

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Chapter 5: Sustainable Development, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities

8
9
10
11
12

Coordinating Lead Authors: Joyashree Roy (India), Petra Tschakert (Australia/Austria), Henri Waisman (France)

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Lead Authors: Sharina Abdul Halim (Malaysia), Philip Antwi-Agyei (Ghana), Purnamita Dasgupta (India), Bronwyn Hayward (New Zealand), Markku Kanninen (Finland), Diana Liverman (United States of America), Chukwumerije Okereke (Nigeria/United Kingdom), Patricia Fernanda Pinho (Brazil), Keywan Riahi (Austria), Avelino G. Suarez Rodriguez (Cuba)

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Contributing Authors: Fernando Aragón–Durand (Mexico), Mustapha Babiker (Sudan), Mook Bangalore (United States of America), Paolo Bertoldi (Italy), Bishwa Bhaskar Choudhary (India), Anton Cartwright (South Africa), Riyanti Djalante (Indonesia), Kristie Ebi (United States of America), Neville Ellis (Australia), Francois Engelbrecht (South Africa), Maria Figueroa (Venezuela/Denmark), Mukesh Gupta (India), Amaha Medhin Haileselassie (Ethiopia), Karen Paiva Henrique (Brazil), Daniel Huppmann (Austria), Saleemul Huq (Bangladesh/United Kingdom), Daniela Jacob (Germany), Rachel James (United Kingdom), Debora Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Peter Marcotullio (United States of America), Omar Massera (Mexico), Reinhard Mechler (Germany), Shagun Mehrotra (United States of America/India), Peter Newman (Australia), Simon Parkinson (Canada), Aromar Revi (India), Wilfried Rickels (Germany), Diana Hinge Salili (Vanuatu), Lisa Schipper (Sweden), Jörn Schmidt (Germany), Seth Schultz (United States of America), Pete Smith (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), William Solecki (United States of America), Shreya Some (India), Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu (Kiribati), Adelle Thomas (Bahamas), Penny Urquhart (South Africa), Margaretha Wewerinke-Singh (Netherlands)

Review Editors: Svitlana Krakovska (Ukraine), Ramon Pichs Madruga (Cuba), Roberto Sanchez (Mexico)

Chapter Scientist: Neville Ellis (Australia)

Date of Draft: 23 May 2018

Notes: TSU Compiled Version. Copy editing not done.

1	Executive Summary	4
2		
3	5.1 Scope and Delineations	8
4	5.1.1 Sustainable Development, SDGs, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities	8
5	5.1.2 Pathways to 1.5°C.....	9
6	5.1.3 Types of evidence.....	10
7		
8	5.2 Poverty, Equality, and Equity Implications of a 1.5°C Warmer World	10
9	5.2.1 Impacts and Risks of a 1.5°C Warmer World: Implications for Poverty and Livelihoods	10
10	5.2.2 Avoided Impacts of 1.5°C versus 2°C Warming for Poverty and Inequality.....	11
11	5.2.3 Risks from 1.5°C versus 2°C Global Warming and the Sustainable Development Goals ..	12
12		
13	Cross-Chapter Box 12: Residual risks, limits to adaptation and loss and damage	13
14		
15	5.3 Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Development.....	16
16	5.3.1 Sustainable Development in Support of Climate Adaptation.....	16
17	5.3.2 Synergies and Trade-offs between Adaptation Options and Sustainable Development ..	17
18	5.3.3 Adaptation Pathways toward a 1.5°C Warmer World and Implications for Inequalities	19
19		
20	Box 5.1: Ecosystem- and Community-based Practices in Drylands	20
21		
22	5.4 Mitigation and Sustainable Development.....	21
23	5.4.1 Synergies and Trade-offs between Mitigation Options and Sustainable Development....	21
24	5.4.1.1 Energy Demand: Mitigation Options to Accelerate Reduction in Energy Use and Fuel Switch ..	21
25	5.4.1.2 Energy Supply: Accelerated Decarbonisation	23
26		
27	Box 5.2: Challenges and Opportunities of Low-Carbon Pathways in Gulf Cooperative	
28	Council (GCC) Countries	24
29		
30	5.4.1.3 Land-based Agriculture, Forestry and Ocean: Mitigation Response Options and Carbon Dioxide	
31	Removal	25
32		
33	5.4.2 Sustainable Development Implications of 1.5°C and 2°C Mitigation Pathways	26
34	5.4.2.1 Air Pollution and Health.....	27
35	5.4.2.2 Food Security and Hunger	27
36	5.4.2.3 Lack of Energy Access/Energy Poverty	28
37	5.4.2.4 Water Security.....	28
38		
39	5.5 Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C	31
40	5.5.1 Integration of Adaptation, Mitigation, and Sustainable Development.....	31
41	5.5.2 Pathways for Adaptation, Mitigation, and Sustainable Development.....	32
42	5.5.3 Climate-Resilient Development Pathways.....	33
43	5.5.3.1 Transformations, Equity, and Well-being.....	34
44	5.5.3.2 Development Trajectories, Sharing of Efforts, and Cooperation	35
45	5.5.3.3 Country and Community Strategies and Experiences	36
46		
47	Box 5.3: Republic of Vanuatu – National Planning for Development and Climate	
48	Resilience	37
49		
50	Cross-Chapter Box 13: Cities and Urban Transformation.....	39
51		

1	5.6	Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Development, Eradicating Poverty and Reducing	
2		Inequalities in 1.5°C Warmer Worlds	41
3	5.6.1	Finance and Technology Aligned with Local Needs.....	41
4	5.6.2	Integration of Institutions	42
5	5.6.3	Inclusive Processes.....	42
6	5.6.4	Attention to Issues of Power and Inequality.....	43
7	5.6.5	Reconsidering Values	43
8			
9	5.7	Synthesis and Research Gaps	43
10			
11		Frequently Asked Questions.....	45
12			
13		References.....	69
14			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Executive Summary

This chapter takes sustainable development as the starting point and focus for analysis. It considers the broad and multifaceted bi-directional interplay between sustainable development, including its focus on eradicating poverty and reducing inequality in their multidimensional aspects, and climate actions in a 1.5°C warmer world. These fundamental connections are embedded in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The chapter also examines synergies and trade-offs of adaptation and mitigation options with sustainable development and the SDGs and offers insights into possible pathways, especially climate-resilient development pathways toward a 1.5°C warmer world.

Sustainable Development, Poverty, and Inequality in a 1.5°C Warmer World

Limiting global warming to 1.5°C rather than 2°C would make it markedly easier to achieve many aspects of sustainable development, with greater potential to eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Impacts avoided with the lower temperature limit could reduce the number of people exposed to climate risks and vulnerable to poverty by 62 to 457 million, and lessen the risks of poor people to experience food and water insecurity, adverse health impacts, and economic losses, particularly in regions that already face development challenges (*medium evidence, medium agreement*) {5.2.2, 5.2.3}. Avoided impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C warming would also make it easier to achieve certain SDGs, such as those that relate to poverty, hunger, health, water and sanitation, cities, and ecosystems (SDGs 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 14, and 15) (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.2.3, Table 5.2 available at the end of the chapter }.

Compared to current conditions, 1.5°C of global warming would nonetheless pose heightened risks to eradicating poverty, reducing inequalities and ensuring human and ecosystem well-being (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Warming of 1.5°C is not considered ‘safe’ for most nations, communities, ecosystems and sectors and poses significant risks to natural and human systems as compared to current warming of 1°C (*high confidence*) {Cross-Chapter Box 12 in Chapter 5}. The impacts of 1.5°C would disproportionately affect disadvantaged and vulnerable populations through food insecurity, higher food prices, income losses, lost livelihood opportunities, adverse health impacts, and population displacements (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.2.1}. Some of the worst impacts on sustainable development are expected to be felt among agricultural and coastal dependent livelihoods, indigenous people, children and the elderly, poor labourers, poor urban dwellers in African cities, and people and ecosystems in the Arctic and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.2.1 Box 5.3, Chapter 3 Box 3.5, Cross-Chapter Box 9 in Chapter 4}.

Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Development

Prioritisation of sustainable development and meeting the SDGs is consistent with efforts to adapt to climate change (*high confidence*). Many strategies for sustainable development enable transformational adaptation for a 1.5°C warmer world, provided attention is paid to reducing poverty in all its forms and to promoting equity and participation in decision-making (*medium evidence, high agreement*). As such, sustainable development has the potential to significantly reduce systemic vulnerability, enhance adaptive capacity, and promote livelihood security for poor and disadvantaged populations (*high confidence*) {5.3.1}.

Synergies between adaptation strategies and the SDGs are expected to hold true in a 1.5°C warmer world, across sectors and contexts (*medium evidence, medium agreement*). Synergies between adaptation and sustainable development are significant for agriculture and health, advancing SDGs 1 (extreme poverty), 2 (hunger), 3 (healthy lives and well-being), and 6 (clean water) (*robust evidence, medium agreement*) {5.3.2}. Ecosystem- and community-based adaptation, along with the incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge, advances synergies with SDGs 5 (gender equality), 10 (reducing inequalities), and 16 (inclusive societies), as exemplified in drylands and the Arctic (*high evidence, medium agreement*) {5.3.2, Box 5.1, Cross-Chapter Box 10 in Chapter 4}.

Do Not Cite, Quote or Distribute

1
2 **Adaptation strategies can result in trade-offs with and among the SDGs (*medium evidence, high***
3 ***agreement*)**. Strategies that advance one SDG may create negative consequences for other SDGs, for
4 instance SDGs 3 versus 7 (health and energy consumption) and agricultural adaptation and SDG 2 (food
5 security) versus SDGs 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, and 15 (*medium evidence, medium agreement*) {5.3.2}.

6
7 **Pursuing place-specific adaptation pathways toward a 1.5°C warmer world has the potential for**
8 **significant positive outcomes for well-being, in countries at all levels of development (*medium evidence,***
9 ***high agreement*)**. Positive outcomes emerge when adaptation pathways (i) ensure a diversity of adaptation
10 options based on people’s values and trade-offs they consider acceptable, (ii) maximise synergies with
11 sustainable development through inclusive, participatory, and deliberative processes, and (iii) facilitate
12 equitable transformation. Yet, such pathways would be difficult to achieve without redistributive measures to
13 overcome path dependencies, uneven power structures, and entrenched social inequalities (*medium evidence,*
14 *high agreement*) {5.3.3}.

15 Mitigation and Sustainable Development

16
17
18 **The deployment of mitigation options consistent with 1.5°C pathways leads to multiple synergies**
19 **across a range of sustainable development dimensions. At the same time, the rapid pace and**
20 **magnitude of change that would be required to limit warming to 1.5°C, if not carefully managed,**
21 **would lead to trade-offs with some sustainable development dimensions (*high confidence*)**. The number
22 of synergies between mitigation response options and sustainable development exceeds the number of trade-
23 offs in energy demand and supply sectors, Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) and for
24 oceans (*very high confidence*) {Figure 5.2, Table 5.2 available at the end of the chapter }. 1.5°C pathways
25 indicate robust synergies particularly for the SDGs 3 (health), 7 (energy), 12 (responsible consumption and
26 production), and 14 (oceans) (*very high confidence*) {5.4.2, Figure 5.3}. For SDGs 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 6
27 (water), and 7 (energy), there is a risk of trade-offs or negative side-effects from stringent mitigation actions
28 compatible with 1.5°C (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.4.2}.

29
30 **Appropriately designed mitigation actions to reduce energy demand can advance multiple SDGs**
31 **simultaneously. Pathways compatible with 1.5°C that feature low energy demand show the most**
32 **pronounced synergies and the lowest number of trade-offs with respect to sustainable development**
33 **and the SDGs (*very high confidence*)**. Accelerating energy efficiency in all sectors has synergies with SDG
34 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17 {5.4.1, Figure 5.2, Cross-Chapter Box 12, Table 1} (*robust evidence, high agreement*).
35 Low demand pathways, which would reduce or completely avoid the reliance on Bioenergy with Carbon
36 Capture and Storage (BECCS) in 1.5°C pathways, would result in significantly reduced pressure on food
37 security, lower food prices, and fewer people at risk of hunger (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.4.2,
38 Figure 5.3}.

39
40 **The impacts of Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) options on SDGs depend on the type of options and**
41 **the scale of deployment (*high confidence*)**. If poorly implemented, CDR options such as bioenergy,
42 BECCS and AFOLU would lead to trade-offs. Appropriate design and implementation requires considering
43 local people’s needs, biodiversity, and other sustainable development dimensions (*very high confidence*)
44 {5.4.1.3, Cross-Chapter Box 7 in Chapter 3}.

45
46 **The design of the mitigation portfolios and policy instruments to limit warming to 1.5°C will largely**
47 **determine the overall synergies and trade-offs between mitigation and sustainable development**
48 **(*very high confidence*)**. **Redistributive policies that shield the poor and vulnerable can resolve trade-**
49 **offs for a range of SDGs (*medium evidence, high agreement*)**. Individual mitigation options are associated
50 with both positive and negative interactions with the SDGs (*very high confidence*) {5.4.1}. However,
51 appropriate choices across the mitigation portfolio can help to maximize positive side-effects while
52 minimizing negative side-effects (*high confidence*) {5.4.2, 5.5.2}. Investment needs for complementary
53 policies resolving trade-offs with a range of SDGs are only a small fraction of the overall mitigation
54 investments in 1.5°C pathways (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.4.2, Figure 5.4}. Integration of

1 mitigation with adaptation and sustainable development compatible with 1.5°C requires a systems
2 perspective (*high confidence*) {5.4.2, 5.5.2}.

3
4 **Mitigation measures consistent with 1.5°C create high risks for sustainable development in countries
5 with high dependency on fossil fuels for revenue and employment generation (*high confidence*).** These
6 risks are caused by the reduction of global demand affecting mining activity and export revenues and
7 challenges to rapidly decrease high carbon intensity of the domestic economy (*robust evidence, high
8 agreement*) {5.4.1.2, Box 5.2}. Targeted policies that promote diversification of the economy and the energy
9 sector could ease this transition (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.4.1.2, Box 5.2}.

10 **Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C**

11
12
13 **Sustainable development broadly supports and often enables the fundamental societal and systems
14 transformations that would be required for limiting warming to 1.5°C (*high confidence*).** Simulated
15 pathways that feature the most sustainable worlds (e.g., Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP)1) are
16 associated with relatively lower mitigation and adaptation challenges and limit warming to 1.5°C at
17 comparatively lower mitigation costs. In contrast, development pathways with high fragmentation, inequality
18 and poverty (e.g., SSP3) are associated with comparatively higher mitigation and adaptation challenges. In
19 such pathways, it is not possible to limit warming to 1.5°C for the vast majority of the integrated assessment
20 models (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.5.2}. In all SSPs, mitigation costs substantially increase in
21 1.5°C pathways compared to 2°C pathways. No pathway in the literature integrates or achieves all 17 SDGs
22 (*high confidence*) {5.5.2}. Real-world experiences at the project level show that the actual integration
23 between adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development is challenging as it requires reconciling trade-
24 offs across sectors and spatial scales (*very high confidence*) {5.5.1}.

25
26 **Without societal transformation and rapid implementation of ambitious greenhouse gas reduction
27 measures, pathways to limiting warming to 1.5°C and achieving sustainable development will be
28 exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to achieve (*high confidence*).** The potential for pursuing such
29 pathways differs between and within nations and regions, due to different development trajectories,
30 opportunities, and challenges (*very high confidence*) {5.5.3.2, Figure 5.1}. Limiting warming to 1.5°C would
31 require all countries and non-state actors to strengthen their contributions without delay. This could be
32 achieved through sharing of efforts based on bolder and more committed cooperation, with support for those
33 with the least capacity to adapt, mitigate, and transform (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.5.3.1,
34 5.5.3.2}. Current efforts toward reconciling low-carbon trajectories and reducing inequalities, including
35 those that avoid difficult trade-offs associated with transformation, are partially successful yet demonstrate
36 notable obstacles (*medium evidence, medium agreement*) {5.5.3.3 Box 5.3, Cross-Chapter Box 13 in this
37 Chapter}.

38
39 **Social justice and equity are core aspects of climate-resilient development pathways for
40 transformational social change. Addressing challenges and widening opportunities between and within
41 countries and communities would be necessary to achieve sustainable development and limit warming
42 to 1.5°C, without making the poor and disadvantaged worse off (*high confidence*).** Identifying and
43 navigating inclusive and socially acceptable pathways toward low-carbon, climate-resilient futures is a
44 challenging yet important endeavour, fraught with moral, practical, and political difficulties and inevitable
45 trade-offs (*very high confidence*) {5.5.2, 5.5.3.3 Box 5.3}. It entails deliberation and problem-solving
46 processes to negotiate societal values, well-being, risks, and resilience and determine what is desirable and
47 fair, and to whom (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Pathways that encompass joint, iterative planning and
48 transformative visions, for instance in Pacific SIDS like Vanuatu and in urban contexts, show potential for
49 liveable and sustainable futures (*high confidence*) {5.5.3.1, 5.5.3.3, Figure 5.5, Box 5.3, Cross-Chapter Box
50 13 in this Chapter}.

51
52 **The fundamental societal and systemic changes to achieve sustainable development, eradicate poverty
53 and reduce inequalities while limiting warming to 1.5°C would require a set of institutional, social,
54 cultural, economic and technological conditions to be met (*high confidence*).** The coordination and

1 monitoring of policy actions across sectors and spatial scales is essential to support sustainable development
2 in 1.5°C warmer conditions (*very high confidence*) {5.6.2, Box 5.3}. External funding and technology
3 transfer better support these efforts when they consider recipients' context-specific needs (*medium evidence,*
4 *high agreement*) {5.6.1}. Inclusive processes can facilitate transformations by ensuring participation,
5 transparency, capacity building, and iterative social learning (*high confidence*) {5.5.3.3, Cross-Chapter Box
6 13, 5.6.3}. Attention to power asymmetries and unequal opportunities for development, among and within
7 countries is key to adopting 1.5°C-compatible development pathways that benefit all populations (*high*
8 *confidence*) {5.5.3, 5.6.4, Box 5.3}. Re-examining individual and collective values could help spur urgent,
9 ambitious, and cooperative change (*medium evidence, high agreement*) {5.5.3, 5.6.5}.

5.1 Scope and Delineations

This chapter takes sustainable development as the starting point and focus for analysis, considering the broader bi-directional interplay and multifaceted interactions between development patterns and climate actions in a 1.5°C warmer world and in the context of eradicating poverty and reducing inequality. It assesses the impacts of keeping temperatures at or below 1.5°C global warming above pre-industrial levels on sustainable development and compares the avoided impacts to 2°C (Section 5.2). It then examines the interactions, synergies and trade-offs of adaptation (Section 5.3) and mitigation (Section 5.4) measures with sustainable development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The chapter offers insights into possible pathways toward a 1.5°C warmer world, especially through climate-resilient development pathways providing a comprehensive vision across different contexts (Section 5.5). We also identify the conditions that would be needed to simultaneously achieve sustainable development, poverty eradication, the reduction of inequalities, and the 1.5°C climate objective (Section 5.6).

5.1.1 Sustainable Development, SDGs, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities

Chapter 1 (see Cross-Chapter Box 4 in Chapter 1) defines sustainable development as ‘development that meets the needs of the present and future generations’ through balancing economic, social and environmental considerations, and then introduces the United Nations (UN) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which sets out 17 ambitious goals for sustainable development for all countries by 2030. These Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are: no poverty (SDG 1), zero hunger (SDG 2), good health and well-being (SDG 3), quality education (SDG 4), gender equality (SDG 5), clean water and sanitation (SDG 6), affordable and clean energy (SDG 7), decent work and economic growth (SDG 8), industry, innovation and infrastructure (SDG 9), reduced inequalities (SDG 10), sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11), responsible consumption and production (SDG 12), climate action (SDG 13), life below water (SDG 14), life on land (SDG 15), peace, justice and strong institutions (SDG 16), and partnerships for the goals (SDG 17).

The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) included extensive discussion of links between climate and sustainable development, especially in Chapter 13 (Olsson et al., 2014) and Chapter 20 (Denton et al., 2014) in WGII and Chapter 4 (Fleurbay et al., 2014) in WGIII. However, the AR5 preceded the 2015 adoption of the SDGs and the literature that argues for their fundamental links to climate (Wright et al., 2015; Salleh, 2016; von Stechow et al., 2016; Hammill and Price-Kelly, 2017; ICSU, 2017; Maupin, 2017; Gomez-Echeverri, 2018).

The SDGs build on efforts under the UN Millennium Development Goals to reduce poverty, hunger and other deprivations. According to the UN, the Millennium Development Goals were successful in reducing poverty and hunger and improving water security (UN, 2015a). However, critics argued that they failed to address within-country disparities, human rights, and key environmental concerns, focused only on developing countries, and had numerous measurement and attribution problems (Langford et al., 2013; Fukuda-Parr et al., 2014). While improvements in water security, slums, and health may have reduced some aspects of climate vulnerability, increases in incomes were linked to rising greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and thus to a trade-off between development and climate change (Janetos et al., 2012; UN, 2015a; Hubacek et al., 2017).

While the SDGs capture many important aspects of sustainable development, including the explicit goals of poverty eradication and reducing inequality, there are direct connections from climate to other measures of sustainable development including multidimensional poverty, equity, ethics, human security, well-being, and climate-resilient development (Bebbington and Larrinaga, 2014; Robertson, 2014; Redclift and Springett, 2015; Barrington-Leigh, 2016; Helliwell et al., 2018; Kirby and O’Mahony, 2018) (see Glossary). The UN proposes sustainable development as ‘eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combating inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion’ (UN, 2015b). There is *robust evidence* of the links between climate change and poverty (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 4). The AR5 concluded with *high confidence*


1 that disruptive levels of climate change would preclude reducing poverty (Denton et al., 2014; Fleurbaey et
 2 al., 2014). International organisations have since stated that climate changes ‘undermine the ability of all
 3 countries to achieve sustainable development’ (UN, 2015b) and can reverse or erase improvements in living
 4 conditions and decades of development (Hallegatte et al., 2016).

5
 6 Climate warming has unequal impacts on different people and places as a result of differences in regional
 7 climate changes, vulnerabilities and impacts, and these differences then result in unequal impacts on
 8 sustainable development and poverty (Section 5.2). Responses to climate change also interact in complex
 9 ways with goals of poverty reduction. The benefits of adaptation and mitigation projects and funding may
 10 accrue to some and not others, responses may be costly and unaffordable to some people and countries, and
 11 projects may disadvantage some individuals, groups and development initiatives (Sections 5.3 and 5.4;
 12 Cross-Chapter Box 11 in Chapter 4).

15 5.1.2 Pathways to 1.5°C

16
 17 Pathways to 1.5°C (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 1 in Chapter 1, Glossary) include ambitious reductions
 18 in emissions and strategies for adaptation that are transformational, as well as complex interactions with
 19 sustainable development, poverty eradication, and reducing inequalities. The AR5 WGII introduced the
 20 concept of climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) (see Glossary) which combine adaptation and
 21 mitigation to reduce climate change and its impacts, and emphasise the importance of addressing structural,
 22 intersecting inequalities, marginalisation, and multidimensional poverty to ‘transform [...] the development
 23 pathways themselves toward greater social and environmental sustainability, equity, resilience, and justice’
 24 (Olsson et al., 2014). This chapter assesses literature on CRDPs relevant to 1.5°C global warming (Section
 25 5.5.3), to understand better the possible societal and systems transformations (see Glossary) that reduce
 26 inequality and increase well-being (Figure 5.1). It also summarises the knowledge on conditions to achieve
 27 such transformations, including changes in technologies, culture, values, financing, and institutions that
 28 support low-carbon and resilient pathways and sustainable development (Section 5.6).

29
 30 [INSERT FIGURE 5.1 HERE]



32
 33
 34 **Figure 5.1:** Climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) (green arrows) between a current world in which
 35 countries and communities exist at different levels of development (A) and future worlds that range from

1 climate-resilient (bottom) to unsustainable (top) (D). CRDPs involve societal transformation rather than
2 business-as-usual approaches, and all pathways involve adaptation and mitigation choices and trade-offs
3 (B). Pathways that achieve the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 and beyond, strive for net zero
4 emissions around mid-21st century, and stay within the global 1.5°C warming target by the end of the 21st
5 century, while ensuring equity and well-being for all, are best positioned to achieve climate-resilient
6 futures (C). Overshooting on the path to 1.5°C will make achieving CRDPs and other sustainable
7 trajectories more difficult; yet, the limited literature does not allow meaningful estimates.
8
9

10 **5.1.3 Types of evidence**

11
12 We use a variety of sources of evidence to assess the interactions of sustainable development and the SDGs
13 with the causes, impacts, and responses to climate change of 1.5°C warming. We build on Chapter 3 to
14 assess the sustainable development implications of impacts at 1.5°C and 2°C, and Chapter 4 to examine the
15 implications of response measures. We assess scientific and grey literature, with a post-AR5 focus, and data
16 that evaluate, measure, and model sustainable development-climate links from various perspectives,
17 quantitatively and qualitatively, across scales, and through well documented case studies.
18

19 Literature that explicitly links 1.5°C global warming to sustainable development across scales remains
20 scarce; yet, we find relevant insights in many recent publications on climate and development that assess
21 impacts across warming levels, the effects of adaptation and mitigation response measures, and interactions
22 with the SDGs. Relevant evidence also stems from emerging literature on possible pathways, overshoot, and
23 enabling conditions (see Glossary) for integrating sustainable development, poverty eradication, and
24 reducing inequalities in the context of 1.5°C.
25
26

27 **5.2 Poverty, Equality, and Equity Implications of a 1.5°C Warmer World**

28
29 Climate change could lead to significant impacts on extreme poverty by 2030 (Hallegatte et al., 2016;
30 Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017). The AR5 concluded, with *very high confidence*, that climate change and
31 climate variability worsen existing poverty and exacerbate inequalities, especially for those disadvantaged by
32 gender, age, race, class, caste, indigeneity and (dis)ability (Olsson et al., 2014). New literature on these links
33 is substantial, showing that the poor will continue to experience climate change severely, and climate change
34 will exacerbate poverty (Fankhauser and Stern, 2016; Hallegatte et al., 2016; O'Neill et al., 2017a;
35 Winsemius et al., 2018) (*very high confidence*). The understanding of regional impacts and risks of 1.5°C
36 global warming and interactions with patterns of societal vulnerability and poverty remains limited. Yet,
37 identifying and addressing poverty and inequality is at the core of staying within a safe and just space for
38 humanity (Raworth, 2017; Bathiany et al., 2018). Building on relevant findings from Chapter 3 (see Section
39 3.4), this section examines anticipated impacts and risks of 1.5°C and higher warming on sustainable
40 development, poverty, inequality, and equity (see Glossary).
41
42

43 **5.2.1 Impacts and Risks of a 1.5°C Warmer World: Implications for Poverty and Livelihoods**

44
45 Global warming of 1.5°C will have consequences for sustainable development, poverty and inequalities. This
46 includes residual risks, limits to adaptation, and losses and damages (Cross-Chapter Box 12 in this Chapter;
47 see Glossary). Some regions have already experienced a 1.5°C warming with impacts on food and water
48 security, health, and other components of sustainable development (*medium evidence, medium agreement*)
49 (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4). Climate change is also already affecting poorer subsistence communities
50 through decreases in crop production and quality, increases in crop pests and diseases, and disruption to
51 culture (Savo et al., 2016). It disproportionately affects children and the elderly and can increase gender
52 inequality (Kaijser and Kronsell, 2014; Vinyeta et al., 2015; Carter et al., 2016; Hanna and Oliva, 2016; Li et
53 al., 2016).
54

1 At 1.5°C warming, compared to current conditions, further negative consequences are expected for poor
2 people, and inequality and vulnerability (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Hallegatte and Rozenberg
3 (2017) report that, by 2030 (roughly approximating a 1.5°C warming), 122 million additional people could
4 experience extreme poverty, based on a ‘poverty scenario’ of limited socio-economic progress, comparable
5 to the Shared Socioeconomic Pathway (SSP)4 (inequality), mainly due to higher food prices and declining
6 health, with substantial income losses for the poorest 20% across 92 countries. Pretis et al. (2018) estimate
7 negative impacts on economic growth in lower-income countries at 1.5°C warming, despite uncertainties.
8 Impacts are likely to occur simultaneously across livelihood, food, human, water, and ecosystem security
9 (Byers et al., 2018) (*limited evidence, high agreement*), but the literature on interacting and cascading effects
10 remains scarce (Hallegatte et al., 2014; O’Neill et al., 2017b; Reyner et al., 2017a, b).

11
12 Chapter 3 outlines future impacts and risks for ecosystems and human systems, many of which could also
13 undermine sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty and hunger, and protect health and
14 ecosystems. Chapter 3 findings (see Section 3.5.2.1) suggest increasing Reasons for Concern from moderate
15 to high at a warming of 1.1 to 1.6°C, including for indigenous people, their livelihoods, and ecosystems in
16 the Arctic (O’Neill et al., 2017b). In 2050, based on the Hadley Centre Climate Prediction Model 3
17 (HadCM3) and the Special Report on Emission Scenarios (SRES) A1b scenario (roughly comparable to
18 1.5°C warming), 450 million more flood-prone people would be exposed to doubling in flood frequency, and
19 global flood risk would increase substantially (Arnell and Gosling, 2016). For droughts, poor people are
20 expected to be more exposed (85% in population terms) in a warming scenario greater >1.5°C for several
21 countries in Asia and Southern and Western Africa (Winsemius et al., 2018). In urban Africa, a 1.5°C
22 warming could expose many households to water poverty and increased flooding (Pelling et al., 2018). At
23 1.5°C warming, fisheries-dependent and coastal livelihoods, of often disadvantaged populations, would
24 suffer from the loss of coral reefs (see Chapter 3, Box 3.4).

25
26 Global heat stress is projected to increase in a 1.5°C warmer world and by 2030, compared to 1961-1990,
27 climate change could be responsible for additional annual deaths of 38,000 people from heat stress,
28 particularly among the elderly, and 48,000 from diarrhoea, 60,000 from malaria, and 95,000 from childhood
29 undernutrition (WHO, 2014). Each 1°C increase could reduce work productivity by 1 to 3% for people
30 working outdoors or without air conditioning, typically the poorer segments of the workforce (Park et al.,
31 2015).

32
33 The regional variation in the ‘warming experience at 1.5°C’ (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1) is large (see
34 Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2). Declines in crop yields are widely reported for Africa (60% of observations), with
35 serious consequences for subsistence and rain-fed agriculture and food security (Savo et al., 2016). In
36 Bangladesh, by 2050, damages and losses are expected for poor households dependent on freshwater fish
37 stocks due to lack of mobility, limited access to land, and strong reliance on local ecosystems (Dasgupta et
38 al., 2017). Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are expected to experience challenging conditions at 1.5°C
39 warming due to increased risk of internal migration and displacement and limits to adaptation (see Chapter 3,
40 Box 3.5, Cross-Chapter Box 12 in this Chapter). An anticipated decline of marine fisheries of 3 million
41 metric tonnes per degree warming would have serious regional impacts for the Indo-Pacific region and the
42 Arctic (Cheung et al., 2016).

43
44

45 **5.2.2 Avoided Impacts of 1.5°C versus 2°C Warming for Poverty and Inequality**

46
47 Avoided impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C warming are expected to have significant positive implications for
48 sustainable development, and reducing poverty and inequality. Using the SSPs (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter
49 Box 1 in Chapter 1; Section 5.5.2), Byers et al. (2018) model the number of people exposed to multi-sector
50 climate risks and vulnerable to poverty (income < \$10/day), comparing 2°C and 1.5°C; the respective
51 declines are from 86 million to 24 million for SSP1 (sustainability), from 498 million to 286 million for
52 SSP2 (middle of the road), and from 1220 million to 763 million for SSP3 (regional rivalry), which suggests
53 overall 62-457 million less people exposed and vulnerable at 1.5°C warming. Across the SSPs, the largest
54 populations exposed and vulnerable are in South Asia (Byers et al., 2018). The avoided impacts on poverty

1 at 1.5°C relative to 2°C are projected to depend at least as much or more on development scenarios than on
2 warming (Wiebe et al., 2015; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017).

3
4 Limiting warming to 1.5°C is expected to reduce the people exposed to hunger, water stress, and disease in
5 Africa (Clements, 2009). It is also expected to limit the number of poor people exposed to floods and
6 droughts at higher degrees of warming, especially in African and Asian countries (Winsemius et al., 2018).
7 Challenges for poor populations relating to food and water security, clean energy access, and environmental
8 well-being are projected to be less at 1.5°C, particularly for vulnerable people in Africa and Asia (Byers et
9 al., 2018). The overall projected socio-economic losses compared to present day are less at 1.5°C (8% loss of
10 gross domestic product per capita) compared to 2°C (13%), with lower-income countries projected to
11 experience greater losses, which may increase economic inequality between countries (Pretis et al., 2018).

14 5.2.3 Risks from 1.5°C versus 2°C Global Warming and the Sustainable Development Goals

15
16 The risks that can be avoided by limiting global warming to 1.5°C rather than 2°C have many complex
17 implications for sustainable development (ICSU, 2017; Gomez-Echeverri, 2018). There is *high confidence*
18 that constraining warming to 1.5°C rather than 2°C would reduce risks for unique and threatened
19 ecosystems, safeguarding the services they provide for livelihoods and sustainable development, and making
20 adaptation much easier (O'Neill et al., 2017b), particularly in Central America, the Amazon, South Africa,
21 and Australia (Schleussner et al., 2016; O'Neill et al., 2017b; Reyer et al., 2017b; Bathiany et al., 2018).

22
23 In places that already bear disproportionate economic and social challenges to their sustainable development,
24 people will face lower risks at 1.5°C compared to 2°C. These include North Africa and the Levant (less
25 water scarcity), West Africa (less crop loss), South America and South-East Asia (less intense heat), and
26 many other coastal nations and island states (lower sea-level rise, less coral reef loss) (Schleussner et al.,
27 2016; Betts et al., 2018). The risks for food, water, and ecosystems, particularly in subtropical regions such
28 as Central America, and countries such as South Africa and Australia, are expected to be lower at 1.5°C than
29 at 2°C warming (Schleussner et al., 2016). Less people would be exposed to droughts and heat waves and the
30 associated health impacts in countries such as Australia and India (King et al., 2017; Mishra et al., 2017).

31
32 Limiting warming to 1.5°C will make it markedly easier to achieve the SDGs for poverty eradication, water
33 access, safe cities, food security, healthy lives, and inclusive economic growth, and will help to protect
34 terrestrial ecosystems and biodiversity (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Table 5.2 available at the end of
35 the chapter)). For example, limiting species loss and expanding climate refugia will make it easier to achieve
36 SDG 15 (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3). One indication of how lower temperatures benefit the SDGs is to
37 compare the impacts of Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP)4.5 (lower emissions) and RCP8.5
38 (higher emissions) on the SDGs (Ansutege et al., 2015). A low emissions pathway allows for greater
39 success in achieving SDGs for reducing poverty and hunger, providing access to clean energy, reducing
40 inequality, ensuring education for all, and making cities more sustainable. Even at lower emissions, a
41 medium risk of failure exists to meet goals for water and sanitation, and marine and terrestrial ecosystems.

42
43 Action on climate change (SDG 13), including slowing the rate of warming, would help reach the goals for
44 water, energy, food, and land (SDGs 6, 7, 2, and 15) (Obersteiner et al., 2016; ICSU, 2017) and contribute to
45 poverty eradication (SDG 1) (Byers et al., 2018). Although the literature that connects 1.5°C to the SDGs is
46 limited, stabilising warming at 1.5°C by the end of the century is expected to increase the chances of
47 achieving the SDGs by 2030, with greater potentials to eradicate poverty, reduce inequality, and foster equity
48 (*limited evidence, medium agreement*). There are no studies on overshoot and dimensions of sustainable
49 development, although literature on 4°C suggests the impacts would be severe (Reyer et al., 2017b).

Table 5.1: Sustainable development implications of avoided impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C global warming

Impacts	Chapter 3 section	1.5°C	2°C	Sustainable development goals (SDGs) more easily achieved when limiting warming to 1.5°C
Water scarcity	3.4.2.1	4% more people exposed to water stress	8% more people exposed to water stress with 184-270 million people more exposed	SDG 6 water availability for all
	Table 3.4	496 (range 103-1159) million people exposed and vulnerable to water stress	586 (range 115-1347) million people exposed and vulnerable to water stress	
Ecosystems	3.4.3 Table 3.4	Around 7% of land area experiences biome shifts	Around 13% (range 8-20%) of land area experiences biome shifts	SDG 15 to protect terrestrial ecosystems and halt biodiversity loss
	Box 3.5	70-90% of coral reefs at risk from bleaching	99% of coral reefs at risk from bleaching	
Coastal cities	3.4.5.2	Less cities and coasts exposed to sea level rise and extreme events	More people and cities exposed to flooding	SDG 11 to make cities and human settlements safe and resilient
	3.4.5.1	31-69 million people exposed to coastal flooding	32-79 million exposed to coastal flooding	
Food systems	3.4.6 and Box 3.1	Significant declines in crop yields avoided, some yields may increase	Average crop yields decline	SDG 2 to end hunger and achieve food security
	Table 3.4	32-36 million people exposed to lower yields	330-396 million people exposed to lower yields	
Health	3.4.7	Lower risk of temperature related morbidity and smaller mosquito range	Higher risks of temperature related morbidity and mortality and larger range of mosquitoes	SDG 3 to ensure healthy lives for all
	Table 3.4	3546-4508 million people exposed to heatwaves	5417-6710 million people exposed to heatwaves	

[INSERT CROSS-CHAPTER BOX 12 HERE]

Cross-Chapter Box 12: Residual risks, limits to adaptation and loss and damage

Lead Authors: Riyanti Djalante (Indonesia), Kristie Ebi (United States of America), Debora Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Patricia Pinho (Brazil), Aromar Revi (India), Petra Tschakert (Australia/Austria)

Contributing Authors: Karen Paiva Henrique (Brazil), Saleemul Huq (Bangladesh/United Kingdom), Rachel James (United Kingdom), Reinhard Mechler (Germany), Adelle Thomas (Bahamas), Margaretha Wewerinke-Singh (Netherlands)

Introduction

Residual climate-related risks, limits to adaptation, and loss and damage (see Glossary) are increasingly assessed in the scientific literature (van der Geest and Warner, 2015; Boyd et al., 2017; Mechler et al., 2018). The AR5 (IPCC, 2013; Oppenheimer et al., 2014) documented impacts that have been detected and attributed to climate change, projected increasing climate-related risks with continued global warming, and recognised barriers and limits to adaptation. It recognised that adaptation is constrained by biophysical, institutional, financial, social, and cultural factors, and that the interaction of these factors with climate change can lead to soft adaptation limits (adaptive actions currently not available) and hard adaptation limits (adaptive actions appear infeasible leading to unavoidable impacts) (Klein et al., 2014).

Loss and damage - concepts and perspectives

“Loss and Damage” (L&D) has been discussed in international climate negotiations for three decades (INC,

1991; Calliari, 2016; Vanhala and Hestbaek, 2016). A work programme on L&D was established as part of the Cancun Adaptation Framework in 2010 supporting developing countries particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts (UNFCCC, 2010). Conference of the Parties (COP) 19 in 2013 established the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) as a formal part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) architecture (UNFCCC, 2013). It acknowledges that L&D “includes, and in some cases involves more than, that which can be reduced by adaptation” (UNFCCC, 2013). The Paris Agreement recognised “the importance of averting, minimising and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change” through Article 8 (UNFCCC, 2015).

There is no one definition of L&D in climate policy, and analysis of policy documents and stakeholder views has demonstrated ambiguity (Vanhala and Hestbaek, 2016; Boyd et al., 2017). UNFCCC documents suggest that L&D is associated with adverse impacts of climate change on human and natural systems, including impacts from extreme events and slow-onset processes (UNFCCC, 2011, 2013, 2015). Some documents focus on impacts in developing or particularly vulnerable countries (UNFCCC, 2011, 2013). They refer to economic (loss of assets and crops) and non-economic (biodiversity, culture, health) impacts, the latter also being an action area under the WIM workplan, and irreversible and permanent loss and damage. Lack of clarity of what the term addresses (avoidance through adaptation and mitigation, unavoidable losses, climate risk management, existential risk) was expressed among stakeholders, with further disagreement ensuing about what constitutes anthropogenic climate change *versus* natural climate variability (Boyd et al., 2017).

Limits to adaptation and residual risks

The AR5 described adaptation limits as points beyond which actors’ objectives are compromised by intolerable risks threatening key objectives such as good health or broad levels of well-being, thus requiring transformative adaptation for overcoming soft limits (Dow et al., 2013; Klein et al., 2014) (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.2.2.3 and 4.5.3; Cross-Chapter Box 9 in Chapter 4; Section 5.3.1). The AR5 WGII risk tables, based on expert judgment, depicted the potential for, and the limits of, additional adaptation to reduce risk. Near-term (2030-2040) risks can be used as a proxy for 1.5°C warming by the end of the century, and compared to longer-term (2080-2100) risks associated with an approximate 2°C warming. Building on the AR5 risk approach, Cross-Chapter Box 12, Figure 1 provides a stylised application example to poverty and inequality.

[INSERT CROSS-CHAPTER BOX 12, FIGURE 1 HERE]



Cross-Chapter Box 12, Figure 1 Stylised reduced risk levels due to avoided impacts between 2°C and 1.5°C warming (in solid red-orange), additional avoided impacts with adaptation under 2°C (striped orange) and under 1.5°C (striped yellow), and unavoidable impacts (losses) with no or very limited potential for adaptation (grey), extracted from the AR5 WGII risk tables (Field et al., 2014), and underlying chapters by Adger et al. (2014) and Olsson et al. (2014). For some systems and sectors (A), achieving 1.5°C could reduce risks to low (with adaptation) from very high (without adaptation) and high (with adaptation) under 2°C. For other areas (C), no or very limited adaptation potential is anticipated, suggesting limits, with the same risks for 1.5°C and 2°C. Other risks are projected to be medium under 2°C with further potential for reduction, especially with adaptation, to very low levels (B).

Limits to adaptation, residual risks, and losses in a 1.5°C warmer world

The literature on risks at 1.5°C (versus 2°C and more) and potentials for adaptation remains limited, particularly for specific regions, sectors, and vulnerable and disadvantaged populations. Adaptation potential at 1.5°C and 2°C is rarely assessed explicitly, making an assessment of residual risk challenging. Substantial progress has been made since the AR5 to assess which climate change impacts on natural and human systems can be attributed to anthropogenic emissions (Hansen and Stone, 2016) and to examine the influence of anthropogenic emissions on extreme weather events (NASEM, 2016), and on consequent impacts on human life (Mitchell et al., 2016), but less so on monetary losses and risks (Schaller et al., 2016). There has also been some limited research to examine local-level limits to adaptation (Warner and Geest, 2013; Filho and Nalau, 2018). What constitutes losses and damages is context-dependent and often requires place-based research into what people value and consider worth protecting (Barnett et al., 2016; Tschakert et al., 2017). Yet, assessments of non-material and intangible losses are particularly challenging, such as loss of sense of place, belonging, identity, and damages to emotional and mental wellbeing (Serdeczny et al., 2017; Wewerinke-Singh, 2018a). Warming of 1.5°C is not considered ‘safe’ for most nations, communities, ecosystems, and sectors and poses significant risks to natural and human systems as compared to current warming of 1°C (*high confidence*) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4, Box 3.4, Box 3.5, Cross-Chapter Box 6 in Chapter 3). Table 5.2, drawing on findings from Chapters 3, 4 and 5, presents examples of soft and hard limits in natural and human systems in the context of 1.5°C and 2°C of warming.

Cross-Chapter Box 12, Table 1: Soft and hard adaptation limits in the context of 1.5°C and 2°C of global warming

System/Region	Example	Soft Limit	Hard Limit
Coral reefs	Loss of 70-90% of tropical coral reefs by mid-century under 1.5°C scenario (total loss under 2°C scenario) (see Chapter 3, Sections 3.4.4 and 3.5.2.1, Box 3.4)		✓
Biodiversity	6% of insects, 8% of plants and 4% of vertebrates lose over 50% of the climatically determined geographic range at 1.5°C (18% of insects, 16% of plants, 8% of vertebrates at 2°C) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.3)		✓
Poverty	24-357 million people exposed to multi-sector climate risks and vulnerable to poverty at 1.5°C (86-1,220 million at 2°C) (see Section 5.2.2)	✓	
Human health	Twice as many megacities exposed to heat stress at 1.5°C compared to present, potentially exposing 350 million additional people to deadly heat wave conditions by 2050 (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.8)	✓	✓
Coastal livelihoods	Large-scale changes in oceanic systems (temperature, acidification) inflict damage and losses to livelihoods, income, cultural identity and health for coastal-dependent communities at 1.5°C (potential higher losses at 2°C) (see Chapter 3, Sections 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.4.6.3, Box 3.4, Box 3.5, Cross-Chapter Box 6; Chapter 4, Section 4.3.5; Section 5.2.3)	✓	✓
Small Island Developing States	Sea level rise and increased wave run up combined with increased aridity and decreased freshwater availability at 1.5°C warming potentially leaving several atoll islands uninhabitable (see Chapter 3, Sections 3.4.3, 3.4.5, Box 3.5; Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter Box 9)		✓

Approaches and policy options to address residual risk and loss and damage

Conceptual and applied work since the AR5 has highlighted the synergies and differences with adaptation and disaster risk reduction policies (van der Geest and Warner, 2015; Thomas and Benjamin, 2017), suggesting more integration of existing mechanisms, yet careful consideration is advised for slow-onset and

1 potentially irreversible impacts and risk (Mechler and Schinko, 2016). Scholarship on justice and equity has
2 provided insight on compensatory, distributive, and procedural equity considerations for policy and practice
3 to address loss and damage (Rosier et al., 2015; Wallimann-Helmer, 2015; Huggel et al., 2016). A growing
4 body of legal literature considers the role of litigation in preventing and addressing loss and damage and
5 finds that litigation risks for governments and business are bound to increase with improved understanding
6 of impacts and risks as climate science evolves (*high confidence*) (Mayer, 2016; Banda and Fulton, 2017;
7 Marjanac and Patton, 2018; Wewerinke-Singh, 2018b). Policy proposals include international support for
8 experienced losses and damages (Crosland et al., 2016; Page and Heyward, 2017), addressing climate
9 displacement, donor-supported implementation of regional public insurance systems (Surminski et al., 2016)
10 and new global governance systems under the UNFCCC (Biermann and Boas, 2017).

11
12 [END CROSS-CHAPTER BOX 12]
13
14

15 **5.3 Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Development**

16
17 Adaptation will be extremely important in a 1.5°C warmer world since substantial impacts will be felt in
18 every region (*high confidence*) (Chapter 3, Section 3.3), even if adaptation needs will be lower than in a 2°C
19 warmer world (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.3.1 to 4.3.5, 4.5.3, Cross-Chapter Box 10 in Chapter 4). Climate
20 adaptation options comprise structural, physical, institutional, and social responses, with their effectiveness
21 depending largely on governance (see Glossary), political will, adaptive capacities, and availability of
22 finance (Betzold and Weiler, 2017; Sonwa et al., 2017; Sovacool et al., 2017) (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.4.1
23 to 4.4.5). Even though the literature is scarce on the expected impacts of future adaptation measures on
24 sustainable development specific to warming experiences of 1.5°C, this section assesses available literature
25 on how (i) prioritising sustainable development enhances or impedes climate adaptation efforts (Section
26 5.3.1); (ii) climate adaptation measures impact sustainable development and the Sustainable Development
27 Goals (SDGs) in positive (synergies) or negative (trade-offs) ways (Section 5.3.2); and (iii) adaptation
28 pathways towards a 1.5°C warmer world affect sustainable development, poverty, and inequalities (Section
29 5.3.3). The section builds on Chapter 4 (see Section 4.3.5) regarding available adaptation options to reduce
30 climate vulnerability and build resilience (see Glossary) in the context of 1.5°C-compatible trajectories, here
31 with emphasis on sustainable development implications.
32
33

34 **5.3.1 Sustainable Development in Support of Climate Adaptation**

35
36 Making sustainable development a priority, and meeting the SDGs, is consistent with efforts to adapt to
37 climate change (*very high confidence*). Sustainable development is effective in building adaptive capacity if
38 it addresses poverty and inequalities, social and economic exclusion, and inadequate institutional capacities
39 (Noble et al., 2014; Abel et al., 2016; Colloff et al., 2017). Four ways in which sustainable development
40 leads to effective adaptation are described below.
41

42 Firstly, sustainable development enables transformational adaptation (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2.2) when
43 an integrated approach is adopted, with inclusive, transparent decision making, rather than addressing current
44 vulnerabilities as stand-alone climate problems (Mathur et al., 2014; Arthurson and Baum, 2015; Shackleton
45 et al., 2015; Lemos et al., 2016; Antwi-Agyei et al., 2017b). Ending poverty in its multiple dimensions (SDG
46 1) is often a highly effective form of climate adaptation (Fankhauser and McDermott, 2014; Leichenko and
47 Silva, 2014; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017). However, ending poverty is not sufficient, and the positive
48 outcome as an adaptation strategy depends on whether increased household wealth is actually directed
49 towards risk reduction and management strategies (Nelson et al., 2016), as shown in urban municipalities
50 (Colenbrander et al., 2017; Rasch, 2017) and agrarian communities (Hashemi et al., 2017), and whether
51 finance for adaptation is made available (Section 5.6.1).
52

53 Secondly, local participation is effective when wider socio-economic barriers are addressed via multi-scale
54 planning (McCubbin et al., 2015; Nyantakyi-Frimpong and Bezner-Kerr, 2015; Toole et al., 2016). This is

1 the case, for instance, when national education efforts (SDG 4) (Muttarak and Lutz, 2014; Striessnig and
2 Loichinger, 2015) and indigenous knowledge (Nkomwa et al., 2014; Pandey and Kumar, 2018) enhance
3 information sharing, which also builds resilience (Santos et al., 2016; Martinez-Baron et al., 2018) and
4 reduces risks for maladaptation (Antwi-Agyei et al., 2018; Gajjar et al., 2018).

5
6 Thirdly, development promotes transformational adaptation when addressing social inequalities (Section
7 5.5.3, 5.6.4), as in SDGs 4, 5, 16, and 17 (O'Brien et al., 2015; K. O'Brien, 2016). For example, SDG 5
8 supports measures that reduce women's vulnerabilities and allow women to benefit from adaptation (Antwi-
9 Agyei et al., 2015; Van Aelst and Holvoet, 2016; Cohen, 2017). Mobilisation of climate finance, carbon
10 taxation, and environmentally-motivated subsidies can reduce inequalities (SDG 10), advance climate
11 mitigation and adaptation (Chancel and Picketty, 2015), and be conducive to strengthening and enabling
12 environments for resilience building (Nhamo, 2016; Halonen et al., 2017).

13
14 Fourthly, when sustainable development promotes livelihood security, it enhances the adaptive capacities of
15 vulnerable communities and households. Examples include SDG 11 supporting adaptation in cities to reduce
16 harm from disasters (Kelman, 2017; Parnell, 2017); access to water and sanitation (SDG 6) with strong
17 institutions (SDG 16) (Rasul and Sharma, 2016); SDG 2 and its targets that promote adaptation in
18 agricultural and food systems (Lipper et al., 2014); and targets for SDG 3 such as reducing infectious
19 diseases and providing health cover are consistent with health-related adaptation (ICSU, 2017; Gomez-
20 Echeverri, 2018).

21
22 Sustainable development has the potential to significantly reduce systemic vulnerability, enhance adaptive
23 capacity, and promote livelihood security for poor and disadvantaged populations (*high confidence*).
24 Transformational adaptation (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.5.3) would require development that
25 takes into consideration multidimensional poverty and entrenched inequalities, local cultural specificities,
26 and local knowledge in decision-making, thereby making it easier to achieve the SDGs in a 1.5°C warmer
27 world (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

30 5.3.2 Synergies and Trade-offs between Adaptation Options and Sustainable Development

31
32 There are short-, medium-, and long-term positive impacts (synergies) and negative impacts (trade-offs)
33 between the dual goal of keeping temperatures below 1.5°C global warming and achieving sustainable
34 development. The extent of synergies between development and adaptation goals will vary by the
35 development process adopted for a particular SDG and underlying vulnerability contexts (*medium evidence,*
36 *high agreement*). Overall, the impacts of adaptation on sustainable development, poverty eradication, and
37 reducing inequalities in general, and the SDGs specifically, are expected to be largely positive, given that the
38 inherent purpose of adaptation is to lower risks. Building on Chapter 4 (see Section 4.3.5), this section
39 examines synergies and trade-offs between adaptation and sustainable development for some key sectors and
40 approaches, also.

41
42 *Agricultural adaptation:* The most direct synergy is between SDG 2 (zero hunger) and adaptation in
43 cropping, livestock, and food systems, designed to maintain or increase production (Lipper et al., 2014;
44 Rockström et al., 2017). Farmers with effective adaptation strategies tend to enjoy higher food security and
45 experience lower levels of poverty (FAO, 2015; Douxchamps et al., 2016; Ali and Erenstein, 2017).
46 Vermeulen et al. (2016) report strong positive returns on investment across the world from agricultural
47 adaptation with side benefits for environment and economic well-being. Well-adapted agricultural systems
48 contribute to safe drinking water, health, biodiversity, and equity goals (DeClerck et al., 2016; Myers et al.,
49 2017). Climate-smart agriculture has synergies with food security, though it can be biased towards
50 technological solutions, may not be gender sensitive, and can create specific challenges for institutional and
51 distributional aspects (Lipper et al., 2014; Arakelyan et al., 2017; Taylor, 2017).

52
53 At the same time, adaptation options increase risk for human health, oceans, and access to water if fertiliser
54 and pesticides are used without regulation or when irrigation reduces water availability for other purposes

1 (Shackleton et al., 2015; Campbell et al., 2016). When agricultural insurance and climate services overlook
2 the poor, inequality may rise (Dinku et al., 2014; Carr and Owusu-Daaku, 2015; Carr and Onzere, 2017;
3 Georgeson et al., 2017a). Agricultural adaptation measures may increase workloads, especially for women,
4 while changes in crop mix can result in loss of income or culturally inappropriate food (Carr and Thompson,
5 2014; Thompson-Hall et al., 2016; Bryan et al., 2017), and they may benefit farmers with more land to the
6 detriment of land-poor farmers, as seen in the Mekong River Basin (see Chapter 3, Cross-Chapter Box 6 in
7 Chapter 3).

8
9 *Adaptation to protect human health:* Adaptation options in the health sector are expected to reduce morbidity
10 and mortality (Arbuthnott et al., 2016; Ebi and Del Barrio, 2017). Heat-early-warning systems help lower
11 injuries, illnesses, and deaths (Hess and Ebi, 2016), with positive impacts for SDG 3. Institutions better
12 equipped to share information, indicators for detecting climate-sensitive diseases, improved provision of
13 basic health care services, and coordination with other sectors also improve risk management, thus reducing
14 adverse health outcomes (Dasgupta et al., 2016; Dovie et al., 2017). Effective adaptation creates synergies
15 via basic public health measures (K.R. Smith et al., 2014; Dasgupta, 2016) and health infrastructure
16 protected from extreme weather events (Watts et al., 2015). Yet, trade-offs can occur when adaptation in one
17 sector leads to negative impacts in another sector. Examples include the creation of urban wetlands through
18 flood control measures which can breed mosquitoes, and migration eroding physical and mental well-being,
19 hence adversely affecting SDG 3 (K.R. Smith et al., 2014; Watts et al., 2015). Similarly, increased use of air
20 conditioning enhances resilience to heat stress (Petkova et al., 2017); yet it can result in higher energy
21 consumption, undermining SDG 13.

22
23 *Coastal adaptation:* Adaptation to sea-level rise remains essential in coastal areas even under a climate
24 stabilisation scenario of 1.5°C (Nicholls et al., 2018). Coastal adaptation to restore ecosystems (for instance
25 by planting mangrove forests) support SDGs for enhancing life and livelihoods on land and oceans (see
26 Chapter 4, Sections 4.3.2.3). Synergistic outcomes between development and relocation of coastal
27 communities are enhanced by participatory decision-making and settlement designs that promote equity and
28 sustainability (Voorn et al., 2017). Limits to coastal adaptation may rise, for instance in low-lying islands in
29 the Pacific, Caribbean, and Indian Ocean, with attendant implications for loss and damage (see Chapter 3
30 Box 3.5, Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter Box 9 in Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter 12 in Chapter 5, Box 5.3).

31
32 *Migration as adaptation:* Migration has been used in various contexts to protect livelihoods from challenges
33 related to climate change (Marsh, 2015; Jha et al., 2017), including through remittances (Betzold and Weiler,
34 2017). Synergies between migration and the achievement of sustainable development depend on adaptive
35 measures and conditions in both sending and receiving regions (Fatima et al., 2014; McNamara, 2015;
36 Entzinger and Scholten, 2016; Ober and Sakdapolrak, 2017; Schwan and Yu, 2017). Adverse developmental
37 impacts arise when vulnerable women or the elderly are left behind or if migration is culturally disruptive
38 (Wilkinson et al., 2016; Albert et al., 2017; Islam and Shamsuddoha, 2017).

39
40 *Ecosystem-based adaptation (EBA):* EBA can offer synergies with sustainable development (Morita and
41 Matsumoto, 2015; Ojea, 2015; Szabo et al., 2015; Brink et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2016; Conservation
42 International, 2016; Huq et al., 2017), although assessments remain difficult (Doswald et al., 2014) (see
43 Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2.2). Examples include mangrove restoration reducing coastal vulnerability,
44 protecting marine and terrestrial ecosystems, and increasing local food security; as well as watershed
45 management reducing flood risks and improving water quality (Chong, 2014). In drylands, EBA practices,
46 combined with community-based adaptation, have shown how to link adaptation with mitigation to improve
47 livelihood conditions of poor farmers (Box 5.1). Synergistic developmental outcomes arise where EBA is
48 cost effective, inclusive of indigenous and local knowledge, and easily accessible by the poor (Ojea, 2015;
49 Daigneault et al., 2016; Estrella et al., 2016). Payment for ecosystem services can provide incentives to land
50 owners and natural resource managers to preserve environmental services with synergies with SDGs 1 and
51 13 (Arriagada et al., 2015), when implementation challenges are overcome (Calvet-Mir et al., 2015; Wegner,
52 2016; Chan et al., 2017). Trade-offs include loss of other economic land use types, tension between
53 biodiversity and adaptation priorities, and conflicts over governance (Wamsler et al., 2014; Ojea, 2015).

1 *Community-based adaptation (CBA)*: CBA (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.3.3.2) enhances resilience and
2 sustainability of adaptation plans (Ford et al., 2016; Fernandes-Jesus et al., 2017; Grantham and Rudd, 2017;
3 Gustafson et al., 2017). Yet, negative impacts occur if it fails to fairly represent vulnerable populations and
4 to foster long-term social resilience (Ensor, 2016; Taylor Aiken et al., 2017). Mainstreaming CBA into
5 planning and decision-making enables the attainment of SDG 5, 10, and 16 (Archer et al., 2014; Reid and
6 Huq, 2014; Vardakoulias and Nicholles, 2014; Cutter, 2016; Kim et al., 2017). Incorporating multiple forms
7 of indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) is an important element of CBA, as shown for instance in the
8 Arctic region (Apgar et al., 2015; Armitage, 2015; Pearce et al., 2015; Chief et al., 2016; Cobbinah and
9 Anane, 2016; Ford et al., 2016) (see Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter Box 9, Box 4.3, Section 4.3.5.5). ILK can be
10 synergistic with achieving SDGs 2, 6, and 10 (Ayers et al., 2014; Lasage et al., 2015; Regmi and Star, 2015;
11 Berner et al., 2016; Chief et al., 2016; Murtinho, 2016; Reid, 2016).

12
13 There are clear synergies between adaptation options and several SDGs, such as poverty eradication,
14 elimination of hunger, clean water, and health (*robust evidence, high agreement*) as well-integrated
15 adaptation supports sustainable development (Eakin et al., 2014; Weisser et al., 2014; Adam, 2015; Smucker
16 et al., 2015). Substantial synergies are observed in the agricultural and health sectors, and in ecosystem-based
17 adaptations. However, particular adaptation strategies can lead to adverse consequences for developmental
18 outcomes (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Adaptation strategies that advance one SDG can result in
19 trade-offs with other SDGs, for instance, agricultural adaptation to enhance food security (SDG 2) causing
20 negative impacts for health, equality, and healthy ecosystems (SDGs 3, 5, 6, 10, 14 and 15), and resilience to
21 heat stress increasing energy consumption (SDGs 3 and 7), and high-cost adaptation in resource-constrained
22 contexts (*medium evidence, medium agreement*).

23 24 25 **5.3.3 Adaptation Pathways toward a 1.5°C Warmer World and Implications for Inequalities**

26
27 In a 1.5°C warmer world, adaptation measures and options would need to be intensified, accelerated, and
28 scaled up. This entails not only the right ‘mix’ of options (asking ‘right for whom and for what?’) but also a
29 forward-looking understanding of dynamic trajectories, that is adaptation pathways (see Chapter 1, Cross-
30 Chapter Box 1 in Chapter 1), best understood as decision-making processes over sets of potential action
31 sequenced over time (Câmpeanu and Fazey, 2014; Wise et al., 2014). Given the scarcity of literature on
32 adaptation pathways that navigate place-specific warming experiences at 1.5°C, this section presents insights
33 into current local decision making for adaptation futures. This grounded evidence shows that choices
34 between possible pathways, at different scales and for different groups of people, are shaped by uneven
35 power structures and historical legacies that create their own, often unforeseen change (Fazey et al., 2016;
36 Bosomworth et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2017; Murphy et al., 2017; Pelling et al., 2018).

37
38 Pursuing a place-specific adaptation pathway approach toward a 1.5°C warmer world harbours the potential
39 for significant positive outcomes, with synergies for well-being possibilities to ‘leap-frog the SDGs’ (J.R.A.
40 Butler et al., 2016), in countries at all levels of development (*medium evidence, high agreement*). It allows
41 for identifying local, socially-salient tipping points before they are crossed, based on what people value and
42 trade-offs that are acceptable to them (Barnett et al., 2014, 2016; Gorddard et al., 2016; Tschakert et al.,
43 2017). Yet, evidence also reveals adverse impacts that reinforce rather than reduce existing social
44 inequalities and hence may lead to poverty traps (Nagoda, 2015; Warner et al., 2015; Barnett et al., 2016;
45 J.R.A. Butler et al., 2016; Godfrey-Wood and Naess, 2016; Pelling et al., 2016; Albert et al., 2017; Murphy
46 et al., 2017) (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

47
48 Past development trajectories as well as transformational adaptation plans can constrain adaptation futures
49 by reinforcing dominant political-economic structures and processes, and narrowing option spaces; this leads
50 to maladaptive pathways that preclude alternative, locally-relevant, and sustainable development initiatives
51 and increase vulnerabilities (Warner and Kuzdas, 2017; Gajjar et al., 2018). Such dominant pathways tend to
52 validate the practices, visions, and values of existing governance regimes and powerful members of a
53 community while devaluing those of less privileged stakeholders. Examples from Romania, the Solomon
54 Islands, and Australia illustrate such pathway dynamics in which individual economic gains and prosperity

1 matter more than community cohesion and solidarity; this discourages innovation, exacerbates inequalities,
2 and further erodes adaptive capacities of the most vulnerable (Davies et al., 2014; Fazey et al., 2016;
3 Bosomworth et al., 2017). In the city of London, United Kingdom, the dominant adaptation and disaster risk
4 management pathway promotes resilience that emphasises self-reliance; yet, it intensifies the burden on low-
5 income citizens, the elderly, migrants, and others unable to afford flood insurance or protect themselves
6 against heat waves (Pelling et al., 2016). Adaptation pathways in the Bolivian Altiplano have transformed
7 subsistence farmers into world-leading quinoa producers, but loss of social cohesion and traditional values,
8 dispossession, and loss of ecosystem services now constitute undesirable trade-offs (Chelleri et al., 2016).

9
10 A narrow view of adaptation decision making, for example focused on technical solutions, tends to crowd
11 out more participatory processes (Lawrence and Haasnoot, 2017; Lin et al., 2017), obscures contested
12 values, and reinforces power asymmetries (Bosomworth et al., 2017; Singh, 2018). A situated and context-
13 specific understanding of adaptation pathways that galvanises diverse knowledge, values, and joint
14 initiatives, helps to overcome dominant path dependencies, avoid trade-offs that intensify inequities, and
15 challenge policies detached from place (Fincher et al., 2014; Wyborn et al., 2015; Murphy et al., 2017;
16 Gajjar et al., 2018). These insights suggest that adaptation pathway approaches to prepare for 1.5°C warmer
17 futures would be difficult to achieve without considerations for inclusiveness, place-specific trade-off
18 deliberations, redistributive measures, and procedural justice mechanisms to facilitate equitable
19 transformation (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

20
21 [INSERT BOX 5.1 HERE]

22 **Box 5.1: Ecosystem- and Community-based Practices in Drylands**

23
24
25 Drylands face severe challenges in building climate resilience (Fuller and Lain, 2017), yet, small-scale
26 farmers can play a crucial role as agents of change through ecosystem- and community-based practices that
27 combine adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development.

28
29 Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) of trees in cropland is practised in 18 countries across Sub-
30 Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia, Timor-Leste, India, and Haiti and has, for example, permitted the restoration
31 of over five million hectares of land in the Sahel (Niang et al., 2014; Bado et al., 2016). In Ethiopia, the
32 Managing Environmental Resources to Enable Transitions (MERET) programme, which entails community-
33 based watershed rehabilitation in rural landscapes, supported around 648,000 people, resulting in the
34 rehabilitation of 25,400,000 hectares of land in 72 severely food-insecure districts across Ethiopia during
35 2012–2015 (Gebrehaweria et al., 2016). In India, local farmers have benefitted from watershed programmes
36 across different agro-ecological regions (Singh et al., 2014; Datta, 2015).

37
38 These low-cost, flexible community-based practices represent low-regrets adaptation and mitigation
39 strategies. These strategies often contribute to strengthened ecosystem resilience and biodiversity, increased
40 agricultural productivity and food security, reduced household poverty and drudgery for women, and
41 enhanced agency and social capital (Niang et al., 2014; Francis et al., 2015; Kassie et al., 2015; Mbow et al.,
42 2015; Reij and Winterbottom, 2015; Weston et al., 2015; Bado et al., 2016; Dumont et al., 2017). Small
43 check dams in dryland areas and conservation agriculture can significantly increase agricultural output
44 (Kumar et al., 2014; Agoramoorthy and Hsu, 2016; Pradhan et al., 2018). Mitigation benefits have also been
45 quantified (Weston et al., 2015); for example, FMNR over five million hectares in Niger has sequestered 25–
46 30 Mtonnes of carbon over 30 years (Stevens et al., 2014).

47
48 However, several constraints hinder scaling-up efforts: inadequate attention to the socio-technical processes
49 of innovation (Grist et al., 2017; Scoones et al., 2017), difficulties in measuring the benefits of an innovation
50 (Coe et al., 2017), farmers' inability to deal with long-term climate risk (Singh et al., 2017), and difficulties
51 for matching practices with agro-ecological conditions and complementary modern inputs (Kassie et al.,
52 2015). Key conditions to overcome these challenges include: developing agroforestry value chains and
53 markets (Reij and Winterbottom, 2015) and adaptive planning and management (Gray et al., 2016). Others
54 include inclusive processes giving greater voice to women and marginalised groups (MRFCJ, 2015a; UN

1 Women and MRFCJ, 2016; Dumont et al., 2017), strengthening of community land and forest rights
2 (Stevens et al., 2014; Vermeulen et al., 2016) and co-learning among communities of practice at different
3 scales (Coe et al., 2014; Reij and Winterbottom, 2015; Sinclair, 2016; Binam et al., 2017; Dumont et al.,
4 2017; Epule et al., 2017).

5
6 [END BOX 5.1]
7
8

9 **5.4 Mitigation and Sustainable Development**

10 The AR5 WGIII examined the potential of various mitigation options for specific sectors (energy supply,
11 industry, buildings, transport, and Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use (AFOLU)); it provided a
12 narrative of dimensions of sustainable development and equity as a framing for evaluating climate responses
13 and policies, respectively, in Chapters 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (IPCC, 2014a). This section builds on analysis of
14 Chapters 2 and 4 of this report to re-assess mitigation and sustainable development in the context of 1.5°C
15 global warming as well as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
16
17
18

19 **5.4.1 Synergies and Trade-offs between Mitigation Options and Sustainable Development**

20
21 Adopting stringent climate mitigation options can generate multiple positive non-climate benefits that have
22 the potential to reduce the costs of achieving sustainable development (IPCC, 2014b; Ürge-Vorsatz et al.,
23 2014, 2016; Schaeffer et al., 2015; von Stechow et al., 2015). Understanding the positive impacts (synergies)
24 but also the negative impacts (trade-offs) is key for selecting mitigation options and policy choices that
25 maximise the synergies between mitigation and developmental actions (Hildingsson and Johansson, 2015;
26 Nilsson et al., 2016; Delponte et al., 2017; van Vuuren et al., 2017b; McCollum et al., 2018).
27 Aligning mitigation response options to sustainable development objectives can ensure public acceptance
28 (IPCC, 2014a), encourage faster action (Lechtenboehmer and Knoop, 2017), and support the design of
29 equitable mitigation (Holz et al., 2017; Winkler et al., 2018) that protect human rights (MRFCJ, 2015b)
30 (Section 5.5.3).
31

32 This sub-section assesses available literature on the interactions of individual mitigation options (see Chapter
33 2, Sections 2.3.1.2, Chapter 4, Sections 4.2 and 4.3) with sustainable development and the SDGs and
34 underlying targets. Table 5.2 (available at the end of the chapter) presents an assessment of these synergies
35 and trade-offs and the strength of the interaction using an SDG-interaction score (see Glossary) (McCollum
36 et al., 2018), with evidence and agreements levels. Figure 5.2 presents the information of Table 5.2
37 (available at the end of the chapter), showing gross (not net) interactions with the SDGs. This detailed
38 assessment of synergies and trade-offs of individual mitigation options with the SDGs (Table 5.2 a–d
39 (available at the end of the chapter), Figure 5.2) reveals that the number of synergies exceeds that of trade-
40 offs. Mitigation response options in the energy demand sector, AFOLU, and oceans have more positive
41 interactions with a larger number of SDGs compared to those on the energy supply side (*robust evidence,*
42 *high agreement*).
43
44

45 **5.4.1.1 Energy Demand: Mitigation Options to Accelerate Reduction in Energy Use and Fuel Switch**

46
47 For mitigation options in the energy demand sectors, the number of synergies with all sixteen SDGs exceeds
48 the number of trade-off (Figure 5.2, also Table 5.2 (available at the end of the chapter)) (*robust evidence,*
49 *high agreement*). Most of the interactions are of reinforcing nature, hence facilitating the achievement of the
50 goals.
51

52 Accelerating energy efficiency in all sectors, which is a necessary condition for a 1.5°C warmer world (see
53 Chapters 2 and 4), has synergies with a large number of SDGs (Figure 5.2, Table 5.2 (available at the end of

1 the chapter)) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). The diffusion of efficient equipment and appliances across
2 end use sectors has synergies with international partnership (SDG 17) and participatory and transparent
3 institutions (SDG 16) because innovations and deployment of new technologies require trans-national
4 capacity building and knowledge sharing. Resource and energy savings support sustainable production and
5 consumption (SDG 12), energy access (SDG 7), innovation and infrastructure development (SDG 9), and
6 sustainable city development (SDG 11). Energy efficiency supports the creation of decent jobs by new
7 service companies providing services for energy efficiency, but the net employment effect of efficiency
8 improvement remains uncertain due to macro-economic feedback (SDG 8) (McCollum et al., 2018).
9

10 In the buildings sector, accelerating energy efficiency by way of, for example, enhancing the use of efficient
11 appliances, refrigerant transition, insulation, retrofitting, and low- or zero-energy buildings generates
12 benefits across multiple SDG targets. For example, improved cook stoves make fuel endowments last longer
13 and hence reduce deforestation (SDG 15), support equal opportunity by reducing school absences due to
14 asthma among children (SDGs 3 and 4), and empower rural and indigenous women by reducing drudgery
15 (SDG 5) (Derbez et al., 2014; Lucon et al., 2014; Maidment et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2014; Cameron et al.,
16 2015; Fay et al., 2015; Liddell and Guiney, 2015; Shah et al., 2015; Sharpe et al., 2015; Wells et al., 2015;
17 Willand et al., 2015; Hallegatte et al., 2016; Kusumaningtyas and Aldrian, 2016; Berrueta et al., 2017;
18 McCollum et al., 2017) (*robust evidence, high agreement*).
19

20 In energy-intensive processing industries, 1.5°C-compatible trajectories require radical technology
21 innovation through maximum electrification, shift to other low-emission energy carriers such as hydrogen or
22 biomass, integration of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) and innovations for Carbon Capture and
23 Utilisation (CCU) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.4.5). These transformations have strong synergies with
24 innovation and sustainable industrialisation (SDG 9), supranational partnerships (SDGs 16 and 17) and
25 sustainable production (SDG 12). However, possible trade-offs due to risks of CCS-based carbon leakage,
26 increased electricity demands, and associated price impacts affecting energy access and poverty (SDGs 7 and
27 1) would need careful regulatory attention (Wesseling et al., 2017). In the mining industry, energy efficiency
28 can be synergetic or face trade-offs with sustainable management (SDG 6), depending on the option retained
29 for water management (Nguyen et al., 2014). Substitution and recycling are also an important driver of
30 1.5°C-compatible trajectories in industrial systems (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.4.2). Structural changes and
31 reorganisation of economic activities in industrial park/clusters following the principles of industrial
32 symbiosis (circular economy) improves the overall sustainability by reducing energy and waste (Fan et al.,
33 2017; Preston and Lehne, 2017) and reinforce responsible production and consumption (SDG 12) through
34 recycling, water use efficiency (SDG 6), energy access (SDG 7), and ecosystem service value enhancement
35 (SDG 15) (Karner et al., 2015; Zeng et al., 2017).
36

37 In the transport sector, deep electrification may trigger increases of electricity prices and adversely affect
38 poor populations (SDG 1), unless pro-poor redistributive policies are in place (Klausbrückner et al., 2016).
39 In cities, governments can lay the foundations for compact, connected low-carbon cities, which are an
40 important component of 1.5°C-compatible transformations (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.3) and show synergies
41 with sustainable cities (SDG 11) (Colenbrander et al., 2016).
42

43 Behavioural responses are important determinants of the ultimate outcome of energy efficiency on emission
44 reductions and energy access (SDG 7) and their management requires a detailed understanding of the drivers
45 of consumption and the potential for and barriers to absolute reductions (Fuchs et al., 2016). Notably, the
46 rebound effect tends to offset the benefits of efficiency for emission reductions through growing demand for
47 energy services (Sorrell, 2015; Suffolk and Poortinga, 2016). However, high rebound can help in providing
48 faster access to affordable energy (SDG 7.1) where the goal is to reduce energy poverty and unmet energy
49 demand (Chakravarty et al., 2013)(see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3). Comprehensive policy design, including
50 rebound suppressing policies such as carbon price and policies that encourage awareness building and
51 promotional material design, are needed to tap the full potential of energy savings, as applicable to 1.5°C
52 warming context (Chakravarty and Tavoni, 2013; IPCC, 2014b; Karner et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2015;
53 Altieri et al., 2016; Santarius et al., 2016) and to address policy-related trade-offs and welfare-enhancing
54 benefits (Chakravarty et al., 2013; Chakravarty and Roy, 2016; Gillingham et al., 2016) (*robust evidence,*

1 *high agreement*).

2
3 Other behavioural responses will affect the interplay between energy efficiency and sustainable
4 development. Building occupants reluctant to change their habits may miss out on welfare-enhancing energy
5 efficiency opportunities (Zhao et al., 2017). Preferences for new products and premature obsolescence for
6 appliances is expected to affect sustainable consumption and production adversely (SDG 12) with
7 ramifications for resource use efficiency (Echegaray, 2016). User behaviour change towards increased
8 physical activity, less reliance on motorised travel over short distances, and the use of public transport would
9 help to decarbonise the transport sector in a synergetic manner with SDGs 3, 11, and 12 (Shaw et al., 2014;
10 Ajanovic, 2015; Chakrabarti and Shin, 2017) while reducing inequality in access to basic facilities (SDG 10)
11 (Lucas and Pangbourne, 2014; Kagawa et al., 2015). However, infrastructure design and regulations would
12 need to ensure road safety and address risks of road accidents for pedestrians (Hwang et al., 2017; Khreis et
13 al., 2017) to ensure sustainable infrastructure growth in human settlements (SDGs 9 and 11) (Lin et al.,
14 2015; SLoCaT, 2017).

15 16 17 5.4.1.2 *Energy Supply: Accelerated Decarbonisation*

18
19 Decreasing the share of coal in energy supply in line with 1.5°C-compatible scenarios (see Chapter 2,
20 Section 2.4.2) reduces adverse impacts of upstream supply-chain activities, in particular air and water
21 pollution, and coal mining accidents, and enhances health by reducing air pollution, notably in cities,
22 showing synergies with SDGs 3, 11 and 12 (Yang et al., 2016; UNEP, 2017).

23
24 Fast deployment of renewables like solar and wind, hydro, modern biomass, together with the decrease of
25 fossil fuels in energy supply (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1), is aligned with the doubling of renewables in
26 the global energy mix (SDG 7.2). Renewables could also support progress on SDGs 1, 10, 11, and 12 and
27 supplement new technology (Chaturvedi and Shukla, 2014; Rose et al., 2014; Smith and Sagar, 2014; Riahi
28 et al., 2015; IEA, 2016; McCollum et al., 2017; van Vuuren et al., 2017a) (*robust evidence, high agreement*).

29 However, some trade-offs with the SDGs can emerge from offshore installations, particularly SDG 14 in
30 local contexts (McCollum et al., 2017). Moreover, trade-offs between renewable energy production and
31 affordability (SDG 7) (Labordena et al., 2017) and other environmental objectives would need to be
32 scrutinised for potential negative social outcomes. Policy interventions through regional cooperation building
33 (SDG 17) and institutional capacity (SDG 16) can enhance affordability (SDG 7) (Labordena et al.,
34 2017). The deployment of small-scale renewables, or off-grid solutions for people in remote areas (Sánchez
35 and Izzo, 2017), has strong potential for synergies with access to energy (SDG 7), but the actualisation of
36 these potentials requires measures to overcome technology and reliability risks associated with large-scale
37 deployment of renewables (Giwa et al., 2017; Heard et al., 2017). Bundling energy-efficient appliances and
38 lighting with off-grid renewables can lead to substantial cost reduction while increasing reliability (IEA,
39 2017). Low-income populations in industrialised countries are often left out of renewable energy generation
40 schemes, either because of high start-up costs or lack of home ownership (UNRISD, 2016).

41
42 Nuclear energy, the share of which increases in most of the 1.5°C-compatible pathways (see Chapter 2,
43 Section 2.4.2.1), can increase the risks of proliferation (SDG 16), have negative environmental effects (e.g.,
44 for water use, SDG 6), and have mixed effects for human health when replacing fossil fuels (SDGs 7 and 3)
45 (see Cross-Chapter Box 12, Table 1). The use of fossil CCS, which plays an important role in deep
46 mitigation pathways (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.3), implies continued adverse impacts of upstream supply-
47 chain activities in the coal sector, and because of lower efficiency of CCS coal power plants (SDG 12),
48 upstream impacts and local air pollution are likely to be exacerbated (SDG 3). Furthermore, there is a non-
49 negligible risk of carbon dioxide leakage from geological storage and the carbon dioxide transport
50 infrastructure (SDG 3) (Table 5.2 (available at the end of the chapter)).

51
52 Economies dependent upon fossil fuel-based energy generation and/or export revenue are expected to be
53 disproportionately affected by future restrictions on the use of fossil fuels, under stringent climate goals and
54 higher carbon prices; this includes impacts on employment, stranded assets, resources left underground,

1 lower capacity use, and early phasing out of large infrastructure already under construction (Johnson et al.,
2 2015; McGlade and Ekins, 2015; UNEP, 2017; Spencer et al., 2018) (Box 5.2) (*robust evidence, high*
3 *agreement*). Investment in coal continues to be attractive in many countries as it is a mature technology,
4 provides cheap energy supply, large-scale employment, and energy security (Jakob and Steckel, 2016; Vogt-
5 Schilb and Hallegatte, 2017; Spencer et al., 2018). Hence, accompanying policies and measures would be
6 required to ease job losses and correct for relatively higher prices of alternative energy (Oosterhuis and Ten
7 Brink, 2014; Oei and Mendelevitch, 2016; Garg et al., 2017; HLCCP, 2017; Jordaan et al., 2017; OECD,
8 2017; UNEP, 2017; Blondeel and van de Graaf, 2018; Green, 2018). Research on historical transitions shows
9 that managing the impacts on workers through retraining programs is essential in order to align the phase
10 down of mining industries with meeting ambitious climate targets, and the objectives of a ‘just transition’
11 (Galgóczi, 2014; Caldecott et al., 2017; Healy and Barry, 2017). This aspect is even more important in
12 developing countries where the mining workforce is largely semi- or un-skilled (Altieri et al., 2016; Tung,
13 2016). Ambitious emission reduction targets can unlock very strong decoupling potentials in industrialised
14 fossil exporting economies (Hatfield-Dodds et al., 2015).

15

16 [START BOX 5.2 HERE]

17

Box 5.2: Challenges and Opportunities of Low-Carbon Pathways in Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC) Countries

19

20

21 The Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC) region (Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab
22 Emirates) is characterised by high dependency on hydrocarbon resources (natural oil and gas), with high
23 risks of socio-economic impacts of policies and response measures to address climate change. The region is
24 also vulnerable to the decrease of the global demand and price of hydrocarbons as a result of climate change
25 response measures. The projected declining use of oil and gas under low emissions pathways creates risks of
26 significant economic losses for the GCC region (e.g., Waisman et al., 2013; Van de Graaf and Verbruggen,
27 2015; Al-Maamary et al., 2016; Bauer et al., 2016), given that natural gas and oil revenues contributed to
28 ~70% of government budgets and > 35% of the gross domestic product in 2010 (Callen et al., 2014).

29

30 The current high energy intensity of the domestic economies (Al-Maamary et al., 2017), triggered mainly by
31 low domestic energy prices (Alshehry and Belloumi, 2015), suggests specific challenges for aligning
32 mitigation towards 1.5°C-consistent trajectories, which would require strong energy efficiency and economic
33 development for the region.

34

35 Economies of the region are highly reliant on fossil fuel for their domestic activities. Yet, the renewables
36 deployment potentials are large, deployment is already happening (Cugurullo, 2013; IRENA, 2016), and
37 positive economic benefits can be envisaged (Sgouridis et al., 2016). Nonetheless, the use of renewables is
38 currently limited by economics and structural challenges (Lilliestam and Patt, 2015; Griffiths, 2017a).
39 Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) is also envisaged with concrete steps towards implementation (Alsheyab,
40 2017; Ustadi et al., 2017); yet, the real potential of this technology in terms of scale and economic
41 dimensions is still uncertain.

42

43 Beyond the above mitigation-related challenges, human societies and fragile ecosystems of the region are
44 highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, such as water stress (Evans et al., 2004; Shaffrey et al.,
45 2009), desertification (Bayram and Öztürk, 2014), sea level rise affecting vast low costal lands, and high
46 temperature and humidity with future levels potentially beyond adaptive capacities (Pal and Eltahir, 2016). A
47 low-carbon pathway that manages climate-related risks within the context of sustainable development
48 requires an approach that jointly addresses both types of vulnerabilities (Al Ansari, 2013; Lilliestam and
49 Patt, 2015; Babiker, 2016; Griffiths, 2017b).

50

51 The Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) for GCC countries identified energy efficiency,
52 deployment of renewables, and technology transfer to enhance agriculture, food security, protection of
53 marine, and management of water and costal zones (Babiker, 2016). Strategic vision documents, such as
54 Saudi Arabia’s “Vision 2030”, identify emergent opportunities for energy price reforms, energy efficiency,

1 turning emissions in valuable products, and deployment of renewables and other clean technologies, if
2 accompanied with appropriate policies to manage the transition and in the context of economic
3 diversification (Luomi, 2014; Atalay et al., 2016; Griffiths, 2017b; Howarth et al., 2017).

4
5 [END BOX 5.2 HERE]

6 7 8 5.4.1.3 *Land-based Agriculture, Forestry and Ocean: Mitigation Response Options and Carbon Dioxide* 9 *Removal*

10
11 In the AFOLU sector, dietary change towards global healthy diets, that is, a shift from over-consumption of
12 animal-related to plant-related diets, and food waste reduction (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2.1) are in synergy
13 with SDGs 2 and 6, and SDG 3 through lower consumption of animal products and reduced losses and waste
14 throughout the food system, contributing to achieving SDGs 12 and 15 (Bajželj et al., 2014; Bustamante et
15 al., 2014; Tilman and Clark, 2014; Hiç et al., 2016).

16
17 Power dynamics plays an important role in achieving behavioural change and sustainable consumption
18 (Fuchs et al., 2016). In forest management (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2.2), encouraging responsible sourcing
19 of forest products and securing indigenous land tenure has the potential to increase economic benefits by
20 creating decent jobs (SDG 8), maintaining biodiversity (SDG 15), facilitating innovation and upgrading
21 technology (SDG 9), and responsible and just decision making (SDG 16) (Ding et al., 2016; WWF, 2017)
22 (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

23
24 Emerging evidence indicates that future mitigation efforts that would be required to reach stringent climate
25 targets, particularly those associated with Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) (e.g., Bioenergy with Carbon
26 Capture and Storage (BECCS) and afforestation and reforestation), may also impose significant constraints
27 upon poor and vulnerable communities (SDG 1) via increased food prices and competition for arable land,
28 land appropriation, and dispossession (Cavanagh and Benjaminsen, 2014; Hunsberger et al., 2014; Work,
29 2015; Muratori et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2016; Burns and Nicholson, 2017; Corbera et al., 2017) with
30 disproportionate negative impacts upon rural poor and indigenous populations (SDG 1) (Grubert et al., 2014;
31 Grill et al., 2015; Zhang and Chen, 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Johansson et al., 2016; Aha and Ayitey, 2017;
32 De Stefano et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2017) (Section 5.4.2.2, Table 5.3 2 (available as a supplementary pdf at the
33 end of the chapter), Figure 5.32) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). Crops for bioenergy may increase
34 irrigation needs and exacerbate water stress with negative associated impacts on SDGs 6 and 10 (Boysen et
35 al., 2017).

36
37 Ocean Iron Fertilisation (OIF) and enhanced weathering have two-way interactions with life under water and
38 on land and food security (SDGs 2, 14, and 15) (Table 5.2 (available at the end of the chapter)).

39 Development of blue carbon resources through coastal (mangrove) and marine (seaweed) vegetative
40 ecosystems encourages integrated water resource management (SDG 6) (Vierros, 2017), promotes life on
41 land (SDG 15) (Potouroglou et al., 2017); poverty reduction (SDG 1) (Schirmer and Bull, 2014; Lamb et al.,
42 2016) and food security (SDG 2) (Ahmed et al., 2017a, b; Duarte et al., 2017; Sondak et al., 2017; Vierros,
43 2017; Zhang et al., 2017).

44
45 [INSERT FIGURE 5.2 HERE]




Figure 5.2: Synergies and trade-offs and gross Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)-interaction with individual mitigation options. The top three wheels represent synergies and the bottom three wheels show trade-offs. The colours on the border of the wheels correspond to the SDGs listed above, starting at the 9 o'clock position, with reading guidance in the top-left corner with the quarter circle (Note 1). Mitigation (climate action, SDG 13) is at the centre of the circle. The coloured segments inside the circles can be counted to arrive at the number of synergies (green) and trade-offs (red). The length of the coloured segments shows the strength of the synergies or trade-offs (Note 3) and the shading indicates confidence (Note 2). Various mitigation options within the energy demand sector, energy supply sector, and land and ocean sector, and how to read them within a segment are shown in grey (Note 4). See also Table 5.2 (available at the end of the chapter).

5.4.2 Sustainable Development Implications of 1.5°C and 2°C Mitigation Pathways

While previous sections have focused on individual mitigation options and their interaction with sustainable development and the SDGs, this section takes a systems perspective. Emphasis is on quantitative pathways depicting path-dependent evolutions of human and natural systems over time. Specifically, the focus is on fundamental transformations and thus stringent mitigation policies consistent with 1.5°C or 2°C, and the differential synergies and trade-offs with respect to the various sustainable development dimensions.

Both 1.5°C and 2°C pathways would require deep cuts in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and large-scale changes of energy supply and demand, as well as in agriculture and forestry systems (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4). For the assessment of the sustainable development implications of these pathways, we draw upon studies that show the aggregated impact of mitigation for multiple sustainable development dimensions (Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al., 2018; Rogelj et al., 2018) and across multiple Integrated Assessment

1 Modelling (IAM) frameworks. Often these tools are linked to disciplinary models covering specific SDGs in
2 more detail (Cameron et al., 2016; Rao et al., 2017; Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al., 2018). Using
3 multiple IAMs and disciplinary models is important for a robust assessment of the sustainable development
4 implications of different pathways. Emphasis is on multi-regional studies, which can be aggregated to the
5 global scale. The recent literature on 1.5°C mitigation pathways has begun to provide quantifications for a
6 range of sustainable development dimensions, including air pollution and health, food security and hunger,
7 energy access, water security, and multidimensional poverty and equity.

8 9 10 *5.4.2.1 Air Pollution and Health*

11
12 Greenhouse gases and air pollutants are typically emitted by the same sources. Hence, mitigation strategies
13 that reduce GHGs or the use of fossil fuels typically also reduce emissions of pollutants, such as particulate
14 matter (e.g., PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), black carbon (BC), sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and other
15 harmful species (Clarke et al., 2014) (Figure 5.3), causing adverse health and ecosystem effects at various
16 scales (Kusumaningtyas and Aldrian, 2016).

17
18 Mitigation pathways typically show that there are significant synergies for air pollution, and that the
19 synergies increase with the stringency of the mitigation policies (Amann et al., 2011; Rao et al., 2016;
20 Klimont et al., 2017; Shindell et al., 2017; Markandya et al., 2018). Recent multi-model comparisons
21 indicate that mitigation pathways consistent with 1.5°C would result in higher synergies with air pollution
22 compared to pathways that are consistent with 2°C (Figures 5.4 and 5.5). Shindell et al. (2018) indicate that
23 health benefits worldwide over the century of 1.5°C pathways could be in the range of 110 to 190 million
24 fewer premature deaths compared to 2°C pathways. The synergies for air pollution are highest in the
25 developing world, particularly in Asia. In addition to significant health benefits, there are also economic
26 benefits from mitigation, reducing the investment needs in air pollution control technologies by about 35%
27 globally (or about 100 billion US\$2015 per year to 2030 in 1.5°C pathways) (McCollum et al., 2018) (Figure
28 5.4).

29 30 31 *5.4.2.2 Food Security and Hunger*

32
33 Stringent climate mitigation pathways in line with ‘well below 2°C’ or ‘1.5°C’ goals often rely on the
34 deployment of large-scale land-related measures, like afforestation and/or bioenergy supply (Popp et al.,
35 2014; Rose et al., 2014; Creutzig et al., 2015). These land-related measures can compete with food
36 production and hence raise food security concerns (Section 5.4.1.3) (P. Smith et al., 2014). Mitigation studies
37 indicate that so-called ‘single-minded’ climate policy, aiming solely at limiting warming to 1.5°C or 2°C
38 without concurrent measures in the food sector, can have negative impacts for global food security
39 (Hasegawa et al., 2015; McCollum et al., 2018). Impacts of 1.5°C mitigation pathways can be significantly
40 higher than those of 2°C pathways (Figures 5.4 and 5.5). An important driver of the food security impacts in
41 these scenarios is the increase of food prices and the effect of mitigation on disposable income and wealth
42 due to GHG pricing. A recent study indicates that, on aggregate, the price and income effects on food may be
43 bigger than the effect due to competition over land between food and bioenergy (Hasegawa et al., 2015).

44
45 In order to address the issue of trade-offs with food security, mitigation policies would need to be designed
46 in a way that shields the population at risk of hunger, including through the adoption of different
47 complementary measures, such as food price support. The investment needs of complementary food price
48 policies are found to be globally relatively much smaller than the associated mitigation investments of 1.5°C
49 pathways (Figure 5.3) (McCollum et al., 2018). Besides food support price, other measures include
50 improving productivity and efficiency of agricultural production systems (FAO and NZAGRC, 2017a, b;
51 Frank et al., 2017) and programs focusing on forest land-use change (Havlík et al., 2014). All these lead to
52 additional benefits of mitigation, improving resilience and livelihoods.

53
54 van Vuuren et al. (2018) and Grubler et al. (2018) show that 1.5°C pathways without reliance on BECCS can

1 be achieved through a fundamental transformation of the service sectors which would significantly reduce
2 energy and food demand (see Chapter 2, Sections 2.1.1, 2.3.1, and 2.4.3). Such low energy demand (LED)
3 pathways would result in significantly reduced pressure on food security, lower food prices, and put fewer
4 people at risk of hunger. Importantly, the trade-offs with food security would be reduced by the avoided
5 impacts in the agricultural sector due to the reduced warming associated with the 1.5°C pathways (see
6 Chapter 3, Section 3.5). However, such feedbacks are not comprehensively captured in the studies on
7 mitigation.

10 5.4.2.3 *Lack of Energy Access/Energy Poverty*

11 A lack of access to clean and affordable energy (especially for cooking) is a major policy concern in many
12 countries, especially in those in South Asia and Africa where major parts of the population still rely
13 primarily on solid fuels for cooking (IEA and World Bank, 2017). Scenario studies which quantify the
14 interactions between climate mitigation and energy access indicate that stringent climate policy which
15 would affect energy prices could significantly slow down the transition to clean cooking fuels, such as
16 liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) or electricity (Cameron et al., 2016).

17
18 Estimates across six different IAMs (McCollum et al., 2018) indicate that, in the absence of compensatory
19 measures, the number of people without access to clean cooking fuels may increase. Re-distributional
20 measures, such as subsidies on cleaner fuels and stoves, could compensate for the negative effects of
21 mitigation on energy access. Investment costs of the re-distributional measures in 1.5°C pathways (on
22 average around 120 billion per year to 2030; Figure 5.4) are much smaller than the mitigation investments of
23 1.5°C pathways (McCollum et al., 2018). The recycling of revenues from climate policy might act as a
24 means to help finance the costs of providing energy access to the poor (Cameron et al., 2016).

28 5.4.2.4 *Water Security*

29
30 Transformations towards low-emissions energy and agricultural systems can have major implications for
31 freshwater demand as well as water pollution. The scaling up of renewables and energy efficiency as
32 depicted by low emissions pathways would, in most instances, lower water demands for thermal energy
33 supply facilities ('water-for-energy') compared to fossil energy technologies, and thus reinforce targets
34 related to water access and scarcity (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1). However, some low-carbon options such
35 as bioenergy, centralised solar power, nuclear, and hydropower technologies could, if not managed properly,
36 have counteracting effects that compound existing water-related problems in a given locale (Byers et al.,
37 2014; Fricko et al., 2016; IEA, 2016; Fujimori et al., 2017a; McCollum et al., 2017; Wang, 2017).



38
39 Under stringent mitigation efforts, the demand for bioenergy can result in a substantial increase of water
40 demand for irrigation, thereby potentially contributing to water scarcity in water-stressed regions (Berger et
41 al., 2015; Bonsch et al., 2016; Jägermeyr et al., 2017). However, this risk can be reduced by prioritising rain-
42 fed production of bioenergy (Hayashi et al., 2015, 2018; Bonsch et al., 2016), but might have adverse effects
43 for food security (Boysen et al., 2017).

44
45 Reducing food and energy demand without compromising the needs of the poor emerges as a robust strategy
46 for both water conservation and GHG emissions reductions (von Stechow et al., 2015; IEA, 2016; Parkinson
47 et al., 2016; Grubler et al., 2018). The results underscore the importance of an integrated approach when
48 developing water, energy, and climate policy (IEA, 2016).

49
50 Estimates across different models for the impacts of stringent mitigation pathways on energy-related water
51 uses seem ambiguous. Some pathways show synergies (Mouratiadou et al., 2018) while others indicate
52 trade-offs and thus increases of water use due to mitigation (Fricko et al., 2016). The signal depends on the
53 adopted policy implementation or mitigation strategies and technology portfolio. A number of adaptation
54 options exist (e.g., dry cooling), which can effectively reduce electricity-related water trade-offs (Fricko et

1 al., 2016; IEA, 2016). Similarly, irrigation water use will depend on the regions where crops are produced,
 2 the sources of bioenergy (e.g., agriculture vs. forestry) and dietary change induced by climate policy.
 3 Overall, and also considering other water-related SDGs, including access to safe drinking water and
 4 sanitation as well as waste-water treatment, investments into the water sector seem to be only modestly
 5 affected by stringent climate policy compatible with 1.5°C (Figure 5.4) (McCollum et al., 2018).
 6
 7


[INSERT FIGURE 5.3 HERE]



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Figure 5.3: Sustainable development implications of mitigation actions in 1.5°C pathways. Panel (a) shows ranges for 1.5°C pathways for selected sustainable development dimensions compared to the ranges of 2°C pathways and baseline pathways. The panel (a) depicts interquartile and the full range across the scenarios for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2 (hunger), SDG 3 (health), SDG 6 (water), SDG 7 (energy), SDG 13 (climate), and SDG 15 (land). Progress towards achieving the SDGs is denoted by arrow symbols (increase or decrease of indicator). Black horizontal lines show 2015 values for comparison. Note that sustainable development effects are estimated for the effect of mitigation and do not include benefits from avoided impacts (see Chapter 3, Section 3.5). Low energy demand (LED) denotes estimates from a pathway with extremely low energy demand reaching 1.5°C without Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS). Panel (b) presents the resulting full range for synergies and trade-offs of 1.5°C pathways compared to the corresponding baseline scenarios. The y-axis in panel (b) indicates the factor change in the 1.5°C pathway compared to the baseline. Note that the figure shows gross impacts of mitigation and does not include feedbacks due to avoided impacts. The realisation of the side-effects will critically depend on local circumstances and implementation practice. Trade-offs across many sustainable development dimensions can be reduced through complementary/re-distributional measures. The figure is not comprehensive and focuses on those sustainable development dimensions for which quantifications across models are available. Sources: 1.5°C pathways database of Chapter 2 (Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al., 2018).

[INSERT FIGURE 5.4 HERE]



24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Figure 5.4: Investment into mitigation up until 2030 and implications for investments for four sustainable development dimensions. Cross-hatched bars show the median investment in 1.5°C pathways across results from different models, and solid bars for 2°C pathways, respectively. Whiskers on bars represent minima and maxima across estimates from six models. Clean water and air pollution investments are available only from one model. Mitigation investments show the change in investments across mitigation options compared to the baseline. Negative mitigation investments (grey bars) denote disinvestment (reduced investment needs) into fossil fuel sectors compared to the baseline. Investments for different

1 sustainable development dimensions denote the investment needs for complementary measures in order to
2 avoid trade-offs (negative impacts) of mitigation. Negative sustainable development investments for air
3 pollution indicate cost savings, and thus synergies of mitigation for air pollution control costs. The values
4 compare to about US\$(2010) 2 trillion (range of 1.4 to 3 trillion) of total energy-related investments in the
5 1.5°C pathways. Source: estimates from CD-LINKS scenarios summarised by McCollum et al. (2018).
6

7 In summary, the assessment of mitigation pathways shows that, to meet the 1.5°C target, a wide range of
8 mitigation options would need to be deployed (see Chapter 2, Sections 2.3 and 2.4). While pathways aiming
9 at 1.5°C are associated with high synergies for some sustainable development dimensions (such as human
10 health and air pollution, forest preservation), the rapid pace and magnitude of the required changes would
11 also lead to increased risks for trade-offs for other sustainable development dimensions (particularly food
12 security) (Figures 5.4 and 5.5). Synergies and trade-offs are expected to be unevenly distributed between
13 regions and nations (Box 5.2), though little literature has formally examined such distributions under 1.5°C
14 consistent mitigation scenarios. Reducing these risks requires smart policy designs and mechanisms that
15 shield the poor and redistribute the burden so that the most vulnerable are not affected. Recent scenario
16 analyses show that associated investments for reducing the trade-offs for, for example, food, water and
17 energy access to be significantly lower than the required mitigation investments (McCollum et al., 2018).
18 Fundamental transformation of demand, including efficiency and behavioural changes, can help to
19 significantly reduce the reliance on risky technologies, such as BECCS, and thus reduce the risk of potential
20 trade-offs between mitigation and other sustainable development dimensions (von Stechow et al., 2015;
21 Grubler et al., 2018; van Vuuren et al., 2018). Reliance on demand-side measures only, however, would not
22 be sufficient for meeting stringent targets, such as 1.5°C and 2°C (Clarke et al., 2014).
23
24

25 **5.5 Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C**

26
27 This section assesses what is known in the literature on development pathways that are sustainable and
28 climate-resilient and relevant to a 1.5°C warmer world. Pathways, transitions from today's world to
29 achieving a set of future goals (see Chapter 1, Section 1.2.3, Cross-Chapter Box 1), follow broadly two main
30 traditions: first, as integrated pathways describing the required societal and systems transformations,
31 combining quantitative modelling and qualitative narratives at multiple spatial scales (global to sub-
32 national); and second, as country- and community-level, solution-oriented trajectories and decision-making
33 processes about context- and place-specific opportunities, challenges, and trade-offs. These two notions of
34 pathways offer different, though complementary, insights into the nature of 1.5°C-relevant trajectories and
35 the short-term actions that enable long-term goals. Both highlight to varying degrees the urgency, ethics, and
36 equity dimensions of possible trajectories and society- and system-wide transformations, yet at different
37 scales, building on Chapter 2 (see Section 2.4) and Chapter 4 (see Section 4.5).
38
39

40 **5.5.1 Integration of Adaptation, Mitigation, and Sustainable Development**

41
42 Insights into climate-compatible development (see Glossary) illustrate how integration between adaptation,
43 mitigation, and sustainable development works in context-specific projects, how synergies are achieved, and
44 what challenges are encountered during implementation (Stringer et al., 2014; Suckall et al., 2014; Antwi-
45 Agyei et al., 2017a; Bickersteth et al., 2017; Kalafatis, 2017; Nunan, 2017). The operationalisation of
46 climate-compatible development, including climate-smart agriculture and carbon-forestry projects (Lipper et
47 al., 2014; Campbell et al., 2016; Quan et al., 2017), shows multi-level and multi-sector trade-offs involving
48 'winners' and 'losers' across governance levels (Kongsager and Corbera, 2015; Naess et al., 2015; Ficklin et
49 al., 2017; Karlsson et al., 2017; Tanner et al., 2017; Taylor, 2017; Wood, 2017) (*high confidence*). Issues of
50 power, participation, values, equity, inequality, and justice transcend case study examples of attempted
51 integrated approaches (Nunan, 2017; Phillips et al., 2017; Stringer et al., 2017; Wood, 2017), also reflected
52 in policy frameworks for integrated outcomes (Stringer et al., 2014; Di Gregorio et al., 2017; Few et al.,
53 2017; Tanner et al., 2017).
54

1 Ultimately, reconciling trade-offs between development needs and emission reductions towards a 1.5°C
2 warmer world requires a dynamic view of the interlinkages between adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable
3 development (Nunan, 2017). This entails recognition of the ways in which development contexts shape the
4 choice and effectiveness of interventions, limit the range of responses afforded to communities and
5 governments, and potentially impose injustices upon vulnerable groups (UNRISD, 2016; Thornton and
6 Comberti, 2017). A variety of approaches, both quantitative and qualitative, exist to examine possible
7 sustainable development pathways under which climate and sustainable development goals can be achieved,
8 and synergies and trade-offs for transformation identified (Sections 5.3 and 5.4).
9

11 *5.5.2 Pathways for Adaptation, Mitigation, and Sustainable Development*

12
13 This section focuses on the growing body of pathways literature describing the dynamic and systemic
14 integration of mitigation and adaptation with sustainable development in the context of a 1.5°C warmer
15 world. These studies are critically important for the identification of ‘enabling’ conditions under which
16 climate and the SDGs can be achieved, and thus help the design of transformation strategies that maximise
17 synergies and avoid potential trade-offs (Sections 5.3 and 5.4). Full integration of sustainable development
18 dimensions is, however, challenging, given their diversity and the need for high temporal, spatial, and social
19 resolution to address local effects, including heterogeneity related to poverty and equity (von Stechow et al.,
20 2015). Research on long-term climate change mitigation and adaptation pathways has covered individual
21 SDGs to different degrees. Interactions between climate and other SDGs have been explored for SDGs 2, 3,
22 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, and 15 (Clarke et al., 2014; Abel et al., 2016; von Stechow et al., 2016; Rao et al., 2017)
23 while interactions with SDGs 1, 5, 11, and 16 remain largely underexplored in integrated long-term scenarios
24 (Zimm et al., 2018).
25

26 Quantitative pathways studies now better represent ‘nexus’ approaches to assess sustainable development
27 dimensions. In such approaches (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.3.8), a sub-set of sustainable development
28 dimensions are investigated together because of their close relationships (Welsch et al., 2014; Conway et al.,
29 2015; Keairns et al., 2016; Parkinson et al., 2016; Rasul and Sharma, 2016; Howarth and Monasterolo,
30 2017). Compared to single objective climate-SDG assessments (Section 5.4.2), nexus solutions attempt to
31 integrate complex interdependencies across diverse sectors in a systems approach for consistent analysis.
32 Recent pathways studies show how water, energy, and climate (SDGs 6, 7 and 13) interact (Parkinson et al.,
33 2016; McCollum et al., 2018), calling for integrated water-energy investment decisions to manage systemic
34 risks. For instance, the provision of bioenergy, important in many 1.5°C-consistent pathways, can help
35 resolve ‘nexus challenges’ by alleviating energy security concerns, but can also have adverse ‘nexus
36 impacts’ on food security, water use, and biodiversity (Lotze-Campen et al., 2014; Bonsch et al., 2016).
37 Policies that improve the resource use efficiency across sectors can maximise synergies for sustainable
38 development (Bartos and Chester, 2014; McCollum et al., 2018; van Vuuren et al., 2018). Mitigation
39 compatible with 1.5°C can significantly reduce impacts and adaptation needs in the nexus sectors compared
40 to 2°C (Byers et al., 2018). In order to avoid trade-offs due to high carbon pricing of 1.5°C pathways,
41 regulation in specific areas may complement price-based instruments. Such combined policies generally lead
42 also to more early action maximizing synergies and avoiding some of the adverse climate effects for
43 sustainable development (Bertram et al., 2018).
44

45 The comprehensive analysis of climate change in the context of sustainable development requires suitable
46 reference scenarios that lend themselves to broader sustainable development analyses. The Shared
47 Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) (O’Neill et al., 2017a; Riahi et al., 2017) (Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 1
48 in Chapter 1) constitute an important first step in providing a framework for the integrated assessment of
49 adaptation and mitigation and their climate-development linkages (Ebi et al., 2014). The five underlying SSP
50 narratives (O’Neill et al., 2017a) map well into some of the key SDG dimensions, with one of the pathways
51 (SSP1) explicitly depicting sustainability as the main theme (van Vuuren et al., 2017b).
52

53 To date, no pathway in the literature proves to achieve all 17 SDGs because several targets are not met or not
54 sufficiently covered in the analysis, hence resulting in a sustainability gap (Zimm et al., 2018). The SSPs

1 facilitate the systematic exploration of different sustainable dimensions under ambitious climate objectives.
2 SSP1 proves to be in line with eight SDGs (3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 15) and several of their targets in a 2°C
3 warmer world (van Vuuren et al., 2017b; Zimm et al., 2018). But, important targets for SDGs 1, 2, and 4
4 (i.e., people living in extreme poverty, people living at the risk of hunger, and gender gap in years of
5 schooling) are not met in this scenario.

6
7 The SSPs show that sustainable socio-economic conditions will play a key role in reaching stringent climate
8 targets (Riahi et al., 2017; Rogelj et al., 2018). Recent modelling work has examined 1.5°C-consistent,
9 stringent mitigation scenarios for 2100 applied to the SSPs, using six different Integrated Assessment
10 Models (IAMs). Despite limitations of these models which are coarse approximations of reality, robust
11 trends can be identified (Rogelj et al., 2018). SSP1 - which depicts broader “sustainability” as well as
12 enhancing equity and poverty reductions - is the only pathway where all models could reach 1.5°C and is
13 associated with the lowest mitigation costs across all SSPs. A decreasing number of models was successful
14 for SSP2, SSP4, and SSP5, respectively, indicating distinctly higher risks of failure due to high growth and
15 energy intensity as well as geographical and social inequalities and uneven regional development. And
16 reaching 1.5°C has even been found infeasible in the less sustainable SSP3 - “regional rivalry” (Fujimori et
17 al., 2017b; Riahi et al., 2017). All these conclusions hold true if a 2°C objective is considered (Calvin et al.,
18 2017; Fujimori et al., 2017b; Popp et al., 2017; Riahi et al., 2017). Rogelj et al. (2018) also show that fewer
19 scenarios are, however, feasible across different SSPs in case of 1.5°C, and mitigation costs substantially
20 increase in 1.5°C pathways compared to 2°C pathways.

21
22 There is a wide range of SSP-based studies focusing on the connections between adaptation/impacts and
23 different sustainable development dimensions (Hasegawa et al., 2014; Ishida et al., 2014; Arnell et al., 2015;
24 Bowyer et al., 2015; Burke et al., 2015; Lemoine and Kapnick, 2016; Rozenberg and Hallegatte, 2016;
25 Blanco et al., 2017; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017; O'Neill et al., 2017a; Rutledge et al., 2017; Byers et al.,
26 2018).

27 New methods for projecting inequality and poverty (downscaled to sub-national rural and urban levels as
28 well as spatially-explicit levels) have enabled advanced SSP-based assessments of locally sustainable
29 development implications of avoided impacts and related adaptation needs. For instance, Byers et al. (2018)
30 find that, in a 1.5°C warmer world, a focus on sustainable development can reduce the climate risk exposure
31 of populations vulnerable to poverty by more than an order of magnitude (Section 5.2.2). Moreover,
32 aggressive reductions in between-country inequality may decrease the emissions intensity of global
33 economic growth (Rao and Min, 2018). This is due to the higher potential for decoupling of energy from
34 income growth in lower-income countries, due to high potential for technological advancements that reduce
35 the energy intensity of growth of poor countries - critical also for reaching 1.5°C in a socially and
36 economically equitable way. Participatory downscaling of SSPs in several European Union countries and in
37 Central Asia shows numerous possible pathways of solutions to the 2-1.5°C goal, depending on differential
38 visions (Tàbara et al., 2018). Other participatory applications of the SSPs, for example in West Africa
39 (Palazzo et al., 2017) and the south-eastern United States (Absar and Preston, 2015), illustrate the potentially
40 large differences in adaptive capacity within regions and between sectors.

41
42 Harnessing the full potential of the SSP framework to inform sustainable development requires (1) further
43 elaboration and extension of the current SSPs to cover sustainable development objectives explicitly; (2) the
44 development of new or variants of current narratives that would facilitate more SDG-focused analyses with
45 climate as one objective (among other SDGs) (Riahi et al., 2017); (3) scenarios with high regional resolution
46 (Fujimori et al., 2017b); (4) a more explicit representation of institutional and governance change associated
47 with the SSPs (Zimm et al., 2018); and (5) a scale-up of localised and spatially-explicit vulnerability, poverty
48 and inequality estimates, which have emerged in recent publications based on the SSPs (Byers et al., 2018)
49 and are essential to investigate equity dimensions (Klinsky and Winkler, 2018).


5.5.3 *Climate-Resilient Development Pathways*

54 This section assesses the literature on pathways as solution-oriented trajectories and decision-making

1 processes for attaining transformative visions for a 1.5°C warmer world. It builds on climate-resilient
 2 development pathways (CRDPs) introduced in the AR5 (Olsson et al., 2014) (Section 5.1.2) as well as
 3 growing literature (e.g., Eriksen et al., 2017; Johnson, 2017; Orindi et al., 2017; Kirby and O'Mahony, 2018;
 4 Solecki et al., 2018) that uses CRDPs as a conceptual and aspirational idea for steering societies towards
 5 low-carbon, prosperous, and ecologically safe futures. Such a notion of pathways foregrounds decision-
 6 making processes at local to national levels to situate transformation, resilience, equity, and well-being in the
 7 complex reality of specific places, nations, and communities (Harris et al., 2017; Ziervogel et al., 2017;
 8 Fazey et al., 2018; Gajjar et al., 2018; Klinsky and Winkler, 2018; Patterson et al., 2018; Tàbara et al., 2018).

9
 10 Pathways compatible with 1.5°C warming are not merely scenarios to envision possible futures but processes
 11 of deliberation and implementation that address societal values, local priorities, and inevitable trade-offs.
 12 This includes attention to politics and power that perpetuate business-as-usual trajectories (K. O'Brien, 2016;
 13 Harris et al., 2017), the politics that shape sustainability and capabilities of everyday life (Agyeman et al.,
 14 2016; Schlosberg et al., 2017), and ingredients for community resilience and transformative change (Fazey et
 15 al., 2018). Chartering CRDPs encourages locally-situated and problem-solving processes to negotiate and
 16 operationalise resilience 'on the ground' (Beilin and Wilkinson, 2015; Harris et al., 2017; Ziervogel et al.,
 17 2017). This entails contestation, inclusive governance, and iterative engagement of diverse populations with
 18 varied needs, aspirations, agency, and rights claims, including those most affected, to deliberate trade-offs in
 19 a multiplicity of possible pathways (see Figure 5.65) (Stirling, 2014; Vale, 2014; Walsh-Dilley and Wolford,
 20 2015; Biermann et al., 2016; J.R.A. Butler et al., 2016; K.L. O'Brien, 2016; Harris et al., 2017; Jones and
 21 Tanner, 2017; Mapfumo et al., 2017; Rosenbloom, 2017; Gajjar et al., 2018; Klinsky and Winkler, 2018;
 22 Lyon, 2018; O'Brien, 2018; Tàbara et al., 2018) (*high confidence*).

23
 24 [INSERT FIGURE 5.6 5 HERE]
 25



26
 27
 28 **Figure 5.5:** Pathways into the future, with path dependencies and iterative problem-solving and decision-making (after
 29 Fazey et al. (2016)).
 30

31 32 5.5.3.1 Transformations, Equity, and Well-being

33
 34 Most literature related to CRDPs invokes the concept of transformation, underscoring the need for urgent
 35 and far-reaching changes in practices, institutions, and social relations in society. Transformations toward a
 36 1.5°C warmer world would need to address considerations for equity and well-being, including in trade-off
 37 decisions (see Figure 5.1).

1
2 To attain the anticipated *transformations*, all countries as well as non-state actors would need to strengthen
3 their contributions, through bolder and more committed cooperation and equitable effort-sharing (Rao, 2014;
4 Frumhoff et al., 2015; Ekwurzel et al., 2017; Holz et al., 2017; Millar et al., 2017; Shue, 2017; Robinson and
5 Shine, 2018) (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Sustaining decarbonisation rates at a 1.5°C-compatible
6 level would be unprecedented and not possible without rapid transformations to a net-zero-emissions global
7 economy by mid-century or the later half of the century (see Chapters 2 and 4). Such efforts would entail
8 overcoming technical, infrastructural, institutional, and behavioural barriers across all sectors and levels of
9 society (Pfeiffer et al., 2016; Seto et al., 2016) and defeating path dependencies, including poverty traps
10 (Boonstra et al., 2016; Enqvist et al., 2016; Haider et al., 2017; Lade et al., 2017). Transformation also
11 entails ensuring that 1.5°C-compatible pathways are inclusive and desirable, build solidarity and alliances,
12 and protect vulnerable groups, including against disruptions of transformation (Patterson et al., 2018).

13
14 There is growing emphasis on the role of *equity, fairness, and justice* (see Glossary) regarding context-
15 specific transformations and pathways to a 1.5°C warmer world (Shue, 2014; Thorp, 2014; Dennig et al.,
16 2015; Moellendorf, 2015; Klinsky et al., 2017b; Roser and Seidel, 2017; Sealey-Huggins, 2017; Klinsky and
17 Winkler, 2018; Robinson and Shine, 2018) (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Consideration for what is
18 equitable and fair suggests the need for stringent decarbonisation and up-scaled adaptation that do not
19 exacerbate social injustices, locally and at national levels (Okereke and Coventry, 2016), uphold human
20 rights (Robinson and Shine, 2018), are socially desirable and acceptable (von Stechow et al., 2016;
21 Rosenbloom, 2017), address values and beliefs (O'Brien, 2018), and overcome vested interests (Normann,
22 2015; Patterson et al., 2016). Attention is often drawn to huge disparities in the cost, benefits, opportunities,
23 and challenges involved in transformation within and between countries, and the fact that the suffering of
24 already poor, vulnerable, and disadvantaged populations may be worsened, if care to protect them is not
25 taken (Holden et al., 2017; Klinsky and Winkler, 2018; Patterson et al., 2018).

26
27 *Well-being for all* (Dearing et al., 2014; Raworth, 2017) is at the core of an ecologically safe and socially just
28 space for humanity, including health and housing to peace and justice, social equity, gender equality, and
29 political voices (Raworth, 2017). It is in alignment with transformative social development (UNRISD, 2016)
30 and the 2030 Agenda of 'leaving no one behind'. The social conditions to enable well-being for all are to
31 reduce entrenched inequalities within and between countries (Klinsky and Winkler, 2018), rethink prevailing
32 values, ethics and behaviours (Holden et al., 2017), allow people to live a life in dignity while avoiding
33 actions that undermine capabilities (Klinsky and Golub, 2016), transform economies (Popescu and Ciurlau,
34 2016; Tàbara et al., 2018), overcome uneven consumption and production patterns (Dearing et al., 2014;
35 Häyhä et al., 2016; Raworth, 2017) and conceptualise development as well-being rather than mere economic
36 growth (Gupta and Pouw, 2017) (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

37 38 39 5.5.3.2 *Development Trajectories, Sharing of Efforts, and Cooperation*

40
41 The potential for pursuing sustainable and climate-resilient development pathways toward a 1.5°C warmer
42 world differs between and within nations, due to differential development achievements and trajectories, and
43 opportunities and challenges (Figure 5.1) (*very high confidence*). There are clear differences between high-
44 income countries where social achievements are high, albeit often with negative effects on the environment,
45 and most developing nations where vulnerabilities to climate change are high and social support and life
46 satisfaction are low, especially in the Least Developed Countries (Sachs et al., 2017; O'Neill et al., 2018).
47 Differential starting points for CRDPs between and within countries, including path dependencies (Figure
48 5.5), call for sensitivity to context (Klinsky and Winkler, 2018). For the developing world, limiting warming
49 to 1.5°C also means potentially severely curtailed development prospects (Okereke and Coventry, 2016) and
50 risks to human rights from both climate action and inaction to achieve this goal (Robinson and Shine, 2018)
51 (Section 5.2). Within-country development differences remain, despite efforts to ensure inclusive societies
52 (Gupta and Arts, 2017; Gupta and Pouw, 2017). Cole et al. (2017), for instance, show how differences
53 between provinces in South Africa constitute barriers to sustainable development trajectories and for
54 operationalising nation-level SDGs, across various dimensions of social deprivation and environmental

1 stress, reflecting historic disadvantages.

2
3 Moreover, various equity and effort- or burden-sharing approaches to climate stabilisation in the literature
4 allow to sketch national potentials for a 1.5°C warmer world (e.g., CSO Review, 2015; Meinshausen et al.,
5 2015; Okereke and Coventry, 2016; Anand, 2017; Bexell and Jönsson, 2017; Holz et al., 2017; Otto et al.,
6 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Robiou du Pont et al., 2017; Kartha et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2018). Many
7 approaches build on the AR5 ‘responsibility-capacity-need’ assessment (Clarke et al., 2014), complement
8 other proposed national-level metrics for capabilities, equity, and fairness (Heyward and Roser, 2016;
9 Klinsky et al., 2017a), or fall under the wider umbrella of fair share debates on responsibility, capability, and
10 right to development in climate policy (Fuglestedt and Kallbekken, 2016). Importantly, different principles
11 and methodologies generate different calculated contributions, responsibilities, and capacities (Skeie et al.,
12 2017).

13
14 The notion of nation-level fair shares is now also discussed in the context of limiting global warming to
15 1.5°C, and the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) (see Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter Box 11 in
16 Chapter 4) (CSO Review, 2015; Mace, 2016; Holz et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Robiou du Pont et al., 2017;
17 Kartha et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2018). A study by Pan et al. (2017) concluded that all countries would
18 need to contribute to ambitious emission reduction and that current pledges for 2030 by seven out of eight
19 high-emitting countries would be insufficient to meet 1.5°C. Emerging literature on justice-centred pathways
20 to 1.5°C points toward ambitious emission reductions domestically and committed cooperation
21 internationally whereby wealthier countries support poorer ones, technologically, financially, and otherwise
22 to enhance capacities (Okereke and Coventry, 2016; Holz et al., 2017; Robinson and Shine, 2018; Shue,
23 2018). These findings suggest that equitable and 1.5°C-compatible pathways would require fast action across
24 all countries at all levels of development rather than late accession of developing countries (as assumed
25 under SSP3, see Chapter 2), with external support for prompt mitigation and resilience-building efforts in the
26 latter (*medium evidence, medium agreement*).

27
28 Scientific advances since the AR5 now also allow to determine contributions to climate change for non-state
29 actors (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1) and their potential to contribute to CRDPs (*medium evidence, medium*
30 *agreement*). This includes cities (Bulkeley et al., 2013, 2014; Byrne et al., 2016), businesses (Heede, 2014;
31 Frumhoff et al., 2015; Shue, 2017), transnational initiatives (Castro, 2016; Andonova et al., 2017), and
32 industries. Recent work demonstrates the contributions of 90 industrial carbon producers to global
33 temperature and sea level rise, and their responsibilities to contribute to investments in and support for
34 mitigation and adaptation (Heede, 2014; Ekwurzel et al., 2017; Shue, 2017) (Sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2).

35
36 At the level of groups and individuals, equity in pursuing climate resilience for a 1.5°C warmer world means
37 addressing disadvantage, inequities, and empowerment that shape transformative processes and pathways
38 (Fazey et al., 2018), and deliberate efforts to strengthen the capabilities, capacities, and well-being of poor,
39 marginalised, and vulnerable people (Byrnes, 2014; Tokar, 2014; Harris et al., 2017; Klinsky et al., 2017a;
40 Klinsky and Winkler, 2018). Community-driven CRDPs can flag potential negative impacts of national
41 trajectories on disadvantaged groups, such as low-income families and communities of colour (Rao, 2014).
42 They emphasise social equity, participatory governance, social inclusion, and human rights, as well as
43 innovation, experimentation, and social learning (see Glossary) (*medium evidence, high agreement*)
44 (Sections 5.5.3.3 and 5.6).

45 46 47 5.5.3.3 Country and Community Strategies and Experiences

48
49 There are many possible pathways toward climate-resilient futures (O’Brien, 2018; Tàbara et al., 2018).
50 Literature depicting different sustainable development trajectories in line with CRDPs is growing with some
51 specific to 1.5°C global warming. Most experiences to date are at local and sub-national levels (Cross-
52 Chapter Box 13 in this Chapter) while state-level efforts align largely with green economy trajectories or
53 planning for climate resilience (Box 5.3). Due to the fact that these strategies are context-specific, the
54 literature is scarce on comparisons, efforts to scale up, and systematic monitoring.

1
2 States can play an enabling or hindering role in transitions to 1.5°C warmer worlds (Patterson et al., 2018).
3 The literature on strategies to reconcile low-carbon trajectories with sustainable development and ecological
4 sustainability through green growth, inclusive growth, de-growth, post-growth, and development as well-
5 being shows *low agreement* (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5). Efforts that align best with CRDPs are described as
6 ‘transformational’ and ‘strong’ (Ferguson, 2015). Some view ‘thick green’ perspectives as enabling equity,
7 democracy, and agency building (Lorek and Spangenberg, 2014; Stirling, 2014; Ehresman and Okereke,
8 2015; Buch-Hansen, 2018), others show how green economy and sustainable development pathways can
9 align (Brown et al., 2014; Georgeson et al., 2017b), and how a green economy can help link the SDGs with
10 NDCs, for instance in Mongolia, Kenya, and Sweden (Shine, 2017). Others still critique the continuous
11 reliance on market mechanisms (Wanner, 2014; Brockington and Ponte, 2015), and disregard for equity and
12 distributional and procedural justice (Stirling, 2014; Bell, 2015).

13
14 Country-level pathways and achievements vary significantly (*robust evidence, medium agreement*). For
15 instance, the Scandinavian countries rank top in the Global Green Economy Index (Dual Citizen LLC, 2016),
16 although they also tend to show high spill-over effects (Holz et al., 2017) and transgress their biophysical
17 boundaries (O’Neill et al., 2018). State-driven efforts in non-member countries of the Organisation for
18 Economic Co-operation and Development include Ethiopia’s ‘Climate-resilient Green Economy Strategy’,
19 Mozambique’s ‘Green Economy Action Plan’, and Costa Rica’s ecosystem- and conservation-driven green
20 transition paths. China and India have adopted technology and renewables pathways (Brown et al., 2014;
21 Death, 2014, 2015, 2016; Khanna et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2015; Kim and Thurbon, 2015; Wang et al., 2015;
22 Weng et al., 2015). Brazil promotes low per-capita GHG emissions, clean energy sources, green jobs,
23 renewables, and sustainable transportation while slowing rates of deforestation (Brown et al., 2014; La
24 Rovere, 2017) (see Chapter 4, Box 4.7). Yet, concerns remain regarding persistent inequalities, ecosystem
25 monetisation, lack of participation in green-style projects (Brown et al., 2014), and labour conditions and
26 risk of displacement in the sugarcane ethanol sector (McKay et al., 2016). Experiences with low-carbon
27 development pathways in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) highlight the crucial role of identifying
28 synergies across scale, removing institutional barriers, and ensuring equity and fairness in distributing
29 benefits as part of the right to development (Rai and Fisher, 2017).

30
31 In small islands states, for many of which climate change hazards and impacts at 1.5°C pose significant risks
32 to sustainable development (see Chapter 3 Box 3.5, Chapter 4 Box 4.3, Box 5.3), examples of CRDPs have
33 emerged since the AR5. This includes the SAMOA Pathway: SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (see
34 Chapter 4, Box 4.3) (UN, 2014a; Government of Kiribati, 2016; Steering Committee on Partnerships for
35 SIDS and UNDESA, 2016; Lefale et al., 2017) and the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific,
36 a leading example of integrated regional climate change adaptation planning for mitigation and sustainable
37 development, disaster risk management and low carbon economies (FRDP, 2016). Small islands of the
38 Pacific vary significantly in their capacity and resources to support effective integrated planning (McCubbin
39 et al., 2015; Barnett and Walters, 2016; Cvitanovic et al., 2016; Hemstock, 2017; Robinson and Dornan,
40 2017). Vanuatu (Box 5.3) has developed a significant coordinated national adaptation plan to advance the
41 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, respond to the Paris Agreement, and reduce the risk of disasters
42 in line with the Sendai targets (UNDP, 2016; Republic of Vanuatu, 2017).

43
44 [START BOX 5.3 HERE]

45 46 **Box 5.3:** Republic of Vanuatu – National Planning for Development and Climate Resilience

47
48 The Republic of Vanuatu is leading Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to develop a nationally
49 coordinated plan for climate-resilient development in the context of high exposure to hazard risk (MCCA,
50 2016; UNU-EHS, 2016). The majority of the population depends on subsistence, rain-fed agriculture and
51 coastal fisheries for food security (Sovacool et al., 2017). Sea level rise, increased prolonged drought, water
52 shortages, intense storms, cyclone events, and degraded coral reef environments threaten human security in a
53 1.5°C warmer world (see Chapter 3, Box 3.5) (SPC, 2015; Aipira et al., 2017). Given Vanuatu’s long history
54 of disasters, local adaptive capacity is relatively high, despite barriers to the use of local knowledge and

Do Not Cite, Quote or Distribute

5-37

Total pages: 97

1 technology, and low rates of literacy and women’s participation (McNamara and Prasad, 2014; Aipira et al.,
2 2017; Granderson, 2017). However, the adaptive capacity of Vanuatu and other SIDS is increasingly
3 constrained due to more frequent severe weather events (see Chapter 3 Box 3.5, Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter
4 Box 9 in Chapter 4) (Gero et al., 2013; Kuruppu and Willie, 2015; SPC, 2015; Sovacool et al., 2017).

5
6 Vanuatu has developed a national sustainable development plan for 2016-2030: the People’s Plan (Republic
7 of Vanuatu, 2016). This coordinated, inclusive plan of action on economy, environment, and society aims to
8 strengthen adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change and disasters. It emphasises rights of all Ni-
9 Vanuatu, including women, youth, the elderly, and vulnerable groups (Nalau et al., 2016). Vanuatu has also
10 developed a Coastal Adaptation Plan (Republic of Vanuatu, 2016), an integrated Climate Change and
11 Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (2016–2030) (SPC, 2015), and the first South Pacific National Advisory
12 Board on Climate Change & Disaster Risk Reduction (SPC, 2015; UNDP, 2016).

13
14 Vanuatu aims to integrate planning at multiple scales, and increase climate resilience by supporting local
15 coping capacities and iterative processes of planning for sustainable development and integrated risk
16 assessment (Aipira et al., 2017; Eriksson et al., 2017; Granderson, 2017). Climate-resilient development is
17 also supported by non-state partnerships, for example, the ‘Yumi stap redi long climate change’ – or the
18 Vanuatu non-governmental organisation Climate Change Adaptation Program (MacLellan, 2015). This
19 programme focuses on equitable governance, with particular attention to supporting women’s voices in
20 decision making through allied programs addressing domestic violence, and rights-based education to reduce
21 social marginalisation; alongside institutional reforms for greater transparency, accountability, and
22 community participation in decision-making (Davies, 2015; MacLellan, 2015; Sterrett, 2015; Ensor, 2016;
23 UN Women, 2016).

24
25 Power imbalances embedded in the political economy of development (Nunn et al., 2014), gender
26 discrimination (Aipira et al., 2017), and the priorities of climate finance (Cabezón et al., 2016) may
27 marginalise the priorities of local communities and influence how local risks are understood, prioritised, and
28 managed (Kuruppu and Willie, 2015; Baldacchino, 2017; Sovacool et al., 2017). However, the experience of
29 the low death toll after Cyclone Pam suggests effective use of local knowledge in planning and early
30 warning may support resilience at least in the absence of storm surge flooding (Handmer and Iveson, 2017;
31 Nalau et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the very severe infrastructure damage of Cyclone Pam 2015 highlights the
32 limits of individual Pacific SIDS efforts and the need for global and regional responses to a 1.5°C warmer
33 world (Dilling et al., 2015; Ensor, 2016; Shultz et al., 2016; Rey et al., 2017) (see Chapter 3 Box 3.5,
34 Chapter 4 Box 4.3).

35
36 [END BOX 5.3 HERE]

37
38 Communities, towns, and cities also contribute to low-carbon pathways, sustainable development and fair
39 and equitable climate resilience, often focused on processes of power, learning, and contestation as entry
40 points to more localised CRDPs (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Cross-Chapter Box 13 in this Chapter,
41 Box 5.2). In the Scottish Borders Climate Resilient Communities Project (United Kingdom), local flood
42 management is linked with national policies to foster cross-scalar and inclusive governance, with attention to
43 systemic disadvantages, shocks and stressors, capacity building, learning for change, and climate narratives
44 to inspire hope and action, all of which are essential for community resilience in a 1.5°C warmer world
45 (Fazey et al., 2018). Narratives and storytelling are vital for realising place-based 1.5°C futures as they create
46 space for agency, deliberation, co-constructing meaning, imagination, and desirable and dignified pathways
47 (Veland et al., 2018). Engagement with possible futures, identity, and self-reliance is also documented for
48 Alaska where 1.5°C warming has already been exceeded and indigenous communities invest in renewable
49 energy, greenhouses for food security, and new fishing practices to overcome loss of sea ice, flooding, and
50 erosion (Chapin et al., 2016; Fazey et al., 2018). The Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network
51 (ACCRN) facilitates shared learning dialogues, risk-to-resilience workshops, and iterative, consultative
52 planning in flood-prone cities in India; vulnerable communities, municipal governmental agents,
53 entrepreneurs, and technical experts negotiate different visions, trade-offs, and local politics to identify
54 desirable pathways (Harris et al., 2017).

1
2 Transforming our societies and systems to limit global warming to 1.5°C and ensuring equity and well-being
3 for human populations and ecosystems in a 1.5°C warmer world would require ambitious and well-integrated
4 adaptation-mitigation-development pathways that deviate fundamentally from high-carbon, business-as-
5 usual futures (Okereke and Coventry, 2016; Arts, 2017; Gupta and Arts, 2017; Sealey-Huggins, 2017).
6 Identifying and negotiating socially acceptable, inclusive, and equitable pathways toward climate-resilient
7 futures is a challenging, yet important, endeavour, fraught with complex moral, practical, and political
8 difficulties and inevitable trade-offs (*very high confidence*). The ultimate questions are: what futures do we
9 want (Bai et al., 2016; Tàbara et al., 2017; Klinsky and Winkler, 2018; O'Brien, 2018; Veland et al., 2018),
10 whose resilience matters, for what, where, when and why (Meerow and Newell, 2016), and 'whose vision ...
11 is being pursued and along which pathways' (Gillard et al., 2016).

12
13 [START CROSS-CHAPTER BOX 13 HERE]

14 15 **Cross-Chapter Box 13: Cities and Urban Transformation**

16
17 **Lead Authors:** Fernando Aragon-Durand (Mexico), Paolo Bertoldi (Italy), Anton Cartwright (South Africa),
18 François Engelbrecht (South Africa), Bronwyn Hayward (New Zealand), Daniela Jacob (Germany), Debora
19 Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Shagun Mehrotra (United States of America/India), Peter Newman (Australia),
20 Aromar Revi (India), Seth Schultz (United States of America), William Solecki (United States of America),
21 Petra Tschakert (Australia/Austria)

22
23 **Contributor Authors:** Peter Marcotullio (United States of America)

24 25 **Global Urbanisation in a 1.5°C Warmer World**

26 The concentration of economic activity, dense social networks, human resource capacity, investment in
27 infrastructure and buildings, relatively nimble local governments, close connection to surrounding rural and
28 natural environments, and a tradition of innovation provide urban areas with transformational potential
29 (Castán Broto, 2017) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.3). In this sense, the urbanisation mega-trend that will take
30 place over the next three decades, and add approximately 2 billion people to the global urban population
31 (UN, 2014b), offers opportunities for efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C.

32
33 Cities can also, however, concentrate the risks of flooding, landslides, fire, and infectious and parasitic
34 disease that are expected to heighten in a 1.5°C warmer world (Chapter 3). In African and Asian countries
35 where urbanisation rates are highest, these risks could expose and amplify pre-existing stresses related to
36 poverty, exclusion, and governance (Gore, 2015; Dodman et al., 2017; Jiang and O'Neill, 2017; Pelling et
37 al., 2018; Solecki et al., 2018). Through its impact on economic development and investment, urbanisation
38 often leads to increased consumption and environmental degradation and enhanced vulnerability, risk, and
39 impacts (Rosenzweig et al., 2018). In the absence of innovation, the combination of urbanisation and urban
40 economic development could contribute 226 GtCO₂ in emissions by 2050 (Bai et al., 2018). At the same
41 time, some new urban developments are demonstrating combined carbon and Sustainable Development
42 Goals (SDG) benefits (Wiktorowicz et al., 2018), and it is in towns and cities that building renovation rates
43 can be most easily accelerated to support the transition to 1.5°C pathways (Kuramochi et al., 2018),
44 including through voluntary programs (Van der Heijden, 2018).

45 46 **Urban Transformations and Emerging Climate-Resilient Development Pathways**

47 1.5°C pathways require action in all cities and urban contexts. Recent literature emphasises the need to
48 deliberate and negotiate how resilience and climate-resilient pathways can be fostered in the context of
49 people's daily lives, including the failings of everyday development such as unemployment, inadequate
50 housing, and growing informality, in order to acknowledge local priorities and foster transformative learning
51 (Vale, 2014; Shi et al., 2016; Harris et al., 2017; Ziervogel et al., 2017; Fazey et al., 2018; Macintyre et al.,
52 2018). Enhancing deliberate transformative capacities in urban contexts also entails new and relational forms
53 of envisioning agency, equity, resilience, social cohesion, and well-being (Gillard et al., 2016; Ziervogel et
54 al., 2016) (Section 5.5.3). Two examples of urban transformation are explored here.

1
2 The built environment, spatial planning, infrastructure, energy services, mobility, and urban-rural linkages
3 necessary in **rapidly growing cities in South Asia and Africa** in the next three decades present mitigation,
4 adaptation and development opportunities that are crucial for a 1.5°C world (Newman et al., 2017; Lwasa et
5 al., 2018; Teferi and Newman, 2018). Realising these opportunities would require the structural challenges
6 of poverty, weak and contested local governance, and low levels of local government investment to be
7 addressed on an unprecedented scale (Wachsmuth et al., 2016; Chu et al., 2017; van Noorloos and
8 Kloosterboer, 2017; Pelling et al., 2018).

9
10 Urban governance is critical to ensuring that the necessary urban transitions deliver economic growth and
11 equity (Hughes et al., 2018). The proximity of local governments to citizens and their needs can make them
12 powerful agents of climate action (Melica et al., 2018), but urban governance is enhanced when it involves
13 multiple actors (Ziervogel et al., 2016; Pelling et al., 2018), supportive national governments (Tait and
14 Euston-Brown, 2017) and sub-national climate networks (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1). Governance is
15 complicated for the urban population currently living in what is termed ‘informality’. This population is
16 expected to triple, to three billion, by 2050 (Satterthwaite et al., 2018), placing a significant portion of the
17 world’s population beyond the direct reach of formal climate mitigation and adaptation policies (Revi et al.,
18 2014). How to address the co-evolved and structural conditions that lead to urban informality and associated
19 vulnerability to 1.5°C of warming is a central question for this report. Brown and McGranahan (2016) cite
20 evidence that the informal urban “green economy” that has emerged out of necessity in the absence of formal
21 service provisions is frequently low-carbon and resource-efficient.

22
23 Realising the potential for low carbon transitions in informal urban settlements would require an express
24 recognition of the unpaid-for contributions of women in the informal economy, and new partnerships
25 between the state and communities (Ziervogel et al., 2017; Pelling et al., 2018; Satterthwaite et al., 2018).
26 There is no guarantee that these partnerships will evolve or cohere into the type of service delivery and
27 climate governance system that could steer the change on a scale required to limit to warming to 1.5°C
28 (Jaglin, 2014). However, transnational networks such as Shack/Slum Dwellers International, C40, the Global
29 Covenant of Mayors, and International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), as well as
30 efforts to combine in-country planning for Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) (Andonova et al.,
31 2017; Fuhr et al., 2018) with those taking place to support the New Urban Agenda and National Urban
32 Policies, represent one step towards realising the potential (Tait and Euston-Brown, 2017). So too do “old
33 urban agendas” such as slum upgrading and universal water and sanitation provision (McGranahan et al.,
34 2016; Satterthwaite, 2016; Satterthwaite et al., 2018).

35
36 **Transition Towns (TTs)** is a type of urban transformation mainly in high-income countries. The grassroots
37 TT movement (origin in the United Kingdom) combines adaptation, mitigation, and just transitions, mainly
38 at the level of communities and small towns. It now has >1,300 registered local initiatives in >40 countries
39 (Grossmann and Creamer, 2017), many of them in the United Kingdom, the United States, and other high-
40 income countries. TTs are described as ‘progressive localism’ (Cretney et al., 2016), aiming to foster a
41 ‘communitarian ecological citizenship’ that goes beyond changes in consumption and lifestyle (Kenis, 2016).
42 They aspire to promote equitable communities resilient to the impacts of climate change, peak oil, and
43 unstable global markets; re-localisation of production and consumption; and transition pathways to a post-
44 carbon future (Feola and Nunes, 2014; Evans and Phelan, 2016; Grossmann and Creamer, 2017).

45
46 TT initiatives typically pursue lifestyle-related low-carbon living and economies, food self-sufficiency,
47 energy efficiency through renewables, construction with locally-sourced material, and cottage industries
48 (Barnes, 2015; Staggenborg and Ogrodnik, 2015; Taylor Aiken, 2016). Social and iterative learning through
49 the collective involves dialogue, deliberation, capacity building, citizen science engagements, technical re-
50 skilling to increase self-reliance, for example canning and preserving food and permaculture, future
51 visioning, and emotional training to share difficulties and loss (Feola and Nunes, 2014; Barnes, 2015; Boke,
52 2015; Taylor Aiken, 2015; Kenis, 2016; Mehmood, 2016; Grossmann and Creamer, 2017).

53
54 Important conditions for successful transition groups include flexibility, participatory democracy, care ethics,

1 inclusiveness, and consensus-building, assuming bridging or brokering roles, and community alliances and
2 partnerships (Feola and Nunes, 2014; Mehmood, 2016; Taylor Aiken, 2016; Grossmann and Creamer, 2017).
3 Smaller scale rural initiatives allow for more experimentation (Cretney et al., 2016) while those in urban
4 centres benefit from stronger networks and proximity to power structures (North and Longhurst, 2013;
5 Nicolosi and Feola, 2016). Increasingly, TTs recognise the need to participate in policy making (Kenis and
6 Mathijs, 2014; Barnes, 2015).

7
8 Despite high self-ratings of success, some TT initiatives are too inwardly focused and geographically
9 isolated (Feola and Nunes, 2014) while others have difficulties in engaging marginalised, non-white, non-
10 middle-class community members (Evans and Phelan, 2016; Nicolosi and Feola, 2016; Grossmann and
11 Creamer, 2017). In the United Kingdom, expectations of innovations growing in scale (Taylor Aiken, 2015)
12 and carbon accounting methods required by funding bodies (Taylor Aiken, 2016) undermine local resilience
13 building. Tension between explicit engagements with climate change action and efforts to appeal to more
14 people have resulted in difficult trade-offs and strained member relations (Grossmann and Creamer, 2017)
15 though the contribution to changing an urban culture that prioritises climate change can be underestimated
16 (Wiktorowicz et al., 2018).

17
18 Urban actions that can highlight the 1.5°C agenda include individual actions within homes (Werfel, 2017;
19 Buntaine and Prather, 2018), demonstration zero carbon developments (Wiktorowicz et al., 2018), new
20 partnerships between communities, government and business to build mass transit and electrify transport
21 (Glazebrook and Newman, 2018), city plans to include climate outcomes (Millard-Ball, 2013), and support
22 for transformative change across political, professional, and sectoral divides (Bai et al., 2018).

23
24 [END CROSS-CHAPTER BOX 13 HERE]

25 26 27 **5.6 Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Development, Eradicating Poverty and Reducing** 28 **Inequalities in 1.5°C Warmer Worlds**

29
30 This chapter has described the fundamental, urgent, and systemic transformations that would be needed to
31 achieve sustainable development, eradicate poverty, and reduce inequalities in a 1.5°C warmer world, in
32 various contexts and across scales. In particular, it has highlighted the societal dimensions, putting at the
33 centre people's needs and aspirations in their specific contexts. Here, we synthesise some of the most
34 pertinent enabling conditions (see Glossary) to support these profound transformations. These conditions are
35 closely interlinked and connected by the overarching concept of governance, which broadly includes
36 institutional, socioeconomic, cultural, and technological elements (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 4 in
37 Chapter 1).

38 39 40 **5.6.1 Finance and Technology Aligned with Local Needs**

41
42 Significant gaps in green investment constrain transitions to a low-carbon economy aligned with
43 development objectives (Volz et al., 2015; Campiglio, 2016). Hence, unlocking new forms of public, private,
44 and public-private financing is essential to support environmental sustainability of the economic system
45 (Croce et al., 2011; Blyth et al., 2015; Falcone et al., 2018) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.5). To avoid risks of
46 undesirable trade-offs with the SDGs caused by national budget constraints, improved access to international
47 climate finance is essential for supporting adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development, especially for
48 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (Shine and Campillo, 2016;
49 Wood, 2017) (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Care needs to be taken when international donors or
50 partnership arrangements influence project financing structures (Kongsager and Corbera, 2015; Purdon,
51 2015; Ficklin et al., 2017; Phillips et al., 2017). Conventional climate funding schemes, especially the Clean
52 Development Mechanism (CDM), have shown positive effects on sustainable development but also adverse
53 consequences, for example on adaptive capacities of rural households and uneven distribution of costs and

1 benefits, often exacerbating inequalities (Aggarwal, 2014; Brohé, 2014; He et al., 2014; Schade and
2 Obergassel, 2014; Smits and Middleton, 2014; Wood et al., 2016a; Horstmann and Hein, 2017; Kreibich et
3 al., 2017) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). Close consideration of recipients' context-specific needs when
4 designing financial support helps to overcome these limitations as it better aligns community needs, national
5 policy objectives, and donors' priorities, puts the emphasis on the increase of transparency and predictability
6 of support, and fosters local capacity building (Barrett, 2013; Boyle et al., 2013; Shine and Campillo, 2016;
7 Ley, 2017; Sánchez and Izzo, 2017) (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

8
9 The development and transfer of technologies is another enabler for developing countries to contribute to the
10 requirements of the 1.5°C objective while achieving climate resilience and their socioeconomic development
11 goals (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.4). International-level governance would be needed to boost domestic
12 innovation and the deployment of new technologies such as Negative Emission Technologies toward the
13 1.5°C objective (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.7), but the alignment with local needs depends on close
14 consideration of the specificities of the domestic context in countries at all levels of development (de
15 Coninck and Sagar, 2015; IEA, 2015; Parikh et al., 2018). Technology transfer supporting development in
16 developing countries would require an understanding of local and national actors and institutions (de
17 Coninck and Puig, 2015; de Coninck and Sagar, 2017; Michaelowa et al., 2018), careful attention to the
18 capacities in the entire innovation chain (Khosla et al., 2017; Olawuyi, 2017), and transfer of not only
19 equipment but also knowledge (Murphy et al., 2015) (*medium evidence, high agreement*).

20 21 22 **5.6.2 Integration of Institutions**

23
24 Multi-level governance in climate change has emerged as a key enabler for systemic transformation and
25 effective governance (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1). On the one hand, low-carbon and climate-resilient
26 development actions are often well aligned at the lowest scale possible (Suckall et al., 2015; Sánchez and
27 Izzo, 2017), and informal, local institutions are critical in enhancing the adaptive capacity of countries and
28 marginalised communities (Yaro et al., 2015). On the other hand, international and national institutions can
29 provide incentives for projects to harness synergies and avoid trade-offs (Kongsager et al., 2016).

30
31 Governance approaches that coordinate and monitor multi-scale policy actions and trade-offs across sectoral,
32 local, national, regional, and international levels are therefore best suited to implement goals toward 1.5°C
33 warmer conditions and sustainable development (Ayers et al., 2014; Stringer et al., 2014; von Stechow et al.,
34 2016; Gwimbi, 2017; Hayward, 2017; Maor et al., 2017; Roger et al., 2017; Michaelowa et al., 2018).
35 Vertical and horizontal policy integration and coordination is essential to take into account the interplay and
36 trade-offs between sectors and spatial scales (Duguma et al., 2014; Naess et al., 2015; von Stechow et al.,
37 2015; Antwi-Agyei et al., 2017a; Di Gregorio et al., 2017; Runhaar et al., 2018), enable the dialogue
38 between local communities and institutional bodies (Colenbrander et al., 2016), and involve non-state actors
39 such as business, local governments, and civil society operating across different scales (Hajer et al., 2015;
40 Labriet et al., 2015; Hale, 2016; Pelling et al., 2016; Kalafatis, 2017; Lyon, 2018) (*robust evidence, high
41 agreement*).

42 43 44 **5.6.3 Inclusive Processes**

45
46 Inclusive governance processes are critical for preparing for a 1.5°C warmer world (Fazey et al., 2018;
47 O'Brien, 2018; Patterson et al., 2018). These processes have been shown to serve the interests of diverse
48 groups of people and enhance empowerment of often excluded stakeholders, notably women and youth,
49 (MRFCJ, 2015a; Dumont et al., 2017). They also enhance social and co-learning which, in turn, facilitates
50 accelerated and adaptive management and the scaling up of capacities for resilience building (Ensor and
51 Harvey, 2015; Reij and Winterbottom, 2015; Tschakert et al., 2016; Binam et al., 2017; Dumont et al., 2017;
52 Fazey et al., 2018; Lyon, 2018; O'Brien, 2018), and provides opportunities to blend indigenous, local, and
53 scientific knowledge (Antwi-Agyei et al., 2017a; Coe et al., 2017; Thornton and Comberti, 2017) (see
54 Chapter 4, Section 4.3.5.5, Box 4.3; Section 5.3) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). Such co-learning has

1 been effective in improving deliberative decision-making processes that incorporate different values and
2 world views (Cundill et al., 2014; C. Butler et al., 2016; Ensor, 2016; Fazey et al., 2016; Gorrdard et al.,
3 2016; Aipira et al., 2017; Fook, 2017; Maor et al., 2017), and create space for negotiating diverse interests
4 and preferences (O'Brien et al., 2015; Gillard et al., 2016; DeCaro et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2017; Lahn,
5 2017) (*robust evidence, high agreement*).

6 7 8 **5.6.4 Attention to Issues of Power and Inequality**

9
10 Societal transformations to limit global warming to 1.5°C and strive for equity and well-being for all are not
11 power neutral (Section 5.5.3). Development preferences are often shaped by powerful interests that
12 determine the direction and pace of change, anticipated benefits and beneficiaries, and acceptable and
13 unacceptable trade-offs (Newell et al., 2014; Fazey et al., 2016; Tschakert et al., 2016; Winkler and Dubash,
14 2016; Wood et al., 2016b; Karlsson et al., 2017; Quan et al., 2017; Tanner et al., 2017). Each development
15 pathway, including legacies and path dependencies, creates its own set of opportunities and challenges and
16 winners and losers, both within and across countries (Figure 5.5) (Mathur et al., 2014; Ficklin et al., 2017;
17 Phillips et al., 2017; Stringer et al., 2017; Wood, 2017; Gajjar et al., 2018) (*robust evidence, high*
18 *agreement*).

19
20 Addressing the uneven distribution of power is critical to ensure that societal transformation toward a 1.5°C
21 warmer world does not exacerbate poverty and vulnerability or create new injustices but rather encourages
22 equitable transformational change (Patterson et al., 2018). Equitable outcomes are enhanced when they pay
23 attention to just outcomes for those negatively affected by change (Newell et al., 2014; Dilling et al., 2015;
24 Naess et al., 2015; Sovacool et al., 2015; Cervigni and Morris, 2016; Keohane and Victor, 2016) and
25 promote human rights, increase equality, and reduce power asymmetries within societies (UNRISD, 2016;
26 Robinson and Shine, 2018) (*robust evidence, high agreement*).

27 28 29 **5.6.5 Reconsidering Values**

30
31 The profound transformations that would be needed to integrate sustainable development and 1.5°C-
32 compatible pathways call for examining the values, ethics, attitudes, and behaviours that underpin societies
33 (Hartzell-Nichols, 2017; O'Brien, 2018; Patterson et al., 2018). Infusing values that promote sustainable
34 development (Holden et al., 2017), overcome individual economic interests and go beyond economic growth
35 (Hackmann, 2016), encourage desirable and transformative visions (Tàbara et al., 2018), and care for the less
36 fortunate (Howell and Allen, 2017) is part and parcel of climate-resilient and sustainable development
37 pathways. This entails helping societies and individuals to strive for sufficiency in resource consumption
38 within planetary boundaries alongside sustainable and equitable well-being (O'Neill et al., 2018). Navigating
39 1.5°C societal transformations, characterised by action from local to global, stresses the core commitment to
40 social justice, solidarity, and cooperation, particularly regarding the distribution of responsibilities, rights,
41 and mutual obligations between nations (Patterson et al., 2018; Robinson and Shine, 2018) (*medium*
42 *evidence, high agreement*).

43 44 45 **5.7 Synthesis and Research Gaps**

46
47 The assessment in Chapter 5 illustrates that limiting global warming to 1.5°C is fundamentally connected
48 with achieving sustainable development, poverty eradication, and reducing inequalities. It shows that
49 avoided impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C temperature stabilisation would make it easier to achieve many
50 aspects of sustainable development, although important risks would remain at 1.5°C (Section 5.2). Synergies
51 between adaptation and mitigation response measures with sustainable development and the Sustainable
52 Development Goals (SDGs) can often be enhanced when attention is paid to well-being and equity while,
53 when unaddressed, poverty and inequalities may be exacerbated (Section 5.3 and 5.4). Climate-resilient

1 development pathways (CRDPs) open up routes toward socially desirable futures that are sustainable and
2 liveable, but concrete evidence reveals complex trade-offs along a continuum of different pathways,
3 highlighting the role of societal values, internal contestations, and political dynamics (Section 5.5). The
4 transformations towards sustainable development in a 1.5°C warmer world, in all contexts, involve
5 fundamental societal and systemic changes over time and across scale, and a set of enabling conditions
6 without which the dual goal is difficult if not impossible to achieve (Sections 5.5 and 5.6).

7
8 This assessment is supported by growing knowledge on the linkages between a 1.5°C warmer world and
9 different dimensions of sustainable development. However, several gaps in the literature remain:

10
11 Limited evidence exists that explicitly examines the real-world implications of a 1.5°C warmer world (and
12 overshoots) as well as avoided impacts between 1.5°C versus 2°C for the SDGs and sustainable development
13 more broadly. Few projections are available for households, livelihoods, and communities. And literature on
14 differential localised impacts and their cross-sector interacting and cascading effects with multidimensional
15 patterns of societal vulnerability, poverty, and inequalities remains scarce. Hence, caution is needed when
16 global-level conclusions about adaptation and mitigation measures in a 1.5°C warmer world are applied to
17 sustainable development in local, national, and regional settings.

18
19 Limited literature has systematically evaluated context-specific synergies and trade-offs between and across
20 adaptation and mitigation response measures in 1.5°C-compatible pathways and the SDGs. This hampers the
21 ability to inform decision-making and fair and robust policy packages adapted to different local, regional, or
22 national circumstances. More research is required to understand how trade-offs and synergies will intensify
23 or decrease, differentially across geographic regions and time, in a 1.5°C warmer world and as compared to
24 higher temperatures.

25
26 Limited availability of interdisciplinary studies also poses a challenge for connecting the socio-economic
27 transformations and the governance aspects of low-emission, climate-resilient transformations. For example,
28 it remains unclear how governance structures enable or hinder different groups of people and countries to
29 negotiate pathway options, values, and priorities.

30
31 The literature does not demonstrate the existence of 1.5°C-compatible pathways achieving the “universal and
32 indivisible” agenda of the 17 SDGs, and hence does not show whether and how the nature and pace of
33 changes that would be required to meet 1.5°C climate stabilisation could be fully synergetic with all the
34 SDGs.

35
36 The literature on low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways in local, regional, and national
37 contexts is growing. Yet, the lack of standard indicators to monitor such pathways makes it difficult to
38 compare evidence grounded in specific contexts with differential circumstances and therefore to derive
39 generic lessons on the outcome of decisions on specific indicators. This knowledge gap poses a challenge for
40 connecting local-level visions with global-level trajectories to better understand key conditions for societal
41 and systems transformations that reconcile urgent climate action with well-being for all.

1 Frequently Asked Questions

2
3 **FAQ 5.1:** What are the connections between sustainable development and limiting global warming to
4 1.5°C?

5
6 **Summary:** *Sustainable development seeks to meet the needs of people living today without compromising the*
7 *needs of future generations, while balancing social, economic and environmental considerations. The 17 UN*
8 *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include targets for eradicating poverty; ensuring health, energy and*
9 *food security; reducing inequality; protecting ecosystems; pursuing sustainable cities and economies; and a*
10 *goal for climate action (SDG13). Climate change affects the ability to achieve sustainable development*
11 *goals and limiting warming to 1.5°C will help meet some sustainable development targets. Pursuing*
12 *sustainable development will influence emissions, impacts and vulnerabilities. Responses to climate change*
13 *in the form of adaptation and mitigation will also interact with sustainable development with positive effects,*
14 *known as synergies, or negative effects, known as trade-offs. Responses to climate change can be planned to*
15 *maximize synergies and limit trade-offs with sustainable development.*

16
17 For more than 25 years, the United Nations (UN) and other international organizations have embraced the
18 concept of sustainable development to promote wellbeing and meet the needs of today's population without
19 compromising the needs of future generations. This concept spans economic, social and environmental
20 objectives including poverty and hunger alleviation, equitable economic growth, access to resources, and the
21 protection of water, air and ecosystems. Between 1990 and 2015, the UN monitored a set of eight
22 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). They reported progress in reducing poverty, easing hunger and
23 child mortality, and improving access to clean water and sanitation. But with millions remaining in poor
24 health, living in poverty, and facing serious problems associated with climate change, pollution and land use
25 change, the UN decided that more needed to be done. In 2015, the UN *Sustainable Development Goals*
26 (SDGs) were endorsed as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The 17 SDGs (Figure FAQ
27 5.1) apply to all countries and have a timeline for success by 2030. The SDGs seek to eliminate extreme
28 poverty and hunger; ensure health, education, peace, safe water, and clean energy for all; promote inclusive
29 and sustainable consumption, cities, infrastructure and economic growth; reduce inequality including gender
30 inequality; combat climate change and protect oceans and terrestrial ecosystems.

31
32 Climate change and sustainable development are fundamentally connected. Previous IPCC reports found that
33 climate change can undermine sustainable development, and that well-designed mitigation and adaptation
34 responses can support poverty alleviation, food security, healthy ecosystems, equality and other dimensions
35 of sustainable development. Limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require mitigation actions and
36 adaptation measures to be taken at all levels. These adaptation and mitigation actions would include reducing
37 emissions and increasing resilience through technology and infrastructure choices, as well as changing
38 behaviour and policy. These actions can interact with sustainable development objectives in positive ways
39 that strengthen sustainable development, known as *synergies*. Or negative ways, where sustainable
40 development is hindered or reversed, known as *trade-offs*.

41
42 An example of a synergy is sustainable forest management, which can prevent emissions from deforestation
43 and take up carbon to reduce warming at reasonable cost. It can work synergistically with other dimensions
44 of sustainable development by providing food (SDG 2), cleaning water (SDG 6) and protecting ecosystems
45 (SDG 15). Other examples of synergies are when climate adaptation measures, such as coastal or agricultural
46 projects, empower women and benefit local incomes, health and ecosystems.

47
48 An example of a trade-off can occur if ambitious climate change mitigation compatible with 1.5°C changes
49 land use in ways that have negative impacts on sustainable development. An example could be turning
50 natural forests, agricultural areas, or land under indigenous or local ownership to plantations for bioenergy
51 production. If not managed carefully, such changes could undermine dimensions of sustainable development
52 by threatening food and water security, creating conflict over land rights, and causing biodiversity loss.
53 Another trade-off could occur for some countries, assets, workers, and infrastructure already in place if a

1 switch is made from fossil fuels to other energy sources without adequate planning for such a transition.
 2 Trade-offs can be minimised if effectively managed as when care is taken to improve bioenergy crop yields
 3 to reduce harmful land-use change or where workers are retrained for employment in lower carbon sectors.
 4

5 Limiting temperatures to 1.5°C can make it much easier to achieve the SDGs, but it is also possible that
 6 pursuing the SDGs could result in trade-offs with efforts to limit climate change. There are trade-offs when
 7 people escaping from poverty and hunger consume more energy or land and thus increase emissions, or if
 8 goals for economic growth and industrialization increase fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas
 9 emissions. Conversely, efforts to reduce poverty and gender inequalities, and to enhance food, health and
 10 water security can reduce vulnerability to climate change. Other synergies can occur when coastal and ocean
 11 ecosystem protection reduces the impacts of climate change on these systems. The sustainable development
 12 goal of affordable and clean energy (SDG 7) specifically targets access to renewable energy and energy
 13 efficiency, important to ambitious mitigation and limiting warming to 1.5°C.
 14

15 The link between sustainable development and limiting global warming to 1.5°C is recognized by the
 16 Sustainable Development Goal for climate action (SDG 13) which seeks to combat climate change and its
 17 impacts while acknowledging that the UNFCCC is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for
 18 negotiating the global response to climate change.
 19

20 The challenge is to put in place sustainable development policies and actions that reduce deprivation,
 21 alleviate poverty and ease ecosystem degradation while also lowering emissions, reducing climate change
 22 impacts and facilitating adaptation. It is important to strengthen synergies and minimize trade-offs when
 23 planning climate change adaptation and mitigation actions. Unfortunately, not all trade-offs can be avoided
 24 or minimised, but careful planning and implementation can build the enabling conditions for long-term
 25 sustainable development.
 26

FAQ5.1: The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The link between sustainable development and limiting global warming to 1.5°C is recognised by the Sustainable Development Goal for climate action (SDG 13)



27 **FAQ 5.1, Figure 1:** Climate change action is one of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and is
 28 connected to sustainable development more broadly. Actions to reduce climate risk can interact with other sustainable
 29 development objectives in positive ways (synergies) and negative ways (trade-offs).
 30
 31
 32

1
2 **FAQ 5.2:** What are the pathways to achieving poverty reduction and reducing inequalities while reaching
3 the 1.5°C world?
4

5 ***Summary:** There are ways to limit global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Of the pathways
6 that exist, some simultaneously achieve sustainable development. They entail a mix of measures that lower
7 emissions and reduce the impacts of climate change, while contributing to poverty eradication and reducing
8 inequalities. Which pathways are possible and desirable will differ between and within regions and nations.
9 This is due to the fact that development progress to date has been uneven and climate-related risks are
10 unevenly distributed. Flexible governance would be needed to ensure that such pathways are inclusive, fair,
11 and equitable to avoid poor and disadvantaged populations becoming worse off. ‘Climate-Resilient
12 Development Pathways’ (CRDPs) offer possibilities to achieve both equitable and low-carbon futures.
13*

14 Issues of equity and fairness have long been central to climate change and sustainable development. Equity,
15 like equality, aims to promote justness and fairness for all. This is not necessarily the same as treating
16 everyone equally, since not everyone comes from the same starting point. Often used interchangeably with
17 fairness and justice, equity implies implementing different actions in different places, all with a view to
18 creating an equal world that is fair for all and where no one is left behind.
19

20 The Paris Agreement states that it “will be implemented to reflect equity... in the light of different national
21 circumstances” and calls for “rapid reductions” of greenhouse gases to be achieved “on the basis of equity,
22 and in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty”. Similarly, the United
23 Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include targets to reduce poverty and inequalities, and to
24 ensure equitable and affordable access to health, water, and energy for all.
25

26 The principles of equity and fairness are important for considering pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C in a
27 way that is liveable for every person and species. They recognise the uneven development status between
28 richer and poorer nations, the uneven distribution of climate impacts (including on future generations), and
29 the uneven capacity of different nations and people to respond to climate risks. This is particularly true for
30 those who are highly vulnerable to climate change such as indigenous communities in the Arctic, people
31 whose livelihoods depend on agriculture or coastal and marine ecosystems, and inhabitants of small-island
32 developing states. The poorest people will continue to experience climate change through the loss of income
33 and livelihood opportunities, hunger, adverse health effects, and displacement.
34

35 Well-planned adaptation and mitigation measures are essential to avoid exacerbating inequalities or creating
36 new injustices. Pathways that are compatible with limiting warming to 1.5°C and aligned with the SDGs
37 consider mitigation and adaptation options that reduce inequalities in terms of who benefits, who pays the
38 costs, and who is affected by possible negative consequences. Attention to equity ensures that disadvantaged
39 people can secure their livelihoods and live in dignity, and that those who experience mitigation or
40 adaptation costs have financial and technical support to enable fair transitions.
41


42 Climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) describe trajectories that pursue the dual goal of limiting
43 warming to 1.5°C while strengthening sustainable development. This includes eradicating poverty as well as
44 reducing vulnerabilities and inequalities for regions, countries, communities, businesses, and cities. These
45 trajectories entail a mix of adaptation and mitigation measures consistent with profound societal and systems
46 transformations. The goals are to meet the short-term SDGs, achieve longer-term sustainable development,
47 reduce emissions toward net zero around the middle of the century, build resilience and enhance human
48 capacities to adapt, all while paying close attention to equity and well-being for all.
49

50 The characteristics of CRDPs will differ across communities and nations, and will be based on deliberations
51 with a diverse range of people, including those most affected by climate change and by possible routes
52 toward transformation. For this reason, there are no standard methods for designing CRDPs or for
53 monitoring their progress toward climate-resilient futures. However, examples from around the world
54 demonstrate that flexible and inclusive governance structures and broad participation often help support

1 iterative decision-making, continuous learning, and experimentation. Such inclusive processes can also help
 2 to overcome weak institutional arrangements and power structures that may further exacerbate inequalities.
 3

FAQ5.2: Climate-resilient development pathways

Decision-making that achieves the United Nation Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), lowers greenhouse gas emissions, limits global warming, and enhances adaptation, could help lead to a climate-resilient world












4
 5 **FAQ 5.2, Figure 1:** Climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) describe trajectories that pursue the dual goal of
 6 limiting warming to 1.5°C while strengthening sustainable development. Decision-making that achieves the SDGs,
 7 lowers greenhouse gas emissions and limits global warming could help lead to a climate-resilient world, within the
 8 context of enhancing adaptation.

9
 10 Ambitious actions already underway around the world can offer insight into CRDPs for limiting warming to
 11 1.5°C. For example, some countries have adopted clean energy and sustainable transport while creating
 12 environmentally friendly jobs and supporting social welfare programs to reduce domestic poverty. Other
 13 examples teach us about different ways to promote development through practices inspired by community
 14 values. For instance, *Buen Vivir*, a Latin American concept based on indigenous ideas of communities living
 15 in harmony with nature, is aligned with peace, diversity, solidarity, rights to education, health, and safe food,
 16 water, and energy, and well-being and justice for all. The Transition Movement, with origins in Europe,
 17 promotes equitable and resilient communities through low-carbon living, food self-sufficiency, and citizen
 18 science. Such examples indicate that pathways that reduce poverty and inequalities while limiting warming
 19 to 1.5°C are possible and that they can provide guidance on pathways towards socially desirable, equitable,
 20 and low-carbon futures.

21
 22
 23

1 INSERT TABLE 5.2 HERE
2
3 **Table 5.2:** Mitigation – SDG table
4










	1 ENERGY					2 FOOD SECURITY					3 GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING					4 QUALITY EDUCATION					
	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	
Industry	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	↑	[+2]	Reduces poverty	★★★	[0]	No direct interaction	↑	[+2]	Air, water pollution reduction and better health (3.9)	★★	↑	[+1]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★	↑	[+1]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★	★★	
				% of people living below poverty line declines from 49% to 18% in South African context.							People living in the deprived communities feel positive and predict considerable financial savings. Efficiency changes in the industrial sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in industrial demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. In extractive industries there is trade off unless strategically managed. Behavioral changes in the industrial sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in industrial demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.				Awareness, knowledge and technical and managerial capability are closely linked, energy audit , information for trade unions, product /appliance labeling help in sustianbility education						
				Altieri et al (2016)								Xi et al. (2013), Zhang et al. (2015), Vassolo and Doell (2005); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016); Nguyen et al. (2014)				Fernando et al. (2016), Apearing and Thollandar (2013), Roy et al. (2018)					
	Low-carbon fuel switch	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	↑	[+2]	water and air pollution reduction and better health (3.9)	★★	↑	[+1]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★	↑	[+1]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★	★★	
										Industries are becoming supplier of energy, waste heat , water, roof tops for solar energy generation and hence helping in improving air and water quality.				New technplogy deployment creates demand for awareness, knowledge with technical and managerial capability otherwise acts as barrier for rapid expansion.							
										Vassolo and Doell (2005); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016); Nguyen et al (2014), Karner et al (2015)				Fernando et al. (2016), Apeaning and Thollandar (2013), Roy et al. (2018)							
	Decarbonisation/ CCS/CCU	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	↓	[-1]	Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)	★★★	↓	[0]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★★	↓	[0]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★★	★★★	
										There is a risk of CO2 leakage both from geological formations as well as from the transportation infrastructure from source to sequestration locations.				No direct interaction							
										IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Atchley et al. (2013); Apps et al. (2010); Siirila et al. (2012); Wang and Jaffe (2004); Koorneef et al. (2011); Singh et al. (2011); Hertwich et al. (2008); Weltman et al. (2010); Corsten et al.(2013)											
Buildings	Behaviorial response	↑	[+2]	Poverty reduction via financial savings (1.1)	★★★	[0]	No direct interaction	↑	[+2]	Improved warmth and comforts	★★★	↑	[0]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★★	↑	[0]	Technical education, vocational training, education for sustainability (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7)	★★★	★★★	
				People living in the deprived communities feel positive and predict considerable financial savings.							Home occupants reported warmth as the most important aspect of comfort which were largely temperature-related and low in energy costs. Residents living in the deprived areas expect improved warmth in their properties after energy efficiency measures are employed.				No direct interaction						
				Scott, Jones, and Webb (2014)							Scott, Jones, and Webb (2014); Huebner, Cooper, and Jones (2013); Yue, Long, and Chen (2013); Zhao et al. 2017										
	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	↑ / ↓	[+2, -1]	Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)	★★★	↑	[+2]	Food Security (2.1)	★★	↑	[+2]	Healthy lives and well-being for all at all ages(3.2, 3.9)	★★★★	↑	[+2]	Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)	★★	↑	[+2]	Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)	★★
				Energy efficiency interventions lead to cost savings which are realized due to reduced energy bills that further lead to poverty reduction. Participants with low incomes experience greater benefits. Energy efficiency and biomass strategies benefited poor more than wind and solar whose benefits are captured by industry. carbon mitigation can increase or decrease inequalities. The distributional costs of new energy policies (e.g., supporting renewables and energy efficiency) are dependent on instrument design. If costs fall disproportionately on the poor, then this could impair progress toward universal energy access and, by extension, counteract the fight to eliminate poverty. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018), Smart Home Technology				Using the improved stoves supports local food security and has significantly impacted on food security. By making fuel lasting longer, the improved stoves also help improve food security and provide a better buffer against fuel shortages induced by climate change-related events such as droughts, floods or hurricanes (Berrueta et al. 2017).				Efficient cookstove improves health especially for indigenous and poor rural communities. Household energy efficiency has positive health impacts on children's respiratory health, weight, and susceptibility to illness, and the mental health of adults. Household energy efficiency improves winter warmth, lowers relative humidity with benefits for cardiovascular and respiratory health. Further improved Indoor Air Quality by thermal regulation and occupant comfort are realised. However in one instance negative health impacts (asthma) of increased household energy efficiency were also noted when housing upgrades take place without changes in occupant behaviours. Home occupants reported warmth as the most important aspect of comfort which were largely temperature-related and low in energy costs. Residents living in the deprived areas expect improved warmth in their properties after energy efficiency measures are employed.				Household energy efficiency measures reduce school absences for children with asthma due to indoor pollution					
				Maidment et al. (2014); Scott, Jones, and Webb (2014); Berrueta et al. (2017); McCollum et al. (2018); Cameron et al. (2016); Casillas and Kammen (2012); Fay et al. (2015); Hallegate et al. (2016); Hirth and Ueckerdt (2013); Jakob and Steckel (2014); Casillas et al (2012)				Berrueta et al. (2017)													
	Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	↑	[+2]	Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)	★★★★	~ / ↓	[0, -1]	Food Security and Agricultural Productivity (2.1/2.4)	★★	↑	[+2]	Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)	★★★★	↑	[+1]	Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)	★★	↑	[+1]	Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)	★★
				Access to modern energy forms (electricity, clean cook-stoves, high-quality lighting) is fundamental to human development since the energy services made possible by them help alleviate chronic and persistent poverty. Strength of the impact varies in the literature. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)				Modern energy access is critical to enhance agricultural yields/productivity, decrease post-harvest losses, and mechanize agri-processing - all of which can aid food security. However, large-scale bioenergy and food production may compete for scarce land and other inputs (e.g., water, fertilizers), depending on how and where biomass supplies are grown and the indirect land use change impacts that result. If not implemented thoughtfully, this could lead to higher food prices globally, and thus reduced access to affordable food for the poor. Enhanced agricultural productivities can ameliorate the situation by allowing as much bioenergy to be produced on as little land as possible.				Access to modern energy services can contribute to fewer injuries and diseases related to traditional solid fuel collection and burning, as well as utilization of kerosene lanterns. Access to modern energy services can facilitate improved health care provision, medicine and vaccine storage, utilization of powered medical equipment, and dissemination of health-related information and education. Such services can also enable thermal comfort in homes and contribute to food preservation and safety. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)				Access to modern energy is necessary for schools to have quality lighting and thermal comfort, as well as modern information and communication technologies. Access to modern lighting and energy allows for studying after sundown and frees constraints on time management that allow for higher school enrollment rates and better literacy outcomes. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)					
				McCollum et al. (2018); Bonan et al. (2014); Burlig and Preonas (2016); Casillas and Kammen (2010); Cook (2011); Kirubi et al. (2009); Pachauri et al. (2012); Pueyo et al. (2013); Rao et al. (2014); Zulu and Richardson, 2013; Pode, 2013				McCollum et al. (2018); Asaduzzaman et al. (2010); Cabraal et al. (2005); Finco and Doppler (2010); Hasegawa et al. (2015); Lotze-Campen et al. (2014); Msangi et al. (2010); Smith et al. (2013); Smith, P. et al. (2014); Sola et al. (2016); Tilman et al. (2009); van Vuuren et al. (2009)													

Transport	Behavioural response	Equal right to economic resources access basic services (1.1,1.4,1.a, 1.b)	Ensure Access to Safe Nutritious Food (2.1; 2.2)	Road Traffic Accidents (3.4/3.6)	Equal Safe Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)
	<p>Equal right to economic resources access basic services (1.1,1.4,1.a, 1.b)  The costs of daily mobility can have important economic stress impacts not only impacting carless family with low-mobility, but in countries with high levels of car dependence, the costs of motoring can be burdensome, raising questions of affordability for households with limited economic resources. During economic crisis public transport authorities may react by reducing levels of service and increasing fares, likely exacerbating the situation for low-income households.</p> <p>Dodson et al. (2004); Cascajo et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Ensure Access to Safe Nutritious Food (2.1; 2.2)  Low-income community residents (non-white) who lack local access to affordable, quality sources of nutrition have to travel outside their immediate neighborhood to find better sources of food to feed themselves and their families. Lack of locally available healthy food often exacerbates the rates of obesity in many of these communities since it is often difficult or expensive to travel long distances on a regular basis to shop for food.</p> <p>Lowery et al. (2016); Hillier et al. (2011); Krukowski et al. (2013); LeDoux and Vojnovic (2013); Zenk et al. (2014); Ghosh-Dastidar et al. (2014); Clifton (2004)</p>	<p>Road Traffic Accidents (3.4/3.6)  Active travel modes' (such as walking and cycling) represent strategies not only for boosting energy efficiency but also, potentially, for improving health and well-being (e.g., lowering rates of diabetes, obesity, heart disease, dementia, and some cancers). However, a risk associated with these measures is that they could increase rates of road traffic accidents, if the provided infrastructure is unsatisfactory. Overall health effects will depend on the severity of the injuries sustained from these potential accidents relative to the health benefits accruing from increased exercise (McCollum et al., 2018).</p> <p>McCollum et al. (2018); Creutzig et al. (2012); Haines and Dora (2012); Saunders et al. (2013); Shaw et al. (2014); Woodcock et al. (2009); Shaw et al. (2017); Chakrabarti and Shin (2017); Hunag et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Equal Safe Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)  Differences in road ways affects school travel safety, collaborative efforts need to address safety issues from a dual perspective, first by working to change the existing infrastructure and use of roads to better address the traffic problems that children currently face walking to school, and then to better site schools and better control the roadways and land uses around them in the future</p> <p>Chia-Yuan Yu (2015)</p>	
Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	<p>End Poverty in all its forms everywhere (1.1,1.4,1.a, 1.b)  Decarbonisation of public bus in Sweden is receiving attention more than efficiency improvement. With more electrification electricity price goes up and affordability can worsen for poor unless redistributive policies are in place.</p> <p>Xylia et al (2017)</p>	[0]	<p>Reduce illnesses from hazardous air, water and soil pollution (3.9)  Locally relevant policies targeting traffic reductions and ambitious diffusion of electric vehicles results in measured changes in non-climatic population exposure included ambient air pollution, physical activity, and noise. The transition to low-carbon equitable and sustainable transport can be fostered by numerous short- and medium-term strategies that would benefit energy security, health, productivity, and sustainability. Evidence-based approach that takes into account greenhouse gas emissions, ambient air pollutants, economic factors (affordability, cost optimisation), social factors (poverty alleviations, public health benefits), and political acceptability is needed tackle these challenges.</p> <p>Schucht et al. (2015); Figueroa et al. (2014); Peng et al. (2017); Klausbruckner et al. (2016)</p>	[0]	
Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	<p>End Poverty in all its forms everywhere (1.1,1.4,1.a, 1.b)  Increasingly volatile global oil prices have raised concerns for the vulnerability of households to fuel price increases. Pricing measures as a key component of sustainable transport policy need to consider equity. Pro-poor mitigation policies are needed to reduce climate impact reduce threat; for example investing more and better in infrastructure by leveraging private resources and using designs that account for future climate change and the related uncertainty. Communities in poor areas cope with and adapt to multiple-stressors including climate change. Coping strategies provide short-term relief but in the long-term may negatively affect development goals. And responses generate a trade-off between adaptation, mitigation and development. African cities with slums and due to high commuting costs many walk to work places which limit access. In Latin America tripple informality leading to low productivity and living standards.</p> <p>Dodson and Sipe (2007); Hallegate et al. (2015); Suckall, Tompkins, and Stringer (2014); Lall, Henderson, and Venables (2017); Corporacion Andina de Fomento (2017); Klausbruckner et al. (2016)</p>	<p>Ensure Access to Food Security (2.1, 2.3, 2.a, 2.b,2.c)  21 projects aiming at resilient transport infrastructure development to improve access (e.g. C40 Cities Clean Bus Declaration, UITP Declaration on Climate Leadership, Cycling Delivers on the Global Goals, Global Sidewalk Challenge) do not substantially contribute to realizing the (indirect) transport targets with mostly a rural focus: Agricultural Productivity (SDG 2) and Access to Safe Drinking Water (SDG 6)</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017)</p>	<p>Reduce illnesses from hazardous air pollution (3.9)  Projects aiming at resilient transport infrastructure development (e.g. C40 Cities Clean Bus Declaration, UITP Declaration on Climate Leadership, Cycling Delivers on the Global Goals, Global Sidewalk Challenge) are targeting at reducing airpollution, Electric vehicles using electricity from renewables or low carbon sources combined with e-mobility options such as trolleybuses, metros, trams and electro buses, as well as promote walking and biking, especially for short distances need consideration</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017); Ajanovic (2015)</p>	[0]	

		1 ENERGY				2 AIR QUALITY				3 CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND RISK				4 HEALTH AND WELL-BEING							
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE					
Replacing coal	Non-biomass renewables solar, wind, hydro	↑	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]		No direct interaction			↑	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	↑	[+1]	■■	⊕	★
		Deployment of renewable energy and improvements in energy efficiency globally will aid climate change mitigation efforts, and this, in turn, can help to reduce the exposure of the world's poor to climate-related extreme events, negative health impacts, and other environmental shocks (McCollum et al., 2018).										Promoting most types of renewables and boosting efficiency greatly aid the achievement of targets to reduce local air pollution and improve air quality; however, the order of magnitude of the effects, both in terms of avoided emissions and monetary valuation, varies significantly between different parts of the world. Benefits would especially accrue to those living in the dense urban centers of rapidly developing countries. Utilization of biomass and biofuels might not lead to any air pollution benefits, however, depending on the control measures applied. In addition, household air quality can be significantly improved through lowered particulate emissions from access to modern energy services (McCollum et al., 2018).					Decentralized renewable energy systems (e.g., home- or village-scale solar power) can support education and vocational training.				
		McCollum et al. (2018); Hallegatte et al. (2016); IPCC (2014); Riahi et al. (2012)										McCollum et al. (2018); Anenberg et al. (2013); Chaturvedi and Shukla (2014); Haines et al. (2007); IEA (2016); Kaygusuz (2011); Nemet et al. (2010); Rafaj et al. (2013); Rao et al. (2013); Rao et al. (2016); Riahi et al. (2012); Rose et al. (2014); Smith and Sagar (2014); van Vliet et al. (2012); West et al. (2013)					Anderson A., Loomba P., Orajaka I., Numfor J., Saha S., Janko S., Johnson N., Podmore R., Larsen R. (2017)				
Increased use of biomass		↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	■■■	⊕⊕	★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	↑	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]				
		Large-scale bioenergy production could lead to the creation of agricultural jobs, as well higher farm wages and more diversified income streams for farmers. Modern energy access can make marginal lands more cultivable, thus potentially generating on-farm jobs and incomes; on the other hand, greater farm mechanization can also displace labor. On the other hand, large-scale bioenergy production could alter the structure of global agricultural markets in a way that is, potentially, unfavorable to small-scale food producers. see SDG2 (McCollum et al., 2018).					Farm Employment and Incomes (2.3) Large-scale bioenergy production could lead to the creation of agricultural jobs, as well higher farm wages and more diversified income streams for farmers. Modern energy access can make marginal lands more cultivable, thus potentially generating on-farm jobs and incomes; on the other hand, greater farm mechanization can also displace labor. On the other hand, large-scale bioenergy production could alter the structure of global agricultural markets in a way that is, potentially, unfavorable to small-scale food producers. The distributional effects of bioenergy production are underexplored in the literature (McCollum et al., 2018).					Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4), Air Pollution (3.9) Replacing coal by biomass can reduce adverse impacts of upstream supply-chain activities, in particular local air and water pollution, and prevent coal mining accidents. Improvements to local air pollution in power generation compared to coal-fired power plants depend on the technology and fuel of biomass powerplants, but could be significant when switching from outdated coal combustion technologies to state-of-the-art biogas power generation.					No direct interaction				
		McCollum et al. (2018); Balishter et al. (1991); Creutzig et al. (2013); de Moraes et al. (2010); Gohin (2008); Rud (2012); Satolo and Bacchi (2013); van der Horst and Vermeylen (2011); Corbera and Pascual (2012); Creutzig et al. (2013); Davis et al. (2013); van der Horst and Vermeylen (2011); Muys et al. (2014); Ertem, Kappler, and Neubauer (2017)					McCollum et al. (2018); Balishter et al. (1991); Creutzig et al. (2013); de Moraes et al. (2010); Gohin (2008); Rud (2012); Satolo and Bacchi (2013); van der Horst and Vermeylen (2011); Corbera and Pascual (2012); Creutzig et al. (2013); Davis et al. (2013); van der Horst and Vermeylen (2011); Muys et al. (2014); Ertem, Kappler, and Neubauer (2017)					IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Koorneef et al. (2011); Singh et al. (2011); Hertwich et al. (2008); Veltman et al. (2010); Corsten et al. (2013); Ashworth et al. (2012); Einsiedel et al. (2013); IPCC (2005); Miller et al. (2007); de Best-Waldhober et al. (2009); Shackley et al. (2009); Wong-Parodi and Ray (2009); Waöquist et al. (2009, 2010); Reiner and Nuttall (2011); Epstein et al. (2010); Burgherr et al. (2012); Chen et al. (2012); Chan and Griffiths (2010); Asfaw et al. (2013)									
Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear		[0]					[0]		No direct interaction			↓	[-1]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]				
		No direct interaction					No direct interaction					Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4) In spite of the industry's overall safety track record, a non-negligible risk for accidents in nuclear power plants and waste treatment facilities remains. The long-term storage of nuclear waste is a politically fraught subject, with no large-scale long-term storage operational worldwide. Negative impacts from upstream uranium mining and milling are comparable to those of coal, hence replacing fossil fuel combustion by nuclear power would be neutral in that aspect. Increased occurrence of childhood leukaemia in populations living within 5 km of nuclear power plants was identified by some studies, even though a direct causal relation to ionizing radiation could not be established and other studies could not confirm any correlation (low evidence/agreement in this issue).					No direct interaction				
												IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Cardis et al. (2006); Balonov et al. (2011); Moomaw et al. (2011a); WHO (2013); Abdelouas (2006); Al-Zoughool and Kewski (2009) cited in Sathaye et al. (2011a); Smith et al. (2013); Schnelzer et al. (2010); Tirmarche (2012); Brugge and Buchner (2011); Möller et al. (2012); Hiyama et al. (2013); Mousseau and Möller (2013); Möller and Mousseau (2011); Möller et al. (2011); von Stechow et al. (2016); Heinävaara et al. (2010); Kaatsch et al. (2008); Sermage-Faure et al. (2012); Hoeve and Jacobson (2012)									
CCS: Bio energy		↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	■■■	⊕⊕	★	↑ / ↓	[+1,-2]	■■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]				
		See effects of increased bioenergy use.					Farm Employment and Incomes (2.3) See increased use of biomass effects. In addition, the concern that more bioenergy (for BECCS) necessarily leads to unacceptably high food prices is not founded on large agreement in the literature. AR5, for example, finds a significantly lower effect of large-scale bioenergy deployment on food prices by mid-century than the effect of climate change on crop yields. Also, Muratori et al. (2016) show that BECCS reduces the upward pressure on food crop prices by lowering carbon prices and lowering the total biomass demand in climate change mitigation scenarios. Competition for land-use. Use of agricultural residue for bioenergy can reduce soil carbon thereby threatening agricultural productivity.					Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4) See positive impacts of increased biomass use. On the other hand, there is a non-negligible risk of CO2 leakage both from geological formations as well as from the transportation infrastructure from source to sequestration locations.					No direct interaction				
		See literature on increased biomass use and Muratori et al. (2016), IPCC AR5 (2014), Dooley,K. & Karthä,S. (2018)										IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Atchley et al. (2013); Apps et al. (2010); Siirila et al. (2012); Wang and Jaffe (2004); Koorneef et al. (2011); Singh et al. (2011); Hertwich et al. (2008); Veltman et al. (2010); Corsten et al. (2013)									
Advanced coal	CCS: Fossil	[0]					[0]		No direct interaction			↓	[-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]				
		No direct interaction					No direct interaction					Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4) The use of fossil CCS imply continued adverse impacts of upstream supply-chain activities in the coal sector, and because of lower efficiency of CCS coal power plants, upstream impacts and local air pollution are likely to be exacerbated. Furthermore, IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Atchley et al. (2013); Apps et al. (2010); Siirila et al. (2012); Wang and Jaffe (2004); Koorneef et al. (2011); Singh et al. (2011); Hertwich et al. (2008); Veltman et al. (2010); Corsten et al. (2013)					No direct interaction				
												IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Atchley et al. (2013); Apps et al. (2010); Siirila et al. (2012); Wang and Jaffe (2004); Koorneef et al. (2011); Singh et al. (2011); Hertwich et al. (2008); Veltman et al. (2010); Corsten et al. (2013)									



	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE						
Agriculture & Livestock	Behavioural response: Sustainable healthy diets and reduced food waste	- / ↓	Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)	[0,-1]	■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★	Cutting livestock consumption can increase food security for some if land grows food not feed, but can also undermine livelihoods and culture where livestock has long been the best use of land such as in parts of SSA.	IPCC WGIII, 2014	Food Security and promotion of Sustainable Agriculture(2.1/2.4/2a)	↑	[+2]	■■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Curbing consumer waste of major food crops (i.e., wheat, rice, and vegetables) and meats (i.e., beef, pork, and poultry) in China , USA and India alone could feed ~413 million people per year (West et al., 2014). One billion extra people could be fed if food crop losses could be halved (Kummu et al., 2012). Reducing waste, especially from meat and dairy could play a role in delivering food security and reduce the need for sustainable intensification (Smith, 2013). Dietary change toward global healthy diets could improve nutritional health, food security and reduce emissions.	Tobacco Control (3.a/ 3.a.1)	↑	[+1]	■■	⊕	★	[0]	No direct interaction		
																									Consume fewer foods with low nutritional value e.g. alcohol, (Garnett, 2011). Demand-side measures aimed at reducing the proportion of livestock products in human diets, where the consumption of animal products is higher than recommended, are associated with multiple health benefits, especially in industrialized countries (Bustamante et al., 2014).	Garnett, T. (2011), Bustamante, M., et al. (2014)
Land based greenhouse gas reduction and soil carbon sequestration	Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)	↑	[+2]	■■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Many climate smart agriculture interventions aim to improve rural livelihoods, thereby contributing to poverty alleviation. Agroforestry or integrated crop–livestock–biogas systems can substitute costly, external inputs, saving on household expenditures – or even lead to the selling of some of the products, providing the farmer with extra income, leading to increased adaptive capacity (Bogdanski, 2012).	Lipper et al. (2014), Bogdanski (2012), Branca et al. (2011), Campbell et al. (2014), Hammond et al. (2016), Mbow et al. (2013), Scherr et al. (2012), Steenwerth et al. (2014), Vermeulen et al. (2012)	Food Security, sustainable agriculture and improved nutrition	↑	[+2]	■■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Safe application of biotechnology, both conventional and modern methods can help to improve agricultural productivity,improving crops adaptability thereby catering to food security. Reducing tillage,eliminating fallow and keeping the soil covered with residue, cover crops or perennial vegetation help prevent soil erosion and has the potential to increase Soil Organic Matter (SOC). Efficient land management techniques can help in increasing crop yield and hence food security issues can be addressed. Yield projections are actually higher for developing countries than for developed countries, reflecting the fact that they have more “catch-up” potential (Evenson, 1999). Action is needed throughout the food system, on moderating demand, reducing waste, improving governance and producing more food. (Godfray & Garnett, 2014). Improving cropland management is the key to increase crop productivity without further degrading soil and water resources (Branca et al., 2011). Climatee Smart Agriculture practices increases productivity and priotizes food security.	Ensure healthy lives (3.c)	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	■■	⊕⊕	★★	[+2,-2]	■■	⊕	★	Science-based actions within CSA is required to integrate data sets and sound metrics for testing hypotheses about feedback regarding climate, weather data products and agricultural productivity, such as the nonlinearity of temperature effects on crop yield and the assessment of trade-offs and synergies that arise from different agricultural intensification strategies (Steenwerth, 2014). Low commodity prices have led to declining investment in research and development, farmer education, etc. (Lamb et al., 2016).
Greenhouse gas reduction from improved livestock production and manure management systems	Poverty reduction and minimize exposure to risk (1.5)	↑	[+2]	■■	⊕	★	Mixed-farming systems, can not only farmers mitigate risks by producing a multitude of commodities, but they can also increase the productivity of both crops and animals in a more profitable and sustainable way, (Quoted from Sansoucy, R. (1995))	Sansoucy (1995)	Food Security and promotion of Sustainable Agriculture(2.1/2.4/2a)	↑	[+2]	■■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Fostering transitions toward more productive livestock production systems targeting land-use change appears to be the most efficient lever to deliver food availability outcomes. (Quoted from Havlik, P., et al. (2014)) Genomic selection should be able to at least double the rate of genetic gain in the dairy industry. Given the prevalence of mixed crop–livestock systems in many parts of the world, closer integration of crops and livestock in such systems can give rise to increased productivity and increased soil fertility (Thornton, 2010). Managing the indirect effects of livestock systems intensification is critical for the sustainability of the global food system: like improving productivity and their close link to land sparing (Herrero and Thornton, 2013). In East Africa pastoralists have shifted from cows to camels, which are better-adapted to survive periods of water scarcity and able to consistently provide more milk (Steenwerth et al., 2014). Scenarios where zero human-edible concentrate feed is use for livestock soil erosion potential reduces by 12%.	Ensure healthy lives (3.c)	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	■■	⊕⊕	★★	[0]	No direct interaction			
																								Havlik et al. (2014); Steenwerth (2014), Thornton (2010); Herrero and Thornton (2013); Steenwerth et al. (2014); Schader et al. (2015)	Sansoucy (1995); Burton (2007)	

<p>Reduced deforestation, REDD+</p>	<p>Poverty reduction (1.5)  Partnerships between local forest managers, community enterprises and private sector companies can support local economies and livelihoods, and boost regional and national economic growth. Katila et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Food Security and promotion of Sustainable Agriculture(2.1/2.4/2a)  Food security, may lead to the conversion of productive land under forest, including community forests, into agricultural production. In a similar fashion, the production of biomass for energy purposes(SDG 7) may reduce land available for food production and/or for community forest activities Katila et al., 2017). Efforts by the Government of Zambia to reduce emissions by REDD+ have contributed erosion control, ecotourism and pollination valued at 2.5% of the country's GDP. Katila et al. (2017); Turpie, Warr, & Ingram (2015); Epstein and Theuer (2017); Dooley and Kartha (2018)</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>Ensure inclusive and quality education(4.4/4.7)  Local forest users learn to understand laws, regulations and policies which facilitate their participation in the society. Education and capacity building provide technical skill and knowledge (Katila et al., 2017). Katila et al. (2017)</p>
<p>Afforestation and reforestation</p>	<p>Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)  CDM-AR can have different implications on local community livelihoods. Willingness to adopt afforestation is influenced in particular by Australian landholder's perceptions of its potential to provide a diversified income stream, and its impacts on flexibility of land management (Schirmer and Bull, 2014). Land sparing would have far reaching implications for the UK countryside and would affect landowners, rural communities (Lamb et al., 2016). Livelihoods threatened if subsistence agriculture targeted (Dooley and Kartha, 2018). Zomer et al. (2008); Schirmer and Bull (2014); Lamb et al. (2016); Dooley and Kartha (2018)</p>	<p>Food Security (2.1)  CDM-AR can have different implications on local to regional food security and local community livelihoods. Zomer et al. (2008); Dooley and Kartha (2018)</p>	<p>Ensure healthy lives (3.c)  Urban trees are increasingly seen as a way to reduce harmful air pollutants and hence improve cardio-respiratory health. Jones et al. (2018)</p>	<p>Promote knowledge and skill to promote SD (4.7)  Most landholders reported having low levels of knowledge about tree planting for carbon sequestration—particularly available programmes, prices and markets, and government rules and regulations Schirmer and Bull, 2014). Schirmer and Bull (2014)</p>
<p>Behavioural response (responsible sourcing)</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>
<p>Oceans</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>Food Security (2.2/2.3)  OIF can have different implications on fish stocks and aquaculture, it might actually increase food availability for fish stocks (increasing yields) but potentially at the cost of reducing the yields of fisheries outside the enhancement region by depleting other nutrients. Smetacek and Naqvi (2008); Lampitt et al. (2008); Williamson et al. (2012)</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>
<p>Blue carbon</p>	<p>Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.5)  Avoiding loss of mangroves and maintaining the 2000 stock could save a value of ecosystem services from mangroves in Southeast Asia of approximately US\$2.16 billion until 2050 (2007prices), with a 95% prediction interval of US\$1.58–2.76 billion (case study area South East Asia); Seaweed aquaculture will enhance carbon uptake and provide employment; traditional management systems provide benefits for blue carbon and support livelihoods for local communities; Greening of aquaculture can significantly enhance carbon storage; PES schemes could help capture the benefits derived from multiple ecosystem services beyond carbon sequestration. Zomer et al. (2008); Schirmer and Bull (2014); Lamb et al. (2016)</p>	<p>Food Production (2.3/2.4)  avoiding loss of mangroves and maintaining the 2000 stock could save a value of ecosystem services from mangroves in Southeast Asia including fisheries; Seaweed aquaculture will provide employment; traditional management systems provide livelihoods for local communities; Greening of aquaculture can increase income and well-being; Mariculture is a promising approach for China. Brander et al. (2012); Sondak et al. (2017); Vierros (2017); Ahmed et al. (2017a); Ahmed et</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>
<p>Enhanced Weathering</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0] No direct interaction</p>

	5 SUSTAINABLE ENERGY	10 AFFORDABLE ENERGY	16 CLIMATE ACTION	17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS																
	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE
Industry	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	[0]	No direct interaction	Knowledge and skill needed to promote sustainable development (4.7) [↑] [+1] [■] [●●●] [★★★] There is need for skill in manging in house energy efficiency. Sometimes ESCOs also help. Energy audit but many a times absence of skill acts as barrier for energy efficiency improvement. In many countries especially in developing countries these act as barrier Johansson and Thollander (2018); Apeaning and Thollander (2013)					[0]	No direct interaction	Global Partnership (17.6, 17.7) [↑] [+2] [■] [●●●] [★★★] Driving force for Energy efficiency is collaboration among companies, networks, experience sharing, Management tools . Sharing among countries can help accelerating managerial action. Absence of Information, budgetary funding, lack of access to capital etc. play important barrier to advance action. Cooperation at various levels e.g. value chain collaboration can open up with need for accelerating action. Johansson and Thollander (2018); Apeaning and Thollander (2013); Lawrence et al (2018); Griffin et al. (2017)									
	Low-carbon fuel switch	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	Global Partnership (17.6, 17.7) [↑] [+2] [■] [●●] [★★] Ultra low carbon steel making and breakthrough technologies are under trial across many countries and helping in enhancing the learning. Quader et al (2016)										
	Decarbonisation/ CCS/CCU	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	Global Partnership (17.6, 17.7) [↑] [+2] [■] [●●●] [★★★] EPI plants are capital intensive and are mostly operated by multinational with long investment cycles. In developed countries new innovation investments are happening in brown fields . Such large innovation investmets need strong collaboration among partners/competitors which can be facilitated by public fund. They happen at national ,supra national scale, across sectors, needs fresh revisit at IPR issues. Global production of biobased polymers increase need public support, incentive to push forward. Wesseling et al. (2017); Griffin et al. (2017)										
Buildings	Behaviorial response	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	Environmental justice (16.7) [↑] [+2] [■] [●] [★] Hult et al. found that consumption perspective strengthens the environmental justice discourse (as it claims to be a more just way of calculating global and local environmental effects) while possibly also increasing the participatory environmental discourse. Hult and Larsson (2016)					[0]	No direct interaction								
	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	[↑] [+1] [■] [●●] [★★]	Efficient cookstoves lead to empowerment of rural and indigenous women.	Empowerment and Inclusion (10.1/10.2/10.3/10.4) [↑ / ↓] [1,-1] [■] [●●●] [★★★] Energy efficiency measures and the provision of energy access can free up resources that can then be put towards other productive uses (e.g., educational and employment opportunities), especially for women and children in poor, rural areas. The distributional costs of new energy policies are dependent on instrument design. If costs fall disproportionately on the poor, then this could work against the promotion of social, economic and political equality for all. The impacts of energy efficiency measures and policies on inequality can be both positive, if they reduce energy costs, or negative, if mandatory standards increase the need for purchasing more expensive equipment and appliances. Berrueta et al. (2017); Bhojvaid Vasundhara et al. (2014)					[↑] [+2] [■] [●●●] [★★★★]	Institutions that are effective, accountable, and transparent are needed at all levels of government (local to national to international) for providing energy access, promoting modern renewables, and boosting efficiency. Strengthening the participation of developing countries in international institutions (e.g., international energy agencies, United Nations organizations, World Trade Organization, regional development banks and beyond) will be important for issues related to energy trade, foreign direct investment, labor migration, and knowledge and technology transfer. Reducing corruption, where it exists, will help these bodies and related domestic institutions maximize their societal impacts. Limiting armed conflict and violence will aid most efforts related to sustainable development, including progress in the energy dimension. McCollum et al. (2018); Acemoglu (2009); Acemoglu et al. (2014); ICSU, ISSC (2015); Tabellini (2010)	[↑] [+2] [■] [●] [★]	Enhance Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (17.4) Implementing refrigerant transition and energy efficiency improvement policies in parallel for room ACs, roughly doubles the benefit of either policy implemented in isolation Shah et al (2015)								
	Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	[↑] [+1] [■] [●●] [★★]	Improved access to electric lighting can improve women's safety and girls' school enrollment. Cleaner cooking fuel and lighting access can reduce health risks and drudgery, which are disproportionately faced by women. Access to modern energy services has the potential to empower women by improving their income-earning and entrepreneurial opportunities and reducing drudgery. Participating in energy supply chains can increase women's opportunities and agency and improve business outcomes (McCollum et al., 2018).	[0]	No direct interaction	Institutional Capacity and Accountability (16.1/16.3/16.5/16.6/16.7/16.8) [↑] [+2] [■] [●●●] [★★★★] Institutions that are effective, accountable, and transparent are needed at all levels of government (local to national to international) for providing energy access, promoting modern renewables, and boosting efficiency. Strengthening the participation of developing countries in international institutions (e.g., international energy agencies, United Nations organizations, World Trade Organization, regional development banks and beyond) will be important for issues related to energy trade, foreign direct investment, labor migration, and knowledge and technology transfer. Reducing corruption, where it exists, will help these bodies and related domestic institutions maximize their societal impacts. Limiting armed conflict and violence will aid most efforts related to sustainable development, including progress in the energy dimension. McCollum et al. (2018); Acemoglu (2009); Acemoglu et al. (2014); ICSU, ISSC (2015); Tabellini (2010)					[↑] [+2] [■] [●] [★]	Promote transfer and diffusion of technology (17.6,17.7) Green building technology in Kazakhstan was based on transfer of knowledge among various parties. Kim et al (2017)								

Transport	Behavioural response	<p>Recognize Women's unpaid Work (5.1/5.4) / Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🏠🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★★</p> <p>The average woman's trip to work differs markedly from the average man's. Working-poor mothers rely on extensive social networks creating communities of spatial necessity, bartering for basic needs to overcome transportation constraints. Women earn lower wages and so are less likely to justify longer commutes. Many women need to manage dual roles as workers and mothers. Women tend to perform multi-purpose commuting, combining both work and household needs.</p> <p>Rogalsky, 2010; Crane, 2007</p>	<p>Reduce Inequality (10.2)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★★</p> <p>The equity impacts of climate change mitigation measures for transport, and indeed of transport policy intervention overall, are poorly understood by policymakers. This is in large part because standard assessment of these impacts is not a statutory requirement of current policy making. Managing transport energy demand growth will have to be advanced alongside efforts in passenger travel toward reducing the deep inequalities in access to transport services that currently affect the poor worldwide. Free provision of roads and parking spaces converts vast amounts of public land and capital into underpriced space for cars, in extreme cases like Los Angeles, CA, roads and streets free for parking and driving are 20% of land area, as governments give drivers free land people drive more than they would otherwise. High levels of car dependence, and the costs of motoring can be burdensome, and lead to increasing debt, raising questions of affordability for households with limited resources, particularly low-income houses located in suburban areas.</p> <p>Lucas and Pangbourne (2014); Figueroa et al. (2014); Manville (2017); Walks (2015); Belton et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Accountable and transparent institutions at all levels (16.6, 16.8)</p> <p>↑ / ↓ [+1, -1] 🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★</p> <p>With behavioural change towards walking for short distance pedestrian safety on the road might reduce unless public policy is appropriately formulated. Prevalence of high level of triple forms of informality of jobs, housing and transportation are responsible for low productivity and low standards of living as major challenge for policies targeting urban growth in Latin America.</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017); Corporacion Andina de Fomento (2017)</p>	<p>Help promote global partnership(17.1, 17.3,17.5,17.6,17.7)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★</p> <p>Projects aiming at resilient transport infrastructure development (e.g. C40 Cities Clean Bus Declaration, UITP Declaration on Climate Leadership, Cycling Delivers on the Global Goals, Global Sidewalk Challenge) are happening through multistakeholder coalition</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017)</p>	
Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	[0]	No direct interaction	[0]	No direct interaction	<p>Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory decision making (16.7)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★★</p> <p>In transport mitigation is necessary to conduct need assessment and stakeholder consultation to determine plausible challenges, prior to introducing a desired planning reforms. Further, the involved personnel should actively engage transport-based stakeholders during policy identification and its effective implementation to achieve desired results. User behaviour and stakeholder integration is key for successful transport policy implementation</p> <p>Aggarwal, 2017, AlSabbagh, Siu, Guehnemann, & Barrett (2017)</p>	<p>Help promote global partnership(17.1, 17.3,17.5,17.6,17.7)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★</p> <p>Projects aiming at resilient transport infrastructure development and technology adoption (e.g. C40 Cities Clean Bus Declaration, UITP Declaration on Climate Leadership, Cycling Delivers on the Global Goals, Global Sidewalk Challenge) are happening through multistakeholder coalition</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017)</p>
Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	[0]	No direct interaction	<p>Reduce Inequality (10.2)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★★</p> <p>The equity impacts of climate change mitigation measures for transport, and indeed of transport policy intervention overall, are poorly understood by policymakers. This is in large part because standard assessment of these impacts is not a statutory requirement of current policy making. Managing transport energy demand growth will have to be advanced alongside efforts in passenger travel toward reducing the deep inequalities in access to transport services that currently affect the poor worldwide.</p> <p>Lucas & Pangbourne, 2014; Figueroa et al. (2014)</p>	<p>Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory decision making (16.7)</p> <p>↑ / ↓ [+1, -1] 🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★</p> <p>Formal transport infrastructure improvement in many cities in developing countries lead to eviction from informal settlements which need appropriate redistributive policies and cooperation and partnership with all.</p> <p>Colenrander et al 2017</p>	<p>Help promote global partnership(17.1, 17.3,17.5,17.6,17.7)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🏠 🗣️🗣️ ★</p> <p>Projects aiming at resilient transport infrastructure development (e.g. C40 Cities Clean Bus Declaration, UITP Declaration on Climate Leadership, Cycling Delivers on the Global Goals, Global Sidewalk Challenge) are happening through multistakeholder coalition</p> <p>Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (2017)</p>	

		5 GENDER EQUALITY				10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES				16 PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS				17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR DEVELOPMENT						
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE				
Replacing coal	Non-biomass renewables solar, wind, hydro		[+1]			★		[+1]			★★		[+2]			★				
		Decentralized renewable energy systems (e.g., home- or village-scale solar power) can reduce the burden on girls and women of procuring traditional biomass. Schwerhoff G., Sy M. (2017)					Empowerment and Inclusion (10.1/10.2/10.3/10.4) Decentralized renewable energy systems (e.g., home- or village-scale solar power) can enable a more participatory, democratic process for managing energy-related decisions within communities. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)					Energy Justice The energy justice framework serves as an important decision-making tool in order to understand how different principles of justice can inform energy systems and policies. Islar et al. (2017) states that off-grid and micro-scale energy development offers an alternative path to fossil-fuel use and top-down resource management as they democratize the grid and increase marginalized communities' access to renewable energy, education and health care. Islar et al. (2017)					International Cooperation (all goals) International cooperation (in policy) and collaboration (in science) is required for the protection of shared resources. Fragmented approaches have been shown to be more costly. Specific to SDG7, to achieve the targets for energy access, renewables, and efficiency, it will be critical that all countries: (i) are able to mobilize the necessary financial resources (e.g., via taxes on fossil energy, sustainable financing, foreign direct investment, financial transfers from industrialized to developing countries); (ii) are willing to disseminate knowledge and share innovative technologies between each other; (iii) follow recognized international trade rules while at the same time ensuring that the least developed countries are able to take part in that trade; (iv) respect each other's policy space and decisions; (v) forge new partnerships between their public and private entities and within civil society; and (vi) support the collection of high-quality, timely, and reliable data relevant to the furthering their missions. There is some disagreement in the literature on the effect of some of the above strategies, such as free trade. Regarding international agreements, "no-regrets options", where all sides gain through cooperation, are seen as particularly beneficial (e.g., nuclear test ban treaties) (McCollum et al., 2018). McCollum et al. (2018); Clarke et al. (2009); Eis et al. (2016); Montreal Protocol (1989); New Climate Economy (2015); O'Neill et al. (2017); Ramaker et al. (2003); Riahi et al. (2015); Riahi et al. (2017)			
	Increased use of biomass		[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction						
	Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear		[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction				[-1]			★★				
			[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction						
	CCS: Bio energy		[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction						
Advanced coal	CCS: Fossil		[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction				[0]	No direct interaction						

		5 GENDER EQUALITY					10 REDUCE POVERTY					16 PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS					17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR RESILIENCE							
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE			
Agriculture & Livestock	Behavioural response: Sustainable healthy diets and reduced food waste		[0]					[0]				Strong and effective institutions and responsive decision making (16.6/ 16.7 / 16.a)		[+1,-1]	■■■■	⊕⊖	★★	Resource mobilization and Strengthen Partnership (17.1/17.14)		[+1,-1]	■■	⊕	★	
		No direct interaction					No direct interaction					Appropriate incentives to reduce food waste may require some policy innovation and experimentation, but a strong commitment for devising and monitoring them seems essential. (Quoted from Bajželj et al.(2014)) A financial incentive to minimise waste could be created through effective taxation (e.g. by taxing foods with the highest wastage rates, or by increasing taxes on waste disposal). Decision makers should try to integrate agricultural, environmental and nutritional objectives through appropriate policy measures to achieve sustainable healthy diets coupled with reduction in food waste. It is surprising that politicians and policy makers demonstrate little regarding the need of having strategies to reduce meat consumption and to encourage more sustainable eating practices in Netherlands. Bajželj et al.(2014); Lamb et al. (2016); Garnett (2011); Dagevos and Voordouw (2013)						Decision makers should try to integrate agricultural, environmental and nutritional objectives through appropriate policy measures to achieve sustainable healthy diets coupled with reduction in food waste. It is surprising that politicians and policy makers demonstrate little regarding the need of having strategies to reduce meat consumption and to encourage more sustainable eating practices in Netherlands. Garnett (2011); Dagevos and Voordouw (2013)						
Land based greenhouse gas reduction and soil carbon sequestration	Equal access, empowerment of women (5.5)	↑/~	[+2,0]	■■■	⊕⊖	★★★	Empower economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of sex (10.2)	↑/~	[+1,0]	■■■	⊕⊖	★★	Build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions (16.6/ 16.7/16.8)	↑/~	[0,-1]	■■■■	⊕⊖	★★	Resource mobilization and Strengthen multi-stakeholder Partnership	↑	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊖⊕	★★★
	Many programmes for climate smart agriculture have been used to empower women and to improve gender equality. Women often have an especially important role to play in adaptation, because of their gendered indigenous knowledge on matters such as agriculture (Terry, 2009). Without access to land, credit and agricultural technologies, women farmers face major constraints in their capacity to diversify into alternative livelihoods (Demetriades and Esplen, 2008).	In many rural societies women are sidelined from decisions regarding agriculture even when male household heads are absent, and they often lack access to important inputs such as irrigation water, credit, tools, and fertiliser. To be effective, agricultural mitigation strategies need to take these and other aspects of local gender relations into account (Terry, 2009). Women's key role in maintaining biodiversity, through conserving and domesticating wild edible plant seed, and in food crop breeding, is not sufficiently recognised in agricultural and economic policy-making; nor is the importance of biodiversity to sustainable rural livelihoods in the face of predicted climate changes (Nelson et al., 2002).	Godfray and Garnett (2014); Behnassi, Boussaid and Gopichandran (2014); Steenwerth (2014); Lipper et al. (2014); Bustamante (2014)	Behnassi, Boussaid and Gopichandran (2014); Lipper et al. (2014); Steenwerth (2014)																				
Greenhouse gas reduction from improved livestock production and manure management systems	Equal access to economic resources, promote empowerment of women (5.5/5.a/5.b)	↑/~	[+2,0]	■■	⊕	★	Empower economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of sex (10.2)	↑/~	[+1,0]	■■	⊕	★	Responsible decision making (16.7)	↑	[+1]	■■	⊕	★	Improve domestic capacity for tax collection (17.1)	↑	[+2]	■■■	⊕⊖	★★
	Most of the animal farming activities such as fodder collection, feeding, are performed by women. Besides, considerable involvement and contribution of women, considerable gender inequalities also exist in Indian villages in terms of accessing natural resources, extension services, marketing opportunities and financial services as well as in exercising their decision-making powers. Therefore, there is a need to correct gender bias in livestock sector. Efforts are needed to increase the capacity of women to negotiate with confidence and meet their strategic needs. Access, control and management of small ruminants, grazing areas and feed resources empower women and lead to an overall positive impact on the welfare of the household.	Livestock ownership is increasing women's decision-making and economic power within both the household and the community. Access, control and management of small ruminants, grazing areas and feed resources empower women and lead to an overall positive impact on the welfare of the household.	Havlik, P., et al. (2014)	Havlik, et al. (2014); Herrero and Thornton (2013)																				

<p>Reduced deforestation, REDD+</p>	<p>Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)</p> <p>↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>Women have been less involved in REDD+ initiative (pilot project) design decisions and processes than men. Girls and women have an important role in forestry activities, related to fuel-wood, forest-food and medicine. Their empowerment contributes to sustainable forestry as well as reducing inequality (Katila et al., 2017).</p> <p>Brown (2011); Larson et al. (2015); Katila et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Reduced inequality, empowerment and inclusion (10.1/10.2/10.3/10.4)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>Urges developed country to support, through multilateral and bilateral channels, the development of REDD+ national strategies or action plans and implementation (Lima et al., 2017). Girls and women have an important role in forestry activities, related to fuel-wood, forest-food and medicine. Their empowerment contributes to sustainable forestry as well as reducing inequality (Katila et al., 2017).</p> <p>Lima et al. (2017); Katila et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions, Responsible decision making (16.6/ 16.7/16.8)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ 🌐 🌐 🌐 ★★</p> <p>Institutional building (National Forest Monitoring Systems, Safeguard Information Systems, etc.), with full and effective participation of all relevant countries (Lima et al., 2017). REDD+ actions also deliver non-carbon benefits (e.g. local socioeconomic benefits, governance improvements, Lima et al., 2015). Forest governance is another central aspect in recent studies, including debate on decentralization of forest management, logging concessions in public owned commercially valuable forests, and timber certification, primarily in temperate forests (Bustamante et al., 2014).</p> <p>Lima et al. (2017); Lima et al. (2015); Bustamante et al. (2014)</p>	<p>Resource mobilization and Strengthen multi-stakeholder Partnership (17.1/ 17.3/17.5/17.17)</p> <p>↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>To provide finance and technology to developing countries to support emissions reductions. Be supported by adequate and predictable financial and technology support, including support for capacity-building (Lima et al., 2017). Partnerships in the form of significant aid money from, e.g., Norway, other bilateral donors, and the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) are forthcoming (Andrew, 2017). Estimates of opportunity cost for REDD are very low. Lower costs and/or higher carbon prices could combine to protect more forests, including those with lower carbon content. Conversely, where the cost of action is high, a large amount of additional funding would be required for the forest to be protected (Miles and Kapos, 2008). Forest governance is another central aspect in recent studies, including debate on decentralization of forest management, logging concessions in public owned commercially valuable forests, and timber certification, primarily in temperate forests (Bustamante et al., 2014). Partnerships between local forest managers, community enterprises and private sector companies can support local economies and livelihoods, and boost regional and national economic growth (Katila et al., 2017).</p> <p>Lima et al. (2017); Andrew (2017); Miles and Kapos (2008); Bustamante et al. (2014); Katila et al. (2017)</p>
<p>Afforestation and reforestation</p>	<p>Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>Many women in developing countries are already prominently engaged in economic sectors related to climate adaptation and mitigation efforts such as agriculture, renewable energy, forest management and are important drivers and leaders in climate responses that are innovative and effective, benefitting not only their families but their larger communities as well. Women's participation in the decision-making process of forest management, for example, has been shown to increase rates of reforestation while decreasing the illegal extraction of forest products</p> <p>UNDESA, 2016</p>	<p>Empower economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of sex (10.2)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>Women's participation in the decision-making process of forest management, for example, has been shown to increase rates of reforestation while decreasing the illegal extraction of forest products.</p> <p>UNDESA, 2016</p>	<p>Responsible decision making (16.7)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★</p> <p>Land-related mitigation, such as biofuel production, as well as conservation and reforestation action can increase competition for land and natural resources so these measures should be accompanied by complementary policies. (Quoted from Epstein, A. H., & Theuer, S. L. H. (2017))</p> <p>Epstein and Theuer (2017)</p>	<p>Resource mobilization and Strengthen Partnership (17.1/17.14)</p> <p>↑ [+2] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★★</p> <p>Financing at the national and international level is required to grow more seedlings/sapling, restore land, create awareness education factsheets, providing training of local communities regarding the benefits of afforestation and reforestation. Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol further sets a Clean Development Mechanism through which countries in Annex I earn "certified emissions reductions" through projects implemented in developing countries (Montanarella and Alva, 2015). Afforestation and reforestation in India are being carried out under various programmes, namely social forestry initiated in the early 1980s, Joint Forest Management Programme initiated in 1990, afforestation under National Afforestation and Eco-development Board (NAEB) programmes since 1992, and private farmer and industry initiated plantation forestry. If the current rate of afforestation and reforestation is assumed to continue, the carbon stock could increase of 11% by 2030 (Ravindranath, Chaturvedi, and Murthy, 2008).</p> <p>Kibria, G. (2015); Montanarella and Alva (2015); Ravindranath, Chaturvedi, and Murthy (2008)</p>
<p>Behavioural response (responsible sourcing)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Responsible decision making (16.7)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★★</p> <p>Indonesian factories may seek advantages through non-price competition—perhaps by highlighting decent working conditions or the existence of a union—or to see trade associations or government agencies promoting the country as a responsible sourcing location (Bartley, 2010). In the absence of domestic legal instruments providing incentives to improve sustainability of sourcing, it appears that initiatives to engage the major importing enterprises in developing responsible sourcing practices and policies is a practical approach. Unless initiatives involve all the major importers, they are unlikely to be successful since the high costs associated with accreditation would increase production costs for these firms relative to their competitors (Huang, Wilkes, Sun and Terheggen, 2013).</p> <p>Bartley (2010); Huang, Wilkes, Sun and Terheggen (2013)</p>	<p>Finance and trade (17.1/17.10)</p> <p>↑ [+1] 🗺️ 🌐 ⚙️ ★★</p> <p>Private certification initiatives for wood product and biomass sourcing may extend their schemes with criteria for "leakage" (external GHG effects). Also Recycling of waste wood in pellets is not yet practiced, due to unclear rules in the EU Waste Directive about overseas shipping (Sikkema et al., 2014). Engagement of Chinese government and private sector stakeholders in supply country sustainability initiatives may be the best way to support this gradual process of improvement. Although carrying out due diligence in timber sourcing can require considerable internal resources, it may be substantially less of a financial burden than the potential fines and reputational damage resulting from sourcing unknown or controversial timber (Huang, Wilkes, Sun and Terheggen, 2013).</p> <p>Sikkema et al. (2014); Huang, Wilkes, Sun, and Terheggen (2013)</p>
<p>Oceans</p>	<p>Ocean iron fertilization</p> <p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>
<p>Blue carbon</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>
<p>Enhanced Weathering</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>

		6					12					14					15					
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	
Industry	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2,-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★	Sustainable and Efficient resource (12.2,12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12 a)	[+1]	■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	No direct interaction							
		Efficiency and behavioural changes in the industrial sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in industrial demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. Likewise, reducing material inputs for industrial processes through efficiency and behavioural changes will reduce water inputs in the material supply chains. In extractive industries there can be a trade off with production unless strategically managed and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. In extractive industries there is trade off unless strategically managed. Behavioral changes in the industrial sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in industrial demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.					Once started leads to chain of actions within the sector and policy space to sustain the effort. Help in expansion of sustainable industrial production (Ghana)															
		Vassolo and Doell (2005); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016); Nguyen et al (2014)					Apeaning and Thollandar (2013); Fernando et al. (2017)															
	Low-carbon fuel switch	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2,-2]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	Sustainable production (12.2,12.3, 12.a)	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	Sustainable production (15.1,15.5,15.9,15.10)	[+1,-1]	■■	⊕	★			
	A switch to low-carbon fuels can lead to a reduction in water demand and wastewater if the existing higher-carbon fuel is associated with a higher water intensity than the lower-carbon fuel. However, in some situations the switch to a low-carbon fuel such as e.g., biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock.					Circular economy instead of linear global economy can achieve climate goal and can help in economic growth through industrialisation which saves on resources, environment and supports small, medium and even large industries, can lead to employment generation. so new regulations, incentives, tax regime can help in achieving the goal especially in newly emerging developing countries although applicable for large industrialised countries also.								Circular economy instead of linear global economy can achieve climate goal and can help in economic growth through industrialisation which saves on resources, environment and supports small, medium and even large industries, can lead to employment generation. so new regulations, incentives, tax regime can help in achieving the goal especially in newly emerging developing countries although applicable for large industrialised countries also.								
	Hejazi et al. (2015); Song et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016)					Supino et al. (2015); Fan et al. (2017); Leider et al. (2015); Zheng et al. (2016); Shi et al. (2017)																
	Decarbonisation/ CCS/CCU	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+1,-1]	■■■	⊕	★★	Sustainable production and consumption (12.1,12.6 12.a)	[+2]	■■	⊕⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	Conserve and Sustainably use ocean (14.1, 14.5)	[-1]	■■	⊕	★			
	CCU/S requires access to water for cooling and processing which could contribute to localized water stress. CCS/U process can potentially be configured for increased water efficiency compared to a system without carbon capture via process integration.					EPI plants are capital intensive and are mostly operated by multinational with long investment cycles. In developed countries new investments are happening in brown fields, while in developing countries these are in green fields. Collaboration among partners and user demand change, policy change are essential for encouraging these large risky investments.								CCU/S in chemical industry faces challenge for transport cost and storage. In UK cluster region have been identified for storage under sea.								
	Meldrum et al. (2013); Fricko et al. (2016); Byers et al. (2016); Brandl et al. (2017)					Wesseling et al. (2017)																
Buildings	Behavioral response	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	Responsible and sustainable consumption	[+2]	■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	No direct interaction							
		Behavioral changes in the residential sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in residential demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.					Technological improvements alone are not sufficient to increase energy savings. Zhao et al. (2017) findings indicate that building technology and occupant behaviors interact with each other and finally affect energy consumption from home. They found that occupant habits could not take advantage of more than 50 percent of energy efficiency potential allowed by an efficient building. In the electronic segment product obsolescence represents a key challenge for sustainability. Echegaray (2015) discusses the dissonance between consumers' product durability experience, orientations to replace devices before terminal technical failure, and perceptions of industry responsibility and performance. The results from their urban sample survey indicate that technical failure is far surpassed by subjective obsolescence as a cause for fast product replacement. At the same time Liu, Oosterveer, and Spaargaren (2017) suggest that we need to go beyond individualist and structuralist perspectives to analyse sustainable consumption (i.e. combines both human agency paradigm and social structural perspective).															
		Bartos and Chester (2014); Fricko et al. (2016) Holland et al. (2016)					Zhao et al. (2017); Somerfeld, Buys, and Vine (2017); Isenhour and Feng (2016); He,															
	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	Sustainable Practices and Lifestyles (12.6/12.7/12.8)	[+1]	■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	Reduced deforestation (15.5)	[+2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★			
	Efficiency changes in the residential sector that lead to reduced energy demand can lead to reduced requirements on energy supply. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, the reduction in residential demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. A switch to low-carbon fuels in the residential sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and wastewater if the existing higher-carbon fuel is associated with a higher water intensity than the lower-carbon fuel. However, in some situations the switch to a low-carbon fuel such as e.g., biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock. As water is used to convert energy into useful forms, energy efficiency is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. Subsidies for renewables are anticipated to lead to the benefits and tradeoffs outlined when deploying renewables. Subsidies for renewables could lead to improved water access and treatment if subsidies support projects that provide both water and energy services (e.g., solar desalination).					Sustainable practices adopted by public and private bodies in their operations (e.g., for goods procurement, supply chain management, and accounting) create an enabling environment in which renewable energy and energy efficiency measures may gain greater traction (McCollum et al., 2018).								Improved cook stove help halting deforestation in rural India								
	Hendrickson et al. (2014); Bartos and Chester (2014); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016); Bartos and Chester (2014); Bilton et al. (2011); Scott et al. (2011); Kumar et al. (2012); Kern et al. (2014); Meldrum et al. (2014); Kim et al (2017)					McCullum et al. (2018); CDP (2015); European Climate Foundation (2014); Khan et al. (2015); New Climate Economy (2015); Stefan and Paul (2008)																
	Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	Access to improved water and sanitation (6.1/6.2), Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2,-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	Sustainable use and management of natural resource (12.2)	[+2,-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★★	[0]	[0]	No direct interaction	Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)	[+2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★			
	A switch to low-carbon fuels in the residential sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and wastewater if the existing higher-carbon fuel is associated with a higher water intensity than the lower-carbon fuel. However, in some situations the switch to a low-carbon fuel such as e.g., biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock. Improved access to energy can support clean water and sanitation technologies. If energy access is supported with water-intensive energy sources, there could be tradeoffs with water efficiency targets.					A switch to low-carbon fuels in the residential sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and wastewater if the existing higher-carbon fuel is associated with a higher water intensity than the lower-carbon fuel. However, in some situations the switch to a low-carbon fuel such as e.g., biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock. Improved access to energy can support clean water and sanitation technologies. If energy access is supported with water-intensive energy sources, there could be tradeoffs with water efficiency targets.								Ensuring that the world's poor have access to modern energy services would reinforce the objective of halting deforestation, since firewood taken from forests is a commonly used energy resource among the poor (McCullum et al., 2018).								
	Hejazi et al. (2015); Song et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016); Rao and Pachauri (2017); Cibin et al. (2016)					Hejazi et al. (2015); Song et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016); Rao and Pachauri (2017); Cibin et al. (2016)																

<p>Transport</p> <p>Behavioural response</p>	<p>Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) [+2] ★★</p> <p>Behavioral changes in the transport sector that lead to reduced transport demand can lead to reduced transport energy supply. As water is used to produce a number of important transport fuels, the reduction in transport demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.</p> <p>Vidic et al. (2013); Tiedemann et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016)</p>	<p>Ensure Sustainable Consumption & Production patterns (12.3) [+2] ★★</p> <p>Urban carbon mitigation must consider the supply chain management of imported goods, the production efficiency within the city, the consumption patterns of urban consumers, and the responsibility of the ultimate consumers outside the city. Important for climate policy of monitoring the CO2 clusters that dominate CO2 emissions in global supply chains because they offer insights on where climate policy can be effectively directed.</p> <p>Lin et al. (2015); Kagawa et al. (2015); Felix et al (2016)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>
<p>Accelerating energy efficiency improvement</p>	<p>Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) [+2] ★★★</p> <p>Similar to behavioral changes, efficiency measures in the transport sector that lead to reduced transport demand can lead to reduced transport energy supply. As water is used to produce a number of important transport fuels, the reduction in transport demand is anticipated to reduce water consumption and wastewater, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.</p> <p>Vidic et al. (2013); Tiedemann et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016)</p>	<p>Sustainable Consumption (12.2/12.8) [+2] ★★★</p> <p>Relational complex transport behavior resulting in significant growth in energy-inefficient car choices, as well as differences in mobility patterns (distances driven, driving styles) and actual fuel consumption between different car segments all affect the non-progress on transport decarbonisation. Consumption choices, and individual lifestyles are situated tied to the form of the surrounding urbanization. Major behavioral changes and emissions reductions requires understanding of this relational complexity, consideration of potential interactions with other policies and the local context and implementation of both command-and-control as well as market-based measures.</p> <p>Stanley, Hensher and Loader (2011); Heinonen et al. (2013); Gallego, Montero and Salas (2013); Aamaas and Peters (2017); Gössling and Metzler (2017); Azevedo and Leal (2017)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>
<p>Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy</p>	<p>Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) / [+2,-1] ★★★</p> <p>A switch to low-carbon fuels in the transport sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and wastewater if the existing higher-carbon fuel is associated with a higher water intensity than the lower-carbon fuel. However, in some situations the switch to a low-carbon fuel such as e.g., biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock. Transport electrification could lead to tradeoffs with water use if the electricity is provided with water intensive power generation.</p> <p>Hejazi et al. (2015); Song et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016)</p>	<p>Ensure Sustainable Consumption & Production patterns (12.3) [+2] ★★★</p> <p>Due to persistent reliance on fossil fuels, it is posited that transport is more difficult to decarbonize than other sectors. This study partially confirms that transport is less reactive to a given carbon tax than the non-transport sectors: in the first half of the century, transport mitigation is delayed by 10–30 years compared to non-transport mitigation. The extent to which earlier mitigation is possible strongly depends on implemented technologies and model structure.</p> <p>Pietzcker et al. (2013); Figueroa et al. (2014); IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Creutzig et al., (2015)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>



		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE					
Replacing coal	Non-biomass renewables solar, wind, hydro	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) / Access to improved water and sanitation (6.1)	[+2,-2]	■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)	[+2]	■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★★	Marine Economies (14.7) / Marine Protection (14.1/14.2/14.4/14.5)	[2,-1]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★	Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)	[-1]	■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★
	Wind/solar renewable energy technologies are associated with very low water requirements compared to existing thermal power plant technologies. Widespread deployment is therefore anticipated to lead to improved water efficiency and avoided thermal pollution. However, managing wind and solar variability can increase water use at thermal power plants and can cause poor water quality downstream from hydropower plants. Access to distributed renewables can provide power to improve water access, but could also lead to increased groundwater pumping and stress if mismanaged. Developing dams to support reliable hydropower production can fragment rivers and alter natural flows reducing water and ecosystem quality. Developing dams to support reliable hydropower production can result in disputes for water in basins with up- and down-stream users. Storing water in reservoirs increases evaporation, which could offset water conservation targets and reduce availability of water downstream. However, hydropower plays an important role in energy access for water supply in developing regions, can support water security, and has the potential to reduce water demands if used without reservoir storage to displace other water intensive energy processes.		Renewable energy and energy efficiency slow the depletion of several types of natural resources, namely coal, oil, natural gas, and uranium. In addition, the phasing-out of fossil fuel subsidies encourages less wasteful energy consumption; but if that is done, then the policies implemented must take care to minimize any counteracting adverse side-effects on the poor (e.g., fuel price rises). (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)		Ocean-based energy from renewable sources (e.g., offshore wind farms, wave and tidal power) are potentially significant energy resource bases for island countries and countries situated along coastlines. Multi-use platforms combining renewable energy generation, aqua-culture, transport services and leisure activities can lay the groundwork for more diversified marine economies. Depending on the local context and prevailing regulations, ocean-based energy installations could either induce spatial competition with other marine activities, such as tourism, shipping, resources exploitation, and marine and coastal habitats and protected areas, or provide further grounds for protecting those exact habitats, therefore enabling marine protection. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018). Hydropower disrupts the integrity and connectivity of aquatic habitats and impact the productivity of inland waters and their fisheries		Landscape and wildlife impact for wind, habitat impact for hydropower.														
		Blton et al. (2011); Scott et al. (2011); Kumar et al. (2012); Kern et al. (2014); Meldrum et al. (2014); Fricko et al. (2016); Ziv et al. (2012); Grill et al. (2015); Grubert et al. (2016); Fricko et al. (2016); De Stefano et al. (2017)		McCollum et al. (2018); Banerjee et al. (2012); Bhattacharyya et al. (2016); Cameron et al. (2016); Riahi et al. (2012); Schwanitz et al. (2014)		McCollum et al. (2018); Buck and Krause (2012); Michler-Gieluch et al. (2009); WBGU (2013); Inger et al. (2009); Matthews N., McCartney M. (2017); Cooke S.J., Allison E.H., Beard T.D., Jr., Arlinghaus R., Arthington A.H., Bartley D.M., Cowx I.G., Fuentesville C., Leonard N.J., Lorenzen K., Lynch A.J., Nguyen V.M., Youn S.-J., Taylor W.W., Welcomme R.L. (2016)		Wiser et al. (2011); Lovich and Ennen (2013); Garvin et al. (2011); Grodsky et al. (2011); Dahl et al. (2012); de Lucas et al. (2012); Dahl et al. (2012); Jain et al. (2011); Kumar et al. (2011); Alho (2011); Kunz et al. (2011); Smith et al. (2013); Ziv et al. (2012); Matthews N., McCartney M. (2017)													
Increased use of biomass		Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+1,-2]	■■■■■	⊕	★★★★	Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)	[+2]	■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★★		[0]				Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)	[+1,-2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★
	Biomass expansion could lead to increased water stress when irrigated feedstocks and water-intensive processing steps are used. Bioenergy crops can alter flow over land and through soils as well as require fertilizer and this can reduce water availability and quality. Planting bioenergy crops on marginal lands or in some situations to replace existing crops can lead to reductions in soil erosion and fertilizer inputs, improving water quality.		Switching to renewable energy reduce the depletion of finite natural resources.		No direct interaction		Protecting terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably managing forests, halting deforestation, preventing biodiversity loss and controlling invasive alien species could potentially clash with renewable energy expansion, if that would mean constraining large-scale utilization of bioenergy or hydropower. Good governance, cross-jurisdictional coordination, and sound implementation practices are critical for minimizing trade-offs (McCollum et al., 2018).														
		Hejazi et al. (2015); Bonsch et al. (2016); Cibir et al. (2016); Song et al. (2016); Gao et al. (2017); Taniwaki (2017); Woodbury et al. (2017); Griffiths et al. (2017); Ha et al. (2017)		McCollum et al. (2018); Banerjee et al. (2012); Bhattacharyya et al. (2016); Cameron et al. (2016); Riahi et al. (2012); Schwanitz et al. (2014)				McCollum et al. (2018); Smith et al. (2010); Smith et al. (2014); Acheampong M., Ertem F.C., Kappler B., Neubauer P. (2017)													
Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear		Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+2,-1]	■■■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★★		[0]					[0]				Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)	[-1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★
	Nuclear power generation requires water for cooling which can lead to localized water stress and the resulting cooling effluents can cause thermal pollution in rivers and oceans.		No direct interaction		No direct interaction		Safety and waste concerns, uranium mining and milling														
		Webster et al. (2013); Fricko et al. (2016); Raptis et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016)						IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Visschers and Siegrist (2012); Greenberg (2013a); Kim et al. (2013); Visschers and Siegrist (2012); Bickerstaff et al. (2008); Sjoberg and Drott-Sjo-berg (2009); Corner et al. (2011); Ahearne (2011)													
CCS: Bio energy		Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+1,-2]	■■■	⊕	★★	Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)	[+1]	■■■	⊕⊕	★★		[0]				Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)	[+1,-2]	■■■	⊕⊕⊕	★★
	CCU/S requires access to water for cooling and processing which could contribute to localized water stress. However, CCS/U process can potentially be configured for increased water efficiency compared to a system without carbon capture via process integration. The bioenergy component adds the additional tradeoffs associated with bioenergy use. Large-scale bioenergy increases input demand, resulting in environmental degradation and water stress		Switching to renewable energy reduce the depletion of finite natural resources. On the other hand, the available of underground storage is limited and therefore reduces the benefits of switching from finite resources to bioenergy.		No direct interaction		Protecting terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably managing forests, halting deforestation, preventing biodiversity loss and controlling invasive alien species could potentially clash with renewable energy expansion, if that would mean constraining large-scale utilization of bioenergy or hydropower. Good governance, cross-jurisdictional coordination, and sound implementation practices are critical for minimizing trade-offs (McCollum et al., 2018). Large-scale bioenergy increases input demand, resulting in environmental degradation and water stress.														
		Meldrum et al. (2013); Fricko et al. (2016); Byers et al. (2016); Brandl et al. (2017); Dooley,K. & Kartha,S. (2018)		McCollum et al. (2018); Banerjee et al. (2012); Bhattacharyya et al. (2016); Cameron et al. (2016); Riahi et al. (2012); Schwanitz et al. (2014)				McCollum et al. (2018); Smith et al. (2010); Smith et al. (2014); Acheampong et al. (2017); Dooley and Kartha (2018)													
Advanced coal	CCS: Fossil	Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)	[+1,-2]	■■■■■	⊕	★★		[0]					[0]					[0]			
	CCU/S requires access to water for cooling and processing which could contribute to localized water stress. However, CCS/U process can potentially be configured for increased water efficiency compared to a system without carbon capture via process integration. Coal mining to support clean coal CCS will negatively impact water resources due to the associated water demands, wastewater and land-use requirements.		No direct interaction		No direct interaction		No direct interaction														
		Meldrum et al. (2013); Fricko et al. (2016); Byers et al. (2016); Brandl et al. (2017)																			

	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE			
Agriculture & Livestock	Behavioural response: Sustainable healthy diets and reduced food waste		Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)		***	Ensure Sustainable Consumption & Production patterns, Sustainable		[+2]		****	[0]		Conservation of Biodiversity and restoration of land (15.1/ 15.5/15.9)		***			
		↑ / ↓	[-2,-1]		⊕⊕⊕	↑	[+2]		⊕⊕⊕	****			↑	[+1]		⊕	***	
			Reduced food waste avoids direct water demand and wastewater for crops and food processing, and avoids water used for energy supply by reducing agricultural, food processing and waste management energy inputs. Healthy diets will support water efficiency targets if the shift towards healthy foods results in food supply chains that are less water intensive than the supply chains supporting the historical dietary pattern.		Reduce loss and waste in food systems, processing, distribution and by changing household habits. To reduce environmental impact of livestock both production and consumption trends of this sector should be traced. Livestock production needs to be intensified in a responsible way (i.e., be made more efficient in the way that it uses natural resources). Wasted food represents a waste of all the emissions generated during the course of producing and distributing that food. Mitigation measures include: Eat no more than needed to maintain a healthy body weight, Eat seasonal, robust, field grown vegetables rather than protected, fragile foods prone to spoilage and requiring heating and lighting in their cultivation, refrigeration stage, Consume fewer foods with low nutritional value e.g. Alcohol, tea, coffee, chocolate, bottled water (These foods are not needed in our diet and need not be produced). Shop on foot or over the internet (Reduced energy use). Reduction in food waste will not only pave the path for sustainable production but will also help in achieving sustainable consumption (Garnett, 2011). Reduce meat consumption to encourage more sustainable eating practices.		Reduce loss and waste in food systems, processing, distribution and by changing household habits. To reduce environmental impact of livestock both production and consumption trends of this sector should be traced. Livestock production needs to be intensified in a responsible way (i.e., be made more efficient in the way that it uses natural resources). Wasted food represents a waste of all the emissions generated during the course of producing and distributing that food. Mitigation measures include: Eat no more than needed to maintain a healthy body weight, Eat seasonal, robust, field grown vegetables rather than protected, fragile foods prone to spoilage and requiring heating and lighting in their cultivation, refrigeration stage, Consume fewer foods with low nutritional value e.g. Alcohol, tea, coffee, chocolate, bottled water (These foods are not needed in our diet and need not be produced). Shop on foot or over the internet (Reduced energy use). Reduction in food waste will not only pave the path for sustainable production but will also help in achieving sustainable consumption (Garnett, 2011). Reduce meat consumption to encourage more sustainable eating practices.		No direct interaction		Reducing food waste has secondary benefits like protecting soil from degradation, and decreasing pressure for land conversion into agriculture and thereby protecting biodiversity. The agricultural area that becomes redundant through the dietary transitions can be used for other agricultural purposes such as energy crop production, or will revert to natural vegetation. A global food transition to less meat, or even a complete switch to plant-based protein food have a dramatic effect on land use. Up to 2,700 Mha of pasture and 100 Mha of cropland could be abandoned (Quoted from Stehfest et al. (2009))							
			Khan et al. (2009); Bajzelj et al. (2014); Ran et al. (2016); Villarreal Walker et al. (2014);		Beddington et al. (2012); Steinfeld, H., & Gerber, P. (2010); Bajzelj et al. (2014); Ingram, J.												Kummu et al. (2012); Stehfest et al. (2009)	
Land based greenhouse gas reduction and soil carbon sequestration			Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)		***	Ensure Sustainable Production patterns(12.3)		[+1]		*	[0]		Conservation of Biodiversity and restoration of land (15.1/ 15.5/15.9)		***			
		↑ / ↓	[-1,-1]		⊕⊕	↑	[+1]		⊕	*			↑ / ↓	[-1,-1]		⊕⊕⊕	***	
			Soil carbon sequestration can alter the capacity of soils to store water, which impacts the hydrological cycle and could be positive or negative from a water perspective, dependent on existing conditions. Climate Smart Agriculture enrich linkages across sectors including management, water resources. Minimum tillage systems have been reported to reduce water erosion and thus sedimentation of water courses (Bustamante, 2014).		Yield of millet or sorghum can double as compared with unimproved land more than 1 tonne per hectare due to sustainable intensification. An integrated approach to safe applications of both conventional and modern agricultural biotechnologies will contribute to increased yield (Lakshmi et al., 2015).		Yield of millet or sorghum can double as compared with unimproved land more than 1 tonne per hectare due to sustainable intensification. An integrated approach to safe applications of both conventional and modern agricultural biotechnologies will contribute to increased yield (Lakshmi et al., 2015).		No direct interaction		Agricultural intensification can promote conservation of biological diversity by reducing deforestation, and by rehabilitation and restoration of biodiverse communities on previously developed farm or pasture land. However, planting monocultures on biodiversity hot spots can have adverse side-effects, reducing biodiversity. Genetically modified crops reduces demand for cultivated land. Adoption of integrated landscape approaches can provide various ecosystem services. CSA enrich linkages across sectors including management of land and bio-resources. Land sparing has the potential to be beneficial for biodiversity, including for many species of conservation concern, but benefits will depend strongly on the use of spared land. In addition, high yield farming involves trade-offs and is likely to be detrimental for wild species associated with farmland. (Lamb et al., 2016).							IPCC WGIII (2014); Lamb et al. (2016); Lybbert and Sumner (2010); Harvey et al. (2014); Behnassi, Boussaid and Gopichandran (2014); Lamb et al. (2016)
			Smith (2016); Behnassi, Boussaid and Gopichandran (2014); Bustamante (2014)		Campbell et al. (2014), Lakshmi et al. (2015)													
Greenhouse gas reduction from improved livestock production and manure management systems			Water use efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)		***	Ensure Sustainable Production patterns and restructuring taxation(12.3/12c)		[+1]		**	[0]		Restoration of land (15.1)		*			
		↑ / ↓	[-2,-1]		⊕⊕⊕	↑	[+1]		⊕⊕	**			↑	[+1]		⊕	*	
			Livestock efficiency measures are expected to reduce water required for livestock systems as well as associated livestock wastewater flows. However, efficiency measures that include agricultural intensification could increase water demands locally, leading to increased water stress if the intensification is mismanaged. Scenarios where zero human-edible concentrate feed is used for livestock, freshwater use reduces by 21%.		In the future, many developed countries will see a continuing trend in which livestock breeding focuses on other attributes in addition to production and productivity, such as product quality, increasing animal welfare, disease resistance (Thornton, 2010). Diet composition and quality are key determinants of the productivity and feed-use efficiency of farm animals (Herrero, et al., 2013). Mechanisms for effecting behavioral change in livestock systems need to be better understood by implementing combinations of incentives and taxes simultaneously in different parts of the world (Herrero and Thornton, 2013). Reducing the amount of human-edible crops that are fed to livestock represents a reversal of the current trend of steep increases in livestock production, and especially of monogastrics, so would require drastic changes in production and consumption (Schader et al., 2015).		In the future, many developed countries will see a continuing trend in which livestock breeding focuses on other attributes in addition to production and productivity, such as product quality, increasing animal welfare, disease resistance (Thornton, 2010). Diet composition and quality are key determinants of the productivity and feed-use efficiency of farm animals (Herrero, et al., 2013). Mechanisms for effecting behavioral change in livestock systems need to be better understood by implementing combinations of incentives and taxes simultaneously in different parts of the world (Herrero and Thornton, 2013). Reducing the amount of human-edible crops that are fed to livestock represents a reversal of the current trend of steep increases in livestock production, and especially of monogastrics, so would require drastic changes in production and consumption (Schader et al., 2015).		No direct interaction		Grasslands Are Precious, but improved management is required as grass accounts for close to 50% of feed use in livestock systems (Herrero et al., 2013). The scenario with 100% reduction of Food-Competing-Feedstuffs resulted in a 335 Mha decrease in arable land area, which corresponds to a decrease of 22% in arable and 7% in the total agricultural area (Schader et al., 2015).							Herrero, M., et al. (2013), Schader, C., et al. (2015)
			Mekonnen et al. (2013); Kong et al. (2016); Ran et al. (2016); Schader et al. (2015)		Thornton (2010); Herrero et al. (2013); Herrero and Thornton (2013); Schader et al. (2015)													

<p>Forest</p> <p>Reduced deforestation, REDD+</p>	<p>Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) [+1,-1] ***</p> <p>Forest management alters the hydrological cycle which could be positive or negative from a water perspective and is dependent on existing conditions. Conservation of ecosystem services—indirectly could help countries maintain watershed integrity. Forests provide sustainable and regulated provision and helps in water purification.</p> <p>Bonsch et al. (2016); Griffiths et al. (2016); Gao et al (2017); Zomer et al. (2008); Kibria (2015); Katila et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Ensure Sustainable consumption(12.3) [+1] *</p> <p>Reduce the human pressure on forests, including actions to address drivers of deforestation.</p> <p>Lima et al. (2017)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Conservation of Biodiversity, sustainability of terrestrial ecosystems [+1] ***</p> <p>Policies and programs for reducing deforestation and forest degradation, for rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands can promote conservation of biological diversity. Reduce the human pressure on forests, including actions to address drivers of deforestation. Efforts by the Government of Zambia to reduce emissions by REDD+, have contributed erosion control, ecotourism and pollution valued at 2.5% of the country's GDP.</p> <p>IPCC WGIII (2014); Lima et al. (2015); Miles and Kapos (2008); Katila et al. (2017); Turpie, Warr and Ingram (2015); Epstein and Theuer (2017)</p>
<p>Afforestation and reforestation</p>	<p>Enhance water quality (6.3) [+2,-1] ***</p> <p>Similar to REDD+, forest management alters the hydrological cycle which could be positive or negative from a water perspective and is dependent on existing conditions. Forest landscape restoration can have a large impact water cycles. Strategic placement of tree belts in lands affected by dryland salinity can remediate the affected lands by modifying landscape water balances. Watershed scale reforestation can result in the restoration of water quality. Fast-growing species can increase nutrient input and water inputs that can cause ecological damage and alter local hydrological patterns. Reforestation of mixed native species and in carefully chosen sites could increase biodiversity and restore waterways, reducing run-off and erosion (Dooley and Kartha, 2018).</p> <p>Kibria, G. (2015), Zomer et al. (2008); Lamb et al. (2016); Bustamante et al. (2014); Dooley and Kartha (2018)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Marine Economies (14.7) / Marine Protection and income generation [+2] *</p> <p>Mangroves would help to enhance fisheries, tourism business.</p> <p>Kibria, G. (2015)</p>	<p>Conservation of Biodiversity and restoration of land (15.1/ 15.5/15.9) [+2] ***</p> <p>Identified large amounts of land (749 Mha) globally as biophysically suitable and meeting the CDM-AR eligibility criteria (Zomer et al., 2008). Forest landscape restoration can conserve biodiversity and reduce land degradation. Mangroves reduce impacts of disasters (cyclones/storms/floods) acting as live seawalls, enhance forest resources /biodiversity. Forest loss goal can conserve/ restore 3.9 – 8.8 m ha / year average, 77.2 – 176.9 m ha in total and 7.7 – 17.7 m ha / year in 2030 of forest area by 2030 (Wolosin, 2014). Forest and biodiversity conservation, protected area formation, and forestry-based afforestation are practices enhance resilience of forest ecosystems to climate change (IPCC, 2014). Strategic placement of tree belts in lands affected by dryland salinity can remediate the affected lands by modifying landscape water balances and protect livestock. It can restore biologically diverse communities on previously developed farmland (Bustamante et al., 2014). Large-scale restoration is likely to benefit ecosystem service provision, including recreation biodiversity conservation and flood mitigation. Reforestation of mixed native species and in carefully chosen sites could increase biodiversity, reducing run-off and erosion (Dooley and Kartha, 2018).</p> <p>Zomer et al. (2008); Kibria (2015); Dooley and Kartha (2018); Wolosin (2014); IPCC, 2014; Epstein and Theuer (2017); Bustamante et al. (2014); Lamb et al. 2016</p>
<p>Behavioural response (responsible sourcing)</p>	<p>Water efficiency and pollution prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6) [+2,-1] **</p> <p>Responsible sourcing will have co-benefits for water efficiency and pollution prevention if the sourcing strategies incorporate water metrics. There is a risk that shifting supply sources could lead to increased water use in another part of the economy. At local levels, Forest certification programmes and practicing sustainable forest management (SFM) provides freshwater supplies.</p> <p>van Oel et al. (2012); Launiainen et al. (2014); Hontelez (2016)</p>	<p>Ensure Sustainable Production patterns (12.3) [+1] *</p> <p>At local levels, Forest certification programmes and practicing sustainable forest management (SFM) provides the provision of raw materials for a 'low ecological footprint' economy.</p> <p>Hontelez J. (2016)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Sustainability and Conservation (15.1/15.2/15.3) [+1,-1] *</p> <p>At the macro level, forest certification has done little to stem the tide of forest degradation, conversion of forest land to agriculture, and illegal logging—all of which remain serious threats to Indonesian forests (Bartley, 2010). At local levels, forest certification programmes and practicing sustainable forest management (SFM) helps in biodiversity protection.</p> <p>Bartley, T. (2010); Hontelez J. (2016)</p>
<p>Oceans</p> <p>Ocean iron fertilization</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Nutrient Pollution, Ocean Acidification, Fish Stocks, MPAs, SISD [+1,-2] *</p> <p>OIF could exacerbate or reduce nutrient pollution, increase the likelihood of mid-water deoxygenation, increases ocean acidification, might contribute to the rebuilding of fish stocks in producing plankton, generating therefore benefits for SISD, but might be in conflict with designing MPAs.</p> <p>Gnanadesikan et al. (2003); Jin and Gruber (2003); Denman (2008); Smetacek and Naqvi (2008); Lampitt et al. (2008); Oschlies et al. (2010); Güssow et al. (2010); Trick et al. (2010); Williamson et al. (2012)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>
<p>Blue carbon</p>	<p>Integrated water resources management (6.3/6.5) [+2] *</p> <p>Development of blue carbon resources (coastal and marine vegetated ecosystems) can lead to coordinated management of water in coastal areas.</p> <p>Vierros et al. (2013)</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Ocean Acidification, Nutrient Pollution (14.3, 14.1) [+2,0] ***</p> <p>Mangroves could buffer acidification in their immediate vicinity, Seaweeds have not been able to mitigate the effect on ocean foraminifera</p> <p>Sippo et al. (2016); Pettit et al. (2015)</p>	<p>conservation of Biodiversity and restoration of land (15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.9) [+3] ***</p> <p>average difference of 31 mm per year in elevation rates between areas with seagrass and unvegetated areas (case study areas Scotland, Kenya, Tanzania and Saudi Arabia); Mangroves fostering sediment accretion of about 5mm a year)</p> <p>Potouroglou et al (2017); Alongi (2012)</p>
<p>Enhanced Weathering</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>[0]</p> <p>No direct interaction</p>	<p>Ocean Acidification, Nutrient Pollution (14.3, 14.1) [+2,-1] ***</p> <p>Enhanced weathering (either by spreading lime or quicklime (in combination with CCS) over the ocean or olivine at beaches or the catchment area of rivers) opposes ocean acidification. "End-of-century ocean acidification is reversed under RCP4.5 and reduced by about two-thirds under RCP8.5; additionally, surface ocean aragonite saturation state, a key control on coral calcification rates, is maintained above 3.5 throughout the low latitudes, thereby helping maintain the viability of tropical coral reef ecosystems (Tick et al. 2010)" However, also marine biology would be affected, in particular if spreading olivine is used which actually works rather like ocean (iron) fertilization.</p> <p>Köhler et al. (2010); Hartmann et al. (2013); Köhler et al. (2013); Paquay und Zeebe (2013); Taylor et al. (2015); Smith et al. (2015)</p>	<p>Protect inland freshwater systems (14.1) [-1] *</p> <p>Olivine can contain toxic metals such as nickel which could accumulate in the environment or disrupt the local ecosystem by changing the pH of the water (in case of spreading in the catchment area of rivers).</p> <p>Hartmann et al. (2013)</p>

		10				8				9				11							
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE
Industry	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	Energy savings (7.1, 7.3, 7a, 7b)	[+2]	Energy Efficiency lead to reduced relatively less energy demand and hence energy supply and energy security, reduces import. Positive rebound effect can raise demand but to a very less extent due to low rebound effect in industry sector in many countries and by appropriate mix of industries (china) can maintain energy savings gain. supplying surplus energy to cities is also happening.proving mtenceance culture, Switching off idle equipment help saving energy (e.g Ghana)	***	Reduces Unemployment (8.2,8.3,8.4,8.5, 8.6)	[+1]	Unemployment rate reduction from 25% to 12% in south africa. Enhances firm productivity and technical and managerial capacity of the employees. New jobs for manginenergy efficiency opens up opportunities in energy service delivery sector.	***	Infrastructure renewal (9.1,9.3,9.5,9a)	[+1]	Transitioning to a more renewably-based energy system that is highly energy efficient is well aligned with the goal of upgrading energy infrastructure and making the energy industry more sustainable. In the reverse direction, infrastructure upgrades in other parts of the economy, such as modernized telecommunication networks, can create the conditions for a successful expansion of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures (e.g., smart-metering and demand-side management, McCollum et al., 2018).	***	Sustainable cities (15.6,15.8,15.9)	[+2]	Industries are becoming supplier of energy, waste heat , water, to neighbourial human settlements and hence reduced primary energy demand also and make towns and cities grow sustainably	***	Apeaning and Thollandar (2013); Zhang et al. (2015); IPCC WGIII (2014); Chakravarty et al. (2013); Karner et al. (2015); Fernando et al. (2017); Li et al. (2016); Wesseling et al. (2017)	Alteri et al (2016); Fernando et al. (2017); Johansson and Thollandar (2018)	Apeaning and Thollandar (2013); McCollum et al. (2018); Bhattacharyya et al. (2016); Goldthau (2014); Meltzer (2016); Riahhi et al. (2012)	Karner et al (2015)
	Low-carbon fuel switch	Sustainable and modern (7.2, 7.a)	[+2]	Industries are becoming supplier of energy, waste heat , water, roof tops for solar energy generation and hence reduced primary energy demand. CHP in chemical industries can help providing surplus power in the grid.	***	Economic growth with decent employment (8.1,8.2,8.3,8.4)	[+2]	Circular economy instead of liner global economy can achieve climate goal and can help in economic growth through industrialisation which saves on resources, enviornment and supports small, edium and even large industries, can lead to employment generation. so new regulations, incentives, tax regime can help in achieving the goal.	***	Innovation and new infrastructure (9.2,9.3,9.4,9.5,9.a)	[+2]	Circular economy instead of liner global economy is helping new innovation and infrastructure can achieve climate goal and can help in economic growth through industrialisation which saves on resources, enviornment and supports small, edium and even large industries, can lead to employment generation. so new regulations, incentives, tax regime can help in achieving the goal.	***	Sustainable cities (15.6,15.8,15.9)	[+2]	Industries are becoming supplier of energy, waste heat , water, roof tops for solar energy generation and supply to neighbourial human settlements and hence reduced primary energy demand also and make towns and cities grow sustainably	***	Karner et al (2015); Griffin et al (2017)	Supino et al (2015); Fan et al (2017); Leider et al (2015); Zheng et al (2016); Shi et al (2017); Liu et al (2014); Stahel (2017)	Supino et al (2015); Fan et al (2017); Leider et al (2015); Zeng et al (2016); Shi et al (2017); Liu et al (2014); Stahel (2017)	Karner et al (2015)
	Decarbonisation/ CCS/CCU	Affordable and sustainable energy sources	[+2,2]	CCS for EPIs can be incremental but needs additional space and can need additional energy sometimes compensating for higher efficiency otherwise, Recirculating Blast R Furnace & CCS for iron steel means high energy demand, electric melting in glass can mean higher electricity prices, in paper industry new separation and drying technologies are key to reduce the energy intensity, allowing for carbon neutral operation in the future , bio refineries can reduce petrorefineries, DRI in iron and steel with H2 encourages innovation in hydrogen infrastructure, in chemicals industry also encourage renewable electricity and hydrogen, biobased polymers can increase biomass price.	**	Decouple growth from environ degradation (8.1, 8.2, 8.4)	[+2]	EPIs are important players for economic growth. Deep decarbonisation of EPI through radical innovation is consistent with well below 2C scenario	***	Innovation and new infrastructure (9.2,9.4,9.5)	[+2]	Deep decarbonisation through radical technological change in EPI will lead to radical innovations e.g.,in completely changing industries' innovation strategy, plant and equipment , skill, production technique, design and so on. Radical CCS will need new infrastructure to transport CO2.	***	[0]		No direct interaction		Wesseling et al. (2017); Griffin et al (2017)	Wesseling et al. (2017), Åhman et al. (2016); Denis-Ryan et al. (2016)	Wesseling et al. (2017), Åhman et al (2016); Denis-Ryan et al. (2016); Griffin et al. (2017)	
Buildings	Behavioral response	Saving energy, improvement in Energy efficiency (7.3, 7a, 7b)	[+2]	Lifestyle change measures and adoption behavior affect residential energy use and implementation of efficient technologies as residential HVAC systems. Also social influence can drive energy savings in users exposed to energy consumption feedback. Effect of autonomous motivation on energy savings behaviour is greater than that of other more established predictors such as intentions, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control and past behaviour. Use of a hybrid engineering approach using social psychology and economic behaviour models are suggested for Residential peak electricity demand response. However, some take back in energy savings can happen due to rebound effect unless managed appropriately or accounted for welfare improvement. Adjusting Thermostat helps in saving energy . Uptake of energy efficient appliance by households with introduction of appliance standard, training, promotional material dissemination, desire to save energy bill are helping to change acquisition behaviour.	***	Progressively improve resource efficiency (8.4), Employment opportunities	[+2]	Behavioural change programmes help in sustaining energy savings through new infrastructuer development	**	Innovation and new infrastructure (9.2,9.4,9.5)	[+2]	Adoption of smart meter and smart grid following community based social marketing help in infrastructure expansion. People are adopting solar rooftops, white roof/vertical garden/green roofs at much faster rate due to new innovation, regulations.	**	Sustainable cities (15.6,15.8,15.9)	[+2]	Behavioural change programmes help in making cities more sustainable.	***	Yue, Yang, and Chen (2013); Somerfeld, Buys, and Vine (2017); Zhao et al. (2017); de Koning et al. (2016); Isenhour and Feng (2016); Sluisveld et al. (2016); Noonan et al. (2015); Allen et al. (2015); Jain et al. (2013a); Hori et al. (2013); Sweeny et al. (2013); Webb et al., (2013); Huebner et al. (2013); Gyamfi, Krumdieck, and Urmee (2013); Chakravarty et al (2013); Santarius (2016); Song et al. (2016); Anda et al. (2014); Roy et al (2018)	Anda et al. (2014)	Anda et al. (2014); Roy et al. (2018)	Anda et al. (2014); Roy et al. (2018)
	Accelerating energy efficiency improvement	Increase in energy savings (7.3)	[+2]	There is high agreement among researchers based on large number of evidence across various countries that energy efficiency improvement reduce energy consumption and hence lead to energy savings. Efficient cookstove saves bioenergy. Efficient cookstove saves bioenergy. Countries with higher hours of use due to higher ambient temperature or a more carbon intensive electricity grid benefit more from available improvements in energy efficiency and use of refrigerant transition .	***	Employment Opportunities (8.2/8.3/8.5/8.6) / Strong Financial Institutions (8.10)	[+2,-1]	Deploying renewables and energy-efficient technologies, when combined with other targeted monetary and fiscal policies, can help spur innovation and reinforce local, regional, and national industrial and employment objectives. Gross employment effects seem likely to be positive; however, uncertainty remains regarding the net employment effects due to several uncertainties surrounding macro-economic feedback loops playing out at the global level. Moreover, the distributional effects experienced by individual actors may vary significantly. Strategic measures may need to be taken to ensure that a large-scale switch to renewable energy minimizes any negative impacts on those currently engaged in the business of fossil fuels (e.g., government support could help businesses re-tool and workers re-train). To support clean energy and energy efficiency efforts, strengthened financial institutions in developing country communities are necessary for providing capital, credit, and insurance to local entrepreneurs attempting to enact change. (McCollum et al., 2018).	**	Innovation and new infrastructure (9.2,9.4,9.5)	[+2]	Adoption of smart meter and smart grid following community based social marketing help in infrastructure expansion, statutory norms to enhance energy and resource efficiency in building is encouraging green building projects .	**	Urban Environmental Sustainability (11.3/11.6, 11.b,11.c)	[+2]	Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient urban infrastructure solutions (e.g., public transit) can also promote urban environmental sustainability by improving air quality and reducing noise. Efficient transportation technologies powered by renewably-based energy carriers will be a key building block of any sustainable transport system (McCollum et al., 2018). Green buildings help in sustainable construction.	***	Berrueta et al. (2017); Cameron, Taylor, and Emmett (2015); Liddell and Guiney (2015); McLeod, Hopfe, and Kwan (2013); Noris et al. (2013); Salvalai et al. (2017); Yang, Yan, and Lam (2014); Kwong, Adam, and Sahar (2014); Holopainen et al. (2014); Bhojvaid Vasundhara et al. (2014); Kim et al. (2017); Shah (2015)	Berrueta et al. (2017); McCollum et al. (2018); Aether (2016); Babiker and Eckaus (2007); Bertram et al. (2015); Blyth et al. (2014); Borenstein (2012); Creutzig et al. (2013); Clarke et al. (2014); Dechezleprêtre and Sato (2014); Dinkelmann (2011); Fankhauser et al. (2008); Ferroukhi et al. (2016); Frondei et al. (2010); Gohin (2008); Guivarch et al. (2011); Jackson and Senker (2011); Johnson et al. (2015)	Anda et al. (2014); Roy et al. (2018)	McCollum et al. (2018); Bongardt et al. (2013); Creutzig et al. (2012); Grubler and Bork (2012); Kahn Ribeiro et al. (2012); Raji et al. (2015); Riahhi et al. (2012); Kim et al (2017)
Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy	Meeting energy demand	[+2]	Renewable energies could potentially serve as the main source of meeting energy demand in the rapidly growing developing country cities. Ali e et al. (2015) estimated the potential of solar, wind and biomass renewable energy options to meet part of the electrical demand in Karachi, Pakistan.	***	Sustainable economic growth and employment	[+2]	Creutzig et al. 2014 assessed the potential for renewable energies in the European region. They found that a European energy transition with a high-level of renewable energy installations in the periphery could act as an economic stimulus, decrease trade deficits, and possibly have positive employment effects. Provision of energy access can play a critical enabling role for new productive activities , livelihoods and employment. Reliable access to modern energy services can have an important influence on productivity and earnings. (McCollum et al., 2018)	**	Innovation and new infrastructure (9.2,9.4,9.5)	[+2]	Adoption of smart meter and smart grid following community based social marketing help in infrastructure expansion, statutory norms to enhance energy and resource efficiency in building is encouraging green building projects . Introduction of incentives and norms for solar rooftops/white/green roofs in cities are helping to accelerate the expansion of the innovation and infrastructure.	**	Housing (11.1)	[+3]	Ensuring access to basic housing services implies that households have access to modern energy forms. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018), roof top solar in Macau make cities sustainable . Introduction of incentives and norms for solar/white/green rooftops in cities are helping to accelerate the expansion of the infrastructure.	***	Creutzig et al. (2014); Connolly et al. (2014); Islar et al. (2017); Mittlefehldt (2016); Bilgiliy et al. (2017); Osturk et al. (2017); Mahony and Dufour (2015); Byravan et al. (2017); Abanda et al. (2016); Peng and Lu (2013); Pietzcker (2013); Ali et al. (2015); Li, Yang, and Lam (2014); Yanine and Sauma (2013); Pade (2013); Zulu and Richardson (2013)	Creutzig et al. (2014); Byravan et al. (2017); Ali et al. (2015); McCollum et al. (2018); Bernard and Torero (2015); Chakravorty et al. (2014); Grogan and Sadanand (2013); Pueyo et al. (2013); Rao (2013)	Anda et al. (2014); Roy et al. (2018)	McCollum et al. (2018); Bhattacharya et al. (2016); UN (2016); Song et al (2016); Roy et al. (2018)	

<p>Behavioural response</p>	<p>Energy savings (7.3, 7a, 7b) [+2] **</p> <p>Behavioural response will reduce the volume of transport needs and, by extension, energy demand.</p> <p>Ahmad S., Puppim de Oliveira J.A., 2016; Figueroa M.J., Ribeiro S.K., 2013</p>	<p>Promote Sustained, inclusive economic growth (8.3) [-2] **</p> <p>Policy contradictions (e.g. standards, efficient technologies leading to increased electricity prices leading the poor to switch away from clean(er) fuels); unintended outcomes (e.g. redistribution of income generated by carbon taxes) results in contradiction to the primary aims of (productive) job creation and poverty alleviation, and in trade-offs between mitigation adaptation and development policies. Detailed assessment of consequences of mitigation policies requires developing methods and reliable evidence to enable policymakers to more systematically identify how different social groups may be affected by the different available policy options.</p> <p>(Klausbruckner, Annegarn, Henneman, & Rafaj, 2016); (Lucas & Pangbourne, 2014);(Suckall, Tompkins, & Stringer, 2014)</p>	<p>Build Resilient Infrastructure (9.1) [+2,-2] **</p> <p>As people prefer more mass transportation, integrating train lines, a tram line, BRTs, gondola lift systems, a bicycle-sharing systems and hybrid buses and telecommuting need for new infrastructure increases</p> <p>Dulac (2013); Aamaas and Peters (2017); Martínez-Jaramillo et al. (2017); Xylia et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Make cities & Human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient (11.2) [+2] **</p> <p>Climate change threatens to worsen poverty, therefore pro-poor mitigation policies are needed to reduce this threat; for example investing more and better in infrastructure by leveraging private resources and using designs that account for future climate change and the related uncertainty</p> <p>Hallegate et al. (2015); Ahmad and Puppim de Oliveira (2016)</p>
<p>Accelerating energy efficiency improvement</p>	<p>Energy savings (7.3, 7a, 7b) [+2] *</p> <p>Accelerating efficiency in tourism transport reduces energy demand (china)</p> <p>Shukxin et al (2016)</p>	<p>Promote Sustained, inclusive economic growth (8.3) [+2,-2] **</p> <p>Significant opportunities to slow travel growth and improve efficiency exist and, similarly, alternatives to petroleum exist but have different characteristics in terms of availability, cost, distribution, infrastructure, storage, and public acceptability. Production of new technologies, fuels and infrastructure can favour economic growth, however, efficient financing of increased capital spending and infrastructure is critical.</p> <p>Gouldson et al. (2015); Karkatsoulset al. (2016)</p>	<p>Build Resilient Infrastructure (9.1) [+2,-2] **</p> <p>Combining promotion of mass transportation, integrating train lines, a tram line, BRTs, gondola lift systems, a bicycle-sharing systems and hybrid buses and telecommuting, reduce traffic and significantly contribute to meet climate targets a comprehensive package of complementary mitigation options is necessary for deep and sustained emission reductions. In sweden public bus fleet is aiming more towards decarbonisation compared to efficiency</p> <p>Dulac (2013); Aamaas and Peters (2017); Martínez-Jaramillo et al. (2017); Xylia et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Make cities sustainable (11.2,11.3) [+2] *</p> <p>Two most important elements of making cities sustainable are efficient building and transport (case of Macau).</p> <p>Song et al. (2016)</p>
<p>Improved access & fuel switch to modern low-carbon energy</p>	<p>Increase share of renewable (7.2) [+2] **</p> <p>Biofuel increase share of renewables but can perform poorly if too many countries increase their use of biofuel, whereas electrification performs best when many other countries implement this technology. The strategies are not mutually exclusive and simultaneous implementation of some provides synergies for national energy security. Therefore, important to consider result of material and contextual factors that co-evolve. Electric vehicles using electricity from renewables or low carbon sources combined with e-mobility options such as trolleybuses, metros, trams and electro buses, as well as promote walking and biking, especially for short distances need consideration</p> <p>Månsson (2016); Ajanovic (2015); Wolfram et al. (2017); Alahakoon (2017)</p>	<p>Promote Sustained, inclusive economic growth (8.3) [+2,-2] **</p> <p>the decarbonisation of the freight sector tends to occur in the second part of the century and that the sector decarbonises by a lower extent than the rest of the economy. Decarbonising road freight on a global scale remains a challenge even when notable progress in biofuels and electric vehicles has been accounted for.</p> <p>Carrara and Longden (2016); Creutzig et al. (2015); IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014)</p>	<p>Help building inclusive infrastructure (9.1, 9.a) [+2] **</p> <p>Lack of appropriate infrastructure lead to limited access to job for urban poor (africa, Latin America, India)</p> <p>Gouldson et al. (2015); Figueroa, Fulton and Tiwari (2013); Vasconcellos and Mendonça (2016); Lall et al. (2017)</p>	<p>Make cities & Human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient (11.2) [+2] **</p> <p>in rapidly growing cities, the carbon savings from investments at scale, in cost-effective low-carbon measures could be quickly overwhelmed – in as little as 7 years – by the impacts of sustained population and economic growth, highlighting the need to build capacities that enable the exploitation not only of the economically attractive options in the short term but also of those deeper and more structural changes that are likely to be needed in the longer term. With hybrid electric vehicles, plug-in electric vehicles there is emerging new concepts in transportation such as electric highways</p> <p>Gouldson et al. (2015); Figueroa, Fulton and Tiwari (2013); Vasconcellos and Mendonça (2016); Alahakoon (2017)</p>

		7 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY				8 DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH				9 INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE				11 CLIMATE ACTION							
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE
Replacing coal	Non-biomass renewables solar, wind, hydro	↑	[+3]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★	-	[0]		⊕⊕	★★	~ / ↓	[0, -1]		⊕⊕⊕	★★	↑	[+2]		⊕⊕	★★★
		Decarbonization of the energy system through an up-scaling of renewables will greatly facilitate access to clean, affordable and reliable energy. Hydropower plays an increasingly important role for the global electricity supply. This mitigation option is in line with the targets of SDG7 under the caveat of a transition to modern biomass.					Decarbonization of the energy system through an up-scaling of renewables and energy efficiency is consistent with sustained economic growth and resource decoupling. Long-term scenarios point towards slight consumption losses caused by a rapid and pervasive expansion of such energy solutions. Whether sustainable growth, as an overarching concept, is attainable or not is more disputed in the literature. Existing literature is also undecided as to whether or not access to modern energy services causes economic growth (McCollum et al., 2018).					A rapid up-scaling of renewable energies could necessitate the early retirement of fossil energy infrastructure (e.g., power plants, refineries, pipelines) on a large-scale. The implications of this could in some cases be negative, unless targeted policies can help alleviate the burden on industry (McCollum et al., 2018).					Deployment of renewable energy and improvements in energy efficiency globally will aid climate change mitigation efforts, and this, in turn, can help to reduce the exposure of people to certain types of disasters and extreme events (McCollum et al., 2018).				
		Cherian (2015); Rogelj (2013); Cherian (2015); Jingura and Kamusoko (2016)					McCollum et al. (2018); Bonan et al. (2014); Clarke et al. (2014); Jackson and Senker (2011); New Climate Economy (2014); OECD (2017); York and McGee (2017)					McCollum et al. (2018); Bertram et al. (2015); Fankhauser et al. (2008); Guivarch et al. (2011); Johnson et al. (2015)					McCollum et al. (2018); Daut et al. (2013); Hallegatte et al. (2016); IPCC (2014); Riahi et al. (2012); Tully (2006)				
	Increased use of biomass	↑	[+3]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★	↑	[+1]		⊕	*	↑	[+1]		⊕⊕⊕	★★		[0]			
		Increased use of modern biomass will facilitate access to clean, affordable and reliable energy. This mitigation option is in line with the targets of SDG7.					Decarbonization of the energy system through an up-scaling of renewables will greatly facilitate access to clean, affordable and reliable energy.					Access to modern and sustainable energy will be critical to sustain economic growth.					No direct interaction				
		Cherian A. (2015); Jingura R.M., Kamusoko R. (2016); Rogelj (2013)					Jingura R.M., Kamusoko R. (2016)					Jingura and Kamusoko (2016); Shahbazet al. (2016)									
	Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear	↑	[1]		⊕	★★	↑	[1]		⊕	★★	↓	[-1]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★		[0]			
		Increased use of nuclear power can provide stable baseload power supply and reduce price volatility.					Local employment impact and reduced price volatility					Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4) Legacy cost of waste and abandoned reactors					No direct interaction				
		IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014)					IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014)					IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Marra and Palmer (2011); Greenberg, (2013a); Schwenk-Ferrero (2013a); Skipperud et al. (2013); Tyler et al. (2013a)									
	CCS: Bio energy	↑	[+2]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★	↑	[+1]		⊕	*	↑	[+1]		⊕	*		[0]			
		Increased use of modern biomass will facilitate access to clean, affordable and reliable energy.					See positive impacts of bio-energy use.					See positive impacts of bio-energy use and CCS/CCU in industrial demand.					No direct interaction				
		IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014)																			
Advanced coal	CCS: Fossil	↑	[+2]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★	↓	[-1]		⊕⊕⊕	★★★	↑	[+1]		⊕	*		[0]			
		Advanced and cleaner fossil-fuel technology is in line with the targets of SDG7.					Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4) Lock-in of human and physical capital in the fossil-resources industry					See positive impacts of CCS/CCU in industrial demand.					No direct interaction				
		IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014)					IPCC AR5 WG3 (2014); Vergragt et al. (2011); Markusson et al. (2012); IPCC (2005); Benson et al. (2005); Fankhauser et al. (2008); Shackley and Thompson (2012); Johnson et al. (2015); Bertram et al. (2015)														

		10 SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND AFFORDABLE CLEAN ENERGY				9 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY				11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES														
		INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE	INTERACTION	SCORE	EVIDENCE	AGREEMENT	CONFIDENCE								
Agriculture & Livestock	Behavioural response: Sustainable healthy diets and reduced food waste	↑	[+1]	Energy Efficiency, universal access (7.1,7.3)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+1]	Sustained and inclusive economic growth (8.2)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★★	↑	[+1]	Infrastructure building and promotion of inclusive industrialization (9.1/ 9.2)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★★	[0]	No interaction	
	Land based greenhouse gas reduction and soil carbon sequestration	↑	[+1]	Sustainable and modern energy (7.b)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	★★★	↑/↓	[+2,-1]	Sustainable Growth (8.2)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★	↑/↓	[+2,-2]	Infrastructure building, promotion of inclusive industrialization and innovation (9.1/ 9.2)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★★	[0]	no direct interaction	
	Greenhouse gas reduction from improved livestock production and manure management systems	↑	[+1]	Energy Efficiency (7.3)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	↑	[+1]	Sustainable Economic Growth (8.4)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	↑	[+2]	Technological upgradation and Innovation (9.2)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★★	[0]	No direct interaction
Forest	Reduced deforestation, REDD+	↑/↓	[+1,-1]	Energy Efficiency (7.3)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+1]	Sustainable Economic Growth (8.4)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★	↑/↓	[+1,-1]	Infrastructure building ,promotion of inclusive industrialization (9.1/ 9.2/9.5)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★	[0]	No direct interaction	
	Afforestation and reforestation	↑	[+1]	Energy Conservation (7.3/7.b)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+2]	Decent job creation and Sustainable economic growth (8.3/8.4)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★★	[0]								[0]	No direct interaction
	Behavioural response (responsible sourcing)	↑	[+1]	Universal access (7.3)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+2]	Decent job creation and Sustainable economic growth (8.3/8.4)	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+2]	Technological upgradation and Innovation,promotion of inclusive industrialization	Ⓜ	Ⓢ	Ⓢ	★	↑	[+2]	Improving air quality, green and public spaces, peri urban spaces (11.6,11.7, 11a, 11b)
Oceans	Ocean iron fertilization	[0]						[0]						[0]									[0]	No direct interaction
	Blue carbon	[0]						[0]						[0]									[0]	No direct interaction
	Enhanced Weathering	[0]						[0]						[0]									[0]	No direct interaction

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59**References**

- Abel, G.J., B. Barakat, S. KC, and W. Lutz, 2016: Meeting the Sustainable Development Goals leads to lower world population growth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113(50)**, 14294-14299, doi:10.1073/pnas.1611386113.
- Absar, S.M. and B.L. Preston, 2015: Extending the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways for sub-national impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability studies. *Global Environmental Change*, **33**, 83-96, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.04.004.
- Adam, H.N., 2015: Mainstreaming adaptation in India - the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and climate change. *Climate and Development*, **7(2)**, 142-152, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.934772.
- Adger, W.N. et al., 2014: Human security. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 755-791.
- Aggarwal, A., 2014: How sustainable are forestry clean development mechanism projects? A review of the selected projects from India. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **19(1)**, 73-91, doi:10.1007/s11027-012-9427-x.
- Agoramoorthy, G. and M.J. Hsu, 2016: Small dams revive dry rivers and mitigate local climate change in India's drylands. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **8(2)**, 271-285, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-12-2014-0141.
- Agyeman, J., D. Schlosberg, L. Craven, and C. Matthews, 2016: Trends and directions in environmental justice: from inequity to everyday life, community, and just sustainabilities. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **41**, 321-340, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-090052.
- Aha, B. and J.Z. Ayitey, 2017: Biofuels and the hazards of land grabbing: tenure (in)security and indigenous farmers' investment decisions in Ghana. *Land Use Policy*, **60**, 48-59, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.10.012.
- Ahmed, N., W.W.L. Cheung, S. Thompson, and M. Glaser, 2017a: Solutions to blue carbon emissions: Shrimp cultivation, mangrove deforestation and climate change in coastal Bangladesh. *Marine Policy*, **82(May)**, 68-75, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.007.
- Ahmed, N., S.W. Bunting, M. Glaser, M.S. Flaherty, and J.S. Diana, 2017b: Can greening of aquaculture sequester blue carbon? *Ambio*, **46(4)**, 468-477, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0849-7.
- Aipira, C., A. Kidd, and K. Morioka, 2017: Climate change adaptation in Pacific countries: fostering resilience through gender equality. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific Countries: Fostering Resilience and Improving the Quality of Life* [Leal Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer International Publishing AG, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 225-239.
- Ajanovic, A., 2015: The future of electric vehicles: prospects and impediments. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment*, **4(6)**, 521-536, doi:10.1002/wene.160.
- Al Ansari, M.S., 2013: Climate change policies and the potential for energy efficiency in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Economy. *Environment and Natural Resources Research*, **3(4)**, 106-117, doi:10.5539/enrr.v3n4p106.
- Albert, S. et al., 2017: Heading for the hills: climate-driven community relocations in the Solomon Islands and Alaska provide insight for a 1.5°C future. *Regional Environmental Change*, 1-12, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1256-8.
- Ali, A. and O. Erenstein, 2017: Assessing farmer use of climate change adaptation practices and impacts on food security and poverty in Pakistan. *Climate Risk Management*, **16**, 183-194, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2016.12.001.
- Al-Maamary, H.M.S., H.A. Kazem, and M.T. Chaichan, 2016: Changing the energy profile of the GCC states: a review. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, **11(3)**, 1980-1988.
- Al-Maamary, H.M.S., H.A. Kazem, and M.T. Chaichan, 2017: The impact of oil price fluctuations on common renewable energies in GCC countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **75**, 989-1007, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.079.
- Alshehry, A.S. and M. Belloumi, 2015: Energy consumption, carbon dioxide emissions and economic growth: the case of Saudi Arabia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **41**, 237-247, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.08.004.
- Alsheyab, M.A.T., 2017: Qatar's effort for the deployment of Carbon Capture and Storage. *Global Nest Journal*, **19(3)**, 453-457.
- Altieri, K.E. et al., 2016: Achieving development and mitigation objectives through a decarbonization development pathway in South Africa. *Climate Policy*, **16(sup1)**, S78-S91, doi:10.1080/14693062.2016.1150250.
- Amann, M. et al., 2011: Cost-effective control of air quality and greenhouse gases in Europe: Modeling and policy applications. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, **26(12)**, 1489-1501, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2011.07.012.
- Anand, R., 2017: International environmental justice: a North-South dimension. .

- 1 Andonova, L.B., T.N. Hale, and C.B. Roger, 2017: National policy and transnational governance of climate change:
2 substitutes or complements? *International Studies Quarterly*, **61(2)**, 253-268, doi:10.1093/isq/sqx014.
- 3 Ansuategi, A. et al., 2015: *The impact of climate change on the achievement of the post-2015 sustainable development*
4 *goals*. Metroeconomica, HR Wallingford and CDKN, 84 pp.
- 5 Antwi-Agyei, P., A.J. Dougill, and L.C. Stringer, 2015: Impacts of land tenure arrangements on the adaptive capacity of
6 marginalized groups: The case of Ghana's Ejura Sekyedumase and Bongo districts. *Land Use Policy*, **49**, 203-
7 212, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.08.007.
- 8 Antwi-Agyei, P., A. Dougill, and L. Stringer, 2017a: Assessing Coherence between Sector Policies and Climate
9 Compatible Development: Opportunities for Triple Wins. *Sustainability*, **9(11)**, 2130, doi:10.3390/su9112130.
- 10 Antwi-Agyei, P., A.J. Dougill, L.C. Stringer, and S.N.A. Codjoe, 2018: Adaptation opportunities and maladaptive
11 outcomes in climate vulnerability hotspots of northern Ghana. *Climate Risk Management*, **19(April 2017)**, 83-
12 93, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2017.11.003.
- 13 Antwi-Agyei, P. et al., 2017b: Perceived stressors of climate vulnerability across scales in the Savannah zone of Ghana:
14 a participatory approach. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(1)**, 213-227, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0993-4.
- 15 Apgar, M.J., W. Allen, K. Moore, and J. Ataria, 2015: Understanding adaptation and transformation through indigenous
16 practice: the case of the Guna of Panama. *Ecology and Society*, **20(1)**.
- 17 Arakelyan, I., D. Moran, and A. Wreford, 2017: Climate smart agriculture: a critical review. In: *Making climate*
18 *compatible development happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp.
19 66-86.
- 20 Arbuthnott, K., S. Hajat, C. Heavyside, and S. Vardoulakis, 2016: Changes in population susceptibility to heat and cold
21 over time: assessing adaptation to climate change. *Environmental Health*, **15(S1)**, S33, doi:10.1186/s12940-
22 016-0102-7.
- 23 Archer, D. et al., 2014: Moving towards inclusive urban adaptation: approaches to integrating community-based
24 adaptation to climate change at city and national scale. *Climate and Development*, **6(4)**, 345-356,
25 doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.918868.
- 26 Armitage, D.R., 2015: Social-ecological change in Canada's Arctic: coping, adapting, learning for an uncertain future.
27 In: *Climate Change and the Coast: Building Resilient Communities* [Glavovic, B., M. Kelly, R. Kay, and A.
28 Travers (eds.)]. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, pp. 103-124.
- 29 Arnell, N.W. and S.N. Gosling, 2016: The impacts of climate change on river flood risk at the global scale. *Climatic*
30 *Change*, **134(3)**, 387-401, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1084-5.
- 31 Arnell, N.W. et al., 2015: *The global impacts of climate change under pathways that reach 2°, 3° and 4°C above pre-*
32 *industrial levels*. Report from AVOID2 project to the Committee on Climate Change, 34 pp.
- 33 Arriagada, R.A., E.O. Sills, P.J. Ferraro, and S.K. Pattanayak, 2015: Do payments pay off? Evidence from participation
34 in Costa Rica's PES program. *PLOS ONE*, **10(7)**, 1-17, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131544.
- 35 Arthurson, K. and S. Baum, 2015: Making space for social inclusion in conceptualising climate change vulnerability.
36 *Local Environment*, **20(1)**, 1-17, doi:10.1080/13549839.2013.818951.
- 37 Arts, K., 2017: Inclusive sustainable development: a human rights perspective. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
38 *Sustainability*, **24**, 58-62, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.02.001.
- 39 Atalay, Y., F. Biermann, and A. Kalfagianni, 2016: Adoption of renewable energy technologies in oil-rich countries:
40 explaining policy variation in the Gulf Cooperation Council states. *Renewable Energy*, **85**, 206-214,
41 doi:10.1016/j.renene.2015.06.045.
- 42 Ayers, J.M., S. Huq, H. Wright, A.M. Faisal, and S.T. Hussain, 2014: Mainstreaming climate change adaptation into
43 development in Bangladesh. *Climate and Development*, **6(4)**, 293-305, doi:10.1002/wcc.226.
- 44 Babiker, M.H., 2016: Options for climate change policy in MENA countries after Paris. .
- 45 Bado, B.V., P. Savadogo, and M.L.S. Manzo, 2016: *Restoration of Degraded Lands in West Africa Sahel: Review of*
46 *experiences in Burkina Faso and Niger*. 16 pp.
- 47 Bai, X. et al., 2016: Plausible and desirable futures in the Anthropocene: A new research agenda. *Global Environmental*
48 *Change*, **39**, 351-362, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.09.017.
- 49 Bai, X. et al., 2018: Six Research Priorities for Cities and Climate Change. *Nature*, **555**, 23-25, doi:10.1038/d41586-
50 018-02409-z.
- 51 Bajželj, B. et al., 2014: Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(10)**,
52 924-929.
- 53 Baldacchino, G., 2017: Seizing history: development and non-climate change in Small Island Developing States.
54 *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, IJCCSM-02-2017-0037,
55 doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-02-2017-0037.
- 56 Banda, M.L. and S. Fulton, 2017: Litigating Climate Change in National Courts: Recent Trends and Developments in
57 Global Climate Law. *Environmental Law Rep. News & Analysis*, **47(10121)**, 10121-10134.
- 58 Barnes, P., 2015: The political economy of localization in the transition movement. *Community Development Journal*,
59 **50(2)**, 312-326, doi:10.1093/cdj/bsu042.

- 1 Barnett, J. and E. Walters, 2016: Rethinking the vulnerability of small island states: climate change and development in
2 the Pacific Islands. *The Palgrave Handbook of International Development*, doi:10.1057/978-1-137-42724-
3 3_40.
- 4 Barnett, J., P. Tschakert, L. Head, and W.N. Adger, 2016: A science of loss. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(November)**,
5 976-978, doi:10.1038/nclimate3140.
- 6 Barnett, J. et al., 2014: A local coastal adaptation pathway. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(12)**, 1103-1108,
7 doi:10.1038/nclimate2383.
- 8 Barrett, S., 2013: Local level climate justice? Adaptation finance and vulnerability reduction. *Global Environmental*
9 *Change*, **23(6)**, 1819-1829, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.07.015.
- 10 Barrington-Leigh, C., 2016: Sustainability and Well-Being: A Happy Synergy. *Development*, **59**, 292-298,
11 doi:10.1057/s41301-017-0113-x.
- 12 Bartos, M.D. and M. Chester, 2014: The conservation nexus: Valuing interdependent water and energy savings in
13 Arizona. *Environmental science & technology*, **48(4)**, 2139-2149.
- 14 Bathiany, S., V. Dakos, M. Scheffer, and T.M. Lenton, 2018: Climate models predict increasing temperature variability
15 in poor countries. *Science Advances*, **4(5)**, eaar5809, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aar5809.
- 16 Bauer, N. et al., 2016: Global fossil energy markets and climate change mitigation - an analysis with REMIND.
17 *Climatic Change*, **136(1)**, 69-82, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0901-6.
- 18 Bayram, H. and A.B. Öztürk, 2014: Global climate change, desertification, and its consequences in Turkey and the
19 Middle East. In: *Global Climate Change and Public Health* [Pinkerton, K.E. and W.N. Rom (eds.)]. Springer,
20 New York, NY, USA, pp. 293-305.
- 21 Bebbington, J. and C. Larrinaga, 2014: Accounting and sustainable development: an exploration. *Accounting,*
22 *Organizations and Society*, **39(6)**, 395-413, doi:10.1016/j.aos.2014.01.003.
- 23 Beilin, R. and C. Wilkinson, 2015: Introduction: Governing for urban resilience. *Urban Studies*, **52(7)**, 1205-1217,
24 doi:10.1177/0042098015574955.
- 25 Bell, K., 2015: Can the capitalist economic system deliver environmental justice? *Environmental Research Letters*,
26 **10(12)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/125017.
- 27 Berger, M., S. Pfister, V. Bach, and M. Finkbeiner, 2015: Saving the planet's climate or water resources? The trade-off
28 between carbon and water footprints of European biofuels. *Sustainability*, **7(6)**, 6665-6683,
29 doi:10.3390/su7066665.
- 30 Berner, J. et al., 2016: Adaptation in Arctic circumpolar communities: food and water security in a changing climate.
31 *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, **3982(May 2017)**, 1-8, doi:10.3402/ijch.v75.33820.
- 32 Berrueta, V.M., M. Serrano-Medrano, C. Garcia-Bustamante, M. Astier, and O.R. Masera, 2017: Promoting sustainable
33 local development of rural communities and mitigating climate change: the case of Mexico's Patsari improved
34 cookstove project. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 63-77, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1523-y.
- 35 Bertram, C. et al., 2018: Targeted policies can compensate most of the increased sustainability risks in 1.5°C mitigation
36 scenarios. *Environmental Research Letters* (in press).
- 37 Betts, R.A. et al., 2018: Changes in climate extremes, fresh water availability and vulnerability to food insecurity
38 projected at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming with a higher-resolution global climate model. *Philosophical*
39 *Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160452,
40 doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0452.
- 41 Betzold, C. and F. Weiler, 2017: Allocation of aid for adaptation to climate change: do vulnerable countries receive
42 more support? *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **17**, 17-36.
- 43 Bexell, M. and K. Jönsson, 2017: Responsibility and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. *Forum for*
44 *Development Studies*, **44(1)**, 13-29, doi:10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424.
- 45 Bickersteth, S. et al., 2017: *Mainstreaming climate compatible development: Insights from CDKN's first seven years*.
- 46 Biermann, F. and I. Boas, 2017: Towards a global governance system to protect climate migrants: taking stock. In:
47 *Research Handbook on Climate Change, Migration and the Law* [Mayer, B. and F. Crepeau (eds.)]. Edward
48 Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK ; Northampton, MA, USA, pp. 405-419.
- 49 Biermann, M., K. Hillmer-Pegram, C.N. Knapp, and R.E. Hum, 2016: Approaching a critical turn? A content analysis
50 of the politics of resilience in key bodies of resilience literature. *Resilience*, **4(2)**, 59-78,
51 doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1094170.
- 52 Binam, J.N., F. Place, A.A. Djalal, and A. Kalinganire, 2017: Effects of local institutions on the adoption of
53 agroforestry innovations: evidence of farmer managed natural regeneration and its implications for rural
54 livelihoods in the Sahel. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, **5(1)**, 2, doi:10.1186/s40100-017-0072-2.
- 55 Blanco, V., C. Brown, S. Holzhauser, G. Vulturius, and M.D.A. Rounsevell, 2017: The importance of socio-ecological
56 system dynamics in understanding adaptation to global change in the forestry sector. *Journal of Environmental*
57 *Management*, **196**, 36-47, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.02.066.
- 58 Blondeel, M. and T. van de Graaf, 2018: Toward a global coal mining moratorium? A comparative analysis of coal
59 mining policies in the USA, China, India and Australia. *Climatic Change*, 1-13, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-

- 1 2135-5.
- 2 Blyth, W., R. McCarthy, and R. Gross, 2015: Financing the UK power sector: is the money available? *Energy Policy*,
3 **87**, 607-622, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.08.028.
- 4 Boke, C., 2015: Resilience's problem of the present: reconciling social justice and future-oriented resilience planning in
5 the Transition Town movement. *Resilience*, **3(3)**, 207-220, doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1072313.
- 6 Bonsch, M. et al., 2016: Trade-offs between land and water requirements for large-scale bioenergy production. *GCB*
7 *Bioenergy*, **8(1)**, 11-24.
- 8 Boonstra, W.J., E. Björkvik, L.J. Haider, and V. Masterson, 2016: Human responses to social-ecological traps.
9 *Sustainability Science*, **11(6)**, 877-889, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0397-x.
- 10 Bosomworth, K., P. Leith, A. Harwood, and P.J. Wallis, 2017: What's the problem in adaptation pathways planning?
11 The potential of a diagnostic problem-structuring approach. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **76(January)**,
12 23-28, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.007.
- 13 Bowyer, P., M. Schaller, S. Bender, and D. Jacob, 2015: Adaptation as climate risk management: methods and
14 approaches. *Handbook of Climate Change Adaptation*, 71-92.
- 15 Boyd, E., R.A. James, R.G. Jones, H.R. Young, and F.E.L. Otto, 2017: A typology of loss and damage perspectives.
16 *Nature Climate Change*, **7(10)**, 723-729, doi:10.1038/nclimate3389.
- 17 Boyle, J. et al., 2013: *Exploring trends in low-carbon, climate-resilient development*. 37 pp.
- 18 Boysen, L.R., W. Lucht, and D. Gerten, 2017: Trade-offs for food production, nature conservation and climate limit the
19 terrestrial carbon dioxide removal potential. *Global Change Biology*, **23(10)**, 4303-4317,
20 doi:10.1111/gcb.13745.
- 21 Brink, E. et al., 2016: Cascades of green: A review of ecosystem-based adaptation in urban areas. *Global*
22 *Environmental Change*, **36**, 111-123, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.11.003.
- 23 Brockington, D. and S. Ponte, 2015: The Green Economy in the global South: experiences, redistributions and
24 resistance. *Third World Quarterly*, **36(12)**, 2197-2206, doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1086639.
- 25 Brohé, A., 2014: Whither the CDM? Investment outcomes and future prospects. *Environment, Development and*
26 *Sustainability*, **16(2)**, 305-322, doi:10.1007/s10668-013-9478-5.
- 27 Brown, D. and G. McGranahan, 2016: The urban informal economy, local inclusion and achieving a global green
28 transformation. *Habitat International*, **53**, 97-105.
- 29 Brown, E., J. Cloke, D. Gent, P.H. Johnson, and C. Hill, 2014: Green growth or ecological commodification: debating
30 the green economy in the global south. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography*, **96(3)**, 245-259,
31 doi:10.1111/geob.12049.
- 32 Bryan, E., Q. Bernier, M. Espinal, and C. Ringler, 2017: Making climate change adaptation programmes in sub-Saharan
33 Africa more gender responsive: insights from implementing organizations on the barriers and opportunities.
34 *Climate and Development*, 1-15, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1301870.
- 35 Buch-Hansen, H., 2018: The Prerequisites for a Degrowth Paradigm Shift: Insights from Critical Political Economy.
36 *Ecological Economics*, **146(October 2017)**, 157-163, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.10.021.
- 37 Bulkeley, H., G.A.S. Edwards, and S. Fuller, 2014: Contesting climate justice in the city: examining politics and
38 practice in urban climate change experiments. *Global Environmental Change*, **25(1)**, 31-40,
39 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.01.009.
- 40 Bulkeley, H., J.A. Carmin, V. Castán Broto, G.A.S. Edwards, and S. Fuller, 2013: Climate justice and global cities:
41 mapping the emerging discourses. *Global Environmental Change*, **23(5)**, 914-925,
42 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.010.
- 43 Buntaine, M.T. and L. Prather, 2018: Preferences for Domestic Action Over International Transfers in Global Climate
44 Policy. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1-15, doi:10.1017/XPS.2017.34.
- 45 Burke, M., S.M. Hsiang, and E. Miguel, 2015: Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*,
46 **527(7577)**, 235-239, doi:10.1038/nature15725.
- 47 Burns, W. and S. Nicholson, 2017: Bioenergy and carbon capture with storage (BECCS): the prospects and challenges
48 of an emerging climate policy response. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, **7(4)**, 527-534,
49 doi:10.1007/s13412-017-0445-6.
- 50 Bustamante, M. et al., 2014: Co-benefits, trade-offs, barriers and policies for greenhouse gas mitigation in the
51 agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) sector. *Global Change Biology*, **20(10)**, 3270-3290,
52 doi:10.1111/gcb.12591.
- 53 Butler, C., K.A. Parkhill, and N.F. Pidgeon, 2016: Energy consumption and everyday life: choice, values and agency
54 through a practice theoretical lens. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, **16(3)**, 887-907,
55 doi:10.1177/1469540514553691.
- 56 Butler, J.R.A. et al., 2016: Scenario planning to leap-frog the Sustainable Development Goals: an adaptation pathways
57 approach. *Climate Risk Management*, **12**, 83-99, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2015.11.003.
- 58 Butt, N. et al., 2016: Challenges in assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change to inform conservation
59 actions. *Biological Conservation*, **199**, 10-15, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.04.020.

- 1 Byers, E. et al., 2018: Global exposure and vulnerability to multi-sector climate change hotspots. *Environmental*
2 *Research Letters* (in press), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabf45.
- 3 Byers, E.A., J.W. Hall, and J.M. Amezcaga, 2014: Electricity generation and cooling water use: UK pathways to 2050.
4 *Global Environmental Change*, **25**, 16-30, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.01.005.
- 5 Byrne, J. et al., 2016: Could urban greening mitigate suburban thermal inequity?: the role of residents' dispositions and
6 household practices. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 095014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095014.
- 7 Byrnes, W.M., 2014: Climate justice, Hurricane Katrina, and African American environmentalism. *Journal of African*
8 *American Studies*, **18(3)**, 305-314, doi:10.1007/s12111-013-9270-5.
- 9 Cabezón, E., L. Hunter, P. Tumbarello, K. Washimi, and Yiqun Wu, 2016: Strengthening Macro-Fiscal Resilience to
10 Natural Disasters and Climate Change in the Small States of the Pacific. In: *Resilience and Growth in the*
11 *Small States of the Pacific* [Khor, H.E., R.P. Kronenberg, and P. Tumbarello (eds.)]. pp. 71-94.
- 12 Caldecott, B., O. Sartor, and T. Spencer, 2017: *Lessons from previous 'coal transitions': High-level summary for*
13 *decision-makers*. 24 pp.
- 14 Callen, T., R. Cherif, F. Hasanov, A. Hegazy, and P. Khandelwal, 2014: Economic diversification in the GCC: past,
15 present, and future.
- 16 Calliari, E., 2016: Loss and damage: a critical discourse analysis of Parties' positions in climate change negotiations.
17 *Journal of Risk Research*, **9877**, 1-23, doi:10.1080/13669877.2016.1240706.
- 18 Calvet-Mir, L., E. Corbera, A. Martin, J. Fisher, and N. Gross-Camp, 2015: Payments for ecosystem services in the
19 tropics: a closer look at effectiveness and equity. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **14(May)**,
20 150-162, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.06.001.
- 21 Calvin, K. et al., 2017: The SSP4: A world of deepening inequality. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 284-296,
22 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.010.
- 23 Cameron, C. et al., 2016: Policy trade-offs between climate mitigation and clean cook-stove access in South Asia.
24 *Nature Energy*, **1**, 1-5, doi:10.1038/nenergy.2015.10.
- 25 Cameron, R.W.F., J. Taylor, and M. Emmett, 2015: A Hedera green facade - energy performance and saving under
26 different maritime-temperate, winter weather conditions. *Building and Environment*, **92**, 111-121,
27 doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.04.011.
- 28 Campbell, B.M. et al., 2016: Reducing risks to food security from climate change. *Global Food Security*, **11**, 34-43,
29 doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2016.06.002.
- 30 Câmpeanu, C.N. and I. Fazey, 2014: Adaptation and pathways of change and response: a case study from Eastern
31 Europe. *Global Environmental Change*, **28**, 351-367, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.010.
- 32 Campiglio, E., 2016: Beyond carbon pricing: The role of banking and monetary policy in financing the transition to a
33 low-carbon economy. *Ecological Economics*, **121**, 220-230, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.03.020.
- 34 Carr, E.R. and M.C. Thompson, 2014: Gender and climate change adaptation in agrarian settings. *Geography Compass*,
35 **8/3(October)**, 182-197, doi:10.1111/gec3.12121.
- 36 Carr, E.R. and K.N. Owusu-Daaku, 2015: The shifting epistemologies of vulnerability in climate services for
37 development: The case of Mali's agrometeorological advisory programme. *Area*, 7-17,
38 doi:10.1111/area.12179.
- 39 Carr, E.R. and S.N. Onzere, 2017: Really effective (for 15% of the men): lessons in understanding and addressing user
40 needs in climate services from Mali. *Climate Risk Management* (in press), doi:10.1016/j.crm.2017.03.002.
- 41 Carter, T.R. et al., 2016: Characterising vulnerability of the elderly to climate change in the Nordic region. *Regional*
42 *Environmental Change*, **16(1)**, 43-58, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0688-7.
- 43 Castán Broto, V., 2017: Urban Governance and the Politics of Climate change. *World Development*, **93**, 1-15,
44 doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.12.031.
- 45 Castro, P., 2016: Common but differentiated responsibilities beyond the nation state: how is differential treatment
46 addressed in transnational Climate governance initiatives? *Transnational Environmental Law*, **5(02)**, 379-400,
47 doi:10.1017/S2047102516000224.
- 48 Cavanagh, C. and T.A. Benjaminsen, 2014: Virtual nature, violent accumulation: The 'spectacular failure' of carbon
49 offsetting at a Ugandan National Park. *Geoforum*, **56**, 55-65, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.013.
- 50 Cervigni, R. and M. Morris (eds.), 2016: *Confronting drought in Africa's drylands: opportunities for enhancing*
51 *resilience*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA.
- 52 Chakrabarti, S. and E.J. Shin, 2017: Automobile dependence and physical inactivity: insights from the California
53 Household Travel Survey. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6(April)**, 262-271, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.002.
- 54 Chakravarty, D. and M. Tavoni, 2013: Energy poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation: Is there a trade off?
55 *Energy Economics*, **40**, S67-S73.
- 56 Chakravarty, D. and J. Roy, 2016: The Global South: new estimates and insights from urban India. In: *Rethinking*
57 *climate and energy policies: new perspectives on the rebound phenomenon* [Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and
58 A. Carlo (eds.)]. Springer, pp. 55-72.
- 59 Chakravarty, D., S. Dasgupta, and J. Roy, 2013: Rebound effect: how much to worry? *Current Opinion in*

- 1 *Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 216-228, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.03.001.
- 2 Chan, K.M.A., E. Anderson, M. Chapman, K. Jespersen, and P. Olmsted, 2017: Payments for ecosystem services: rife
3 with problems and potential-for transformation towards sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, **140**, 110-122,
4 doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.029.
- 5 Chancel, L. and T. Picketty, 2015: *Carbon and inequality: from Kyoto to Paris. Trends in the global inequality of
6 carbon emissions (1998-2013) & prospects for an equitable adaptation fund.* 50 pp.
- 7 Chapin, F.S., C.N. Knapp, T.J. Brinkman, R. Bronen, and P. Cochran, 2016: Community-empowered adaptation for
8 self-reliance. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **19**, 67-75, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.12.008.
- 9 Chaturvedi, V. and P.R. Shukla, 2014: Role of energy efficiency in climate change mitigation policy for India:
10 assessment of co-benefits and opportunities within an integrated assessment modeling framework. *Climatic
11 Change*, **123(3)**, 597-609, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0898-x.
- 12 Chelleri, L., G. Minucci, and E. Skrimizea, 2016: Does community resilience decrease social-ecological vulnerability?
13 Adaptation pathways trade-off in the Bolivian Altiplano. *Regional Environmental Change*, **16(8)**, 2229-2241,
14 doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1046-8.
- 15 Chen, X., X. Liu, and D. Hu, 2015: Assessment of sustainable development: A case study of Wuhan as a pilot city in
16 China. *Ecological Indicators*, **50**, 206-214, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.11.002.
- 17 Cheung, W.W.L., G. Reygondeau, and T.L. Frölicher, 2016: Large benefits to marine fisheries of meeting the 1.5°C
18 global warming target. *Science*, **354(6319)**, 1591-1594, doi:10.1126/science.aag2331.
- 19 Chief, K., A. Meadow, and K. Whyte, 2016: Engaging southwestern tribes in sustainable water resources topics and
20 management. *Water*, **8(8)**, 1-21, doi:10.3390/w8080350.
- 21 Chong, J., 2014: Ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation: progress and challenges. *International
22 Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **14(4)**, 391-405, doi:10.1007/s10784-014-9242-9.
- 23 Chu, E., I. Anguelovski, and D. Roberts, 2017: Climate adaptation as strategic urbanism: assessing opportunities and
24 uncertainties for equity and inclusive development in cities. *Cities*, **60**, 378-387,
25 doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.10.016.
- 26 Clarke, L.E. et al., 2014: Assessing transformation pathways. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change.
27 Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
28 Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum,
29 S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C.
30 Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 413-
31 510.
- 32 Clements, R., 2009: *The Economic Cost of Climate Change in Africa.* 52 pp.
- 33 Cobbinah, P.B. and G.K. Anane, 2016: Climate change adaptation in rural Ghana: indigenous perceptions and
34 strategies. *Climate and Development*, **8(2)**, 169-178, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1034228.
- 35 Coe, R., F. Sinclair, and E. Barrios, 2014: Scaling up agroforestry requires research 'in' rather than 'for' development.
36 *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **6(1)**, 73-77, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.013.
- 37 Coe, R., J. Njoloma, and F. Sinclair, 2017: To control or not to control: how do we learn more about how agronomic
38 innovations perform on farms? *Experimental Agriculture*, 1-7, doi:10.1017/S0014479717000102.
- 39 Cohen, M.G. (ed.), 2017: *Climate change and gender in rich countries: work, public policy and action.* Routledge,
40 Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 322 pp.
- 41 Cole, M.J., R.M. Bailey, and M.G. New, 2017: Spatial variability in sustainable development trajectories in South
42 Africa: provincial level safe and just operating spaces. *Sustainability Science*, **12(5)**, 829-848,
43 doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0418-9.
- 44 Colenbrander, S., D. Dodman, and D. Mitlin, 2017: Using climate finance to advance climate justice: the politics and
45 practice of channelling resources to the local level. *Climate Policy*, 1-14,
46 doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1388212.
- 47 Colenbrander, S. et al., 2016: Can low-carbon urban development be pro-poor? The case of Kolkata, India.
48 *Environment and Urbanization*, **29(1)**, 139-158, doi:10.1177/0956247816677775.
- 49 Colloff, M.J. et al., 2017: An integrative research framework for enabling transformative adaptation. *Environmental
50 Science and Policy*, **68**, 87-96, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.007.
- 51 Conservation International, 2016: *Ecosystem Based Adaptation: Essential for Achieving the Sustainable Development
52 Goals.* 4 pp.
- 53 Conway, D. et al., 2015: Climate and southern Africa's water-energy-food nexus. *Nature Climate Change*, **5(9)**, 837-
54 846, doi:10.1038/Nclimate2735.
- 55 Corbera, E., C. Hunsberger, and C. Vaddhanaphuti, 2017: Climate change policies, land grabbing and conflict:
56 perspectives from Southeast Asia. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, **38(3)**, 297-304,
57 doi:10.1080/02255189.2017.1343413.
- 58 Cretney, R.M., A.C. Thomas, and S. Bond, 2016: Maintaining grassroots activism: Transition Towns in Aotearoa New
59 Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*, **72(2)**, 81-91.

- 1 Creutzig, F. et al., 2015: Bioenergy and climate change mitigation: an assessment. *GCB Bioenergy*, **7(5)**, 916-944,
2 doi:10.1111/gcbb.12205.
- 3 Croce, D., C. Kaminker, and F. Stewart, 2011: The role of pension funds in financing green growth initiatives. OECD
4 Working Papers on Finance, Insurance and Private Pensions.
- 5 Crosland, T., A. Meyer, and M. Wewerinke-singh, 2016: The Paris Agreement Implementation Blueprint: a practical
6 guide to bridging the gap between actions and goal and closing the accountability deficit (Part 1).
7 *Environmental liability*, **25(2)**, 114-125.
- 8 CSO Review, 2015: Fair shares: a civil society equity review of INDCs. , doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.5917399.
- 9 Cugurullo, F., 2013: How to build a sandcastle: an analysis of the genesis and development of Masdar City. *Journal of*
10 *Urban Technology*, **20(1)**, 23-37, doi:10.1080/10630732.2012.735105.
- 11 Cundill, G. et al., 2014: *Social learning for adaptation: a descriptive handbook for practitioners and action*
12 *researchers*. 118 pp.
- 13 Cutter, S.L., 2016: Resilience to What? Resilience for Whom? *Geographical Journal*, **182(2)**, 110-113,
14 doi:10.1111/geoj.12174.
- 15 Cvitanovic, C. et al., 2016: Linking adaptation science to action to build food secure Pacific Island communities.
16 *Climate Risk Management*, **11**, 53-62, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2016.01.003.
- 17 Daigneault, A., P. Brown, and D. Gawith, 2016: Dredging versus hedging: Comparing hard infrastructure to ecosystem-
18 based adaptation to flooding. *Ecological Economics*, **122**, 25-35, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.11.023.
- 19 Dasgupta, P., 2016: *Climate Sensitive Adaptation in Health: Imperatives for India in a Developing Economy Context*.
20 Springer India, 194 pp.
- 21 Dasgupta, P., K. Ebi, and I. Sachdeva, 2016: Health sector preparedness for adaptation planning in India. *Climatic*
22 *Change*, **138(3-4)**, 551-566, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1745-7.
- 23 Dasgupta, S., M. Huq, M.G. Mustafa, M.I. Sobhan, and D. Wheeler, 2017: The impact of aquatic salinization on fish
24 habitats and poor communities in a changing climate: evidence from southwest coastal Bangladesh. *Ecological*
25 *Economics*, **139**, 128-139, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.009.
- 26 Datta, N., 2015: Evaluating impacts of watershed development program on agricultural productivity, income, and
27 livelihood in bhalki watershed of Bardhaman District, West Bengal. *World Development*, **66**, 443-456,
28 doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.08.024.
- 29 Davies, K., 2015: Kastom, climate change and intergenerational democracy: experiences from Vanuatu. In: *Climate*
30 *change in the Asia-Pacific region* [Leal Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer, pp. 49-66.
- 31 Davies, T.E., N. Pettorelli, W. Cresswill, and I.R. Fazey, 2014: Who are the poor? Measuring wealth inequality to aid
32 understanding of socioeconomic contexts for conservation: a case-study from the Solomon Islands.
33 *Environmental Conservation*, **41(04)**, 357-366, doi:10.1017/S0376892914000058.
- 34 de Coninck, H.C. and D. Puig, 2015: Assessing climate change mitigation technology interventions by international
35 institutions. *Climatic Change*, **131(3)**, 417-433, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1344-z.
- 36 de Coninck, H.C. and A. Sagar, 2015: Making sense of policy for climate technology development and transfer.
37 *Climate Policy*, **15(1)**, 1-11, doi:10.1080/14693062.2014.953909.
- 38 de Coninck, H.C. and A. Sagar, 2017: Technology development and transfer (Article 10). *The Paris Agreement on*
39 *Climate Change*, 258-276.
- 40 De Stefano, L., J.D. Petersen-Perlman, E.A. Sproles, J. Eynard, and A.T. Wolf, 2017: Assessment of transboundary
41 river basins for potential hydro-political tensions. *Global Environmental Change*, **45**, 35-46.
- 42 Dearing, J.A. et al., 2014: Safe and just operating spaces for regional social-ecological systems. *Global Environmental*
43 *Change*, **28(1)**, 227-238, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.06.012.
- 44 Death, C., 2014: The Green Economy in South Africa: Global Discourses and Local Politics. *Politikon*, **41(1)**, 1-22,
45 doi:10.1080/02589346.2014.885668.
- 46 Death, C., 2015: Four discourses of the green economy in the global South. *Third World Quarterly*, **36(12)**, 2207-2224,
47 doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1068110.
- 48 Death, C., 2016: Green states in Africa: beyond the usual suspects. *Environmental Politics*, **25:1**, 116-135,
49 doi:10.1080/09644016.2015.1074380.
- 50 DeCaro, D.A., C. Anthony, T. Arnold, E.F. Boamah, and A.S. Garmestani, 2017: Understanding and applying
51 principles of social cognition and decision making in adaptive environmental governance. *Ecology and*
52 *Society*, **22(1)**, 33, doi:doi.org/10.5751/ES-09154-220133.
- 53 DeClerck, F.A.J. et al., 2016: Agricultural ecosystems and their services: the vanguard of sustainability? *Current*
54 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **23**, 92-99, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2016.11.016.
- 55 Delponte, I., I. Pittaluga, and C. Schenone, 2017: Monitoring and evaluation of Sustainable Energy Action Plan:
56 practice and perspective. *Energy Policy*, **100**, 9-17, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.10.003.
- 57 Dennig, F., M.B. Budolfson, M. Fleurbaey, A. Siebert, and R.H. Socolow, 2015: Inequality, climate impacts on the
58 future poor, and carbon prices. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112(52)**, 15827-15832,
59 doi:10.1073/pnas.1513967112.

- 1 Denton, F. et al., 2014: Climate-resilient pathways: adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development. In: *Climate*
2 *Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of*
3 *Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change* [Field,
4 C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O.
5 Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White
6 (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 1101-1131.
- 7 Derbez, M. et al., 2014: Indoor air quality and comfort in seven newly built, energy-efficient houses in France. *Building*
8 *and Environment*, **72**, 173-187, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.10.017.
- 9 Di Gregorio, M. et al., 2017: Climate policy integration in the land use sector: Mitigation, adaptation and sustainable
10 development linkages. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **67**, 35-43, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.004.
- 11 Dilling, L., M.E. Daly, W.R. Travis, O. Wilhelmi, and R.A. Klein, 2015: The dynamics of vulnerability: why adapting
12 to climate variability will not always prepare us for climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate*
13 *Change*, **6(4)**, 413-425, doi:10.1002/wcc.341.
- 14 Ding, H. et al., 2016: *Climate Benefits, Tenure Costs: The Economic Case For Securing Indigenous Land Rights in the*
15 *Amazon*. 98 pp.
- 16 Dinku, T. et al., 2014: Bridging critical gaps in climate services and applications in Africa. *Earth Perspectives*, **1(1)**, 15,
17 doi:10.1186/2194-6434-1-15.
- 18 Dodman, D., H. Leck, M. Rusca, and S. Colenbrander, 2017: African urbanisation and urbanism: implications for risk
19 accumulation and reduction. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, **26(January)**, 7-15,
20 doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.06.029.
- 21 Doswald, N. et al., 2014: Effectiveness of ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation: review of the evidence-base.
22 *Climate and Development*, **6(2)**, 185-201, doi:10.1080/17565529.2013.867247.
- 23 Douchamps, S. et al., 2016: Linking agricultural adaptation strategies, food security and vulnerability: evidence from
24 West Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, **16(5)**, 1305-1317, doi:10.1007/s10113-015-0838-6.
- 25 Dovie, D.B.K., M. Dzodzomenyo, and O.A. Ogunseitan, 2017: Sensitivity of health sector indicators' response to
26 climate change in Ghana. *Science of the Total Environment*, **574**, 837-846,
27 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.066.
- 28 Dow, K. et al., 2013: Limits to adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, **3(4)**, 305-307, doi:10.1038/nclimate1847.
- 29 Dual Citizen LLC, 2016: *The Global Green Economy Index - GGEI 2016: Measuring National Performance in the*
30 *Green Economy*. Dual Citizen LLC, Washington DC, USA and New York, NY, USA, 58 pp.
- 31 Duarte, C.M., J. Wu, X. Xiao, A. Bruhn, and D. Krause-Jensen, 2017: Can seaweed farming play a role in climate
32 change mitigation and adaptation? *Frontiers in Marine Science*, **4(April)**, doi:10.3389/fmars.2017.00100.
- 33 Duguma, L.A., P.A. Minang, and M. Van Noordwijk, 2014: Climate change mitigation and adaptation in the land use
34 sector: from complementarity to synergy. *Environmental Management*, **54(3)**, 420-432, doi:10.1007/s00267-
35 014-0331-x.
- 36 Dumont, E.S., S. Bonhomme, T.F. Pagella, and F.L. Sinclair, 2017: Structured stakeholder engagement leads to
37 development of more diverse and inclusive agroforestry options. *Experimental Agriculture*, 1-23,
38 doi:10.1017/S0014479716000788.
- 39 Eakin, H.C., M.C. Lemos, and D.R. Nelson, 2014: Differentiating capacities as a means to sustainable climate change
40 adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, **27(27)**, 1-8, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.013.
- 41 Ebi, K.L. and M.O. Del Barrio, 2017: Lessons learned on health adaptation to climate variability and change:
42 Experiences across low- and middle-income countries. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, **125(6)**,
43 doi:10.1289/EHP405.
- 44 Ebi, K.L. et al., 2014: A new scenario framework for climate change research: background, process, and future
45 directions. *Climatic Change*, **122(3)**, 363-372, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0912-3.
- 46 Echegaray, F., 2016: Consumers' reactions to product obsolescence in emerging markets: the case of Brazil. *Journal of*
47 *Cleaner Production*, **134**, 191-203, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.119.
- 48 Ehresman, T.G. and C. Okereke, 2015: Environmental justice and conceptions of the green economy. *International*
49 *Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **15(1)**, 13-27, doi:10.1007/s10784-014-9265-2.
- 50 Ekwurzel, B. et al., 2017: The rise in global atmospheric CO₂, surface temperature, and sea level from emissions traced
51 to major carbon producers. *Climatic Change*, 1-12, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-1978-0.
- 52 Enqvist, J., M. Tengö, and W.J. Boonstra, 2016: Against the current: rewiring rigidity trap dynamics in urban water
53 governance through civic engagement. *Sustainability Science*, **11(6)**, 919-933, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0377-
54 1.
- 55 Ensor, J., 2016: Adaptation and resilience in Vanuatu: Interpreting community perceptions of vulnerability, knowledge
56 and power for community-based adaptation programming. 32 pp.
- 57 Ensor, J. and B. Harvey, 2015: Social learning and climate change adaptation: evidence for international development
58 practice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **6(5)**, 509-522, doi:10.1002/wcc.348.
- 59 Entzinger, H. and P. Scholten, 2016: *Adapting to Climate Change through Migration. A case study of the Vietnamese*

- 1 *Mekong River Delta*. 62 pp.
- 2 Epule, T.E., J.D. Ford, S. Lwasa, and L. Lepage, 2017: Climate change adaptation in the Sahel. *Environmental Science*
- 3 & *Policy*, **75**(May), 121-137, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.05.018.
- 4 Eriksen, S., L.O. Naess, R. Haug, L. Lenaerts, and A. Bhonagiri, 2017: Courting catastrophe? Can humanitarian actions
- 5 contribute to climate change adaptation? *IDS Bulletin*, **48**(4), doi:10.19088/1968-2017.149.
- 6 Eriksson, H. et al., 2017: The role of fish and fisheries in recovering from natural hazards: lessons learned from
- 7 Vanuatu. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **76**(March), 50-58, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.012.
- 8 Estrella, M., F.G. Renaud, K. Sudmeier-Rieux, and U. Nehren, 2016: Defining New Pathways for Ecosystem-Based
- 9 Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation in the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda. In: *Ecosystem-*
- 10 *Based Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation in Practice* [Renaud, F.G., K. Sudmeier-Rieux, M. Estrella, and
- 11 U. Nehren (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp. 553-591.
- 12 Evans, G. and L. Phelan, 2016: Transition to a post-carbon society: linking environmental justice and just transition
- 13 discourses. *Energy Policy*, **99**, 329-339, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.05.003.
- 14 Evans, J.P., R.B. Smith, and R.J. Oglesby, 2004: Middle East climate simulation and dominant precipitation processes.
- 15 *International Journal of Climatology*, **24**(13), 1671-1694, doi:10.1002/joc.1084.
- 16 Falcone, P.M., P. Morone, and E. Sica, 2018: Greening of the financial system and fuelling a sustainability transition: a
- 17 discursive approach to assess landscape pressures on the Italian financial system. *Technological Forecasting*
- 18 & *Social Change*, **127**, 23-37, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.05.020.
- 19 Fan, Y., Q. Qiao, L. Fang, and Y. Yao, 2017: Energy analysis on industrial symbiosis of an industrial park: a case study
- 20 of Hefei economic and technological development area. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **141**, 791-798,
- 21 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.159.
- 22 Fankhauser, S. and T.K.J. McDermott, 2014: Understanding the adaptation deficit: Why are poor countries more
- 23 vulnerable to climate events than rich countries? *Global Environmental Change*, **27**, 9-18,
- 24 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.014.
- 25 Fankhauser, S. and N. Stern, 2016: Climate change, development, poverty and economics. Grantham Research Institute
- 26 on Climate Change and the Environment Working Paper, 1-30 pp.
- 27 FAO, 2015: Adaptation to climate risk and food security: evidence from smallholder farmers in Ethiopia. .
- 28 FAO and NZAGRC, 2017a: Low emissions development of the beef cattle sector in Uruguay - reducing enteric
- 29 methane for food security and livelihoods. .
- 30 FAO and NZAGRC, 2017b: Supporting low emissions development in the Ethiopian dairy cattle sector - reducing
- 31 enteric methane for food security and livelihoods. .
- 32 Fatima, R., A.J. Wadud, and S. Coelho, 2014: Human rights, climate change, environmental degradation: a new
- 33 paradigm. *IOM, MPI, Issue in Brief*.
- 34 Fay, M. et al., 2015: *Decarbonizing Development: Three Steps to a Zero-Carbon Future*. World Bank, Washington,
- 35 DC, USA, 185 pp.
- 36 Fazey, I. et al., 2016: Past and future adaptation pathways. *Climate and Development*, **8**(1), 26-44,
- 37 doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.989192.
- 38 Fazey, I. et al., 2018: Community resilience for a 1.5°C world. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**,
- 39 30-40, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.006.
- 40 Feola, G. and R. Nunes, 2014: Success and failure of grassroots innovations for addressing climate change: the case of
- 41 the Transition Movement. *Global Environmental Change*, **24**, 232-250.
- 42 Ferguson, P., 2015: The green economy agenda: business as usual or transformational discourse? *Environmental*
- 43 *Politics*, **24**(1), 17-37, doi:10.1080/09644016.2014.919748.
- 44 Fernandes-Jesus, M., A. Carvalho, L. Fernandes, and S. Bento, 2017: Community engagement in the Transition
- 45 movement: views and practices in Portuguese initiatives. *Local Environment*, **22**(12), 1546-1562,
- 46 doi:10.1080/13549839.2017.1379477.
- 47 Few, R., A. Martin, and N. Gross-Camp, 2017: Trade-offs in linking adaptation and mitigation in the forests of the
- 48 Congo Basin. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17**(3), 851-863, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1080-6.
- 49 Ficklin, L., L.C. Stringer, A.J. Dougill, and S.M. Sallu, 2017: Climate compatible development reconsidered: calling for
- 50 a critical perspective. *Climate and Development*, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1372260.
- 51 Field, C.B. et al., 2014: Technical Summary. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A:*
- 52 *Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
- 53 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D.
- 54 Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N.
- 55 Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
- 56 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 35-94.
- 57 Filho, L. and J. Nalau, 2018: Limits to climate change adaptation. , doi:10.1007/978-3-319-64599-5.
- 58 Fincher, R., J. Barnett, S. Graham, and A. Hurlimann, 2014: Time stories: making sense of futures in anticipation of
- 59 sea-level rise. *Geoforum*, **56**, 201-210, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.07.010.

- 1 Fleurbaey, M. et al., 2014: Sustainable development and equity. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate*
2 *Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on*
3 *Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler,
4 I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and
5 J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp.
6 283-350.
- 7 Fook, T.C.T., 2017: Transformational processes for community-focused adaptation and social change: a synthesis.
8 *Climate and Development*, **5529(October)**, 1-17, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1086294.
- 9 Ford, J.D. et al., 2016: Community-based adaptation research in the Canadian Arctic. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews:*
10 *Climate Change*, **7(2)**, 175-191, doi:10.1002/wcc.376.
- 11 Francis, R., P. Weston, and J. Birch, 2015: *The social, environmental and economics benefits of Farmer Managed*
12 *Natural Regeneration (FMNR)*.
- 13 Frank, S. et al., 2017: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture without compromising food security?
14 *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(10)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa8c83.
- 15 FRDP, 2016: *Framework for resilient development in the Pacific: an integrated approach to address climate change*
16 *and disaster risk management (FRDP) 2017-2030*. Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific.
- 17 Fricko, O. et al., 2016: Energy sector water use implications of a 2°C degree climate policy. *Environmental Research*
18 *Letters*, **11(3)**, 34011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034011.
- 19 Frumhoff, P.C., R. Heede, and N. Oreskes, 2015: The climate responsibilities of industrial carbon producers. *Climatic*
20 *Change*, **132(2)**, 157-171, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1472-5.
- 21 Fuchs, D. et al., 2016: Power: the missing element in sustainable consumption and absolute reductions research and
22 action. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **132**, 298-307, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.006.
- 23 Fuglestedt, J.S. and S. Kallbekken, 2016: Climate responsibility: fair shares? *Nature Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 19-20,
24 doi:10.1038/nclimate2791.
- 25 Fuhr, H., T. Hickmann, and K. Kern, 2018: The role of cities in multi-level climate governance: local climate policies
26 and the 1.5 °C target. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 1-6,
27 doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.10.006.
- 28 Fujimori, S., N. Hanasaki, and T. Masui, 2017a: Projections of industrial water withdrawal under shared socioeconomic
29 pathways and climate mitigation scenarios. *Sustainability Science*, **12**, 275-292, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-
30 0392-2.
- 31 Fujimori, S. et al., 2017b: SSP3: AIM implementation of Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Global Environmental*
32 *Change*, **42**, 268-283, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.009.
- 33 Fukuda-Parr, S., A.E. Yamin, and J. Greenstein, 2014: The power of numbers: a critical review of Millennium
34 Development Goal targets for human development and human rights. *Journal of Human Development and*
35 *Capabilities*, **15(2-3)**, 105-117, doi:10.1080/19452829.2013.864622.
- 36 Fuller, R. and J. Lain, 2017: Building resilience: a meta-analysis of Oxfam's resilience Effectiveness Reviews. .
37 Gajjar, S.P., C. Singh, and T. Deshpande, 2018: Tracing back to move ahead: a review of development pathways that
38 constrain adaptation futures. *Climate and Development*, 1-15, doi:10.1080/17565529.2018.1442793.
- 39 Galgóczi, B., 2014: The Long and Winding Road from Black to Green: Decades of Structural Change in the Ruhr
40 Region. *International Journal of Labour Research*, **6(2)**, 217-240.
- 41 Garg, A., P. Mohan, S. Shukla, B. Kankal, and S.S. Vishwanathan, 2017: *High impact opportunities for energy*
42 *efficiency in India*. UNEP DTU Partnership, Copenhagen, 49 pp.
- 43 Gebrehaweria, G., A. Dereje Assefa, G. Girmay, M. Giordano, and L. Simon, 2016: An assessment of integrated
44 watershed management in Ethiopia. IWMI Working Paper 170.
- 45 Georgeson, L., M. Maslin, and M. Poessinouw, 2017a: Global disparity in the supply of commercial weather and
46 climate information services. *Science Advances*, **3**, e1602632.
- 47 Georgeson, L., M. Maslin, and M. Poessinouw, 2017b: The global green economy: a review of concepts, definitions,
48 measurement methodologies and their interactions. *Geo: Geography and Environment*, **4(1)**, e00036,
49 doi:10.1002/geo2.36.
- 50 Gero, A. et al., 2013: *Understanding the Pacific's adaptive capacity to emergencies in the context of climate change:*
51 *Country Report - Vanuatu*. Report prepared for NCCARF by the Institute for Sustainable Futures, and WHO
52 Collaborating Centre, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.
- 53 Gillard, R., A. Gouldson, J. Paavola, and J. Van Alstine, 2016: Transformational responses to climate change: beyond a
54 systems perspective of social change in mitigation and adaptation. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate*
55 *Change*, **7(2)**, 251-265, doi:10.1002/wcc.384.
- 56 Gillingham, K., D. Rapson, and G. Wagner, 2016: The rebound effect and energy efficiency policy. *Review of*
57 *Environmental Economics and Policy*, **10(1)**, 68-88, doi:10.1093/reep/rev017.
- 58 Giwa, A., A. Alabi, A. Yusuf, and T. Olukan, 2017: A comprehensive review on biomass and solar energy for
59 sustainable energy generation in Nigeria. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **69(November 2016)**,

- 1 620-641, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.160.
- 2 Glazebrook, G. and P. Newman, 2018: The City of the Future. *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 1, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1247.
- 3 Godfrey-Wood, R. and L.O. Naess, 2016: Adapting to Climate Change: Transforming Development? *IDS Bulletin*,
- 4 **47(2)**, doi:10.19088/1968-2016.131.
- 5 Gomez-Echeverri, L., 2018: Climate and development: enhancing impact through stronger linkages in the
- 6 implementation of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Philosophical*
- 7 *Transactions of the Royal Society A*, **376**, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0444.
- 8 Gorrdard, R., M.J. Colloff, R.M. Wise, D. Ware, and M. Dunlop, 2016: Values, rules and knowledge: Adaptation as
- 9 change in the decision context. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **57**, 60-69,
- 10 doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.004.
- 11 Gore, C., 2015: Climate change adaptation and African cities: understanding the impact of government and governance
- 12 on future action.. *Rethinking the role of cities in the global climate regime*, 205-226.
- 13 Government of Kiribati, 2016: *Kiribati development plan 2016-19*. Government of Kiribati.
- 14 Granderson, A.A., 2017: Value conflicts and the politics of risk: challenges in assessing climate change impacts and
- 15 risk priorities in rural Vanuatu. *Climate and Development*, 1-14, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1318743.
- 16 Grantham, R.W. and M.A. Rudd, 2017: Household susceptibility to hydrological change in the Lower Mekong Basin.
- 17 *Natural Resources Forum*, **41(1)**, 3-17, doi:10.1111/1477-8947.12113.
- 18 Gray, E., N. Henninger, C. Reij, R. Winterbottom, and P. Agostini, 2016: *Integrated landscape approaches for Africa's*
- 19 *drylands*.
- 20 Green, F., 2018: Anti-fossil fuel norms. *Climatic Change*, 1-14, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2134-6.
- 21 Griffiths, S., 2017a: A review and assessment of energy policy in the Middle East and North Africa region. *Energy*
- 22 *Policy*, **102(September 2016)**, 249-269, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.12.023.
- 23 Griffiths, S., 2017b: Renewable energy policy trends and recommendations for GCC countries. *Energy Transitions*,
- 24 **1(1)**, 3, doi:10.1007/s41825-017-0003-6.
- 25 Grill, G. et al., 2015: An index-based framework for assessing patterns and trends in river fragmentation and flow
- 26 regulation by global dams at multiple scales. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(1)**, 15001.
- 27 Grist, N. et al., 2017: Framing innovations for climate resilience for farmers in Sahel. *Resilience Intel*, **9**.
- 28 Grossmann, M. and E. Creamer, 2017: Assessing diversity and inclusivity within the Transition Movement: an urban
- 29 case study. *Environmental Politics*, **26(1)**, 161-182, doi:10.1080/09644016.2016.1232522.
- 30 Grubert, E.A., A.S. Stillwell, and M.E. Webber, 2014: Where does solar-aided seawater desalination make sense? A
- 31 method for identifying sustainable sites. *Desalination*, **339**, 10-17.
- 32 Grubler, A. et al., 2018: A global scenario of low energy demand for sustainable development below 1.5°C without
- 33 negative emission technologies. *Nature Energy* (in press), doi:10.1038/s41560-018-0172-6.
- 34 Gupta, J. and K. Arts, 2017: Achieving the 1.5 °C objective: just implementation through a right to (sustainable)
- 35 development approach. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*,
- 36 doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9376-7.
- 37 Gupta, J. and N. Pouw, 2017: Towards a trans-disciplinary conceptualization of inclusive development. *Current*
- 38 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **24**, 96-103, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.03.004.
- 39 Gustafson, S. et al., 2017: Merging science into community adaptation planning processes: a cross-site comparison of
- 40 four distinct areas of the Lower Mekong Basin. *Climatic Change*, 1-16, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1887-7.
- 41 Gwimbi, P., 2017: Mainstreaming national adaptation programmes of action into national development plans in
- 42 Lesotho: lessons and needs. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **9(3)**, 299-
- 43 315, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-11-2015-0164.
- 44 Hackmann, B., 2016: Regime learning in global environmental governance. *Environmental Values*, **25(6)**,
- 45 doi:10.3197/096327116X14736981715625.
- 46 Haider, L.J., W.J. Boonstra, G.D. Peterson, and M. Schlüter, 2017: Traps and sustainable development in rural areas: a
- 47 review. *World Development*, **xx(2013)**, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.038.
- 48 Hajer, M. et al., 2015: Beyond cockpit-ism: Four insights to enhance the transformative potential of the sustainable
- 49 development goals. *Sustainability*, **7(2)**, doi:10.3390/su7021651.
- 50 Hale, T., 2016: "All hands on deck": the Paris Agreements and nonstate climate action. *Global Environmental Politics*,
- 51 **16(3)**, doi:10.1162/GLEP_a_00362.
- 52 Hallegatte, S. and J. Rozenberg, 2017: Climate change through a poverty lens. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(4)**, 250-256,
- 53 doi:10.1038/nclimate3253.
- 54 Hallegatte, S. et al., 2014: Climate change and poverty: an analytical framework. , doi:10.1596/1813-9450-7126.
- 55 Hallegatte, S. et al., 2016: *Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*. The World Bank,
- 56 Washington, DC, USA, 227 pp.
- 57 Halonen, M. et al., 2017: *Mobilizing climate finance flows: Nordic approaches and opportunities*. TemaNord 2017:519,
- 58 Nordic Council of Ministers, 151 pp.
- 59 Hammill, B.A. and H. Price-Kelly, 2017: *Using NDCs , NAPs and the SDGs to Advance Climate-Resilient*

- 1 *Development*. 1-10 pp.
- 2 Handmer, J. and H. Iveson, 2017: Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu: Learning from the low death toll. *Australian journal of*
3 *Emergency Management*, **22(2)**.
- 4 Hanna, R. and P. Oliva, 2016: Implications of climate change for children in developing countries. *The Future of*
5 *Children*, **26(1)**, 115-132.
- 6 Hansen, G. and D. Stone, 2016: Assessing the observed impact of anthropogenic climate change. *Nature Climate*
7 *Change*, **6(5)**, 532-537, doi:10.1038/nclimate2896.
- 8 Harris, L.M., E.K. Chu, and G. Ziervogel, 2017: Negotiated resilience. *Resilience*, **3293**, 1-19,
9 doi:10.1080/21693293.2017.1353196.
- 10 Hartzell-Nichols, L., 2017: *A climate of risk: precautionary principles, catastrophes and climate change*. Routledge,
11 Abingdon, Oxon, UK and New York, NY, USA.
- 12 Hasegawa, T. et al., 2014: Climate change impact and adaptation assessment on food consumption utilizing a new
13 scenario framework. *Environmental Science and Technology*, **48(1)**, 438-445, doi:10.1021/es4034149.
- 14 Hasegawa, T. et al., 2015: Consequence of climate mitigation on the risk of hunger. *Environmental Science &*
15 *Technology*, **49(12)**, 7245-7253, doi:10.1021/es5051748.
- 16 Hashemi, S., A. Bagheri, and N. Marshall, 2017: Toward sustainable adaptation to future climate change: insights from
17 vulnerability and resilience approaches analyzing agrarian system of Iran. *Environment, Development and*
18 *Sustainability*, **19(1)**, 1-25.
- 19 Hatfield-Dodds, S. et al., 2015: Australia is 'free to choose' economic growth and falling environmental pressures.
20 *Nature*, **527(7576)**, 49-53, doi:10.1038/nature16065.
- 21 Havlík, P. et al., 2014: Climate change mitigation through livestock system transitions. *Proceedings of the National*
22 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **111(10)**, 3709-14, doi:10.1073/pnas.1308044111.
- 23 Hayashi, A., F. Akimoto, F. Sano, and T. Tomoda, 2015: Evaluation of global energy crop production potential up to
24 2100 under socioeconomic development and climate change scenarios. *Journal of the Japan Institute of*
25 *Energy*, **94(6)**, 548-554, doi:doi.org/10.3775/jie.94.548.
- 26 Hayashi, A., F. Sano, Y. Nakagami, and K. Akimoto, 2018: Changes in terrestrial water stress and contributions of
27 major factors under temperature rise constraint scenarios. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global*
28 *Change*, 1-27, doi:10.1007/s11027-018-9780-5.
- 29 Häyhä, T., P.L. Lucas, D.P. van Vuuren, S.E. Cornell, and H. Hoff, 2016: From Planetary Boundaries to national fair
30 shares of the global safe operating space - How can the scales be bridged? *Global Environmental Change*, **40**,
31 60-72, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.008.
- 32 Hayward, B., 2017: *Sea change: climate politics and New Zealand*. Bridget Williams Books, Wellington, NZ.
- 33 He, J., Y. Huang, and F. Tarp, 2014: Has the clean development mechanism assisted sustainable development? *Natural*
34 *Resources Forum*, **38(4)**, 248-260, doi:10.1111/1477-8947.12055.
- 35 Healy, N. and J. Barry, 2017: Politicizing energy justice and energy system transitions: Fossil fuel divestment and a
36 "just transition". *Energy Policy*, **108**, 451-459, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.06.014.
- 37 Heard, B.P., B.W. Brook, T.M.L. Wigley, and C.J.A. Bradshaw, 2017: Burden of proof: A comprehensive review of the
38 feasibility of 100% renewable-electricity systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **76**, 1122-
39 1133, doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2017.03.114.
- 40 Heede, R., 2014: Tracing anthropogenic carbon dioxide and methane emissions to fossil fuel and cement producers,
41 1854-2010. *Climatic Change*, **122(1-2)**, 229-241, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0986-y.
- 42 Helliwell, J., R. Layard, and J. Sachs, 2018: *World Happiness Report*.
- 43 Hemstock, S., 2017: A case for formal education in technical vocational education and training for climate change
44 adaptation and disaster risk reduction in the Pacific Islands region. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific*
45 *Countries: fostering Resilience and Improving the quality of life* [Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer Nature, Cham,
46 Switzerland, pp. 309-324.
- 47 Hess, J.J. and K.L. Ebi, 2016: Iterative management of heat early warning systems in a changing climate. *Annals of the*
48 *New York Academy of Sciences*, **1382(1)**, 21-30, doi:10.1111/nyas.13258.
- 49 Heyward, C. and D. Roser, 2016: Climate justice in a non-ideal world. .
- 50 Hildingsson, R. and B. Johansson, 2015: Governing low-carbon energy transitions in sustainable ways: potential
51 synergies and conflicts between climate and environmental policy objectives. *Energy Policy*, **88**, 245-252,
52 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2015.10.029.
- 53 HLCCP, 2017: *Report of the high-level commission on carbon prices*. High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices
54 (HLCCP). World Bank, Washington DC, USA.
- 55 Holden, E., K. Linnerud, and D. Banister, 2017: The imperatives of sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*,
56 **25(3)**, 213-226, doi:10.1002/sd.1647.
- 57 Holz, C., S. Kartha, and T. Athanasiou, 2017: Fairly sharing 1.5: national fair shares of a 1.5 °C-compliant global
58 mitigation effort. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*,
59 doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9371-z.

- 1 Horstmann, B. and J. Hein, 2017: *Aligning climate change mitigation and sustainable development under the*
 2 *UNFCCC: A critical assessment of the Clean Development Mechanism, the Green Climate Fund and REDD+.*
 3 German Development Institute, Bonn.
- 4 Howarth, C. and I. Monasterolo, 2017: Opportunities for knowledge co-production across the energy-food-water nexus:
 5 making interdisciplinary approaches work for better climate decision making. *Environmental Science and*
 6 *Policy*, **75(June)**, 103-110, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.05.019.
- 7 Howarth, N., M. Galeotti, A. Lanza, and K. Dubey, 2017: Economic development and energy consumption in the GCC:
 8 an international sectoral analysis. *Energy Transitions*, **1(2)**, 6, doi:10.1007/s41825-017-0006-3.
- 9 Howell, R. and S. Allen, 2017: People and Planet: values, motivations and formative influences of individuals acting to
 10 mitigate climate change. *Environmental Values*, **26(2)**, 131-155, doi:10.3197/096327117X14847335385436.
- 11 Hubacek, K., G. Baiocchi, K. Feng, and A. Patwardhan, 2017: Poverty eradication in a carbon constrained world.
 12 *Nature Communications*, **8(1)**, 1-8, doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00919-4.
- 13 Huggel, C., I. Wallimann-Helmer, D. Stone, and W. Cramer, 2016: Reconciling justice and attribution research to
 14 advance climate policy. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(10)**, 901-908, doi:10.1038/nclimate3104.
- 15 Hughes, S., E.K. Chu, and S.G. Mason, 2018: *Climate Change in Cities: Innovations in Multi-Level Governance.*
 16 Springer, Cham.
- 17 Hunsberger, C., S. Bolwig, E. Corbera, and F. Creutzig, 2014: Livelihood impacts of biofuel crop production:
 18 implications for governance. *Geoforum*, **54**, 248-260, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.09.022.
- 19 Huq, N., A. Bruns, L. Ribbe, and S. Huq, 2017: Mainstreaming ecosystem services based climate change adaptation
 20 (EbA) in bangladesh: status, challenges and opportunities. *Sustainability*, **9(6)**, 926, doi:10.3390/su9060926.
- 21 Hwang, J., K. Joh, and A. Woo, 2017: Social inequalities in child pedestrian traffic injuries: Differences in
 22 neighborhood built environments near schools in Austin, TX, USA. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6(May)**,
 23 40-49, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.003.
- 24 ICSU, 2017: *A Guide to SDG interactions: From Science to Implementation.* 239 pp.
- 25 IEA, 2015: *India Energy Outlook.* International Energy Agency (IEA), 1-191 pp.
- 26 IEA, 2016: *World Energy Outlook Special Report: Energy and Air Pollution.* International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris,
 27 France, 266 pp.
- 28 IEA, 2017: *Energy access outlook 2017: from poverty to prosperity.* 144 pp.
- 29 IEA and World Bank, 2017: *Sustainable Energy for All 2017 - Progress towards Sustainable Energy.* International
 30 Energy Agency (IEA) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank,
 31 Washington DC, USA, 208 pp.
- 32 INC, 1991: Vanuatu: Draft annex relating to Article 23 (Insurance) for inclusion in the revised single text on elements
 33 relating to mechanisms (A/AC.237/WG.II/Misc.13) submitted by the Co-Chairmen of Working Group II. .
- 34 IPCC, 2013: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth*
 35 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner,
 36 M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge
 37 University Press, Cambridge, MA, USA and New York, NY, USA.
- 38 IPCC, 2014a: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth*
 39 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y.
 40 Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J.
 41 Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. 1454 pp.
- 42 IPCC, 2014b: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of*
 43 *Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*
 44 [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S.
 45 Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx
 46 (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 1-30.
- 47 IRENA, 2016: *Renewable energy market analysis: the GCC region.* IRENA, Abu Dhabi.
- 48 Ishida, H. et al., 2014: Global-scale projection and its sensitivity analysis of the health burden attributable to childhood
 49 undernutrition under the latest scenario framework for climate change research. *Environmental Research*
 50 *Letters*, **9(6)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/6/064014.
- 51 Islam, M.R. and M. Shamsuddoha, 2017: Socioeconomic consequences of climate induced human displacement and
 52 migration in Bangladesh. *International Sociology*, **32(3)**, 277-298, doi:10.1177/0268580917693173.
- 53 Jägermeyr, J., A. Pastor, H. Biemans, and D. Gerten, 2017: Reconciling irrigated food production with environmental
 54 flows for Sustainable Development Goals implementation. *Nature Communications*, **8(May)**, 1-9,
 55 doi:10.1038/ncomms15900.
- 56 Jaglin, S., 2014: Regulating service delivery in southern cities: rethinking urban heterogeneity. *The Routledge handbook*
 57 *on cities of the global South.*
- 58 Jakob, M. and J.C.J.C. Steckel, 2016: Implications of climate change mitigation for sustainable development.
 59 *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(10)**, 104010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/10/104010.

- 1 Janetos, A.C., E. Malone, E. Mastrangelo, K. Hardee, and A. de Bremond, 2012: Linking climate change and
2 development goals: framing, integrating, and measuring. *Climate and Development*, **4(2)**, 141-156,
3 doi:10.1080/17565529.2012.726195.
- 4 Jha, C.K., V. Gupta, U. Chattopadhyay, and B. Amarayil Sreeraman, 2017: Migration as adaptation strategy to cope
5 with climate change. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, IJCCSM-03-2017-
6 0059, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-03-2017-0059.
- 7 Jiang, L. and B.C. O'Neill, 2017: Global urbanization projections for the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Global
8 Environmental Change*, **42**, 193-199, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.008.
- 9 Johansson, E.L., M. Fader, J.W. Seaquist, and K.A. Nicholas, 2016: Green and blue water demand from large-scale
10 land acquisitions in Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
11 **113(41)**, 11471-11476, doi:10.1073/pnas.1524741113.
- 12 Johnson, C.A., 2017: Resilient cities? The global politics of urban climate adaptation. In: *The Power of Cities in Global
13 Climate Politics* [Johnson, C.A. (ed.)]. Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK, pp. 91-146.
- 14 Johnson, N. et al., 2015: Stranded on a low-carbon planet: implications of climate policy for the phase-out of coal-based
15 power plants. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90(PA)**, 89-102,
16 doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.02.028.
- 17 Jones, L. and T. Tanner, 2017: Subjective resilience': using perceptions to quantify household resilience to climate
18 extremes and disasters. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(1)**, 229-243, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0995-2.
- 19 Jordaan, S.M. et al., 2017: The role of energy technology innovation in reducing greenhouse gas emissions: a case study
20 of Canada. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **78(May)**, 1397-1409, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.162.
- 21 Kagawa, S. et al., 2015: CO2 emission clusters within global supply chain networks: Implications for climate change
22 mitigation. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 486-496, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.04.003.
- 23 Kaijser, A. and A. Kronsell, 2014: Climate change through the lens of intersectionality. *Environmental Politics*, **23(3)**,
24 417-433, doi:10.1080/09644016.2013.835203.
- 25 Kalafatis, S., 2017: Identifying the Potential for Climate Compatible Development Efforts and the Missing Links.
26 *Sustainability*, **9(9)**, 1642, doi:10.3390/su9091642.
- 27 Karlsson, L., A. Nightingale, L.O. Naess, and J. Thompson, 2017: Triple wins' or 'triple faults'? Analysing policy
28 discourse on climate-smart agriculture (CSA). Working Paper no.197, CGIAR Research Program on Climate
29 Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), Copenhagen, Denmark, 43 pp.
- 30 Karner, K., M. Theissing, and T. Kienberger, 2015: Energy efficiency for industries through synergies with urban areas.
31 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **2020**, 1-11, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.010.
- 32 Kartha, S. et al., 2018: Inequitable mitigation: cascading biases against poorer countries. *Nature Climate Change*, **8**,
33 348-349, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0152-7.
- 34 Kassie, M., H. Teklewold, M. Jaleta, P. Marennya, and O. Erenstein, 2015: Understanding the adoption of a portfolio of
35 sustainable intensification practices in eastern and southern Africa. *Land Use Policy*, **42**, 400-411,
36 doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.08.016.
- 37 Keairns, D.L., R.C. Darton, and A. Irabien, 2016: The energy-water-food nexus. *Annual Review of Chemical and
38 Biomolecular Engineering*, **7(1)**, 239-262, doi:10.1146/annurev-chembioeng-080615-033539.
- 39 Kelman, I., 2017: Linking disaster risk reduction, climate change, and the sustainable development goals. *Disaster
40 Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, **26(3)**, 254-258, doi:10.1108/DPM-02-2017-0043.
- 41 Kenis, A., 2016: Ecological citizenship and democracy: Communitarian versus agonistic perspectives. *Environmental
42 Politics*, **4016(August)**, 1-22, doi:10.1080/09644016.2016.1203524.
- 43 Kenis, A. and E. Mathijs, 2014: (De)politicising the local: The case of the Transition Towns movement in Flanders
44 (Belgium). *Journal of Rural Studies*, **34**, 172-183, doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.013.
- 45 Keohane, R.O. and D.G. Victor, 2016: Cooperation and discord in global climate policy. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(6)**,
46 doi:10.1038/nclimate2937.
- 47 Khanna, N., D. Fridley, and L. Hong, 2014: China's pilot low-carbon city initiative: A comparative assessment of
48 national goals and local plans. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, **12**, 110-121, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2014.03.005.
- 49 Khosla, R., A. Sagar, and A. Mathur, 2017: Deploying Low-carbon Technologies in Developing Countries: A view
50 from India's buildings sector. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, **27(2)**, 149-162, doi:10.1002/eet.1750.
- 51 Khreis, H., A.D. May, and M.J. Nieuwenhuijsen, 2017: Health impacts of urban transport policy measures: a guidance
52 note for practice. *Journal of Transport & Health*, **6(June)**, 209-227, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.06.003.
- 53 Kim, S.-Y. and E. Thurbon, 2015: Developmental Environmentalism. *Politics & Society*, **43(2)**, 213-240,
54 doi:10.1177/0032329215571287.
- 55 Kim, Y. et al., 2017: A perspective on climate-resilient development and national adaptation planning based on
56 USAID's experience. *Climate and Development*, **9(2)**, 141-151, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1124037.
- 57 King, A.D., D.J. Karoly, and B.J. Henley, 2017: Australian climate extremes at 1.5 °C and 2 °C of global warming.
58 *Nature Clim. Change*, **7**, 412-416, doi:10.1038/nclimate3296.
- 59 Kirby, P. and T. O'Mahony, 2018: Development models: lessons from international development. In: *The political*

- 1 *economy of the low-carbon transition: pathways beyond techno-optimism* [Kirby, P. and O'Mahony (eds.)].
2 Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 89-114.
- 3 Klausbrückner, C., H. Annegarn, L.R.F. Henneman, and P. Rafaj, 2016: A policy review of synergies and trade-offs in
4 South African climate change mitigation and air pollution control strategies. *Environmental Science & Policy*,
5 **57**, 70-78, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.001.
- 6 Klein, R.J.T. et al., 2014: Adaptation opportunities, constraints, and limits. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts,*
7 *Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the*
8 *Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J.
9 Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B.
10 Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S.M.C. and L.L.W. P.R. Mastrandrea (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press,
11 Cambridge, MA, USA and New York, NY, USA, pp. 899-943.
- 12 Klimont, Z. et al., 2017: Bridging the gap - the role of short-lived climate pollutants. In: *The Emissions Gap Report*
13 *2017: A UN Environmental Synthesis Report*. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, pp.
14 48-57.
- 15 Klinsky, S. and A. Golub, 2016: Justice and Sustainability. In: *Sustainability Science: An introduction* [Heinrichs, H., P.
16 Martens, G. Michelsen, and A. Wiek (eds.)]. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 161-173.
- 17 Klinsky, S. and H. Winkler, 2018: Building equity in: strategies for integrating equity into modelling for a 1.5°C world.
18 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*,
19 **376(2119)**, 20160461, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0461.
- 20 Klinsky, S., D. Waskow, E. Northrop, and W. Bevens, 2017a: Operationalizing equity and supporting ambition:
21 identifying a more robust approach to 'respective capabilities'. *Climate and Development*, **9(4)**, 1-11,
22 doi:10.1080/17565529.2016.1146121.
- 23 Klinsky, S. et al., 2017b: Why equity is fundamental in climate change policy research. *Global Environmental Change*,
24 **44**, 170-173, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.08.002.
- 25 Kongsager, R. and E. Corbera, 2015: Linking mitigation and adaptation in carbon forestry projects: Evidence from
26 Belize. *World Development*, **76**, 132-146, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.07.003.
- 27 Kongsager, R., B. Locatelli, and F. Chazarin, 2016: Addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation together: a
28 global assessment of agriculture and forestry projects. *Environmental Management*, **57(2)**, 271-282,
29 doi:10.1007/s00267-015-0605-y.
- 30 Kreibich, N., L. Hermwille, C. Warnecke, and C. Arens, 2017: An update on the Clean Development Mechanism in
31 Africa in times of market crisis. *Climate and Development*, **9(2)**, 178-190,
32 doi:10.1080/17565529.2016.1145102.
- 33 Kumar, N.S. et al., 2014: *Climate risks and strategizing agricultural adaptation in climatically challenged regions*.
34 Indian Agriculture Research Institute, New Delhi, India.
- 35 Kuramochi, T. et al., 2018: Ten key short-term sectoral benchmarks to limit warming to 1.5°C. *Climate Policy*, **18(3)**,
36 287-305, doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1397495.
- 37 Kuruppu, N. and R. Willie, 2015: Barriers to reducing climate enhanced disaster risks in least developed country-small
38 islands through anticipatory adaptation. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, **7**, 72-83,
39 doi:10.1016/j.wace.2014.06.001.
- 40 Kusumaningtyas, S.D.A. and E. Aldrian, 2016: Impact of the June 2013 Riau province Sumatera smoke haze event on
41 regional air pollution. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(7)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/075007.
- 42 La Rovere, E.L., 2017: Low-carbon development pathways in Brazil and 'Climate Clubs'. *Wiley Interdisciplinary*
43 *Reviews: Climate Change*, **8(1)**, 1-7, doi:10.1002/wcc.439.
- 44 Labordena, M., A. Patt, M. Bazilian, M. Howells, and J. Lilliestam, 2017: Impact of political and economical barriers
45 for concentrating solar power in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Policy*, **102(April 2016)**, 52-72,
46 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.12.008.
- 47 Labriet, M., C. Fiebig, and M. Labrousse, 2015: Inside stories on climate compatible development. .
- 48 Lade, S.J., L.J. Haider, G. Engström, and M. Schlüter, 2017: Resilience offers escape from trapped thinking on poverty
49 alleviation. *Science Advances*, **3(5)**, e1603043, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1603043.
- 50 Lahn, B., 2017: In the light of equity and science: scientific expertise and climate justice after Paris. *International*
51 *Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9375-8.
- 52 Lamb, A. et al., 2016: The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Nature*
53 *Climate Change*, **6**, 488-492, doi:10.1038/nclimate2910.
- 54 Langford, M., A. Sumner, and A.E. Yamin (eds.), 2013: *The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights: Past,*
55 *Present and Future*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 571 pp.
- 56 Lasage, R. et al., 2015: A Stepwise, participatory approach to design and implement community based adaptation to
57 drought in the Peruvian Andes. *Sustainability*, **7(2)**, 1742-1773, doi:10.3390/su7021742.
- 58 Lawrence, J. and M. Haasnoot, 2017: What it took to catalyse uptake of dynamic adaptive pathways planning to address
59 climate change uncertainty. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **68**, 47-57, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.12.003.

- 1 Lechtenboehmer, S. and K. Knoop (eds.), 2017: *Realising long-term transitions towards low carbon societies. Impulses*
2 *from the 8th Annual Meeting of the International Research Network for Low Carbon Societies*. Wuppertal
3 Spezial no. 53, 1-91 pp.
- 4 Lefale, P., P. Faiva, and A. C., 2017: *Living with change: An Integrated national strategy for enhancing the resilience of*
5 *Tokelau to climate change and related hazards 2017-2030*. Government of Tokelau, Apia, Soamoa.
- 6 Leichenko, R. and J.A. Silva, 2014: Climate change and poverty: vulnerability, impacts, and alleviation strategies.
7 *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **5(4)**, 539-556, doi:10.1002/wcc.287.
- 8 Lemoine, D. and S. Kapnick, 2016: A top-down approach to projecting market impacts of climate change. *Nature*
9 *Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 51-55, doi:10.1038/nclimate2759.
- 10 Lemos, C.M., Y. Lo, D.R. Nelson, H. Eakin, and A.M. Bedran-Martins, 2016: Linking development to climate
11 adaptation: Leveraging generic and specific capacities to reduce vulnerability to drought in NE Brazil. *Global*
12 *Environmental Change*, **39**, 170-179, doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2016.05.001.
- 13 Ley, D., 2017: Sustainable Development, Climate Change, and Renewable Energy in Rural Central America. In:
14 *Evaluating Climate Change Action for Sustainable Development* [Uitto, J.I., J. Puri, and R.D. van den Berg
15 (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 187-212.
- 16 Li, T. et al., 2016: Aging will amplify the heat-related mortality risk under a changing climate: projection for the elderly
17 in Beijing, China. *Scientific Reports*, **6(1)**, 28161, doi:10.1038/srep28161.
- 18 Liddell, C. and C. Guiney, 2015: Living in a cold and damp home: Frameworks for understanding impacts on mental
19 well-being. *Public Health*, **129(3)**, 191-199, doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2014.11.007.
- 20 Lilliestam, J. and A. Patt, 2015: Barriers, risks and policies for renewables in the Gulf states. *Energies*, **8(8)**, 8263-8285,
21 doi:10.3390/en8088263.
- 22 Lin, B.B. et al., 2017: Adaptation Pathways in Coastal Case Studies: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. *Coastal*
23 *Management*, **45(5)**, 384-405, doi:10.1080/08920753.2017.1349564.
- 24 Lin, J., Y. Hu, S. Cui, J. Kang, and A. Ramaswami, 2015: Tracking urban carbon footprints from production and
25 consumption perspectives. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(5)**, 054001, doi:10.1088/1748-
26 9326/10/5/054001.
- 27 Lipper, L. et al., 2014: Climate-smart agriculture for food security. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(12)**, 1068-1072,
28 doi:10.1038/nclimate2437.
- 29 Lorek, S. and J.H. Spangenberg, 2014: Sustainable consumption within a sustainable economy - Beyond green growth
30 and green economies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **63**, 33-44, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.08.045.
- 31 Lotze-Campen, H. et al., 2014: Impacts of increased bioenergy demand on global food markets: an AgMIP economic
32 model intercomparison. *Agricultural Economics*, **45(1)**, 103-116, doi:10.1111/agec.12092.
- 33 Lucas, K. and K. Pangbourne, 2014: Assessing the equity of carbon mitigation policies for transport in Scotland. *Case*
34 *Studies on Transport Policy*, **2(2)**, 70-80, doi:10.1016/j.cstp.2014.05.003.
- 35 Lucon, O. et al., 2014: Buildings. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working*
36 *Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O.,
37 R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, S. I. Baum, P. Brunner, B.
38 Eickemeier, J. Kriemann, S. Savolainen, C. Schlömer, V. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)].
39 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 671-738.
- 40 Luomi, M., 2014: Mainstreaming climate policy in the Gulf Cooperation Council States. , 1-73.
- 41 Lwasa, S., K. Buyana, P. Kasaija, and J. Mutyaba, 2018: Scenarios for adaptation and mitigation in urban Africa under
42 1.5°C global warming. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 52-58,
43 doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.012.
- 44 Lyon, C., 2018: Complexity ethics and UNFCCC practices for 1.5°C climate change. *Current Opinion in*
45 *Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 48-55, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.008.
- 46 Mace, M.J., 2016: Mitigation commitments under the Paris Agreement and the way forward. *Climate Law*, **6(1-2)**, 21-
47 39, doi:10.1163/18786561-00601002.
- 48 Macintyre, T., H. Lotz-Sisitka, A. Wals, C. Vogel, and V. Tassone, 2018: Towards transformative social learning on the
49 path to 1.5°C degrees. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 80-87,
50 doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.003.
- 51 Maclellan, N., 2015: *Yumi stap redi long klaemet jenis: Lessons from the Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation*
52 *Program*. 48 pp.
- 53 Maidment, C.D., C.R. Jones, T.L. Webb, E.A. Hathway, and J.M. Gilbertson, 2014: The impact of household energy
54 efficiency measures on health: A meta-analysis. *Energy Policy*, **65**, 583-593, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.054.
- 55 Maor, M., J. Tosun, and A. Jordan, 2017: Proportionate and disproportionate policy responses to climate change: core
56 concepts and empirical applications. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 1-13,
57 doi:10.1080/1523908X.2017.1281730.
- 58 Mapfumo, P. et al., 2017: Pathways to transformational change in the face of climate impacts: an analytical framework.
59 *Climate and Development*, **9(5)**, 439-451, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1040365.

- 1 Marjanac, S. and L. Patton, 2018: Extreme weather event attribution science and climate change litigation: an essential
2 step in the causal chain? *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 1-34,
3 doi:10.1080/02646811.2018.1451020.
- 4 Markandya, A. et al., 2018: Health co-benefits from air pollution and mitigation costs of the Paris Agreement: a
5 modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, **2(3)**, e126 - e133, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-
6 5196(18)30029-9.
- 7 Marsh, J., 2015: Mixed motivations and complex causality in the Mekong. *Forced Migration Review*, 68-69.
- 8 Martinez-Baron, D., G. Orjuela, G. Renzoni, A.M. Loboguerrero Rodríguez, and S.D. Prager, 2018: Small-scale
9 farmers in a 1.5°C future: the importance of local social dynamics as an enabling factor for implementation
10 and scaling of climate-smart agriculture. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31(February)**,
11 112-119, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.013.
- 12 Mathur, V.N., S. Afionis, J. Paavola, A.J. Dougill, and L.C. Stringer, 2014: Experiences of host communities with
13 carbon market projects: towards multi-level climate justice. *Climate Policy*, **14(1)**, 42-62,
14 doi:10.1080/14693062.2013.861728.
- 15 Maupin, A., 2017: The SDG13 to combat climate change: an opportunity for Africa to become a trailblazer? *African*
16 *Geographical Review*, **36(2)**, 131-145, doi:10.1080/19376812.2016.1171156.
- 17 Mayer, B., 2016: The relevance of the no-harm principle to climate change law and politics. *Asia Pacific Journal of*
18 *Environmental Law*, **19(1)**, 79-104, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/apjel.2016.01.04.
- 19 Mbow, C., C. Neely, and P. Dobie, 2015: How can an integrated landscape approach contribute to the implementation
20 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and advance climate-smart objectives? In: *Climate-Smart*
21 *Landscapes: Multifunctionality in Practice* [Minang, P.A., M. van Noordwijk, C. Mbow, J. de Leeuw, and D.
22 Catacutan (eds.)]. World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Nairobi, Kenya, pp. 103-117.
- 23 MCCA, 2016: *Corporate Plan 2016-2018*. Ministry of Climate Change and Adaptation, Government of Vanuatu.
- 24 McCollum, D. et al., 2017: Connecting the Sustainable Development Goals by their energy inter-linkages. .
- 25 McCollum, D.L. et al., 2018: Energy investment needs for fulfilling the Paris Agreement and achieving the Sustainable
26 Development Goals. *Nature Energy*, doi:10.1038/s41560-018-0179-z.
- 27 McCubbin, S., B. Smit, and T. Pearce, 2015: Where does climate fit? Vulnerability to climate change in the context of
28 multiple stressors in Funafuti, Tuvalu. *Global Environmental Change*, **30**, 43-55,
29 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.10.007.
- 30 McGlade, C. and P. Ekins, 2015: The geographical distribution of fossil fuels unused when limiting global warming to
31 2 °C. *Nature*, **517(7533)**, 187-190, doi:10.1038/nature14016.
- 32 McGranahan, G., D. Schensul, and G. Singh, 2016: Inclusive urbanization: can the 2030 Agenda be delivered without
33 it? *Environment and Urbanization*, **28(1)**, 13-34, doi:10.1177/0956247815627522.
- 34 McKay, B., S. Sauer, B. Richardson, and R. Herre, 2016: The political economy of sugarcane flexing: initial insights
35 from Brazil, Southern Africa and Cambodia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, **43(1)**, 195-223,
36 doi:10.1080/03066150.2014.992016.
- 37 McNamara, E., 2015: Cross-border migration with dignity in Kiribati. *Forced Migration Review*, **49(May)**, 2015.
- 38 McNamara, K.E. and S.S. Prasad, 2014: Coping with extreme weather: Communities in Fiji and Vanuatu share their
39 experiences and knowledge. *Climatic Change*, **123(2)**, 121-132, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-1047-2.
- 40 Mechler, R. and T. Schinko, 2016: Identifying the policy space for climate loss and damage. *Science*, **354(6310)**, 290-
41 292, doi:10.1126/science.aag2514.
- 42 , 2018: *Loss and Damage from climate change: concepts, methods and policy options*. Springer International
43 Publishing.
- 44 Meerow, S. and J.P. Newell, 2016: Urban resilience for whom, what, when, where, and why? *Urban Geography*, 1-21,
45 doi:10.1080/02723638.2016.1206395.
- 46 Mehmood, A., 2016: Of resilient places: planning for urban resilience. *European Planning Studies*, **24(2)**, 407-419.
- 47 Meinshausen, M. et al., 2015: National post-2020 greenhouse gas targets and diversity-aware leadership. *Nature*
48 *Climate Change*, **5(12)**, 1098-1106, doi:10.1038/nclimate2826.
- 49 Melica, G. et al., 2018: Multilevel governance of sustainable energy policies: The role of regions and provinces to
50 support the participation of small local authorities in the Covenant of Mayors. *Sustainable Cities and Society*,
51 **39(January)**, 729-739, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.01.013.
- 52 Michaelowa, A., M. Allen, and F. Sha, 2018: Policy instruments for limiting global temperature rise to 1.5°C - can
53 humanity rise to the challenge? *Climate Policy*, **18(3)**, 275-286, doi:10.1080/14693062.2018.1426977.
- 54 Millar, R.J. et al., 2017: Emission budgets and pathways consistent with limiting warming to 1.5 °C. *Nature*
55 *Geoscience*, 1-8, doi:10.1038/ngeo3031.
- 56 Millard-Ball, A., 2013: The limits to planning: causal impacts of city climate action plans. *Journal of Planning*
57 *Education and Research*, **33(1)**, 5-19, doi:10.1177/0739456X12449742.
- 58 Mishra, V., S. Mukherjee, R. Kumar, and D. Stone, 2017: Heat wave exposure in India in current, 1.5°C, and 2.0 °C
59 worlds. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12**, 124012, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa9388.

- 1 Mitchell, D. et al., 2016: Attributing human mortality during extreme heat waves to anthropogenic climate change.
2 *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(7)**, 74006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/074006.
- 3 Moellendorf, D., 2015: Climate change justice. *Philosophy Compass*, **10**, 173-186,
4 doi:10.3197/096327111X12997574391887.
- 5 Morita, K. and K. Matsumoto, 2015: Enhancing Biodiversity Co-benefits of Adaptation to Climate Change. In:
6 *Handbook of Climate Change Adaptation* [Filho, W.L. (ed.)]. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 953-972.
- 7 Mouratiadou, I. et al., 2018: Water demand for electricity in deep decarbonisation scenarios: a multi-model assessment.
8 *Climatic Change*, **147(1)**, 91-106, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2117-7.
- 9 MRFCJ, 2015a: *Women's participation: an enabler of climate justice*.
- 10 MRFCJ, 2015b: *Zero carbon, zero poverty the climate justice way*. Mary Robinson Foundation Climate Justice
11 (MRFCJ), Dublin, Ireland, 69 pp.
- 12 Muratori, M., K. Calvin, M. Wise, P. Kyle, and J. Edmonds, 2016: Global economic consequences of deploying
13 bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS). *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 1-9,
14 doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095004.
- 15 Murphy, D.J., L. Yung, C. Wyborn, and D.R. Williams, 2017: Rethinking climate change adaptation and place through
16 a situated pathways framework: a case study from the Big Hole Valley, USA. *Landscape and Urban Planning*,
17 **167(March 2016)**, 441-450, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.07.016.
- 18 Murphy, K., G.A. Kirkman, S. Seres, and E. Haites, 2015: Technology transfer in the CDM: an updated analysis.
19 *Climate Policy*, **15(1)**, 127-145, doi:10.1080/14693062.2013.812719.
- 20 Murtinho, F., 2016: What facilitates adaptation? An analysis of community-based adaptation to environmental change
21 in the Andes. *International Journal of the Commons*, **10(1)**, 119-141, doi:10.18352/ijc.585.
- 22 Muttarak, R. and W. Lutz, 2014: Is education a key to reducing vulnerability to natural disasters and hence unavoidable
23 climate change? *Ecology and Society*, **19(1)**, doi:10.5751/ES-06476-190142.
- 24 Myers, S.S. et al., 2017: Climate Change and Global Food Systems: Potential Impacts on Food Security and
25 Undernutrition. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 1-19, doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031816-044356.
- 26 Naess, L.O. et al., 2015: Climate policy meets national development contexts: insights from Kenya and Mozambique.
27 *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 534-544, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.015.
- 28 Nagoda, S., 2015: New discourses but same old development approaches? Climate change adaptation policies, chronic
29 food insecurity and development interventions in northwestern Nepal. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 570-
30 579, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.014.
- 31 Nalau, J., J. Handmer, and M. Dalesa, 2017: The role and capacity of government in a climate crisis: Cyclone Pam in
32 Vanuatu. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific Countries: Fostering Resilience and Improving the Quality*
33 *of Life* [Leal Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 151-161.
- 34 Nalau, J. et al., 2016: The practice of integrating adaptation and disaster risk reduction in the south-west Pacific.
35 *Climate and Development*, **8(4)**, 365-375, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1064809.
- 36 NASEM, 2016: *Attribution of Extreme Weather Events in the Context of Climate Change*. National Academies of
37 Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM). The National Academies Press, Washington DC, USA.
- 38 Nelson, D.R., M.C. Lemos, H. Eakin, and Y.-J. Lo, 2016: The limits of poverty reduction in support of climate change
39 adaptation. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 094011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/094011.
- 40 Newell, P. et al., 2014: The Political Economy of Low Carbon Energy in Kenya. IDS Working Papers Vol 2014 No
41 445, 38 pp.
- 42 Newman, P., T. Beatley, and H. Boyer, 2017: *Resilient Cities: Overcoming Fossil Fuel Dependence*. .
- 43 Nguyen, M.T., S. Vink, M. Ziemski, and D.J. Barrett, 2014: Water and energy synergy and trade-off potentials in mine
44 water management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **84(1)**, 629-638, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.063.
- 45 Nhamo, G., 2016: New Global Sustainable Development Agenda: A Focus on Africa. *Sustainable Development*, **25**,
46 227-241, doi:10.1002/sd.1648.
- 47 Niang, I. et al., 2014: Africa. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part B: Regional*
48 *Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel of*
49 *Climate Change* [Barros, V.R., C.B. Field, D.J. Dokken, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, T.E. Bilir, M.
50 Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R.
51 Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New
52 York, NY, USA, pp. 1199-1265.
- 53 Nicholls, R.J. et al., 2018: Stabilisation of global temperature at 1.5°C and 2.0°C: implications for coastal areas.
54 *Philosophical Transactions A*, **376(2119)**, 20160448, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0448.
- 55 Nicolosi, E. and G. Feola, 2016: Transition in place: Dynamics, possibilities, and constraints. *Geoforum*, **76**, 153-163,
56 doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.09.017.
- 57 Nilsson, M., D. Griggs, and M. Visback, 2016: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature*,
58 **534(7607)**, 320-322, doi:10.1038/534320a.
- 59 Nkomwa, E.C., M.K. Joshua, C. Ngongondo, M. Monjerezi, and F. Chipungu, 2014: Assessing indigenous knowledge

- 1 systems and climate change adaptation strategies in agriculture: a case study of Chagaka Village, Chikhwawa,
2 Southern Malawi. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*, **67-69**, 164-172,
3 doi:10.1016/j.pce.2013.10.002.
- 4 Noble, I. et al., 2014: Adaptation needs and options. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability.*
5 *Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
6 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D.
7 Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N.
8 Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
9 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708.
- 10 Normann, H.E., 2015: The role of politics in sustainable transitions: The rise and decline of offshore wind in Norway.
11 *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, **15(2015)**, 180-193, doi:10.1016/j.eist.2014.11.002.
- 12 North, P. and N. Longhurst, 2013: Grassroots localisation? The scalar potential of and limits of the 'transition' approach
13 to climate change and resource constraint. *Urban Studies*, **50(7)**, 1423-1438, doi:10.1177/0042098013480966.
- 14 Nunan, F. (ed.), 2017: *Making climate compatible development happen*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY,
15 USA, 262 pp.
- 16 Nunn, P.D., W. Aalbersberg, S. Lata, and M. Gwilliam, 2014: Beyond the core: Community governance for climate-
17 change adaptation in peripheral parts of Pacific Island Countries. *Regional Environmental Change*, **14(1)**, 221-
18 235, doi:10.1007/s10113-013-0486-7.
- 19 Nyantakyi-Frimpong, H. and R. Bezner-Kerr, 2015: The relative importance of climate change in the context of
20 multiple stressors in semi-arid Ghana. *Global Environmental Change*, **32**, 40-56,
21 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.003.
- 22 Ober, K. and P. Sakdapolrak, 2017: How do social practices shape policy? Analysing the field of 'migration as
23 adaptation' with Bourdieu's 'Theory of Practice'. *The Geographical Journal*, **183(4)**, 359-369,
24 doi:10.1111/geoj.12225.
- 25 Obersteiner, M. et al., 2016: Assessing the land resource-food price nexus of the Sustainable Development Goals.
26 *Science Advances*, **2(9)**, e1501499-e1501499, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1501499.
- 27 O'Brien, K., 2016: Climate change adaptation and social transformation. In: *International Encyclopedia of Geography:*
28 *People, the Earth, Environment and Technology* [Richardson, D., N. Castree, M.F. Goodchild, A. Kobayashi,
29 W. Liu, and R.A. Marston (eds.)]. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- 30 O'Brien, K., 2018: Is the 1.5°C target possible? Exploring the three spheres of transformation. *Current Opinion in*
31 *Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 153-160, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.04.010.
- 32 O'Brien, K., S. Eriksen, T.H. Inderberg, and L. Sygna, 2015: Climate change and development: adaptation through
33 transformation. In: *Climate Change Adaptation and Development: Transforming Paradigms and Practices*
34 [Inderberg, T.H., S. Eriksen, K. O'Brien, and L. Sygna (eds.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York,
35 USA.
- 36 O'Brien, K.L., 2016: Climate change and social transformations: is it time for a quantum leap? *Wiley Interdisciplinary*
37 *Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(5)**, 618-626, doi:10.1002/wcc.413.
- 38 OECD, 2017: *Investing in green growth*. OECD, Paris, France.
- 39 Oei, P. and R. Mendelevitch, 2016: European scenarios of CO2 infrastructure investment until 2050. *The Energy*
40 *Journal*, **37**, doi:10.5547/01956574.37.S13.poei.
- 41 Ojea, E., 2015: Challenges for mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Adaptation into the international climate agenda.
42 *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **14**, 41-48, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.03.006.
- 43 Okereke, C. and P. Coventry, 2016: Climate justice and the international regime: before, during, and after Paris. *Wiley*
44 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(6)**, 834-851, doi:10.1002/wcc.419.
- 45 Olawuyi, D.S., 2017: From technology transfer to technology absorption: addressing climate technology gaps in Africa.
46 Fixing Climate Governance Series.
- 47 Olsson, L. et al., 2014: Livelihoods and Poverty. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Part*
48 *A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
49 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D.
50 Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N.
51 Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
52 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 793-832.
- 53 O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2017a: The roads ahead: narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways describing world futures in
54 the 21st century. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 169-180, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.01.004.
- 55 O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2017b: IPCC reasons for concern regarding climate change risks. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(1)**, 28-
56 37, doi:10.1038/nclimate3179.
- 57 O'Neill, D.W., A.L. Fanning, W.F. Lamb, and J.K. Steinberger, 2018: A good life for all within planetary boundaries.
58 *Nature Sustainability*, **1(2)**, 88-95, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0021-4.
- 59 Oosterhuis, F.H. and P. Ten Brink, 2014: *Paying the polluter: environmentally harmful subsidies and their reform*.

- 1 Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK ; Northampton, MA, USA.
- 2 Oppenheimer, M., M. Campos, and R. Warren, 2014: Emergent risks and key vulnerabilities. In: *Climate Change 2014:*
3 *Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group*
4 *II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros,*
5 *D.J. Dokken, K.J. [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M.*
6 *Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R.*
7 *Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New*
8 *York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708.*
- 9 Orindi, V., Y. Elhadi, and C. Hesse, 2017: Democratising climate finance at local levels. *Building a climate resilient*
10 *economy and society: challenges and opportunities*, 250-264.
- 11 Otto, F., R. Skeie, J.S. Fuglestedt, T. Berntsen, and M.R. Allen, 2017: Assigning historical responsibilities for extreme
12 weather events. *Nature Clim. Change*, **7**, 757-759, doi:doi:10.1038/nclimate3419.
- 13 Page, E.A. and C. Heyward, 2017: Compensating for climate change Loss and Damage. *Political Studies*, **65(2)**, 356-
14 372, doi:10.1177/0032321716647401.
- 15 Pal, J.S. and E.A.B. Eltahir, 2016: Future temperature in southwest Asia projected to exceed a threshold for human
16 adaptability. *Nature Climate Change*, **18203(October)**, 1-4, doi:10.1038/nclimate2833.
- 17 Palazzo, A. et al., 2017: Linking regional stakeholder scenarios and shared socioeconomic pathways: Quantified West
18 African food and climate futures in a global context. *Global Environmental Change*, **45**, 227-242,
19 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.12.002.
- 20 Pan, X., M. Elzen, N. Höhne, F. Teng, and L. Wang, 2017: Exploring fair and ambitious mitigation contributions under
21 the Paris Agreement goals. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **74(March)**, 49-56,
22 doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.04.020.
- 23 Pandey, U.C. and C. Kumar, 2018: Emerging Paradigms of Capacity Building in the Context of Climate Change. In:
24 *Climate Literacy and Innovations in Climate Change Education: Distance Learning for Sustainable*
25 *Development [Azeiteiro, U.M., W. Leal Filho, and L. Aires (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham,*
26 *pp. 193-214.*
- 27 Parikh, K.S., J.K. Parikh, and P.P. Ghosh, 2018: Can India grow and live within a 1.5 degree CO2 emissions budget?
28 *Energy Policy*, **120(May)**, 24-37, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.05.014.
- 29 Park, J., S. Hallegatte, M. Bangalore, and E. Sandhoefner, 2015: Households and heat stress estimating the
30 distributional consequences of climate change. Policy Research Working Paper no. WPS 7479, 58 pp.
- 31 Parkinson, S.C. et al., 2016: Impacts of Groundwater Constraints on Saudi Arabia's Low-Carbon Electricity Supply
32 Strategy. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(4)**, 1653-1662, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05852.
- 33 Parnell, S., 2017: Africa's urban risk and resilience. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, **26**, 1-6,
34 doi:10.1016/J.IJDRR.2017.09.050.
- 35 Patterson, J. et al., 2016: Exploring the governance and politics of transformations towards sustainability.
36 *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 1-16, doi:10.1016/j.eist.2016.09.001.
- 37 Patterson, J.J. et al., 2018: Political feasibility of 1.5°C societal transformations: the role of social justice. *Current*
38 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 1-9, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.002.
- 39 Pearce, T., J. Ford, A.C. Willox, and B. Smit, 2015: Inuit Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), subsistence
40 hunting and adaptation to climate change in the Canadian Arctic. *Arctic*, **68(2)**, 233-245,
41 doi:10.2307/43871322.
- 42 Pelling, M., T. Abeling, and M. Garschagen, 2016: Emergence and Transition in London's Climate Change Adaptation
43 Pathways. *Journal of Extreme Events*, **3(3)**, 1650012, doi:10.1142/S2345737616500123.
- 44 Pelling, M. et al., 2018: Africa's urban adaptation transition under a 1.5° climate. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
45 *Sustainability*, **31**, 10-15, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.005.
- 46 Petkova, E.P. et al., 2017: Towards more comprehensive projections of urban heat-related mortality: estimates for New
47 York city under multiple population, adaptation, and climate scenarios. *Environmental Health Perspectives*,
48 **125(1)**, 47-55, doi:10.1289/EHP166.
- 49 Pfeiffer, A., R. Millar, C. Hepburn, and E. Beinhocker, 2016: The '2°C carbon stock' for electricity generation:
50 cumulative committed carbon emissions from the electricity generation sector and the transition to a green
51 economy. *Applied Energy*, **179**, 1395-1408, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.093.
- 52 Phillips, J., P. Newell, and A. Pueyo, 2017: Triple wins? Propsects for pro-poor, low carbon, climate resilient energy
53 services in Kenya. In: *Making climate compatible development happen [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge,*
54 *Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 114-129.*
- 55 Popescu, G.H. and F.C. Ciurlau, 2016: Can environmental sustainability be attained by incorporating nature within the
56 capitalist economy? *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, **11(4)**, 75-81.
- 57 Popp, A. et al., 2014: Land-use transition for bioenergy and climate stabilization: Model comparison of drivers, impacts
58 and interactions with other land use based mitigation options. *Climatic Change*, **123(3-4)**, 495-509,
59 doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0926-x.

- 1 Popp, A. et al., 2017: Land-use futures in the shared socio-economic pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 331-
2 345, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.002.
- 3 Potouroglou, M. et al., 2017: Measuring the role of seagrasses in regulating sediment surface elevation. *Scientific*
4 *Reports*, **7(1)**, 1-11, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-12354-y.
- 5 Pradhan, A., C. Chan, P.K. Roul, J. Halbrendt, and B. Sipes, 2018: Potential of conservation agriculture (CA) for
6 climate change adaptation and food security under rainfed uplands of India: a transdisciplinary approach.
7 *Agricultural Systems*, **163**, 27-35, doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.002.
- 8 Preston, F. and J. Lehne, 2017: *A wider circle? The circular economy in developing countries*. Chatham House: The
9 Royal Institute of International Affairs, London.
- 10 Pretis, F., M. Schwarz, K. Tang, K. Haustein, and M.R. Allen, 2018: Uncertain impacts on economic growth when
11 stabilizing global temperatures at 1.5°C or 2°C warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A:*
12 *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160460, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0460.
- 13 Purdon, M., 2015: Opening the black box of carbon finance "additionality": the political economy of carbon finance
14 effectiveness across Tanzania, Uganda, and Moldova. *World Development*, **74**, 462-478,
15 doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.024.
- 16 Quan, J., L.O. Naess, A. Newsham, A. Siteo, and M.C. Fernandez, 2017: The political economy of REDD+ in
17 Mozambique: implications for climate compatible development. In: *Making climate compatible development*
18 *happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. pp. 151-181.
- 19 Rai, N. and S. Fisher, 2017: *The political economy of low carbon resilient development: planning and implementation*.
20 Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA.
- 21 Rao, N.D., 2014: International and intranational equity in sharing climate change mitigation burdens. *International*
22 *Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **14(2)**, 129-146, doi:10.1007/s10784-013-9212-7.
- 23 Rao, N.D. and J. Min, 2018: Less global inequality can improve climate outcomes. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews:*
24 *Climate Change*, **9**, e513, doi:10.1002/wcc.513.
- 25 Rao, N.D., B.J. van Ruijven, V. Bosetti, and K. Riahi, 2017: Improving poverty and inequality modeling in climate
26 research. *Nature Climate Change*, **7**, 857-862, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0004-x.
- 27 Rao, S. et al., 2016: Future Air Pollution in the Shared Socio-Economic Pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**,
28 346-358, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.012.
- 29 Rasch, R., 2017: Income Inequality and Urban Vulnerability to Flood Hazard in Brazil. *Social Science Quarterly*, **98(1)**,
30 299-325, doi:10.1111/ssqu.12274.
- 31 Rasul, G. and B. Sharma, 2016: The nexus approach to water-energy-food security: an option for adaptation to climate
32 change. *Climate Policy*, **16(6)**, 682-702, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1029865.
- 33 Raworth, K., 2017: A Doughnut for the Anthropocene: humanity's compass in the 21st century. *The Lancet Planetary*
34 *Health*, **1(2)**, e48-e49, doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(17)30028-1.
- 35 Redclift, M. and D. Springett (eds.), 2015: *Routledge International Handbook of Sustainable Development*. Routledge,
36 Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 448 pp.
- 37 Regmi, B.R. and C. Star, 2015: Exploring the policy environment for mainstreaming community-based adaptation
38 (CBA) in Nepal. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **7(4)**, 423-441,
39 doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-04-2014-0050.
- 40 Reid, H., 2016: Ecosystem- and community-based adaptation: learning from community-based natural resource
41 management. *Climate and Development*, **8(1)**, 4-9, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1034233.
- 42 Reid, H. and S. Huq, 2014: Mainstreaming community-based adaptation into national and local planning. *Climate and*
43 *Development*, **6(4)**, 291-292, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.973720.
- 44 Reij, C. and R. Winterbottom, 2015: *Scaling up Regreening: Six Steps to Success. A Practical Approach to Forest*
45 *Landscape Restoration*. 72 pp.
- 46 Republic of Vanuatu, 2016: *Vanuatu 2030: The People's Plan*. 28 pp.
- 47 Republic of Vanuatu, 2017: *Vanuatu 2030: The People's Plan. National Sustainable Development Plan 2016-2030.*
48 *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*. 48 pp.
- 49 Revi, A. et al., 2014: Urban areas. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global*
50 *and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
51 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D.
52 Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N.
53 Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK,
54 and New York, NY, USA, pp. 535-612.
- 55 Rey, T., L. Le De, F. Leone, and D. Gilbert, 2017: An integrative approach to understand vulnerability and resilience
56 post-disaster: the 2015 cyclone Pam in urban Vanuatu as case study. *Disaster Prevention and Management*,
57 **26(3)**, 259-275, doi:10.1108/DPM-07-2016-0137.
- 58 Reyer, C.P.O. et al., 2017a: Climate change impacts in Latin America and the Caribbean and their implications for
59 development. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(6)**, 1601-1621, doi:10.1007/s10113-015-0854-6.

- 1 Reyer, C.P.O. et al., 2017b: Turn down the heat: regional climate change impacts on development. *Regional*
2 *Environmental Change*, **17(6)**, 1563-1568, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1187-4.
- 3 Riahi, K. et al., 2015: Locked into Copenhagen pledges - Implications of short-term emission targets for the cost and
4 feasibility of long-term climate goals. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90**, 8-23,
5 doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.09.016.
- 6 Riahi, K. et al., 2017: The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions
7 implications: an overview. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 153-168, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009.
- 8 Robertson, M., 2014: *Sustainability Principles and Practice*. Routledge.
- 9 Robinson, M. and T. Shine, 2018: Achieving a climate justice pathway to 1.5°C. *Nature Climate Change* (in press).
- 10 Robinson, S. and M. Dornan, 2017: International financing for climate change adaptation in small island developing
11 states. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(4)**, 1103-1115.
- 12 Robiou du Pont, Y. et al., 2017: Equitable mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement goals. *Nature Climate Change*,
13 **7(1)**, 38-43, doi:10.1038/NCLIMATE3186.
- 14 Rockström, J. et al., 2017: Sustainable intensification of agriculture for human prosperity and global sustainability.
15 *Ambio*, **46(1)**, 4-17, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0793-6.
- 16 Rogelj, J. et al., 2018: Scenarios towards limiting global mean temperature increase below 1.5 °C. *Nature Climate*
17 *Change*, 1-8, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0091-3.
- 18 Roger, C., T. Hale, and L. Andonova, 2017: The comparative politics of transnational climate governance. *International*
19 *Interactions*, **43(1)**, 1-25, doi:10.1080/03050629.2017.1252248.
- 20 Rose, S.K. et al., 2014: Bioenergy in energy transformation and climate management. *Climatic Change*, **123(3-4)**, 477-
21 493, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0965-3.
- 22 Rosenbloom, D., 2017: Pathways: An emerging concept for the theory and governance of low-carbon transitions.
23 *Global Environmental Change*, **43**, 37-50, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.12.011.
- 24 Rosenzweig, C. et al., 2018: *Climate change and cities: Second assessment part of the Urban Climate Change Research*
25 *Network*. Cambridge University Press, London, UK and New York, NY, USA.
- 26 Roser, D. and C. Seidel, 2017: *Climate justice*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon.
- 27 Roser, D., C. Huggel, M. Ohndorf, and I. Wallimann-Helmer, 2015: Advancing the interdisciplinary dialogue on
28 climate justice. *Climatic Change*, **133(3)**, 349-359, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1556-2.
- 29 Rozenberg, J. and S. Hallegatte, 2016: Modeling the Impacts of Climate Change on Future Vietnamese Households: A
30 Micro-Simulation Approach. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper.
- 31 Runhaar, H., B. Wilk, Persson, C. Uittenbroek, and C. Wamsler, 2018: Mainstreaming climate adaptation: taking stock
32 about "what works" from empirical research worldwide. *Regional Environmental Change*, **18(4)**, 1201-1210,
33 doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1259-5.
- 34 Rutledge, D. et al., 2017: Climate Change Impacts and Implications for New Zealand to 2100. In: *Identifying*
35 *Feedbacks, Understanding Cumulative Impacts and Recognising Limits: A National Integrated Assessment*.
36 *Synthesis Report*. pp. 84.
- 37 Sachs, J., G. Schmidt-Traub, C. Kroll, D. Durand-Delacre, and K. Teksoz, 2017: *An SDG Index and Dashboards -*
38 *Global Report*. 427 pp.
- 39 Salleh, A., 2016: Climate, Water, and Livelihood Skills: A Post-Development Reading of the SDGs. *Globalizations*,
40 **13(6)**, 952-959, doi:10.1080/14747731.2016.1173375.
- 41 Sánchez, A. and M. Izzo, 2017: Micro hydropower: an alternative for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and
42 development of marginalized local communities in Hispaniola Island. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 79-87,
43 doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1865-0.
- 44 Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and C. Aall (eds.), 2016: *Rethinking climate and energy policies: new perspectives on the*
45 *rebound phenomenon*. Springer.
- 46 Santos, P., P. Bacelar-Nicolau, M.A. Pardal, L. Bacelar-Nicolau, and U.M. Azeiteiro, 2016: Assessing Student
47 Perceptions and Comprehension of Climate Change in Portuguese Higher Education Institutions. In:
48 *Implementing Climate Change Adaptation in Cities and Communities Integrating Strategies and Educational*
49 *Approaches* [Filho, W.L., K. Adamson, R.M. Dunk, U.M. Azeiteiro, S. Illingworth, and F. Alves (eds.)]. pp.
50 221-236.
- 51 Satterthwaite, D., 2016: Missing the Millennium Development Goal targets for water and sanitation in urban areas.
52 *Environment and Urbanization*, **28(1)**, 99-118, doi:10.1177/0956247816628435.
- 53 Satterthwaite, D. et al., 2018: Responding to climate change in cities and in their informal settlements and economies.
54 In: *International Scientific Conference on Cities and Climate Change*. International Institute for Environment
55 and Development, Edmonton, Canada.
- 56 Savo, V. et al., 2016: Observations of climate change among subsistence-oriented communities around the world.
57 *Nature Climate Change*, **6(5)**, 462-473, doi:10.1038/nclimate2958.
- 58 Schade, J. and W. Obergassel, 2014: Human rights and the Clean Development Mechanism. *Cambridge Review of*
59 *International Affairs*, **27(4)**, 717-735, doi:10.1080/09557571.2014.961407.

- 1 Schaeffer, M. et al., 2015: *Feasibility of limiting warming to 1.5 and 2°C*. Climate Analytics, Berlin, Germany, 20 pp.
- 2 Schaller, N. et al., 2016: Human influence on climate in the 2014 southern England winter floods and their impacts.
- 3 *Nature Climate Change*, **6(6)**, 627-634, doi:10.1038/nclimate2927.
- 4 Schirmer, J. and L. Bull, 2014: Assessing the likelihood of widespread landholder adoption of afforestation and
- 5 reforestation projects. *Global Environmental Change*, **24**, 306-320,
- 6 doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2013.11.009.
- 7 Schleussner, C.-F. et al., 2016: Differential climate impacts for policy-relevant limits to global warming: the case of
- 8 1.5°C and 2°C. *Earth System Dynamics*, **7(2)**, 327-351, doi:10.5194/esd-7-327-2016.
- 9 Schlosberg, D., L.B. Collins, and S. Niemeyer, 2017: Adaptation policy and community discourse: risk, vulnerability,
- 10 and just transformation. *Environmental Politics*, **26(3)**, 1-25, doi:10.1080/09644016.2017.1287628.
- 11 Schwan, S. and X. Yu, 2017: Social protection as a strategy to address climate-induced migration. *International Journal*
- 12 *of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, IJCCSM-01-2017-0019, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-01-2017-0019.
- 13 Scoones, I. et al., 2017: *Pathways to Sustainable Agriculture*. Routledge, 132 pp.
- 14 Scott, F.L., C.R. Jones, and T.L. Webb, 2014: What do people living in deprived communities in the UK think about
- 15 household energy efficiency interventions? *Energy Policy*, **66(September 2011)**, 335-349,
- 16 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.084.
- 17 Sealey-Huggins, L., 2017: 1.5°C to stay alive': climate change, imperialism and justice for the Caribbean. *Third World*
- 18 *Quarterly*, **6597(October)**, 1-20, doi:10.1080/01436597.2017.1368013.
- 19 Serdeczny, O.M., S. Bauer, and S. Huq, 2017: Non-economic losses from climate change: opportunities for policy-
- 20 oriented research. *Climate and Development*, 1-5, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1372268.
- 21 Seto, K.C. et al., 2016: Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications. *Annual Review of Environment and*
- 22 *Resources*, **41(1)**, 425-452, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085934.
- 23 Sgouridis, S. et al., 2016: RE-mapping the UAE's energy transition: an economy-wide assessment of renewable energy
- 24 options and their policy implications. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **55**, 1166-1180,
- 25 doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.05.039.
- 26 Shackleton, S., G. Ziervogel, S. Sallu, T. Gill, and P. Tschakert, 2015: Why is socially-just climate change adaptation in
- 27 sub-Saharan Africa so challenging? A review of barriers identified from empirical cases. *Wiley*
- 28 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **6(3)**, 321-344, doi:10.1002/wcc.335.
- 29 Shaffrey, L.C. et al., 2009: U.K. HiGEM: the new U.K. high-resolution global environment model - model description
- 30 and basic evaluation. *Journal of Climate*, **22(8)**, 1861-1896, doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2508.1.
- 31 Shah, N., M. Wei, V. Letschert, and A. Phadke, 2015: *Benefits of leapfrogging to superefficiency and low global*
- 32 *warming potential refrigerants in room air conditioning*. Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National
- 33 Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA, 58 pp.
- 34 Sharpe, R.A., C.R. Thornton, V. Nikolaou, and N.J. Osborne, 2015: Higher energy efficient homes are associated with
- 35 increased risk of doctor diagnosed asthma in a UK subpopulation. *Environment International*, **75**, 234-244,
- 36 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.11.017.
- 37 Shaw, C., S. Hales, P. Howden-Chapman, and R. Edwards, 2014: Health co-benefits of climate change mitigation
- 38 policies in the transport sector. *Nature Clim. Change*, **4(6)**, 427-433, doi:10.1038/nclimate2247.
- 39 Shi, L. et al., 2016: Roadmap towards justice in urban climate adaptation research. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(2)**, 131-
- 40 137, doi:10.1038/nclimate2841.
- 41 Shi, Y., J. Liu, H. Shi, H. Li, and Q. Li, 2017: The ecosystem service value as a new eco-efficiency indicator for
- 42 industrial parks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **164**, 597-605, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.187.
- 43 Shindell, D.T., G. Faluvegi, K. Seltzer, and C. Shindell, 2018: Quantified, localized health benefits of accelerated
- 44 carbon dioxide emissions reductions. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(4)**, 291-295, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0108-y.
- 45 Shindell, D.T. et al., 2017: A climate policy pathway for near- and long-term benefits. *Science*, **356(6337)**, 493-494,
- 46 doi:10.1126/science.aak9521.
- 47 Shine, T., 2017: *Integrating climate action into national development planning - coherent implementation of the Paris*
- 48 *Agreement and Agenda 2030*. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Stockholm, Sweden.
- 49 Shine, T. and G. Campillo, 2016: The role of development finance in climate action post-2015. OECD Development
- 50 Co-operation Working Papers.
- 51 Shue, H., 2014: *Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection*. Oxford University Press, Oxford UK.
- 52 Shue, H., 2017: Responsible for what? Carbon producer CO2 contributions and the energy transition. *Climatic Change*,
- 53 1-6, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2042-9.
- 54 Shue, H., 2018: Mitigation gambles: uncertainty, urgency and the last gamble possible. *Philosophical transactions.*
- 55 *Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20170105,
- 56 doi:10.1098/rsta.2017.0105.
- 57 Shultz, J.M., M.A. Cohen, S. Hermosilla, Z. Espinel, and Andrew McLean, 2016: Disaster risk reduction and
- 58 sustainable development for small island developing states. *Disaster Health*, **3(1)**, 32-44,
- 59 doi:10.1080/21665044.2016.1173443.

- 1 Sinclair, F.L., 2016: Systems science at the scale of impact: reconciling bottom-up participation with the production of
2 widely applicable research outputs.. *Sustainable Intensification in Smallholder Agriculture: An Integrated*
3 *Systems Research Approach*, 43-57.
- 4 Singh, C., 2018: Is participatory watershed development building local adaptive capacity? Findings from a case study in
5 Rajasthan, India. *Environmental Development*, **25**, 43-58, doi:10.1016/j.envdev.2017.11.004.
- 6 Singh, C. et al., 2017: The utility of weather and climate information for adaptation decision-making: current uses and
7 future prospects in Africa and India. *Climate and Development*, 1-17, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1318744.
- 8 Singh, R., K.K. Garg, S.P. Wani, R.K. Tewari, and S.K. Dhyani, 2014: Impact of water management interventions on
9 hydrology and ecosystem services in Garhkundar-Dabar watershed of Bundelkhand region, Central India. *J.*
10 *Hydrol*, **509**, 132-149, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.030.
- 11 Skeie, R.B. et al., 2017: Perspective has a strong effect on the calculation of historical contributions to global warming.
12 *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(2)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa5b0a.
- 13 SLoCaT, 2017: *Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action (MPGCA) Transport Initiatives: Stock-take on*
14 *action toward implementation of the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development.*
15 *Second Progress Report.* Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (SLoCaT), Bonn, Germany.
- 16 Smith, K.R. and A. Sagar, 2014: Making the clean available: escaping India's Chulha Trap. *Energy Policy*, **75**, 410-414,
17 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.024.
- 18 Smith, K.R. et al., 2014: Human health: impacts, adaptation, and co-benefits. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts,*
19 *Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the*
20 *Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J.
21 Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B.
22 Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge
23 University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 709-754.
- 24 Smith, P. et al., 2014: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of*
25 *Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental*
26 *Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth,
27 A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T.
28 Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York,
29 NY, USA, pp. 811-922.
- 30 Smith, P. et al., 2016: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO2 emissions. *Nature Clim. Change*, **6(1)**, 42-50,
31 doi:10.1038/nclimate2870.
- 32 Smits, M. and C. Middleton, 2014: New arenas of engagement at the water governance-climate finance nexus? An
33 analysis of the boom and bust of hydropower CDM projects in vietnam. *Water Alternatives*, **7(3)**, 561-583.
- 34 Smucker, T.A. et al., 2015: Differentiated livelihoods, local institutions, and the adaptation imperative: Assessing
35 climate change adaptation policy in Tanzania. *Geoforum*, **59**, 39-50, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.11.018.
- 36 Solecki, W. et al., 2018: City transformations in a 1.5°C warmer world. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(3)**, 177-181,
37 doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0101-5.
- 38 Sondak, C.F.A. et al., 2017: Carbon dioxide mitigation potential of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs). *Journal of*
39 *Applied Phycology*, **29(5)**, 2363-2373, doi:10.1007/s10811-016-1022-1.
- 40 Sonwa, D.J. et al., 2017: Drivers of climate risk in African agriculture. *Climate and Development*, **9(5)**, 383-398.
- 41 Sorrell, S., 2015: Reducing energy demand: A review of issues, challenges and approaches. *Renewable and Sustainable*
42 *Energy Reviews*, **47**, 74-82, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.03.002.
- 43 Sovacool, B.K., B.-O. Linnér, and M.E. Goodsite, 2015: The political economy of climate adaptation. *Nature Climate*
44 *Change*, **5(7)**, 616-618, doi:10.1038/nclimate2665.
- 45 Sovacool, B.K., B.O. Linner, and R.J.T. Klein, 2017: Climate change adaptation and the Least Developed Countries
46 Fund (LDCF): qualitative insights from policy implementation in the Asia-Pacific. *Climatic Change*, **140(2)**,
47 209-226, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1839-2.
- 48 SPC, 2015: *Vanuatu climate change and disaster risk reduction policy 2016-2030.* Secretariat of the Pacific
49 Community (SPC), Suva, Fiji, 48 pp.
- 50 Spencer, T. et al., 2018: The 1.5°C target and coal sector transition: at the limits of societal feasibility. *Climate Policy*,
51 **18(3)**, 335-331, doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1386540.
- 52 Staggenborg, S. and C. Ogrodnik, 2015: New environmentalism and Transition Pittsburgh. *Environmental Politics*,
53 **24(5)**, 723-741, doi:10.1080/09644016.2015.1027059.
- 54 Steering Committee on Partnerships for SIDS and UNDESA, 2016: *Partnerships for small island developing states,*
55 *Samoa.* Partnerships for Small Island Developing States.
- 56 Sterrett, C.L., 2015: *Final evaluation of the Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program.* 96 pp.
- 57 Stevens, C., R. Winterbottom, J. Springer, and K. Reyntar, 2014: *Securing rights, combating climate change: how*
58 *strengthening community forests rights mitigates climate change.*
- 59 Stirling, A., 2014: *Emancipating Transformations: From controlling 'the transition' to culturing plural radical*

- 1 *progress*. STEPS Centre (Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability), Brighton, UK,
2 48 pp.
- 3 Striessnig, E. and E. Loichinger, 2015: Future differential vulnerability to natural disasters by level of education.
4 *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, **13**, 221-240.
- 5 Stringer, L.C., S.M. Sallu, A.J. Dougill, B.T. Wood, and L. Ficklin, 2017: Reconsidering climate compatible
6 development as a new development landscape in southern Africa. In: *Making climate compatible development*
7 *happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 22-43.
- 8 Stringer, L.C. et al., 2014: Advancing climate compatible development: Lessons from southern Africa. *Regional*
9 *Environmental Change*, **14(2)**, 713-725, doi:10.1007/s10113-013-0533-4.
- 10 Suckall, N., E. Tompkins, and L. Stringer, 2014: Identifying trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and development
11 in community responses to climate and socio-economic stresses: Evidence from Zanzibar, Tanzania. *Applied*
12 *Geography*, **46**, 111-121, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2013.11.005.
- 13 Suckall, N., L.C. Stringer, and E.L. Tompkins, 2015: Presenting Triple-Wins? Assessing Projects That Deliver
14 Adaptation, Mitigation and Development Co-benefits in Rural Sub-Saharan Africa. *Ambio*, **44(1)**, 34-41,
15 doi:10.1007/s13280-014-0520-0.
- 16 Suffolk, C. and W. Poortinga, 2016: Behavioural changes after energy efficiency improvements in residential
17 properties. In: *Rethinking Climate and Energy Policies: New Perspectives on the Rebound Phenomenon*
18 [Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and C. Aall (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 121-142.
- 19 Surminski, S., L.M. Bouwer, and J. Linnerooth-Bayer, 2016: How insurance can support climate resilience. *Nature*
20 *Climate Change*, **6(4)**, 333-334, doi:10.1038/nclimate2979.
- 21 Szabo, S. et al., 2015: Sustainable Development Goals Offer New Opportunities for Tropical Delta Regions.
22 *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, **57(4)**, 16-23,
23 doi:10.1080/00139157.2015.1048142.
- 24 Tàbara, J.D., A.L. St. Clair, and E.A.T. Hermansen, 2017: Transforming communication and knowledge production
25 processes to address high-end climate change. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **70**, 31-37,
26 doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.01.004.
- 27 Tàbara, J.D. et al., 2018: Positive tipping points in a rapidly warming world. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
28 *Sustainability*, **31**, 120-129, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.01.012.
- 29 Tait, L. and M. Euston-Brown, 2017: What role can African cities play in low-carbon development? A multilevel
30 governance perspective of Ghana, Uganda and South Africa. *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*, **28(3)**, 43,
31 doi:10.17159/2413-3051/2017/v28i3a1959.
- 32 Tanner, T. et al., 2017: Political economy of climate compatible development: artisanal fisheries and climate change in
33 Ghana. In: *Making climate compatible development happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and
34 New York, NY, USA, pp. 223-241.
- 35 Taylor, M., 2017: Climate-smart agriculture: what is it good for? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, **45(1)**, 89-107,
36 doi:10.1080/03066150.2017.1312355.
- 37 Taylor Aiken, G., 2015: (Local-) community for global challenges: carbon conversations, transition towns and
38 governmental elisions. *Local Environment*, **20(7)**, 764-781, doi:10.1080/13549839.2013.870142.
- 39 Taylor Aiken, G., 2016: Prosaic state governance of community low carbon transitions. *Political Geography*, **55**, 20-29,
40 doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2016.04.002.
- 41 Taylor Aiken, G., L. Middlemiss, S. Sallu, and R. Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2017: Researching climate change and
42 community in neoliberal contexts: an emerging critical approach. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate*
43 *Change*, **8(4)**, n/a-n/a, doi:10.1002/wcc.463.
- 44 Teferi, Z.A. and P. Newman, 2018: Slum upgrading: can the 1.5°C carbon reduction work with SDGs in these
45 settlements? *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 52-63, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1239.
- 46 Thomas, A. and L. Benjamin, 2017: Management of loss and damage in small island developing states: implications for
47 a 1.5 °C or warmer world. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(81)**, 1-10, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1184-7.
- 48 Thompson-Hall, M., E.R. Carr, and U. Pascual, 2016: Enhancing and expanding intersectional research for climate
49 change adaptation in agrarian settings. *Ambio*, **45(s3)**, 373-382, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0827-0.
- 50 Thornton, T.F. and C. Comberti, 2017: Synergies and trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and development.
51 *Climatic Change*, 1-14, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0884-3.
- 52 Thorp, T.M., 2014: *Climate justice: a voice for the future*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- 53 Tilman, D. and M. Clark, 2014: Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*, **515(7528)**,
54 518-522, doi:10.1038/nature13959.
- 55 Tokar, B., 2014: *Toward climate justice: perspectives on the climate crisis and social change*. New Compass Press,
56 Porsgrunn, Norway.
- 57 Toole, S., N. Klocker, and L. Head, 2016: Re-thinking climate change adaptation and capacities at the household scale.
58 *Climatic Change*, **135(2)**, 203-209, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1577-x.
- 59 Tschakert, P. et al., 2016: Micropolitics in collective learning spaces for adaptive decision making. *Global*

- 1 *Environmental Change*, **40**, 182-194, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.07.004.
- 2 Tschakert, P. et al., 2017: Climate change and loss, as if people mattered: Values, places, and experiences. *Wiley*
- 3 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **8(5)**, e476, doi:10.1002/wcc.476.
- 4 Tung, R.L., 2016: Opportunities and Challenges Ahead of China's "New Normal". *Long Range Planning*, **49(5)**, 632-
- 5 640, doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2016.05.001.
- 6 UN, 2014a: *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 14 November 2014: SIDS accelerated modalities of action*
- 7 *(SAMOA) pathway*. A/RES/69/15.
- 8 UN, 2014b: *World urbanisation prospects, 2014 revisions*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York,
- 9 NY, USA.
- 10 UN, 2015a: *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. United Nations (UN), New York, NY, USA, 75 pp.
- 11 UN, 2015b: *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1)*. A/RES/70/1, 35
- 12 pp.
- 13 UN Women, 2016: *Time to Act on Gender, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction: An overview of progress in*
- 14 *the Pacific region with evidence from The Republic of Marshall Islands, Vanuatu and Samoa*. 92 pp.
- 15 UN Women and MRFCJ, 2016: *The Full View: Ensuring a comprehensive approach to achieve the goal of gender*
- 16 *balance in the UNFCCC process*.
- 17 UNDP, 2016: *Risk Governance: Building Blocks for Resilient Development in the Pacific*. Policy Brief: October 2016,
- 18 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Pacific Risk Resilience Programme (PRRP), Suva, Fiji,
- 19 20 pp.
- 20 UNEP, 2017: *The Emissions Gap Report 2017*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya.
- 21 UNFCCC, 2010: *Decision 1/CP.16: Warsaw international mechanism for loss and damage associated with climate*
- 22 *change impacts*.
- 23 UNFCCC, 2011: *Decision 7/CP.17: Work programme on loss and damage*.
- 24 UNFCCC, 2013: *Decision 2/CP.19: Warsaw international mechanism for loss and damage associated with climate*
- 25 *change impact*.
- 26 UNFCCC, 2015: *Adoption of the Paris Agreement*. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9, 32 pp.
- 27 UNRISD, 2016: *Policy Innovations for Transformative Change: Implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable*
- 28 *Development*. 248 pp.
- 29 UNU-EHS, 2016: *World Risk Report 2016 - Logistics and infrastructure*. 74 pp.
- 30 Ürge-Vorsatz, D., S.T. Herrero, N.K. Dubash, and F. Lecocq, 2014: Measuring the co-benefits of climate change
- 31 mitigation. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **39(October)**, 549-582, doi:10.1146/annurev-
- 32 environ-031312-125456.
- 33 Ürge-Vorsatz, D. et al., 2016: Measuring multiple impacts of low-carbon energy options in a green economy context.
- 34 *Applied Energy*, **179**, 1409-1426, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.07.027.
- 35 Ustadi, I., T. Mezher, and M.R.M. Abu-Zahra, 2017: The effect of the carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology
- 36 deployment on the natural gas market in the United Arab Emirates. *Energy Procedia*, **114**, 6366-6376,
- 37 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1773.
- 38 Vale, L.J., 2014: The politics of resilient cities: whose resilience and whose city? *Building Research and Information*,
- 39 **42(2)**, 191-201, doi:10.1080/09613218.2014.850602.
- 40 Van Aelst, K. and N. Holvoet, 2016: Intersections of gender and marital status in accessing climate change adaptation:
- 41 evidence from rural Tanzania. *World Development*, **79(July 2015)**, 40-50,
- 42 doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.003.
- 43 Van de Graaf, T. and A. Verbruggen, 2015: The oil endgame: strategies of oil exporters in a carbon-constrained world.
- 44 *Environmental Science & Policy*, **54**, 456-462, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.004.
- 45 van der Geest, K. and K. Warner, 2015: Editorial: Loss and damage from climate change: emerging perspectives.
- 46 *International Journal of Global Warming*, **8(2)**, 133-140.
- 47 Van der Heijden, J., 2018: The limits of voluntary programs for low-carbon buildings for staying under 1.5°C. *Current*
- 48 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 59-66, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.03.006.
- 49 van Noorloos, F. and M. Kloosterboer, 2017: Africa's new cities: The contested future of urbanisation. *Urban Studies*,
- 50 1-19, doi:0.1177/0042098017700574.
- 51 van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2017a: The Shared Socio-economic Pathways: Trajectories for human development and global
- 52 environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 148-152, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.009.
- 53 van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2017b: Energy, land-use and greenhouse gas emissions trajectories under a green growth
- 54 paradigm. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 237-250, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.008.
- 55 van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2018: Alternative pathways to the 1.5 °C target reduce the need for negative emission
- 56 technologies. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(May)**, 1-7, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0119-8.
- 57 Vanhala, L. and C. Hestbaek, 2016: Framing climate change Loss and Damage in UNFCCC negotiations. *Global*
- 58 *Environmental Politics*, **16(4)**, 111-129, doi:10.1162/GLEP_a_00379.
- 59 Vardakoulias, O. and N. Nicholles, 2014: *Managing uncertainty: An economic evaluation of community-based*

- 1 *adaptation in Dakoro, Niger*. 54 pp.
- 2 Veland, S. et al., 2018: Narrative matters for sustainability: the transformative role of storytelling in realizing 1.5°C
3 futures. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 41-47,
4 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.005.
- 5 Vermeulen, S. et al., 2016: *The Economic Advantage: Assessing the value of climate change actions in agriculture*.
6 International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), 77 pp.
- 7 Vierros, M., 2017: Communities and blue carbon: the role of traditional management systems in providing benefits for
8 carbon storage, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 89-100,
9 doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0920-3.
- 10 Vinyeta, K., K.P. Whyte, and K. Lynn, 2015: *Climate change through an intersectional lens: gendered vulnerability
11 and resilience in indigenous communities in the United States*. United States Department of Agriculture, 80 pp.
- 12 Vogt-Schilb, A. and S. Hallegatte, 2017: Climate policies and NDCs: reconciling the needed ambition with the political
13 economy. IDB Working Paper Series.
- 14 Volz, U. et al., 2015: *Financing green transformation: how to make green finance work in Indonesia*. Palgrave
15 Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK.
- 16 von Stechow, C. et al., 2015: Integrating Global Climate Change Mitigation Goals with Other Sustainability Objectives:
17 A Synthesis. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **40(1)**, 363-394, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-
18 021113-095626.
- 19 von Stechow, C. et al., 2016: 2°C and SDGs: United they stand, divided they fall? *Environmental Research Letters*,
20 **11(3)**, 34022, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034022.
- 21 Voorn, T., J. Quist, and C. Pahl-Wostl, 2017: Envisioning robust climate change adaptation futures for coastal regions:
22 a comparative evaluation of cases in three continents. *Mitigation and Adaptation*.
- 23 Wachsmuth, D., D. Cohen, and H. Angelo, 2016: Expand the frontiers of urban sustainability. *Nature*, **536**, 391-393.
- 24 Waisman, H.-D., C. Guivarch, and F. Lecocq, 2013: The transportation sector and low-carbon growth pathways:
25 modelling urban, infrastructure, and spatial determinants of mobility. *Climate Policy*, **13(sup01)**, 106-129,
26 doi:10.1080/14693062.2012.735916.
- 27 Wallimann-Helmer, I., 2015: Justice for climate loss and damage. *Climatic Change*, **133(3)**, 469-480,
28 doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1483-2.
- 29 Walsh-Dilley, M. and W. Wolford, 2015: (Un)Defining resilience: subjective understandings of 'resilience' from the
30 field. *Resilience*, **3(3)**, 173-182, doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1072310.
- 31 Wamsler, C., C. Luederitz, E. Brink, C. Wamsler, and C. Luederitz, 2014: Local levers for change: mainstreaming
32 ecosystem-based adaptation into municipal planning to foster sustainability transitions. *Global Environmental
33 Change*, **29**, 189-201, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.008.
- 34 Wang, X., 2017: The role of attitudinal motivations and collective efficacy on Chinese consumers' intentions to engage
35 in personal behaviors to mitigate climate change. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1-13,
36 doi:10.1080/00224545.2017.1302401.
- 37 Wang, Y., Q. Song, J. He, and Y. Qi, 2015: Developing low-carbon cities through pilots. *Climate Policy*,
38 **15(November)**, 81-103, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1050347.
- 39 Wanner, T., 2014: The new 'Passive Revolution' of the green economy and growth discourse: Maintaining the
40 'Sustainable Development' of Neoliberal capitalism. *New Political Economy*, **20(1)**, 1-21,
41 doi:10.1080/13563467.2013.866081.
- 42 Warner, B.P. and C.P. Kuzdas, 2017: The role of political economy in framing and producing transformative
43 adaptation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **29**, 69-74, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.012.
- 44 Warner, B.P., C. Kuzdas, M.G. Yglesias, and D.L. Childers, 2015: Limits to adaptation to interacting global change
45 risks among smallholder rice farmers in Northwest Costa Rica. *Global Environmental Change*, **30**, 101-112,
46 doi:10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2014.11.002.
- 47 Warner, K. and K. Geest, 2013: Loss and damage from climate change: local-level evidence from nine vulnerable
48 countries. *International Journal of Global Warming*, **5(4)**, 367, doi:10.1504/IJGW.2013.057289.
- 49 Watts, N. et al., 2015: Health and climate change: policy responses to protect public health. *The Lancet*, **386(10006)**,
50 1861-1914.
- 51 Wegner, G.I., 2016: Payments for ecosystem services (PES): a flexible, participatory, and integrated approach for
52 improved conservation and equity outcomes. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **18(3)**, 617-644,
53 doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9673-7.
- 54 Weisser, F., M. Bollig, M. DoevenSpeck, and D. Müller-Mahn, 2014: Translating the 'adaptation to climate change'
55 paradigm: the politics of a travelling idea in Africa. *The Geographical Journal*, **180(2)**, 111-119,
56 doi:10.1111/geoj.12037.
- 57 Wells, E.M. et al., 2015: Indoor air quality and occupant comfort in homes with deep versus conventional energy
58 efficiency renovations. *Building and Environment*, **93(P2)**, 331-338, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.06.021.
- 59 Welsch, M. et al., 2014: Adding value with CLEWS - Modelling the energy system and its interdependencies for

- 1 Mauritius. *Applied Energy*, **113**, 1434-1445, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.08.083.
- 2 Weng, X., Z. Dong, Q. Wu, and Y. Qin, 2015: *China's path to a green economy: decoding China's green economy*
3 *concepts and policies, IIED Country Report*. 40 pp.
- 4 Werfel, S.H., 2017: Household behaviour crowds out support for climate change policy when sufficient progress is
5 perceived. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(7)**, 512-515, doi:10.1038/nclimate3316.
- 6 Wesseling, J.H. et al., 2017: The transition of energy intensive processing industries towards deep decarbonization:
7 characteristics and implications for future research. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79(May)**,
8 1303-1313, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.156.
- 9 Weston, P., R. Hong, C. Kaboré, and C.A. Kull, 2015: Farmer-managed natural regeneration enhances rural livelihoods
10 in dryland West Africa. *Environmental Management*, **55(6)**, 1402-1417, doi:10.1007/s00267-015-0469-1.
- 11 Wewerinke-Singh, M., 2018a: Climate migrants' right to enjoy their culture. In: *Climate refugees: beyond the legal*
12 *impasse?* [Behrman, S. and A. Kent (eds.)]. Earthscan/Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA.
- 13 Wewerinke-Singh, M., 2018b: State responsibility for human rights violations associated with climate change. In:
14 *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights and Climate Governance* [Jodoin, S., S. Duyck, and A. Johl (eds.)].
15 Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA.
- 16 WHO, 2014: *Quantitative risk assessment of the effects of climate change on selected causes of death, 2030s and*
17 *2050s*. World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, Switzerland, 128 pp.
- 18 Wiebe, K. et al., 2015: Climate change impacts on agriculture in 2050 under a range of plausible socioeconomic and
19 emissions scenarios. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(8)**, 085010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/8/085010.
- 20 Wiktorowicz, J., T. Babaeff, J. Eggleston, and P. Newman, 2018: WGV: an Australian urban precinct case study to
21 demonstrate the 1.5C agenda including multiple SDGs. *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 64-81,
22 doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1245.
- 23 Wilkinson, E., A. Kirbyshire, L. Mayhew, P. Batra, and A. Milan, 2016: *Climate-induced migration and displacement:*
24 *closing the policy gap*.
- 25 Willand, N., I. Ridley, and C. Maller, 2015: Towards explaining the health impacts of residential energy efficiency
26 interventions - A realist review. Part 1: Pathways. *Social Science and Medicine*, **133**, 191-201,
27 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.005.
- 28 Winkler, H. and N.K. Dubash, 2016: Who determines transformational change in development and climate finance?
29 *Climate Policy*, **16(6)**, 783-791, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1033674.
- 30 Winkler, H. et al., 2018: Countries start to explain how their climate contributions are fair: more rigour needed.
31 *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **18(1)**, 99-115, doi:10.1007/s10784-
32 017-9381-x.
- 33 Winsemius, H.C. et al., 2018: Disaster risk, climate change, and poverty: assessing the global exposure of poor people
34 to floods and droughts. *Environment and Development Economics*, **17**, 1-21,
35 doi:10.1017/S1355770X17000444.
- 36 Wise, R.M. et al., 2014: Reconceptualising adaptation to climate change as part of pathways of change and response.
37 *Global Environmental Change*, **28**, 325-336, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.002.
- 38 Wood, B.T., 2017: Socially just triple-wins? An evaluation of projects that pursue climate compatible development
39 goals in Malawi. University of Leeds, Leeds, UK, 278 pp.
- 40 Wood, B.T., S.M. Sallu, and J. Paavola, 2016a: Can CDM finance energy access in Least Developed Countries?
41 Evidence from Tanzania. *Climate Policy*, **16(4)**, 456-473, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1027166.
- 42 Wood, B.T., A.J. Dougill, C.H. Quinn, and L.C. Stringer, 2016b: Exploring Power and Procedural Justice Within
43 Climate Compatible Development Project Design: Whose Priorities Are Being Considered? *The Journal of*
44 *Environment & Development*, **25(4)**, 363-395, doi:10.1177/1070496516664179.
- 45 Work, C., 2015: Intersections of climate change mitigation policies, land grabbing and conflict in a fragile state:
46 insights from Cambodia.
- 47 Wright, H., S. Huq, and J. Reeves, 2015: Impact of climate change on least developed countries: are the SDGs possible?
48 IIED Briefing May 2015, 4 pp.
- 49 WWF, 2017: *Responsible sourcing of forest products: the business case for retailers*. World Wide Fund for Nature
50 (WWF), Gland, Switzerland.
- 51 Wyborn, C., L. Yung, D. Murphy, and D.R. Williams, 2015: Situating adaptation: how governance challenges and
52 perceptions of uncertainty influence adaptation in the Rocky Mountains. *Regional Environmental Change*,
53 **15(4)**, 669-682, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0663-3.
- 54 Yang, S., B. Chen, and S. Ulgiati, 2016: Co-benefits of CO2 and PM2.5 Emission Reduction. *Energy Procedia*, **104**,
55 92-97, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2016.12.017.
- 56 Yaro, J.A., J. Teye, and S. Bawakyillenuo, 2015: Local institutions and adaptive capacity to climate change/variability
57 in the northern savannah of Ghana. *Climate and Development*, **7(3)**, 235-245,
58 doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.951018.
- 59 Zeng, H., X. Chen, X. Xiao, and Z. Zhou, 2017: Institutional pressures, sustainable supply chain management, and

- 1 circular economy capability: Empirical evidence from Chinese eco-industrial park firms. *Journal of Cleaner*
2 *Production*, **155**, 54-65, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.093.
- 3 Zhang, H. and W. Chen, 2015: The role of biofuels in China's transport sector in carbon mitigation scenarios. *Energy*
4 *Procedia*, **75**, 2700-2705, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2015.07.682.
- 5 Zhang, S., E. Worrell, and W. Crijns-Graus, 2015: Cutting air pollution by improving energy efficiency of China's
6 cement industry. *Energy Procedia*, **83**, 10-20, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2015.12.191.
- 7 Zhang, Y. et al., 2017: Processes of coastal ecosystem carbon sequestration and approaches for increasing carbon sink.
8 *Science China Earth Sciences*, **60(5)**, 809-820, doi:10.1007/s11430-016-9010-9.
- 9 Zhao, D., A.P. McCoy, J. Du, P. Agee, and Y. Lu, 2017: Interaction effects of building technology and resident
10 behavior on energy consumption in residential buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, **134**, 223-233,
11 doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.10.049.
- 12 Ziervogel, G., A. Cowen, and J. Ziniades, 2016: Moving from adaptive to transformative capacity: Building foundations
13 for inclusive, thriving, and regenerative urban settlements. *Sustainability*, **8(9)**, doi:10.3390/su8090955.
- 14 Ziervogel, G. et al., 2017: Inserting rights and justice into urban resilience: a focus on everyday risk. *Environment and*
15 *Urbanization*, **29(1)**, 123-138, doi:10.1177/0956247816686905.
- 16 Zimm, C., F. Sperling, and S. Busch, 2018: Identifying sustainability and knowledge gaps in socio-economic pathways
17 vis-à-vis the Sustainable Development Goals. *Economies*, **6(2)**, 20, doi:10.3390/economies6020020.