issues.

GERMANY expressed support for the revisions, noting the form's goal is to enhance transparency and does not affect participation at the IPCC.

IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a proposed reverting to the original wording on the areas of concern to the delegations that took the floor. The US agreed to this proposal, but SAUDI ARABIA asked to see the amended report first. Chair Skea proposed the COI Committee work on an amended report.

After conferring with the COI Committee, IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a presented a revised form which was adopted without further amendment.

Final Decision: In its decision (IPCC-LXI-10), the Panel accepts the recommendations of the sub-committee of the COI Committee on the revision of the COI disclosure form as set out in Annex I to the decision.

Progress Reports

Report by the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs: On Thursday evening, Chair Skea presented the Progress Report by the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs (IPCC-LXI/INF. 11), noting that, along with the Progress Report from the IPCC Secretariat, this was one of two new reports aimed at increasing accountability and transparency in the IPCC process. He added that this report covers IPCC business, outreach, and engagement activities. On his own activities, Chair Skea noted, *inter alia:* that he chaired the IPCC Bureau's 67th meeting and five monthly meetings of the Executive Committee; visited Geneva to discuss the execution of IPCC business with the Secretariat; and had multiple conference calls with the Secretary and Deputy Secretary. He added that he visited several TSU sites and had other visits planned.

CONGO asked for a clarification on whether the Chair's "online activities" were included in this report and, supported by the UK, suggested future reports offer progress updates on promises made during the Chair's election campaign. Chair Skea welcomed this suggestion.

NORWAY, supported by the NETHERLANDS, said such progress reports could be one area where the IPCC can reflect on lessons learned. SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA, and SOUTH AFRICA opposed this suggestion, pointing to the lack of agreement on a mechanism for reporting back on the AGLL. Chair Skea said activities undertaken will be reported on, and these may touch upon topics from the AGLL.

BELGIUM, the UK, and GERMANY underscored they trusted the Chair and Vice-Chairs in their reporting, with GERMANY warning against "micromanaging" them.

Chair Skea said this report would outline what the Chair and Vice-Chairs did within the remit of their mandates, and not according to other documents and structures.

The Panel then agreed to take note of the Report by the IPCC Chair and Vice-Chairs.

Report by the IPCC Secretariat: IPCC Secretary Abdalah Mokssit outlined the Secretariat's activities (IPCC-LXI/INF. 9), highlighting the achievements of a "dedicated team" of 15 people who often exceed their terms of reference and working hours, and noting that recruitment of a temporary programme officer and logistics and conference management officer is underway.

Many delegates expressed appreciation for the hard work of the Secretariat. SWITZERLAND requested clarification on the status of recruitment and a strategic human resources plan. Secretary Mokssit said the processes are being managed by the WMO human resources team.

Highlighting the need to manage the expectations of experts, BELGIUM said it would be useful to provide facts and numbers on the expert selection process to ensure those who are not selected do not refrain from future engagement with the IPCC.

KENYA, supported by CONGO, raised concerns about visa challenges, noting this was a longstanding issue, and asked the Secretariat if they would consider a mechanism to ensure the full participation of delegates from developing countries. WGIII Vice-Chair Noureddine Yassaa appreciated the Secretariat's work to provide support letters for delegates and encouraged further work with focal points to address the issue. Secretary Mokssit acknowledged the challenges delegates from developing countries may encounter in securing visas and underscored the importance of applying ahead of the deadline. Chair Skea added that people often face bureaucratic issues that affect their ability to meet visa application deadlines and said providing adequate notice of meetings is important.

KENYA noted that delegates sometimes to have to travel to other countries with host-country embassies to secure visas and hoped the Secretariat would outline plans to ensure visas are obtained and participation is improved. CHAD underscored challenges securing appointments with host-country embassies and requested the Secretariat to work with the host countries to ensure delegates are given appointments.

Secretary Mokssit assured the Panel that the Secretariat is doing its best regarding visas and urged timely applications well before the deadline.

LIBYA noted problems even when applying on time, as citizens of African countries often need to apply twice: once for the country visa, and again to the Schengen visa. SOUTH AFRICA suggested exploring agreements between embassies that provide Schengen visas in African countries.

Chair Skea said this is clearly a perennial problem within IPCC and proposed to continue gathering experiences and exploring solutions.

BELGIUM stressed the need for timely notifications and precise dates to avoid higher costs, something he said was mentioned in the AGLL. Chair Skea noted that having the AR7 strategic planning schedule will greatly help with that, recalling that during AR5 one could predict meetings as far as two years ahead.

The Panel took note of the Report by the IPCC Secretariat.

Report by Working Group I: On Wednesday, WGI Co-Chair Zhang presented information in the WGI Progress Report (IPCC-LXI/INF. 4). He noted, *inter alia,* past and upcoming new hires in the French and Chinese TSU and, on the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, that a majority of WGI Bureau Members attended the scoping meeting in person, along with WGI TSU members. Since then, he added, WGI has contributed to the preparation of the scoping meeting report. On the AR7 Joint Scoping Meeting, he said WGI received over 1,000 applications and is due to make decisions by September 2024. Along with WGII and WGIII, he presented mechanisms for cross-working group collaboration, including bi-monthly meetings.

On a section on the AR7 strategic schedule, SAUDI ARABIA asked for clarification on what elements constituted a "consensus" on the lessons learned from AR6 that fed into their work on the proposed strategic schedule. WGI Co-Chair Zhang said they aimed for a more concise report than in AR6. INDIA asked the report to specify that there was no consensus on the strategic schedule.

FRANCE noted their appreciation for WGI's work, and SWITZERLAND asked which expert meetings WGI would support the most. On the latter, Co-Chair Vautard pointed to the Expert Meeting on High Impact Events and Tipping Points. TÜRKIYE asked for clarification on a point regarding ongoing discussions with international organizations.

The Panel then took note of the WGI Progress Report.

Report by Working Group II: WGII Co-Chair Chow presented the Progress Report for WGII (IPCC-LXI/INF. 8). He described, *inter alia*, the establishment of the WGII TSU in both the Netherlands and Singapore, as well as several new hires in both. On the WGII AR7 scoping meeting, he said over 2,393 nominations were received, invitations will be sent in September 2024, and the meeting will be held 9-13 December 2024 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. He then provided an extensive update on work undertaken in the context of the Special Report on Climate Change in Cities.

He underscored inclusivity efforts during the expert selection process for the scoping meeting that took place in Riga, Latvia, from 16-19 April 2024. One hundred thirty-three experts were selected out of 1,293 nominations received, he explained, with consideration given to the criteria defined by the IPCC Principles and Procedures, including scientific, technical, and socio-economic expertise; geographical representation; a mixture of experts with and without previous IPCC experience; gender balance; and others.

The Panel took note of the WGII Progress Report.

Report by Working Group III: On Wednesday, presenting the WGIII Progress Report (IPCC-LXI/INF. 2), WGIII Co-Chair Pereira described a distributed TSU structure, which includes: a TSU-Washington node, which consists of the TSU Head, Head of Science, and several scientific and operational staff; a TSU-Asheville node, which primarily consists of technical services professionals; and a TSU-Malaysia node. She noted WGIII took the lead in identifying a venue for the AR7 scoping meeting, which will take place in Kuala Lumpur from 9-13 December 2024. She said the WGIII Co-Chairs extended their appreciation to the Government of Norway for co-sponsoring the meeting.

JAPAN called for the WGIII AR7 report to be more "solutions-oriented" than its AR6 counterpart. The UK asked for the number of expert nominations to WGIII. Pereira said there were 1,700 nominations for only 60 positions.

The Panel then took note of the WGIII Progress Report.

Report by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI): On Wednesday, TFI Co-Chair Enoki presented the Progress Report by the TFI (IPCC-LXI/INF. 6). He noted, *inter alia*, the scoping meeting for the Methodology Report on SLCFs was held in Brisbane, Australia, on 26-28 February 2024, and was attended by 68 nominated experts. He also said an Expert Meeting on Carbon Dioxide Removal Technologies, Carbon Capture Utilization, and Storage took place in Vienna, Austria, from 1-3 July 2024 with the aim to develop a Methodology Report on this topic by the end of 2027, as mandated by Decision IPCC-LX-9 adopted at IPCC-60. He also said the IPCC Inventory Software Update was launched in June 2024 to support use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines in reporting under the Paris Agreement.

BELGIUM expressed support for the software update and encouraged a better integration with the IPCC website. SOUTH AFRICA asked for information about the response rate from developing countries in an upcoming software demonstration workshop.

The Panel then took note of the Progress Report by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.

Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments (TG Data): On Thursday morning, TG Data Co-Chair Sebastian Vicuña (Chile) outlined the group's recent work (IPCC-LXI/INF. 7), including coordination meetings, outreach activities, the updating of the TG Data webpage, a webinar held in March 2024 on the role of artificial intelligence in the IPCC process, and the preparation of an expert meeting related to Earth observation data. He highlighted an upcoming open call for participation in the work of the Data Distribution Center (DDC).

The US and BELGIUM supported the open call for participants and said financial implications should be considered by the Financial Task Team. The US: noted that DDC activities are getting more complex and hoped for more information on how this is happening; said the expert meeting should be considered in coordination with the Co-Chairs; and stressed TSU heads should sign off on DDC workplans and requests for tenders.

UKRAINE expressed support for the work of TG Data, saying the group's work is essential for countries that do not have the ability to produce their own data.

Chair Skea invited the panel to take note of the progress report and agree on the launch of the call for participation, "pending the addressing of comments made by delegates." The Panel agreed.

Gender Action Team: IPCC Vice-Chair Ürge-Vorsatz reported on the work of the Gender Action Team (IPCC-LXI/INF. 14), noting work centered on: the code of conduct and process for addressing complaints; training; and preparations for the Expert Meeting on diversity, equity, inclusion, and gender-related issues, expected to be hosted by Canada.

CANADA, FRANCE, CHAD, and CONGO expressed appreciation for the work undertaken, with CHAD urging others to participate, and CONGO noting headway in his country in this regard. CANADA called for completion of the process for dealing with complaints to address issues of gender, racial, or any other form of discrimination.

The Panel took note of the report.

Communication and Outreach Activities: On Thursday morning, Andrej Mahečic, Head of Media and Communications, IPCC Secretariat, presented the Progress Report on Communications and Outreach Activities (IPCC-LXI/INF. 3). He noted that, in the period since IPCC-60, IPCC communications and outreach activities focused primarily on: the visibility of the AR7 Bureau members; media and outreach activities on the scoping meeting for the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities; and the overall coordination and development of media and public outreach activities.

On media relations, Mahečic cited interviews with IPCC Chair Skea in the *Financial Times* and on BBC World News. He said media coverage showed sustained interest but was not as high as during the release of past Special Reports. On outreach, he highlighted key moments of engagement related to the Sixth Session of the UN Environment Assembly, the Bonn Climate Change Conference in June 2024, and IPCC-61, such as the International Scientific Conference on Climate Risks in the Black Sea region that took place just before the current meeting.

On broader communications, he said the AR7 Communication and Outreach Action Team was established in July 2024, a branding strategy for AR7 was underway, and the IPCC social media accounts and website continue to engage, respectively, 1.3 million followers across all platforms and 10,000 visitors per day.

In answer to a question from SAUDI ARABIA on the procedure granting authority to speak on behalf of the IPCC on social media, and a concern raised by INDIA on the language used, Mahečic assured delegates that content on all IPCC platforms is in line with approved language, and the rules about representation of the IPCC are clearly outlined in the IPCC Communications Strategy. CONGO asked about strategies to reach target audiences, particularly in the Global South.

BELGIUM recommended fact sheets be more prominently featured, considering their strong communicative power. SWITZERLAND proposed creating a manual for national focal points, to better connect the TFI website with the IPCC's, and to engage Bureau members and the IPCC's parent organizations, WMO and UNEP, in communications activities.

Matters Related to UNFCCC and Other International Bodies

On Tuesday, the UNFCCC Secretariat provided a Progress Report (IPCC-LXI/INF. 13) on the activities undertaken by the UNFCCC in collaboration with the IPCC, as well as other activities relevant to the work of the IPCC. She noted IPCC participation at the 60th sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies, which featured negotiations on research and systematic observation, as well as consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) of ways to refine procedural and logistical elements of the overall GST process based on experience gained from the first GST. She also presented forthcoming UNFCCC events in 2024 relevant to the IPCC.

CHINA, INDIA, IRAQ, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and SAUDI ARABIA, called into question the IPCC's mandate to consider UNFCCC negotiation items such as the GST refinement process, where there is no consensus yet. SAUDI ARABIA asked for the segment referring to the GST refinement process to be deleted from the Progress Report.

IRELAND, supported by GERMANY, the US, the UK, and SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS, said he was "extremely disappointed" with these interventions, noting the UNFCCC Secretariat was factually reporting on their activities. He stressed the "close and special" relationship between the UNFCCC and the IPCC and their joint working group. GERMANY underscored the UNFCCC is the "main audience" of the IPCC.

KENYA said that, for greater balance, the report should also consider interlinkages between the IPCC and the global goal on adaptation.

Chair Skea said the Secretariat would draft a report of the Session that reflects the diversity of views expressed. The Panel took note of the UNFCCC Progress Report.

Also on Tuesday, the IPBES Secretariat provided an overview of its work (IPCC-LXI/INF. 10), including the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030, the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, methodological assessments, and the preparation of a second Global Assessment of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, starting next year and to be finalized in 2028. She also noted various initiatives exploring options for collaboration with the IPCC, including calls on its members to present potential areas of engagement, and said IPBES looks forward to continuing to engage with IPCC on the links between climate change and biodiversity.

BELGIUM, BURUNDI, CHAD, CHILE, CONGO, the EU, FRANCE, GERMANY, JAPAN, MONACO, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND, and TÜRKIYE supported furthering collaboration between IPCC and IPBES, including at the local level.

SWITZERLAND stressed engagement at the Bureau and country levels, and invited interested delegations to join informal talks on joint roadmaps to facilitate a common understanding of both processes and help focal points work together. BELGIUM and FRANCE emphasized the importance of this bottom-up approach and the organization of thematic workshops and meetings. BELGIUM also suggested IPBES share its experience with integrating Indigenous Knowledge and grey literature, and recalled a decision to have the IPCC Bureau look into options for collaboration. NORWAY suggested the Bureau include this dimension in the scoping and selection of experts, and GERMANY proposed a joint temporary Ad Hoc Group to explore further options for collaboration.

The EU called for concrete activities in this regard, noting since this issue has been on the agenda the IPCC's response has been "quite timid."

Saying that the outcome of collaboration could be counterproductive, citing unclear and possibly contrary implications of climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation as an example, INDIA expressed concern with uncritical engagement, cautioning against a "celebratory" rather than a more objective, analytic engagement.

Vice-Chair Pichs-Madruga noted various informal initiatives that he, as the informal liaison point with IPBES, had engaged in, and pointed to local and Indigenous Knowledge as areas where the IPCC could learn from IPBES. He said that if the Panel wants a more formal collaboration, for which "the door is open," this should be an organized process with a clear mandate, bearing in mind the Terms of Reference of both institutions.

WGIII Vice-Chair Gervais Itsoua Madzous highlighted the need for adaptation indicators, on which IPBES and IPCC could work together.

The EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMISTS pointed to possible areas for collaboration, such as the removal of subsidies harmful to biodiversity and climate, carbon pricing, and biodiversity pricing.

The Panel took note of the report.

Any Other Business

On Thursday, UN-Habitat reported on the 2021 Innovate4Cities conference (IPCC-LXI/INF. 12). This conference was co-sponsored by the IPCC to help inform the Special Report on Cities and Climate Change and encourage innovation. Elaborating on its history, institutional context, objectives and key outcomes, UN-Habitat called for the Panel to jointly explore, with UN-Habitat and the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy, ways to increase IPCC outreach opportunities in the global urban community, particularly regarding underrepresented areas. He invited all participants to the 2024 Innovate4Cities conference, to be held in September in Montreal in a hybrid format, which will focus on finance and multilevel governance and partnerships. The Panel took note of the report.

On Friday afternoon, Ko Barrett, WMO Deputy Secretary-General and former IPCC Vice-Chair, assured the Panel of her support for IPCC in her new role. She recalled the impact of the AR6 in educating the public on the challenge of climate change, including through the referencing of the IPCC's findings in the first Global Stocktake under the UNFCCC, and expressed hope that the Panel will continue working effectively in the future.

IPCC Vice-Chair Chang'a emphasized the importance of the pre-plenary briefing to improve inclusivity of developing countries and requested that this practice be sustained. Drawing attention to the challenges of securing travel visas, he asked the Panel and the WMO to mobilize efforts in this regard.

Chair Skea acknowledged that inclusivity had been a persistent theme at this meeting and assured the Panel he would continue working on it.

WGI Co-Chair Vautard pointed to problems with inclusiveness in the scientific literature and underscored the Co-Chairs' commitment to address this problem, including through regional activities and outreach.

FRANCE regretted the delay on lessons learned and on strategic planning, saying that "IPCC's reputation is at play here," and with WGI Co-Chair Vautard, committed to addressing inclusivity on a lasting basis.

Place and Date for the 62nd Plenary Session of the IPCC

On Friday evening, IPCC Secretary Mokssit announced that IPCC-62 is tentatively scheduled for the fourth week of February 2025. He said the location would be confirmed soon.

Closing of the Session

In closing remarks on Friday evening, Chair Skea said that chairing IPCC-61 was "a pleasure for some stretches of time, and more of a challenge in others." Stressing that the meeting finished "only 50 minutes" past its scheduled end time, he said "we have in the end achieved consensus, at the expense of considerable effort."

Chair Skea thanked the Government of Bulgaria and the city of Sofia for hosting IPCC-61, and delegates applauded the local young scientists who had volunteered their time to assist with the meeting. Thanking them for their efforts, Chair Skea added, "We hope you will want to be IPCC authors in the future." With IPCC Secretary Mokssit, he also thanked the Secretariat for the organization of the meeting, as well as the Bureau, Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs, and TSUs.

Chair Skea gaveled IPCC-61 to a close at 6:56 pm.

A Brief Analysis of IPCC-61

As the consequences of climate change endanger communities around the world, the need for comprehensive, accessible, and trusted scientific information to support policy action has never been more urgent. In the same week that Earth experienced the three hottest days on record, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) convened its 61st session with the aim of advancing work on key elements of its Seventh Assessment Cycle.

IPCC-61 is only the second substantive meeting of this cycle, and objectives for the meeting included approving the outlines of two reports and setting the schedule for delivery of the Working Group Reports that will constitute its Seventh Assessment Report (AR7). The consequential nature of these tasks should not be underestimated. The reports will provide crucial information for policymakers as they undertake different kinds of climate-related work, and decisions on the strategic planning will determine what information from the IPCC is available to feed into the second Global Stocktake (GST-2) under the Paris Agreement. Deliberations were challenging on issues large and small, and delegates quickly realized that reaching consensus on one of the biggest issues —the strategic planning schedule—would not be within reach at this meeting.

This brief analysis considers the challenges and areas of convergence that came to light during IPCC-61, as well as the implications for the Panel's next steps.

Key Tasks for IPCC-61

Short-lived Climate Forcers: Delegates first considered the proposed outline of a methodological report on short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs), or gases and aerosol particles that contribute to anthropogenic global warming but are not persistent in the atmosphere (unlike carbon dioxide emissions, for example, which may remain in the atmosphere for hundreds of years). Many SLCFs, including black carbon, are also air pollutants. Reducing these emissions can lead to immediate climate and health benefits, especially at a regional scale.

Providing common methodologies to estimate and report national greenhouse gas emissions and removals is one of the key responsibilities of the IPCC, as they facilitate coordinated action on climate change. However, views differed as to whether hydrogen and particulate matter 2.5 (PM 2.5) should be included in the report, with some countries saying the scientific basis for their inclusion is not robust enough. This issue could have implications for national reporting under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as a common methodology to estimate emissions is the first step towards accounting for them. In the absence of consensus on the case for including PM 2.5 and hydrogen, the Panel decided to come back to this discussion in the future.

Cities: Delegates also considered the outline for the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, which will be developed jointly by Working Groups I, II, and II. An important aim of this report is to ensure that urban policymakers and practitioners have access to the scientific information they need to inform action on mitigation and adaptation. Cities are both contributors to climate change and particularly vulnerable to its impacts, but they vary dramatically in terms of their characteristics and challenges.

Achieving a shared vision for the report proved challenging, and the outline underwent several rounds of review. Delegates debated typologies and methods for city classification and the appropriate balance between adaptation and mitigation. Discussions also highlighted the need to account for specific regional and urban experiences and contexts, including the very definition of what constitutes a city. Some delegates emphasized the distinction between urban and rural is not always clear or even applicable in some contexts, citing, as an example, cities surrounded by large informal settlements.

A key area of disagreement centered on how much guidance to give authors in this indicative outline. Sticking points included terminology some described as "policy-prescriptive," such as "avoiding maladaptation," as well as references to net-zero and other "targets" that echoed discussions in other bodies such as UNFCCC. While some called for being "less prescriptive" and to "trust the authors," others pointed out that removing such specific terms would give the authors more room to allow narratives to emerge from the literature.

Strategic Planning Schedule: The third major task for IPCC-61was advancing discussions on its strategic planning schedule. After contentious discussions at IPCC-60, many delegates expected difficult deliberations at IPCC-61. At issue is a timeline that could deliver all of the Working Group reports ahead of GST-2. This stocktaking exercise is a mechanism by which parties to the Paris Agreement periodically assess collective progress toward the goals of the Agreement, identify gaps, and consider actions to accelerate action on climate change. The IPCC's independent assessment of the state of the science and identification of options for mitigation and adaptation is considered by many to be a critical foundation for the policy discussions of the UNFCCC.

As such, the Working Group Co-Chairs had prepared a schedule that would allow completion of all three Working Group reports by 2028, which would enable them to feed into GST-2. Some countries, including small island developing states and least developed countries, urged early delivery of these products to ensure adequate input to the GST technical assessment process. IPCC input, they argued, is particularly crucial for those who do not have the capacity to produce their own research and are most vulnerable to the immediate impacts of climate change. Not having the three Working Group reports in time to inform GST-2 would diminish their capacity to represent their needs and interests. Others argued that, while the IPCC is an independent body, missing the opportunity to

contribute its scientific expertise to this critical international process would forsake one of the IPCC's core responsibilities.

Others disagreed, saying the timeline should be built around the needs of the IPCC, rather than those of other international processes. While reasons for this viewpoint varied, some delegates pointed to the difficulties developing countries and their scientists have experienced in fully participating in the work of the IPCC in the past. These delegates strongly objected to establishing a timeline they believed could create barriers to the inclusion of both experts and new research from developing countries.

Countries also raised concerns about the challenges developing country delegations face in reviewing reports. In some countries, one or two people are responsible for all of the intergovernmental work on climate change. The strategic planning schedule was presented to delegates with the assurance that these concerns had been heard and considered, and the revised schedule featured few overlaps that would affect governments. Still, many delegates underscored the importance of taking steps to enhance the inclusivity of its work in AR7.

Yet, divergences are profound, with even calls for greater inclusivity sometimes at odds with each other, particularly in relation to AR7's timeline. Is inclusivity about giving experts and governments from developing countries more time to participate? Or is it about ensuring the most vulnerable countries have access to scientific information as soon as possible to help people deal with the current and expected impacts of climate change, and are represented with solid scientific backing in the multilateral negotiation process?

In the absence of consensus, the Panel decided to postpone consideration of the timeline until after the scoping meeting for the three Working Group reports in December 2024. While some expressed disappointment about the lack of consensus, others were quick to point out that determining the timeline after the scoping meeting for the Working Groups is consistent with past practice and the IPCC's Principles and Procedures.

Striving for a More Inclusive Process

The one issue on which all delegates seemed to agree was the need to enhance the inclusivity of the IPCC's work in both its process and products. Discussions underscored the longstanding challenges faced by many developing country delegates and experts in participating, from securing visas to attend meetings to ensuring the inclusion of scientific research from developing countries. Delegates considered the need to establish a wider knowledge base that includes Indigenous and local knowledge, early career researchers, and practitioners.

The IPCC is no stranger to this issue: inclusivity has been a perennial challenge. Yet at IPCC-61, the Panel's efforts to address barriers to participation seemed more concrete and determined. A document on improving inclusivity in the AR7 cycle was prepared for the meeting, and an Expert Meeting on Gender, Diversity and Inclusivity is planned for early 2025. Preparations for the Special Report demonstrated a way forward, with webinars that incorporated views from a broad set of experts ahead of the scoping meeting.

The Working Group Co-Chairs also reported that, during scoping and report production, specific topics and regions that are underrepresented or face challenges due to lack of data and literature will be identified. Additionally, efforts are underway to engage early career scientists, particularly from developing and least developed countries, with support from the Scholarship Fund; create regional networks; and explore options for ensuring equitable permanent and direct access to scientific journals. Some delegates also noted that new technologies, including artificial intelligence, may be helpful in translating scientific documents.

Looking Ahead

While many of the discussions at IPCC-61 revealed significant differences in delegates' priorities and preferences, preventing quick agreement on agenda items, they also demonstrated areas of convergence. The calls for inclusivity were widespread and backed by many commitments to specific actions. Thus, even though delegates could not agree on a process for taking forward work on "lessons learned" from AR6, concerted efforts to address inclusivity in the AR7 cycle show that the IPCC can be a learning organization, aware of its important role as a catalyzer of climate change understanding and action everywhere.

In the coming months, delegates will continue laying the groundwork for the next steps in the cycle, including through the scoping meetings for the Working Group reports and the methodological work on carbon dioxide removal technologies and carbon capture utilization and storage. As the world contends with the intensifying impacts of climate change, demand for inclusive and comprehensive IPCC assessments of possible responses can only grow.

Further information

Upcoming Events +

Glossary +

Masthead +

Share this page: Twitter Facebook

Participants

African Union European Union Least Developed Countries

Small Island Developing States Children and Youth Youth

Tags

Climate Change

Earth Negotiations Bulletin is a division of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD).

© 1992-2023, IISD. All rights reserved. Designed and built by Soapbox.

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience

By clicking the Accept button, you agree to us doing so.

Accept No, thanks