5

Sustainable Development, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities

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

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

Contributing Authors:
Fernando Aragón-Durand (Mexico), Mustapha Babiker (Sudan), Mook Bangalore (USA), Paolo Bertoldi (Italy), Bishwa Bhaskar Choudhary (India), Edward Byres (Austria/Brazil), Anton Cartwright (South Africa), Riyanti Djalante (Japan/Indonesia), Kristie L. Ebi (USA), Neville Ellis (Australia), Francois Engelbrecht (South Africa), Maria Figueroa (Denmark/Venezuela), Mukesh Gupta (India), Diana Hinge Salili (Vanuatu), Daniel Huppmann (Austria), Saleemul Huq (Bangladesh/UK), Daniela Jacob (Germany), Rachel James (UK), Debora Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Peter Marcotullio (USA), Omar Massera (Mexico), Reinhard Mechler (Germany), Haileselassie Amaha Medhin (Ethiopia), Shagun Mehrotra (USA/India), Peter Newman (Australia), Karen Paiva Henrique (Brazil), Simon Parkinson (Canada), Aromar Revi (India), Wilfried Rickels (Germany), Lisa Schipper (UK/Sweden), Jörn Schmidt (Germany), Seth Schultz (USA), Pete Smith (UK), William Solecki (USA), 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)

This chapter should be cited as:
Roy, J., P. Tschakert, H. Waisman, S. Abdul Halim, P. Antwi-Agyei, P. Dasgupta, B. Hayward, M. Kanninen, D. Liverman, C. Okereke, P.F. Pinho, K. Riahi, and A.G. Suarez Rodriguez, 2018: Sustainable Development, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities. In: *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty* [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 445-538. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157940.007.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 447

5.1 Scope and Delineations 450

5.1.1 Sustainable Development, SDGs, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities 450

5.1.2 Pathways to 1.5°C 450

5.1.3 Types of evidence 451

5.2 Poverty, Equality and Equity Implications of a 1.5°C Warmer World 451

5.2.1 Impacts and Risks of a 1.5°C Warmer World: Implications for Poverty and Livelihoods 452

5.2.2 Avoided Impacts of 1.5°C Versus 2°C Warming for Poverty and Inequality 452

5.2.3 Risks from 1.5°C Versus 2°C Global Warming and the Sustainable Development Goals 453

Cross-Chapter Box 12: Residual Risks, Limits to Adaptation and Loss and Damage 454

5.3 Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Development 456

5.3.1 Sustainable Development in Support of Climate Adaptation 456

5.3.2 Synergies and Trade-Offs between Adaptation Options and Sustainable Development 457

5.3.3 Adaptation Pathways towards a 1.5°C Warmer World and Implications for Inequalities 458

Box 5.1 : Ecosystem- and Community-Based Practices in Drylands 459

5.4 Mitigation and Sustainable Development 459

5.4.1 Synergies and Trade-Offs between Mitigation Options and Sustainable Development 459

Box 5.2: Challenges and Opportunities of Low-Carbon Pathways in Gulf Cooperative Council Countries 462

5.4.2 Sustainable Development Implications of 1.5°C and 2°C Mitigation Pathways 463

5.5 Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C 466

5.5.1 Integration of Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainable Development 467

5.5.2 Pathways for Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainable Development 467

5.5.3 Climate-Resilient Development Pathways 468

Box 5.3: Republic of Vanuatu – National Planning for Development and Climate Resilience 471

Cross-Chapter Box 13: Cities and Urban Transformation 472

5.6 Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Development, Eradicating Poverty and Reducing Inequalities in 1.5°C Warmer Worlds 474

5.6.1 Finance and Technology Aligned with Local Needs 474

5.6.2 Integration of Institutions 474

5.6.3 Inclusive Processes 475

5.6.4 Attention to Issues of Power and Inequality 475

5.6.5 Reconsidering Values 475

5.7 Synthesis and Research Gaps 475

Frequently Asked Questions

FAQ 5.1 What are the Connections between Sustainable Development and Limiting Global Warming to 1.5°C above Pre-Industrial Levels? 477

FAQ 5.2 What are the Pathways to Achieving Poverty Reduction and Reducing Inequalities while Reaching a 1.5°C World? 479

References 510

5

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 towards 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 above pre-industrial levels 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 expected to occur 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, 11, 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 the current warming of 1°C (*high confidence*). {Cross-Chapter Box 12 in Chapter 5} The impacts of 1.5°C of warming 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

Prioritization 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}

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

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

Mitigation and Sustainable Development

The deployment of mitigation options consistent with 1.5°C pathways leads to multiple synergies across a range of sustainable development dimensions. At the same time, the rapid pace and magnitude of change that would be required to limit warming to 1.5°C, if not carefully managed, would lead to trade-offs with some sustainable development dimensions (*high confidence*). The number of synergies between mitigation response options and sustainable development exceeds the number of trade-offs in energy demand and supply sectors; agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU); and for oceans (*very high confidence*). {Figure 5.2, Table 5.2 available at the end of the chapter} The 1.5°C

pathways indicate robust synergies, particularly for the SDGs 3 (health), 7 (energy), 12 (responsible consumption and production) and 14 (oceans) (*very high confidence*). {5.4.2, Figure 5.3} For SDGs 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 6 (water) and 7 (energy), there is a risk of trade-offs or negative side effects from stringent mitigation actions compatible with 1.5°C of warming (*medium evidence, high agreement*). {5.4.2}

Appropriately designed mitigation actions to reduce energy demand can advance multiple SDGs simultaneously. Pathways compatible with 1.5°C that feature low energy demand show the most pronounced synergies and the lowest number of trade-offs with respect to sustainable development and the SDGs (*very high confidence*). Accelerating energy efficiency in all sectors has synergies with SDGs 7 (energy), 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure), 11 (sustainable cities and communities), 12 (responsible consumption and production), 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions), and 17 (partnerships for the goals) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). {5.4.1, Figure 5.2, Table 5.2} Low-demand pathways, which would reduce or completely avoid the reliance on bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) in 1.5°C pathways, would result in significantly reduced pressure on food security, lower food prices and fewer people at risk of hunger (*medium evidence, high agreement*). {5.4.2, Figure 5.3}

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

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

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

Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C

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

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

Social justice and equity are core aspects of climate-resilient development pathways for transformational social change. Addressing challenges and widening opportunities between and within countries and communities would be necessary to achieve sustainable development and limit warming to 1.5°C, without making the poor and disadvantaged worse off (*high confidence*). Identifying and navigating inclusive and socially acceptable pathways towards low-carbon, climate-resilient futures is a challenging yet important endeavour, fraught with moral, practical and political difficulties and inevitable trade-offs (*very high confidence*). {5.5.2, 5.5.3.3, Box 5.3} It entails deliberation and problem-solving

processes to negotiate societal values, well-being, risks and resilience and to determine what is desirable and fair, and to whom (*medium evidence, high agreement*). Pathways that encompass joint, iterative planning and transformative visions, for instance in Pacific SIDS like Vanuatu and in urban contexts, show potential for liveable and sustainable futures (*high confidence*). {5.5.3.1, 5.5.3.3, Figure 5.5, Box 5.3, Cross-Chapter Box 13 in this chapter}

The fundamental societal and systemic changes to achieve sustainable development, eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities while limiting warming to 1.5°C would require meeting a set of institutional, social, cultural, economic and technological conditions (*high confidence*). The coordination and monitoring of policy actions across sectors and spatial scales is essential to support sustainable development in 1.5°C warmer conditions (*very high confidence*). {5.6.2, Box 5.3} External funding and technology transfer better support these efforts when they consider recipients' context-specific needs (*medium evidence, high agreement*). {5.6.1} Inclusive processes can facilitate transformations by ensuring participation, transparency, capacity building and iterative social learning (*high confidence*). {5.5.3.3, Cross-Chapter Box 13, 5.6.3} Attention to power asymmetries and unequal opportunities for development, among and within countries, is key to adopting 1.5°C-compatible development pathways that benefit all populations (*high confidence*). {5.5.3, 5.6.4, Box 5.3} Re-examining individual and collective values could help spur urgent, 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 of global warming above pre-industrial levels on sustainable development and compares the impacts avoided at 1.5°C compared 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 towards a 1.5°C warmer world, especially through climate-resilient development pathways providing a comprehensive vision across different contexts (Section 5.5). The chapter also identifies 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 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 Working Group II and Chapter 4 (Fleurbaey et al., 2014) in Working Group III. 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* that disruptive levels of climate change would preclude reducing poverty (Denton et al., 2014; Fleurbaey et al., 2014). International organizations have since stated that climate changes 'undermine the ability of all countries to achieve sustainable development' (UN, 2015b) and can reverse or erase improvements in living conditions and decades of development (Hallegatte et al., 2016).

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

5.1.2 Pathways to 1.5°C

Pathways to 1.5°C (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 1 in Chapter 1, Glossary) include ambitious reductions in emissions and strategies for adaptation that are transformational, as well as complex interactions with sustainable development, poverty eradication and reducing inequalities. The AR5 WGII introduced the concept of climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) (see Glossary) which combine adaptation and mitigation to reduce climate change and its impacts, and emphasize the importance of addressing structural and intersecting inequalities, marginalization and multidimensional poverty to 'transform […] the development pathways themselves towards greater social and environmental sustainability, equity, resilience, and justice' (Olsson et al., 2014). This chapter assesses literature on CRDPs relevant to 1.5°C global warming (Section 5.5.3), to understand better the possible societal and systems transformations (see Glossary) that reduce inequality and increase well-being

(Figure 5.1). It also summarizes the knowledge on conditions to achieve such transformations, including changes in technologies, culture, values, financing and institutions that support low-carbon and resilient pathways and sustainable development (Section 5.6).



Figure 5.1 | Climate-resilient development pathways (CRDPs) (green arrows) between a current world in which countries and communities exist at different levels of development (A) and future worlds that range from climate-resilient (bottom) to unsustainable (top) (D). CRDPs involve societal transformation rather than business-as-usual approaches, and all pathways involve adaptation and mitigation choices and trade-offs (B). Pathways that achieve the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 and beyond, strive for net zero emissions around mid-21st century, and stay within the global 1.5°C warming target by the end of the 21st century, while ensuring equity and well-being for all, are best positioned to achieve climate-resilient futures (C). Overshooting on the path to 1.5°C will make achieving CRDPs and other sustainable trajectories more difficult; yet, the limited literature does not allow meaningful estimates.

5.1.3 Types of Evidence

A variety of sources of evidence are used to assess the interactions of sustainable development and the SDGs with the causes, impacts and responses to climate change of 1.5°C warming. This chapter builds on Chapter 3 to assess the sustainable development implications of impacts at 1.5°C and 2°C, and on Chapter 4 to examine the implications of response measures. Scientific and grey literature, with a post-AR5 focus, and data that evaluate, measure and model sustainable development–climate links from various perspectives, quantitatively and qualitatively, across scales, and through well-documented case studies are assessed.

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

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

Climate change could lead to significant impacts on extreme poverty by 2030 (Hallegatte et al., 2016; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017). The AR5 concluded, with *very high confidence*, that climate change and climate variability worsen existing poverty and exacerbate inequalities, especially for those disadvantaged by gender, age, race, class, caste, indigeneity and (dis)ability (Olsson et al., 2014). New literature on these links is substantial, showing that the poor will continue to experience climate change severely, and climate change will exacerbate poverty (*very high confidence*) (Fankhauser and Stern, 2016; Hallegatte et al., 2016; O'Neill et al., 2017a; Winsemius et al., 2018). The understanding of regional impacts and risks of 1.5°C global warming and interactions with patterns of societal

vulnerability and poverty remains limited. Yet identifying and addressing poverty and inequality is at the core of staying within a safe and just space for humanity (Raworth, 2017; Bathiany et al., 2018). Building on relevant findings from Chapter 3 (see Section 3.4), this section examines anticipated impacts and risks of 1.5°C and higher warming on sustainable development, poverty, inequality and equity (see Glossary).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Avoided impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C warming are expected to have significant positive implications for sustainable development, and reducing poverty and inequality. Using the SSPs (see Chapter 1, Cross-Chapter Box 1 in Chapter 1, Section 5.5.2), Byers et al. (2018) model the number of people exposed to multi-sector climate risks and vulnerable to poverty (income < $10/day), comparing 2°C and 1.5°C; the respective declines are from 86 million to 24 million for SSP1 (sustainability), from 498 million to 286 million for SSP2 (middle of the road), and from 1220 million to 763 million for SSP3 (regional rivalry), which suggests overall 62–457 million fewer people exposed and vulnerable at 1.5°C warming. Across the SSPs, the largest populations exposed and vulnerable are in South Asia (Byers et al., 2018). The avoided impacts on poverty at 1.5°C relative to 2°C are projected to depend at least as much or more on development scenarios than on warming (Wiebe et al., 2015; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017).

Limiting warming to 1.5°C is expected to reduce the number of people exposed to hunger, water stress and disease in Africa (Clements, 2009). It is also expected to limit the number of poor people exposed to floods and droughts at higher degrees of warming, especially in African and Asian countries (Winsemius et al., 2018). Challenges for poor populations – relating to food and water security, clean energy

access and environmental well-being – are projected to be less at 1.5°C, particularly for vulnerable people in Africa and Asia (Byers et al., 2018). The overall projected socio-economic losses compared to the present day are less at 1.5°C (8% loss of gross domestic product per capita) compared to 2°C (13%), with lower-income countries projected to experience greater losses, which may increase economic inequality between countries (Pretis et al., 2018).

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

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

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

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

Action on climate change (SDG 13), including slowing the rate of warming, would help reach the goals for water, energy, food and land (SDGs 6, 7, 2 and 15) (Obersteiner et al., 2016; ICSU, 2017) and contribute to poverty eradication (SDG 1) (Byers et al., 2018). Although the literature that connects 1.5°C to the SDGs is limited, a pathway that stabilizes warming at 1.5°C by the end of the century is expected to increase the chances of achieving the SDGs by 2030, with greater potential to eradicate poverty, reduce inequality and foster equity (*limited evidence, medium agreement*). There are no studies on overshoot and dimensions of sustainable development, although literature on 4°C of warming 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	3.4.5.1	31–69 million people exposed to coastal flooding	32–79 million exposed to coastal flooding	SDG 11 to make cities and human settlements safe and resilient
	3.4.5.2	Fewer cities and coasts exposed to sea level rise and extreme events	More people and cities exposed to flooding	
Food systems	3.4.6, 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	3.4.5.1	Lower risk of temperature-related morbidity and smaller mosquito range	Higher risks of temperature-related morbidity and mortality and larger geographic range of mosquitoes	SDG 3 to ensure healthy lives for all
	3.4.5.2	3546–4508 million people exposed to heat waves	5417–6710 million people exposed to heat waves	

Cross-Chapter Box 12 | Residual Risks, Limits to Adaptation and Loss and Damage

Lead Authors:
Riyanti Djalante (Japan/Indonesia), Kristie L. Ebi (USA), Debora Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Reinhard Mechler (Germany), Patricia Fernanda Pinho (Brazil), Aromar Revi (India), Petra Tschakert (Australia/Austria)

Contributing Authors:
Karen Paiva Henrique (Brazil), Saleemul Huq (Bangladesh/UK), Rachel James (UK), 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., 2019). 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 recognized barriers and limits to adaptation. It recognized 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, 2011a). In 2013, the Conference of the Parties (COP) 19 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, 2014). It acknowledges that L&D 'includes, and in some cases involves more than, that which can be reduced by adaptation' (UNFCCC, 2014). The Paris Agreement recognized 'the importance of averting, minimizing 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, 2011b, 2014, 2015). Some documents focus on impacts in developing or particularly vulnerable countries (UNFCCC, 2011b, 2014). 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 (see Chapter 4, Sections 4.2.2.3, 4.5.3 and Cross-Chapter Box 9, Section 5.3.1) (Dow et al., 2013; Klein et al., 2014). 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.

Cross-Chapter Box 12 (continued)



Cross-Chapter Box 12, Figure 1 | Stylized 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 damage to emotional and mental well-being (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 the current warming of 1°C (high confidence) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4, Box 3.4, Box 3.5, Table 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 and 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 (86–1220 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 and 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)		✓

Cross-Chapter Box 12 (continued)

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

5.3 Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Development

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

5.3.1 Sustainable Development in Support of Climate Adaptation

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

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

Second, local participation is effective when wider socio-economic barriers are addressed via multiscale planning (McCubbin et al., 2015; Nyantakyi-Frimpong and Bezner-Kerr, 2015; Toole et al., 2016). This is the case, for instance, when national education efforts (SDG 4) (Muttarak and Lutz, 2014; Striessnig and Loichinger, 2015) and indigenous knowledge (Nkomwa et al., 2014; Pandey and Kumar, 2018) enhance information sharing, which also builds resilience (Santos et al., 2016; Martinez-Baron et al., 2018) and reduces risks for maladaptation (Antwi-Agyei et al., 2018; Gajjar et al., 2018).

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

Fourth, when sustainable development promotes livelihood security, it enhances the adaptive capacities of vulnerable communities and households. Examples include SDG 11 supporting adaptation in cities

to reduce harm from disasters (Kelman, 2017; Parnell, 2017); access to water and sanitation (SDG 6) with strong institutions (SDG 16) (Rasul and Sharma, 2016); SDG 2 and its targets that promote adaptation in agricultural and food systems (Lipper et al., 2014); and targets for SDG 3 such as reducing infectious diseases and providing health cover are consistent with health-related adaptation (ICSU, 2017; Gomez-Echeverri, 2018).

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

5.3.2 Synergies and Trade-Offs between Adaptation Options and Sustainable Development

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

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

At the same time, adaptation options increase risks for human health, oceans and access to water if fertiliser and pesticides are used without regulation or when irrigation reduces water availability for other purposes (Shackleton et al., 2015; Campbell et al., 2016). When agricultural insurance and climate services overlook the poor, inequality may rise (Dinku et al., 2014; Carr and Owusu-Daaku, 2015; Georgeson et al., 2017a; Carr and Onzere, 2018). Agricultural adaptation measures may increase workloads, especially for women, while changes in crop mix can result in loss of income or culturally inappropriate food (Carr and Thompson, 2014; Thompson-Hall et al., 2016; Bryan et al., 2017), and they may benefit farmers with more land to the detriment of land-poor farmers, as seen in the Mekong River Basin (see Chapter 3, Cross-Chapter Box 6 in Chapter 3).

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

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

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

Ecosystem-based adaptation: Ecosystem-based adaptation (EBA) can offer synergies with sustainable development (Morita and Matsumoto,

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

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

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

5.3.3 Adaptation Pathways towards a 1.5°C Warmer World and Implications for Inequalities

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

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

Past development trajectories as well as transformational adaptation plans can constrain adaptation futures by reinforcing dominant political-economic structures and processes, and narrowing option spaces; this leads to maladaptive pathways that preclude alternative, locally relevant and sustainable development initiatives and increase vulnerabilities (Warner and Kuzdas, 2017; Gajjar et al., 2018). Such dominant pathways tend to validate the practices, visions and values of existing governance regimes and powerful members of a community while devaluing those of less privileged stakeholders. Examples from Romania, the Solomon Islands and Australia illustrate such pathway dynamics in which individual economic gains and prosperity matter more than community cohesion and solidarity; this discourages innovation, exacerbates inequalities and further erodes adaptive capacities of the most vulnerable (Davies et al., 2014; Fazey et al., 2016; Bosomworth et al., 2017). In the city of London, United Kingdom, the dominant adaptation and disaster risk management pathway promotes resilience that emphasizes self-reliance; yet it intensifies the burden on low-income citizens, the elderly, migrants and others unable to afford flood insurance or protect themselves against heat waves (Pelling et al., 2016). Adaptation pathways in the Bolivian Altiplano have transformed subsistence farmers into world-leading quinoa producers, but loss of social cohesion and traditional values, dispossession and loss of ecosystem services now constitute undesirable trade-offs (Chelleri et al., 2016).

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

Box 5.1 | Ecosystem- and Community-Based Practices in Drylands

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

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

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

However, several constraints hinder scaling-up efforts: inadequate attention to the socio-technical processes of innovation (Grist et al., 2017; Scoones et al., 2017), difficulties in measuring the benefits of an innovation (Coe et al., 2017), farmers' inability to deal with long-term climate risk (Singh et al., 2017), and difficulties for matching practices with agro-ecological conditions and complementary modern inputs (Kassie et al., 2015). Key conditions to overcome these challenges include: developing agroforestry value chains and markets (Reij and Winterbottom, 2015) and adaptive planning and management (Gray et al., 2016). Others include inclusive processes giving greater voice to women and marginalized groups (MRFCJ, 2015a; UN Women and MRFCJ, 2016; Dumont et al., 2017), strengthening community land and forest rights (Stevens et al., 2014; Vermeulen et al., 2016), and co-learning among communities of practice at different scales (Coe et al., 2014; Reij and Winterbottom, 2015; Sinclair, 2016; Binam et al., 2017; Dumont et al., 2017; Epule et al., 2017).

5.4 Mitigation and Sustainable Development

The AR5 WGIII examined the potential of various mitigation options for specific sectors (energy supply, industry, buildings, transport, and agriculture, forestry, and other land use; AFOLU); it provided a narrative of dimensions of sustainable development and equity as a framing for evaluating climate responses and policies, respectively, in Chapters 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 (IPCC, 2014a). This section builds on the analyses of Chapters 2 and 4 of this report to re-assess mitigation and sustainable development in the context of 1.5°C global warming as well as the SDGs.

5.4.1 Synergies and Trade-Offs between Mitigation Options and Sustainable Development

Adopting stringent climate mitigation options can generate multiple positive non-climate benefits that have the potential to reduce the costs of achieving sustainable development (IPCC, 2014b; Ürge-Vorsatz et al., 2014, 2016; Schaeffer et al., 2015; von Stechow et al., 2015). Understanding the positive impacts (synergies) but also the negative impacts (trade-offs) is key for selecting mitigation options and policy choices that maximize the synergies between mitigation and developmental actions (Hildingsson and Johansson, 2015; Nilsson

et al., 2016; Delponte et al., 2017; van Vuuren et al., 2017b; McCollum et al., 2018b). Aligning mitigation response options to sustainable development objectives can ensure public acceptance (IPCC, 2014a), encourage faster action (Lechtenboehmer and Knoop, 2017) and support the design of equitable mitigation (Holz et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2018) that protect human rights (MRFCJ, 2015b) (Section 5.5.3).

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

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

For mitigation options in the energy demand sectors, the number of synergies with all sixteen SDGs exceeds the number of trade-offs (Figure 5.2 and Table 5.2) (*robust evidence, high agreement*). Most of the interactions are of a reinforcing nature, hence facilitating the achievement of the goals.

Accelerating energy efficiency in all sectors, which is a necessary condition for a 1.5°C warmer world (see Chapters 2 and 4), has synergies with a large number of SDGs (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Figure 5.2 and Table 5.2). The diffusion of efficient equipment and appliances across end use sectors has synergies with international partnership (SDG 17) and participatory and transparent institutions (SDG 16) because innovations and deployment of new technologies require transnational capacity building and knowledge sharing. Resource and energy savings support sustainable production and consumption (SDG 12), energy access (SDG 7), innovation and infrastructure development (SDG 9) and sustainable city development (SDG 11). Energy efficiency supports the creation of decent jobs by new service companies providing services for energy efficiency, but the net employment effect of efficiency improvement remains uncertain due to macro-economic feedback (SDG 8) (McCollum et al., 2018b).

In the buildings sector, accelerating energy efficiency by way of, for example, enhancing the use of efficient appliances, refrigerant transition, insulation, retrofitting and low- or zero-energy buildings generates benefits across multiple SDG targets. For example, improved cook stoves make fuel endowments last longer and hence reduce deforestation (SDG 15), support equal opportunity by reducing school absences due to asthma among children (SDGs 3 and 4) and empower rural and indigenous women by reducing drudgery (SDG 5) (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Derbez et al., 2014; Lucon et al., 2014; Maidment et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2014; Cameron et al., 2015; Fay et al., 2015; Liddell and Guiney, 2015; Shah et al., 2015; Sharpe et al., 2015; Wells et al., 2015; Willand et al., 2015; Hallegatte et al., 2016; Kusumaningtyas and Aldrian, 2016; Berrueta et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018a).

In energy-intensive processing industries, 1.5ºC-compatible trajectories require radical technology innovation through maximum electrification, shift to other low emissions energy carriers such as hydrogen or biomass, integration of carbon capture and storage (CCS) and innovations for carbon capture and utilization (CCU) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.4.5). These transformations have strong synergies with innovation and sustainable industrialization (SDG 9), supranational partnerships (SDGs 16 and 17) and sustainable production (SDG 12). However, possible trade-offs due to risks of CCS-based carbon leakage, increased electricity demands, and associated price impacts affecting energy access and poverty (SDGs 7 and 1) would need careful regulatory attention (Wesseling et al., 2017). In the mining industry, energy efficiency can be synergetic or face trade-offs with sustainable management (SDG 6), depending on the option retained for water management (Nguyen et al., 2014). Substitution and recycling are also an important driver of 1.5ºC-compatible trajectories in industrial systems (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.4.2). Structural changes and reorganization of economic activities in industrial park/clusters following the principles of industrial symbiosis (circular economy) improves the overall sustainability by reducing energy and waste (Fan et al., 2017; Preston and Lehne, 2017) and reinforces responsible production and consumption (SDG 12) through recycling, water use efficiency (SDG 6), energy access (SDG 7) and ecosystem protection and restoration (SDG 15) (Karner et al., 2015; Zeng et al., 2017).

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

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

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

5.4.1.2 Energy Supply: Accelerated Decarbonization

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

Fast deployment of renewables such as solar, wind, hydro and modern biomass, together with the decrease of fossil fuels in energy supply (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1), is aligned with the doubling of renewables in the global energy mix (SDG 7.2). Renewables could also support progress on SDGs 1, 10, 11 and 12 and supplement new technology (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Chaturvedi and Shukla, 2014; Rose et al., 2014; Smith and Sagar, 2014; Riahi et al., 2015; IEA, 2016; van Vuuren et al., 2017a; McCollum et al., 2018a). However, some trade-offs with the SDGs can emerge from offshore installations, particularly SDG 14 in local contexts (McCollum et al., 2018a). Moreover, trade-offs between renewable energy production and affordability (SDG 7) (Labordena et al., 2017) and other environmental objectives would need to be scrutinised for potential negative social outcomes. Policy interventions through regional cooperation-building (SDG 17) and institutional capacity (SDG 16) can enhance affordability (SDG 7) (Labordena et al., 2017). The deployment of small-scale renewables, or off-grid solutions for people in remote areas (Sánchez and Izzo, 2017), has strong potential for synergies with access to energy (SDG 7), but the actualization of these potentials requires measures to overcome technology and reliability risks associated with large-scale deployment of renewables (Giwa et al., 2017; Heard et al., 2017). Bundling energy-efficient appliances and lighting with off-grid renewables can lead to substantial cost reduction while increasing reliability (IEA, 2017). Low-income populations in industrialized countries are often left out of renewable energy generation schemes, either because of high start-up costs or lack of home ownership (UNRISD, 2016).

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

Economies dependent upon fossil fuel-based energy generation and/or export revenue are expected to be disproportionally affected by future restrictions on the use of fossil fuels under stringent climate goals and higher carbon prices; this includes impacts on employment, stranded assets, resources left underground, lower capacity use and early phasing out of large infrastructure already under construction (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Box 5.2) (Johnson et al., 2015; McGlade and Ekins, 2015; UNEP, 2017; Spencer et al., 2018). Investment in coal continues to be attractive in many countries as it is a mature technology and provides cheap energy supplies, large-scale employment and energy security (Jakob and Steckel, 2016; Vogt-Schilb and Hallegatte, 2017; Spencer et al., 2018). Hence, accompanying policies and measures would be required to ease job losses and correct for relatively higher prices of alternative energy (Oosterhuis and Ten Brink, 2014; Oei and Mendelevitch, 2016; Garg et al., 2017; HLCCP, 2017; Jordaan et al., 2017; OECD, 2017; UNEP, 2017; Blondeel and van de Graaf, 2018; Green, 2018). Research on historical transitions shows that managing the impacts on workers through retraining programmes is essential in order to align the phase-down of mining industries with meeting ambitious climate targets, and the objectives of a 'just transition' (Galgóczi, 2014; Caldecott et al., 2017; Healy and Barry, 2017). This aspect is even more important in developing countries where the mining workforce is largely semi- or unskilled (Altieri et al., 2016; Tung, 2016). Ambitious emissions reduction targets can unlock very strong decoupling potentials in industrialized fossil exporting economies (Hatfield-Dodds et al., 2015).

Box 5.2 | Challenges and Opportunities of Low-Carbon Pathways in Gulf Cooperative Council Countries

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

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

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

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

The Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) for GCC countries identified energy efficiency, deployment of renewables and technology transfer to enhance agriculture, food security, protection of marine resources, and management of water and costal zones (Babiker, 2016). Strategic vision documents, such as Saudi Arabia's 'Vision 2030', identify emergent opportunities for energy price reforms, energy efficiency, turning emissions into valuable products, and deployment of renewables and other clean technologies, if accompanied with appropriate policies to manage the transition and in the context of economic diversification (Luomi, 2014; Atalay et al., 2016; Griffiths, 2017b; Howarth et al., 2017).

5.4.1.3 Land-based agriculture, forestry and ocean: mitigation response options and carbon dioxide removal

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

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

Emerging evidence indicates that future mitigation efforts that would be required to reach stringent climate targets, particularly those associated with carbon dioxide removal (CDR) (e.g., afforestation and reforestation and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage; BECCS), may also impose significant constraints upon poor and vulnerable communities (SDG 1) via increased food prices and competition for arable land, land appropriation and dispossession (Cavanagh and Benjaminsen, 2014; Hunsberger et al., 2014; Work, 2015; Muratori et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2016; Burns and Nicholson, 2017; Corbera et al., 2017) with disproportionate negative impacts upon rural poor and indigenous populations (SDG 1) (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Section 5.4.2.2, Table 5.2, Figure 5.2) (Grubert et al., 2014; Grill et al., 2015; Zhang and Chen, 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Johansson et al., 2016; Aha and Ayitey, 2017; De Stefano et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2017). Crops for bioenergy may increase irrigation needs and exacerbate water stress with negative associated impacts on SDGs 6 and 10 (Boysen et al., 2017).

Ocean iron fertilization and enhanced weathering have two-way interactions with life under water and on land and food security (SDGs

2, 14 and 15) (Table 5.2). Development of blue carbon resources through coastal (mangrove) and marine (seaweed) vegetative ecosystems encourages: integrated water resource management (SDG 6) (Vierros, 2017); promotes life on land (SDG 15) (Potouroglou et al., 2017); poverty reduction (SDG 1) (Schirmer and Bull, 2014; Lamb et al., 2016); and food security (SDG 2) (Ahmed et al., 2017a, b; Duarte et al., 2017; Sondak et al., 2017; Vierros, 2017; Zhang et al., 2017).



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.

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, this chapter draws upon studies that show the aggregated impact of mitigation for multiple sustainable development dimensions (Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al., 2018b; Rogelj et al., 2018) and across multiple integrated assessment modelling (IAM) frameworks. Often these tools are linked to disciplinary models covering specific SDGs in more detail (Cameron et al., 2016; Rao et al., 2017; Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al.,

2018b). Using multiple IAMs and disciplinary models is important for a robust assessment of the sustainable development implications of different pathways. Emphasis is on multi-regional studies, which can be aggregated to the global scale. The recent literature on 1.5°C mitigation pathways has begun to provide quantifications for a range of sustainable development dimensions, including air pollution and health, food security and hunger, energy access, water security, and multidimensional poverty and equity.

5.4.2.1 Air pollution and health

GHGs and air pollutants are typically emitted by the same sources. Hence, mitigation strategies that reduce GHGs or the use of fossil fuels typically also reduce emissions of pollutants, such as particulate matter (e.g., PM2.5 and PM10), black carbon (BC), sulphur dioxide (SO_2), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and other harmful species (Clarke et al., 2014) (Figure 5.3), causing adverse health and ecosystem effects at various scales (Kusumaningtyas and Aldrian, 2016).

Mitigation pathways typically show that there are significant synergies for air pollution, and that the synergies increase with the stringency of the mitigation policies (Amann et al., 2011; Rao et al., 2016; Klimont et al., 2017; Shindell et al., 2017; Markandya et al., 2018). Recent multimodel comparisons indicate that mitigation pathways consistent with 1.5°C would result in higher synergies with air pollution compared to pathways that are consistent with 2°C (Figures 5.4 and 5.5). Shindell et al. (2018) indicate that health benefits worldwide over the century of 1.5°C pathways could be in the range of 110 to 190 million fewer premature deaths compared to 2°C pathways. The synergies for air pollution are highest in the developing world, particularly in Asia. In addition to significant health benefits, there are also economic benefits from mitigation, reducing the investment needs in air pollution control technologies by about 35% globally (or about 100 billion USD2010 per year to 2030 in 1.5°C pathways; McCollum et al., 2018b) (Figure 5.4).

5.4.2.2 Food security and hunger

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

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

Van Vuuren et al. (2018) and Grubler et al. (2018) show that 1.5°C pathways without reliance on BECCS can be achieved through a fundamental transformation of the service sectors which would significantly reduce energy and food demand (see Chapter 2, Sections 2.1.1, 2.3.1 and 2.4.3). Such low energy demand (LED) pathways would result in significantly reduced pressure on food security, lower food prices and fewer people at risk of hunger. Importantly, the trade-offs with food security would be reduced by the avoided impacts in the agricultural sector due to the reduced warming associated with the 1.5°C pathways (see Chapter 3, Section 3.5). However, such feedbacks are not comprehensively captured in the studies on mitigation.

5.4.2.3 Lack of energy access/energy poverty

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

Estimates across six different IAMs (McCollum et al., 2018b) indicate that, in the absence of compensatory measures, the number of people without access to clean cooking fuels may increase. Redistributional measures, such as subsidies on cleaner fuels and stoves, could compensate for the negative effects of mitigation on energy access. Investment costs of the redistributional measures in 1.5°C pathways (on average around 120 billion USD2010 per year to 2030; Figure 5.4) are much smaller than the mitigation investments of 1.5°C pathways (McCollum et al., 2018b). The recycling of revenues from climate policy might act as a means to help finance the costs of providing energy access to the poor (Cameron et al., 2016).

5.4.2.4 Water security

Transformations towards low emissions energy and agricultural systems can have major implications for freshwater demand as well as water pollution. The scaling up of renewables and energy efficiency as depicted by low emissions pathways would, in most instances, lower water demands for thermal energy supply facilities ('water-for-energy') compared to fossil energy technologies, and thus reinforce targets related to water access and scarcity (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1). However, some low-carbon options such as bioenergy, centralized solar



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 12 (resources), SDG 13/14 (climate/ocean) 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 realization 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 from Chapter 2 (Grubler et al., 2018; McCollum et al., 2018b).

power, nuclear and hydropower technologies could, if not managed properly, have counteracting effects that compound existing water-related problems in a given locale (Byers et al., 2014; Fricko et al., 2016; IEA, 2016; Fujimori et al., 2017a; Wang, 2017; McCollum et al., 2018a).

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

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

Estimates across different models for the impacts of stringent mitigation pathways on energy-related water uses seem ambiguous. Some pathways show synergies (Mouratiadou et al., 2018) while others indicate trade-offs and thus increases of water use due to mitigation (Fricko et al., 2016). The synergies depend on the adopted policy implementation or mitigation strategies and technology portfolio. A number of adaptation options exist (e.g., dry cooling), which can effectively reduce electricity-related water trade-offs (Fricko et al., 2016; IEA, 2016). Similarly, irrigation water use will depend on the regions where crops are produced, the sources of bioenergy (e.g., agriculture vs. forestry) and dietary change induced by climate policy. Overall, and also considering other water-related SDGs, including access to safe drinking water and sanitation as well as waste-water treatment, investments into the water sector seem to be only modestly affected by stringent climate policy compatible with 1.5°C (Figure 5.4) (McCollum et al., 2018b).

In summary, the assessment of mitigation pathways shows that to meet the 1.5°C target, a wide range of mitigation options would need to be deployed (see Chapter 2, Sections 2.3 and 2.4). While pathways aiming at 1.5°C are associated with high synergies for some sustainable development dimensions (such as human health and air pollution, forest preservation), the rapid pace and magnitude of the required changes would also lead to increased risks for trade-offs for other sustainable development dimensions (particularly food security) (Figures 5.4 and 5.5). Synergies and trade-offs are expected to be unevenly distributed between regions and nations (Box 5.2), though little literature has formally examined such distributions under 1.5°C-consistent mitigation scenarios. Reducing these risks requires smart policy designs and mechanisms that shield the poor and redistribute the burden so that the most vulnerable are not disproportionately affected. Recent scenario analyses show that associated investments for reducing the trade-offs for, for example, food, water and energy access to be significantly lower than the required mitigation investments (McCollum et al., 2018b). Fundamental transformation of demand, including efficiency and behavioural changes, can help to significantly reduce the reliance on risky technologies, such as BECCS, and thus reduce the risk of potential



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 sustainable development dimensions denote the investment needs for complementary measures in order to avoid trade-offs (negative impacts) of mitigation. Negative sustainable development investments for air pollution indicate cost savings, and thus synergies of mitigation for air pollution control costs. The values compare to about 2 trillion USD2010 (range of 1.4 to 3 trillion) of total energy-related investments in the 1.5°C pathways. Source: Estimates from CD-LINKS scenarios summarised by McCollum et al., 2018b.

trade-offs between mitigation and other sustainable development dimensions (von Stechow et al., 2015; Grubler et al., 2018; van Vuuren et al., 2018). Reliance on demand-side measures only, however, would not be sufficient for meeting stringent targets, such as 1.5°C and 2°C (Clarke et al., 2014).

5.5 Sustainable Development Pathways to 1.5°C

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

5.5.1 Integration of Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainable Development

Insights into climate-compatible development (see Glossary) illustrate how integration between adaptation, mitigation and sustainable development works in context-specific projects, how synergies are achieved and what challenges are encountered during implementation (Stringer et al., 2014; Suckall et al., 2014; Antwi-Agyei et al., 2017a; Bickersteth et al., 2017; Kalafatis, 2017; Nunan, 2017). The operationalization of climate-compatible development, including climate-smart agriculture and carbon-forestry projects (Lipper et al., 2014; Campbell et al., 2016; Quan et al., 2017), shows multilevel and multisector trade-offs involving 'winners' and 'losers' across governance levels (*high confidence*) (Kongsager and Corbera, 2015; Naess et al., 2015; Karlsson et al., 2017; Tanner et al., 2017; Taylor, 2017; Wood, 2017; Ficklin et al., 2018). Issues of power, participation, values, equity, inequality and justice transcend case study examples of attempted integrated approaches (Nunan, 2017; Phillips et al., 2017; Stringer et al., 2017; Wood, 2017), also reflected in policy frameworks for integrated outcomes (Stringer et al., 2014; Di Gregorio et al., 2017; Few et al., 2017; Tanner et al., 2017).

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

5.5.2 Pathways for Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainable Development

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

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

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

To date, no pathway in the literature proves to achieve all 17 SDGs because several targets are not met or not sufficiently covered in the analysis, hence resulting in a sustainability gap (Zimm et al., 2018). The SSPs facilitate the systematic exploration of different sustainable dimensions under ambitious climate objectives. 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 warmer world (van Vuuren et al., 2017b; Zimm et al., 2018). However, important targets for SDGs 1, 2 and 4 (i.e., people living in extreme poverty, people living at the risk of hunger and gender gap in years of schooling) are not met in this scenario.

The SSPs show that sustainable socio-economic conditions will play a key role in reaching stringent climate targets (Riahi et al., 2017; Rogelj et al., 2018). Recent modelling work has examined 1.5°C-consistent, stringent mitigation scenarios for 2100 applied to the SSPs, using six different IAMs. Despite the limitations of these models, which are coarse approximations of reality, robust trends can be identified

(Rogelj et al., 2018). SSP1 – which depicts broader 'sustainability' as well as enhancing equity and poverty reductions – is the only pathway where all models could reach 1.5°C and is associated with the lowest mitigation costs across all SSPs. A decreasing number of models was successful for SSP2, SSP4 and SSP5, respectively, indicating distinctly higher risks of failure due to high growth and energy intensity as well as geographical and social inequalities and uneven regional development. And reaching 1.5°C has even been found infeasible in the less sustainable SSP3 – 'regional rivalry' (Fujimori et al., 2017b; Riahi et al., 2017). All these conclusions hold true if a 2°C objective is considered (Calvin et al., 2017; Fujimori et al., 2017b; Popp et al., 2017; Riahi et al., 2017). Rogelj et al. (2018) also show that fewer scenarios are, however, feasible across different SSPs in case of 1.5°C, and mitigation costs substantially increase in 1.5°C pathways compared to 2°C pathways.

There is a wide range of SSP-based studies focusing on the connections between adaptation/impacts and different sustainable development dimensions (Hasegawa et al., 2014; Ishida et al., 2014; Arnell et al., 2015; Bowyer et al., 2015; Burke et al., 2015; Lemoine and Kapnick, 2016; Rozenberg and Hallegatte, 2016; Blanco et al., 2017; Hallegatte and Rozenberg, 2017; O'Neill et al., 2017a; Rutledge et al., 2017; Byers et al., 2018). New methods for projecting inequality and poverty (downscaled to sub-national rural and urban levels as well as spatially explicit levels) have enabled advanced SSP-based assessments of locally sustainable development implications of avoided impacts and related adaptation needs. For instance, Byers et al. (2018) find that, in a 1.5°C warmer world, a focus on sustainable development can reduce the climate risk exposure of populations vulnerable to poverty by more than an order of magnitude (Section 5.2.2). Moreover, aggressive reductions in between-country inequality may decrease the emissions intensity of global economic growth (Rao and Min, 2018). This is due to the higher potential for decoupling of energy from income growth in lower-income countries, due to high potential for technological advancements that reduce the energy intensity of growth of poor countries – critical also for reaching 1.5°C in a socially and economically equitable way. Participatory downscaling of SSPs in several European Union countries and in Central Asia shows numerous possible pathways of solutions to the 2°C–1.5°C goal, depending on differential visions (Tàbara et al., 2018). Other participatory applications of the SSPs, for example in West Africa (Palazzo et al., 2017) and the southeastern United States (Absar and Preston, 2015), illustrate the potentially large differences in adaptive capacity within regions and between sectors.

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

5.5.3 Climate-Resilient Development Pathways

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

Pathways compatible with 1.5°C warming are not merely scenarios to envision possible futures but processes of deliberation and implementation that address societal values, local priorities and inevitable trade-offs. This includes attention to politics and power that perpetuate business-as-usual trajectories (O'Brien, 2016; Harris et al., 2017), the politics that shape sustainability and capabilities of everyday life (Agyeman et al., 2016; Schlosberg et al., 2017), and ingredients for community resilience and transformative change (Fazey et al., 2018). Chartering CRDPs encourages locally situated and problem-solving processes to negotiate and operationalize resilience 'on the ground' (Beilin and Wilkinson, 2015; Harris et al., 2017; Ziervogel et al., 2017). This entails contestation, inclusive governance and iterative engagement of diverse populations with varied needs, aspirations, agency and rights claims, including those most affected, to deliberate trade-offs in a multiplicity of possible pathways (*high confidence*) (see Figure 5.5) (Stirling, 2014; Vale, 2014; Walsh-Dilley and Wolford, 2015; Biermann et al., 2016; J.R.A. Butler et al., 2016; O'Brien, 2016, 2018; Harris et al., 2017; Jones and Tanner, 2017; Mapfumo et al., 2017; Rosenbloom, 2017; Gajjar et al., 2018; Klinsky and Winkler, 2018; Lyon, 2018; Tàbara et al., 2018).

5.5.3.1 Transformations, equity and well-being

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

To attain the anticipated *transformations*, all countries as well as non-state actors would need to strengthen their contributions, through bolder and more committed cooperation and equitable effort-sharing (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Rao, 2014; Frumhoff et al., 2015; Ekwurzel et al., 2017; Millar et al., 2017; Shue, 2017; Holz et al., 2018; Robinson and Shine, 2018). Sustaining decarbonization rates at a 1.5°C-compatible level would be unprecedented and not possible without rapid transformations to a net-zero-emissions global economy by mid-century or the later half of the century (see Chapters 2 and 4). Such efforts would entail overcoming technical, infrastructural, institutional and behavioural barriers across all sectors and levels



Figure 5.5 | Pathways into the future, with path dependencies and iterative problem-solving and decision-making (after Fazey et al., 2016).

of society (Pfeiffer et al., 2016; Seto et al., 2016) and defeating path dependencies, including poverty traps (Boonstra et al., 2016; Enqvist et al., 2016; Lade et al., 2017; Haider et al., 2018). Transformation also entails ensuring that 1.5°C-compatible pathways are inclusive and desirable, build solidarity and alliances, and protect vulnerable groups, including against disruptions of transformation (Patterson et al., 2018).

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

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

5.5.3.2 Development trajectories, sharing of efforts and cooperation

The potential for pursuing sustainable and climate-resilient development pathways towards a 1.5°C warmer world differs between and within nations, due to differential development achievements and trajectories, and opportunities and challenges (*very high confidence*) (Figure 5.1). There are clear differences between high-income countries where social achievements are high, albeit often with negative effects on the environment, and most developing nations where vulnerabilities to climate change are high and social support and life satisfaction are low, especially in the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) (Sachs et al., 2017; O'Neill et al., 2018). Differential starting points for CRDPs between and within countries, including path dependencies (Figure 5.5), call for sensitivity to context (Klinsky and Winkler, 2018). For the developing world, limiting warming to 1.5°C also means potentially

severely curtailed development prospects (Okereke and Coventry, 2016) and risks to human rights from both climate action and inaction to achieve this goal (Robinson and Shine, 2018) (Section 5.2). Within-country development differences remain, despite efforts to ensure inclusive societies (Gupta and Arts, 2017; Gupta and Pouw, 2017). Cole et al. (2017), for instance, show how differences between provinces in South Africa constitute barriers to sustainable development trajectories and for operationalising nation-level SDGs, across various dimensions of social deprivation and environmental stress, reflecting historic disadvantages.

Moreover, various equity and effort- or burden-sharing approaches to climate stabilization in the literature describe how to sketch national potentials for a 1.5°C warmer world (e.g., Anand, 2004; CSO Equity Review, 2015; Meinshausen et al., 2015; Okereke and Coventry, 2016; Bexell and Jönsson, 2017; Otto et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Robiou du Pont et al., 2017; Holz et al., 2018; Kartha et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2018;). Many approaches build on the AR5 'responsibility – capacity – need' assessment (Clarke et al., 2014), complement other proposed national-level metrics for capabilities, equity and fairness (Heyward and Roser, 2016; Klinsky et al., 2017a), or fall under the wider umbrella of fair share debates on responsibility, capability and the right to development in climate policy (Fuglestvedt and Kallbekken, 2016). Importantly, different principles and methodologies generate different calculated contributions, responsibilities and capacities (Skeie et al., 2017).

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

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

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

5.5.3.3 Country and community strategies and experiences

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

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

Country-level pathways and achievements vary significantly (*robust evidence, medium agreement*). For instance, the Scandinavian countries rank at the top of the Global Green Economy Index (Dual Citizen LLC, 2016), although they also tend to show high spill-over effects (Holz et al., 2018) and transgress their biophysical boundaries (O'Neill et al., 2018). State-driven efforts in non-member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development include Ethiopia's 'Climate-resilient Green Economy Strategy', Mozambique's 'Green Economy Action Plan' and Costa Rica's ecosystem- and conservation-driven

green transition paths. China and India have adopted technology and renewables pathways (Brown et al., 2014; Death, 2014, 2015, 2016; Khanna et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2015; Kim and Thurbon, 2015; Wang et al., 2015; Weng et al., 2015). Brazil promotes low per capita GHG emissions, clean energy sources, green jobs, renewables and sustainable transportation, while slowing rates of deforestation (see Chapter 4, Box 4.7) (Brown et al., 2014; La Rovere, 2017). Yet concerns remain regarding persistent inequalities, ecosystem monetization, lack of participation in green-style projects (Brown et al., 2014) and labour conditions and risk of displacement in the sugarcane ethanol sector (McKay et al., 2016). Experiences with low-carbon development pathways in LDCs highlight the crucial role of identifying synergies across scale, removing institutional barriers and ensuring equity and fairness in distributing benefits as part of the right to development (Rai and Fisher, 2017).

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

Box 5.3 | Republic of Vanuatu – National Planning for Development and Climate Resilience

The Republic of Vanuatu is leading Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to develop a nationally coordinated plan for climate-resilient development in the context of high exposure to hazard risk (MoCC, 2016; UNU-EHS, 2016). The majority of the population depends on subsistence, rain-fed agriculture and coastal fisheries for food security (Sovacool et al., 2017). Sea level rise, increased prolonged drought, water shortages, intense storms, cyclone events and degraded coral reef environments threaten human security in a 1.5°C warmer world (see Chapter 3, Box 3.5) (SPC, 2015; Aipira et al., 2017). Given Vanuatu's long history of climate hazards and disasters, local adaptive capacity is relatively high, despite barriers to the use of local knowledge and technology, and low rates of literacy and women's participation (McNamara and Prasad, 2014; Aipira et al., 2017; Granderson, 2017). However, the adaptive capacity of Vanuatu and other SIDS is increasingly constrained due to more frequent severe weather events (see Chapter 3, Box 3.5, Chapter 4, Cross-Chapter Box 9 in Chapter 4) (Gero et al., 2013; Kuruppu and Willie, 2015; SPC, 2015; Sovacool et al., 2017).

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

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

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

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

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

Cross-Chapter Box 13 | Cities and Urban Transformation

Lead Authors:
Fernando Aragon-Durand (Mexico), Paolo Bertoldi (Italy), Anton Cartwright (South Africa), François Engelbrecht (South Africa), Bronwyn Hayward (New Zealand), Daniela Jacob (Germany), Debora Ley (Guatemala/Mexico), Shagun Mehrotra (USA/India), Peter Newman (Australia), Aromar Revi (India), Seth Schultz (USA), William Solecki (USA), Petra Tschakert (Australia/Austria)

Contributor:
Peter Marcotullio (USA)

Global Urbanization in a 1.5°C Warmer World

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

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

Urban transformations and emerging climate-resilient development pathways

The 1.5°C pathways require action in all cities and urban contexts. Recent literature emphasizes the need to deliberate and negotiate how resilience and climate-resilient pathways can be fostered in the context of people's daily lives, including the failings of everyday development such as unemployment, inadequate housing and a growing informal sector and settlements (informality), in order

Cross-Chapter Box 13 (continued)

to acknowledge local priorities and foster transformative learning (Vale, 2014; Shi et al., 2016; Harris et al., 2017; Ziervogel et al., 2017; Fazey et al., 2018; Macintyre et al., 2018). Enhancing deliberate transformative capacities in urban contexts also entails new and relational forms of envisioning agency, equity, resilience, social cohesion and well-being (Section 5.5.3) (Gillard et al., 2016; Ziervogel et al., 2016). Two examples of urban transformation are explored here.

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

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

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

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

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

Important conditions for successful transition groups include flexibility, participatory democracy, care ethics, inclusiveness and consensus-building, assuming bridging or brokering roles, and community alliances and partnerships (Feola and Nunes, 2014; Mehmood, 2016; Taylor Aiken, 2016; Grossmann and Creamer, 2017). Smaller scale rural initiatives allow for more experimentation

Cross-Chapter Box 13 (continued)

(Cretney et al., 2016), while those in urban centres benefit from stronger networks and proximity to power structures (North and Longhurst, 2013; Nicolosi and Feola, 2016). Increasingly, TTs recognize the need to participate in policymaking (Kenis and Mathijs, 2014; Barnes, 2015).

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

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

5.6 Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Development, Eradicating Poverty and Reducing Inequalities in 1.5°C Warmer Worlds

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

5.6.1 Finance and Technology Aligned with Local Needs

Significant gaps in green investment constrain transitions to a low-carbon economy aligned with development objectives (Volz et al., 2015; Campiglio, 2016). Hence, unlocking new forms of public, private and public–private financing is essential to support environmental sustainability of the economic system (Croce et al., 2011; Blyth et al., 2015; Falcone et al., 2018) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.5). To avoid risks of undesirable trade-offs with the SDGs caused by national budget constraints, improved access to international climate finance is essential for supporting adaptation, mitigation and sustainable development, especially for LDCs and SIDS (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Shine and Campillo, 2016; Wood, 2017). Care needs to be taken when international donors or partnership arrangements influence project financing structures (Kongsager and Corbera, 2015; Purdon, 2015; Phillips et al., 2017; Ficklin et al., 2018). Conventional climate funding schemes, especially the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), have shown positive effects on sustainable development but also adverse consequences, for example, on adaptive capacities of rural households and uneven distribution of costs and benefits, often exacerbating inequalities (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (Aggarwal, 2014; Brohé, 2014; He et al., 2014; Schade and Obergassel, 2014; Smits and Middleton, 2014; Wood et al., 2016a; Horstmann and Hein, 2017; Kreibich et al., 2017). Close consideration of recipients' context-specific needs when designing financial support helps to overcome these limitations as it better aligns community needs, national policy objectives and donors' priorities; puts the emphasis on the increase of transparency and predictability of support; and fosters local capacity building (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Barrett, 2013; Boyle et al., 2013; Shine and Campillo, 2016; Ley, 2017; Sánchez and Izzo, 2017).

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

5.6.2 Integration of Institutions

Multilevel governance in climate change has emerged as a key enabler for systemic transformation and effective governance (see Chapter 4,

Section 4.4.1). On the one hand, low-carbon and climate-resilient development actions are often well aligned at the lowest scale possible (Suckall et al., 2015; Sánchez and Izzo, 2017), and informal, local institutions are critical in enhancing the adaptive capacity of countries and marginalized communities (Yaro et al., 2015). On the other hand, international and national institutions can provide incentives for projects to harness synergies and avoid trade-offs (Kongsager et al., 2016).

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

5.6.3 Inclusive Processes

Inclusive governance processes are critical for preparing for a 1.5°C warmer world (Fazey et al., 2018; O'Brien, 2018; Patterson et al., 2018). These processes have been shown to serve the interests of diverse groups of people and enhance empowerment of often excluded stakeholders, notably women and youth (MRFCJ, 2015a; Dumont et al., 2017). They also enhance social- and co-learning which, in turn, facilitates accelerated and adaptive management and the scaling up of capacities for resilience building (Ensor and Harvey, 2015; Reij and Winterbottom, 2015; Tschakert et al., 2016; Binam et al., 2017; Dumont et al., 2017; Fazey et al., 2018; Lyon, 2018; O'Brien, 2018), and provides opportunities to blend indigenous, local and scientific knowledge (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.5.5, Box 4.3, Section 5.3) (Antwi-Agyei et al., 2017a; Coe et al., 2017; Thornton and Comberti, 2017) . Such co-learning has been effective in improving deliberative decision-making processes that incorporate different values and world views (Cundill et al., 2014; C. Butler et al., 2016; Ensor, 2016; Fazey et al., 2016; Gorddard et al., 2016; Aipira et al., 2017; Chung Tiam Fook, 2017; Maor et al., 2017), and create space for negotiating diverse interests and preferences (*robust evidence, high agreement*) (O'Brien et al., 2015; Gillard et al., 2016; DeCaro et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2017; Lahn, 2018).

5.6.4 Attention to Issues of Power and Inequality

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

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

5.6.5 Reconsidering Values

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

5.7 Synthesis and Research Gaps

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Frequently Asked Questions

FAQ 5.1 | What are the Connections between Sustainable Development and Limiting Global Warming to 1.5°C above Pre-Industrial Levels?

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

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

Climate change and sustainable development are fundamentally connected. Previous IPCC reports found that climate change can undermine sustainable development, and that well-designed mitigation and adaptation responses can support poverty alleviation, food security, healthy ecosystems, equality and other dimensions of sustainable development. Limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require mitigation actions and adaptation measures to be taken at all levels. These adaptation and mitigation actions would include reducing emissions and increasing resilience through technology and infrastructure choices, as well as changing behaviour and policy.

These actions can interact with sustainable development objectives in positive ways that strengthen sustainable development, known as synergies. Or they can interact in negative ways, where sustainable development is hindered or reversed, known as trade-offs.

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

An example of a trade-off can occur if ambitious climate change mitigation compatible with 1.5°C changes land use in ways that have negative impacts on sustainable development. An example could be turning natural forests, agricultural areas, or land under indigenous or local ownership to plantations for bioenergy production. If not managed carefully, such changes could undermine dimensions of sustainable development by threatening food and water security, creating conflict over land rights and causing biodiversity loss. Another trade-off could occur for some countries, assets, workers and infrastructure already in place if a switch is made from fossil fuels to other energy sources without adequate planning for such a transition. Trade-offs can be minimized if effectively managed, as when care is taken to improve bioenergy crop yields to reduce harmful land-use change or where workers are retrained for employment in lower carbon sectors.

(continued on next page)

FAQ 5.1 (continued)

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

The link between sustainable development and limiting global warming to 1.5°C is recognized by the SDG for climate action (SDG 13), which seeks to combat climate change and its impacts while acknowledging that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate change.

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

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

Frequently Asked Questions

FAQ 5.2 | What are the Pathways to Achieving Poverty Reduction and Reducing Inequalities while Reaching a 1.5°C World?

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

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

The Paris Agreement states that it 'will be implemented to reflect equity… in the light of different national circumstances' and calls for 'rapid reductions' of greenhouse gases to be achieved 'on the basis of equity, and in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty'. Similarly, the UN SDGs include targets to reduce poverty and inequalities, and to ensure equitable and affordable access to health, water and energy for all.

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

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

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

The characteristics of CRDPs will differ across communities and nations, and will be based on deliberations with a diverse range of people, including those most affected by climate change and by possible routes towards transformation. For this reason, there are no standard methods for designing CRDPs or for monitoring their progress towards climate-resilient futures. However, examples from around the world demonstrate that flexible and inclusive governance structures and broad participation often help support iterative decision-making, continuous learning and experimentation. Such inclusive processes can also help to overcome weak institutional arrangements and power structures that may further exacerbate inequalities.

(continued on next page)

FAQ 5.2 (continued)



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

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

Table 5.2 | Mitigation – SDG table
Social-Demand

		1 NO POVERTY					2 ZERO HUNGER					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	**Reduces Poverty**										**Air, Water Pollution Reduction and Better Health (3.9)**					**Technical Education, Vocational Training, Education for Sustainability (4.3/4.4/4.5/4.7)**				
		↑	[+2]	🕮	☺	★		[0]				↑	[+2]	🕮🕮	☺☺	★★	↑	[+1]	🕮🕮	☺☺	★★
		% of people living below poverty line declines from 49% to 18% in South African context.					No direct interaction					People living in 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 are trade-off unless strategically managed. 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.					Awareness, knowledge, technical and managerial capability are closely linked, energy audit, information for trade unions, product/appliance labeling help in sustainability education.				
		Altieri et al., 2016										Vassolo and Döll, 2005; Xi et al., 2013; Nguyen et al., 2014; Holland et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016					Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Fernando and Evans, 2015; Roy et al., 2018				
	Low-carbon Fuel Switch	[0]					[0]					**Water and Air Pollution Reduction and Better Health (3.9)**					**Technical Education, Vocational Training, Education for Sustainability (4.b/4.7)**				
		No direct interaction					No direct interaction					↑	[+2]	🕮🕮	☺☺	★★	↑	[+1]	🕮🕮	☺☺	★★
												Industries are becoming suppliers of energy, waste heat, water and roof tops for solar energy generation, and hence helping to improve air and water quality.					New technology deployment creates demand for awareness and knowledge with technical and managerial capability; otherwise acts as barrier for rapid expansion.				
												Vassolo and Döll, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2014; Holland et al., 2015; Karner et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016					Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Fernando and Evans, 2015; Roy et al., 2018				
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	[0]					[0]					**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)**					[0]				
		No direct interaction					No direct interaction					↓	[-1]	🕮🕮	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction				
												There is a risk of CO_2 leakage both from geological formations as well as from the transportation infrastructure from source to sequestration locations.									
												Wang and Jaffe, 2004; Hertwich et al., 2008; Apps et al., 2010; Veltman et al., 2010; Koornneef et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2011; Siirila et al., 2012; Atchley et al., 2013; Corsten et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014									

Social-Demand (continued)

		1 NO POVERTY					2 ZERO HUNGER					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
Buildings	Behavioural Response	**Poverty Reduction via Financial Savings (1.1)**										**Improved Warmth and Comforts**									
		↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★		[0]				↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]			
		People living in deprived communities feel positive and predict considerable financial savings.					No direct interaction					Home occupants reported warmth as the most important aspect of comfort which was largely temperature-related and low in energy costs. Residents living in deprived areas expect improved warmth in their properties after energy efficiency measures are employed.					No direct interaction				
		Scott et al., 2014										Huebner et al., 2013; Yue et al., 2013; Scott et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2017									
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)**					**Food Security (2.1)**					**Healthy Lives and Well-being for All at All Ages (3.2/3.9)**					**Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★
		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 benefitted the 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 towards universal energy access and, by extension, counteract the fight to eliminate poverty. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018).					Using the improved stoves supports local food security and has significantly impacted on food security. By making fuel last longer, the improved stoves help improve food security and also provide a better buffer against fuel shortages induced by climate change-related events such as droughts, floods or hurricanes (Berrueta et al. 2017).					Efficient stoves improve 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 took place without changes in occupant behaviours. Home occupants reported warmth as the most important aspect of comfort which was 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.				
		Casillas and Kammen, 2012; Hirth and Ueckerdt, 2013; Jakob and Steckel, 2014; Maidment et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2014; Fay et al., 2015; Cameron et al., 2016; Hallegatte et al., 2016b; Berrueta et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Berrueta et al., 2017					Djamila et al., 2013; Huebner et al., 2013; Yue et al., 2013; Bhojvaid et al., 2014; Derbez et al., 2014; Maidment et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2014; Cameron et al., 2015; Liddell and Guiney, 2015; Sharpe et al., 2015; Wells et al., 2015; Willand et al., 2015; Berrueta et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2017					Maidment et al., 2014				
	Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)**					**Food Security and Agricultural Productivity (2.1/2.4)**					**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)**					**Equal Access to Educational Institutions (4.1/4.2/4.3/4.5)**				
		↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★	~ / ↓	[0,-1]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺☺☺	★★
		Access to modern energy forms (electricity, clean 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 reduce 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 enrolment rates and better literacy outcomes. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018)				
		Kirubi et al., 2009; Casillas and Kammen, 2010; Cook, 2011; Pachauri et al., 2012; Pode, 2013; Pueyo et al., 2013; Zulu and Richardson, 2013; Bonan et al., 2014; Rao et al., 2014; Burlig and Preonas, 2016; McCollum et al., 2018					Cabraal et al., 2005; Tilman et al., 2009; van Vuuren et al., 2009; Asaduzzaman et al., 2010; Finco and Doppler, 2010; Msangi et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2013, 2014; Lotze-Campen et al., 2014; Hasegawa et al., 2015; Sola et al., 2016; McCollum et al., 2018					Lam et al., 2012; Lim et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2013; Aranda et al., 2014; McCollum et al., 2018					Lipscomb et al., 2013; van de Walle et al., 2013; McCollum et al., 2018				

Social-Demand (continued)

		1 NO POVERTY					2 ZERO HUNGER					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
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)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺☺☺	★★
		The costs of daily mobility can have important economic stress impacts, not only impacting carless families 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.					Low-income community residents (non-white) who lack local access to affordable, quality sources of nutrition have to travel outside their immediate neighbourhood 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.					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 existing 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).					Poor road quality affects school travel safety, so 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 situate schools and control the roadways and land uses around them in the future.				
		Dodson et al., 2004; Cascajo et al., 2017					Clifton, 2004; Hillier, 2011; Krukowski et al., 2013; LeDoux and Vojnovic, 2013; Ghosh-Dastidar et al., 2014; Zenk et al., 2015; Lowery et al., 2016					Woodcock et al., 2009; Creutzig et al., 2012; Haines and Dora, 2012; Saunders et al., 2013; Shaw et al., 2014, 2017; Chakrabarti and Shin, 2017; Hwang et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Yu, 2015				
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**End Poverty in all its Forms Everywhere (1.1/1.4/1.a/1.b)**					[0]					**Reduce Illnesses from Hazardous Air, Water and Soil Pollution (3.9)**					[0]				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction					↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction				
		Decarbonization of public buses in Sweden is receiving attention more than efficiency improvement. With more electrification, electricity prices go up and affordability can worsen for the poor unless redistributive policies are in place.										Locally relevant policies targeting traffic reductions and ambitious diffusion of electric vehicles results in measured changes in non-climatic exposure for population, including 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. An evidence-based approach that takes into account GHG emissions, ambient air pollutants, economic factors (affordability, cost optimization), social factors (poverty alleviations, public health benefits) and political acceptability is needed to tackle these challenges.									
		Xylia and Silveira, 2017										Figueroa et al., 2014; Schucht et al., 2015; Klausbruckner et al., 2016; Peng et al., 2017									
	Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy	**End Poverty in all its Forms Everywhere (1.1/1.4/1.a/1.b)**					**Ensure Access to Food Security (2.1/2.3/2.a/2.b/2.c)**					**Reduce Illnesses from Hazardous Air Pollution (3.9)**					[0]				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	~	[0]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	No direct interaction				
		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 and 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. For African cities with slums, due to high commuting costs, many walk to work places which limit access. In Latin America triple informality leading to low productivity and living standards.					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).					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 targeted at reducing air pollution; electric vehicles using electricity from renewables or low carbon sources combined with e-mobility options such as trolley buses, metros, trams and electro buses, as well as promoting walking and biking, especially for short distances, need consideration.									
		Dodson and Sipe, 2008; Suckall et al., 2014; Hallegatte et al., 2016a; Klausbruckner et al., 2016; CAF, 2017; Lall et al., 2017					SLoCaT, 2017					Ajanovic, 2015; SLoCaT, 2017									

Social-Supply

		1 NO POVERTY					2 ZERO HUNGER					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
Replacing Coal	Non-biomass Renewables - solar, wind, hydro	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)**										**Air Pollution (3.9)**					**Vocational Trainig, Education for Sustainability (4.b/4.7)**				
		↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	[0]					↑	[+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).					No direct interaction					Promoting most types of renewables and boosting efficiency greatly aids 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 centres 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.				
		Riahi et al., 2012; IPCC, 2014; Hallegatte et al., 2016b; McCollum et al., 2018										Haines et al., 2007; Nemet et al., 2010; Kaygusuz, 2011; Riahi et al., 2012; van Vliet et al., 2012; Anenberg et al., 2013; Rafaj et al., 2013; Rao et al., 2013, 2016; West et al., 2013; Chaturvedi and Shukla, 2014; Rose et al., 2014; Smith and Sagar, 2014; IEA, 2016; McCollum et al., 2018					Anderson et al., 2017				
	Increased Use of Biomass	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)**					**Farm Employment and Incomes (2.3)**					**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4), Air Pollution (3.9)**					[0]				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖	☺☺	★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction				
		Large-scale bioenergy production could lead to the creation of agricultural jobs, as well as 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 labour. However, large-scale bioenergy production could alter the structure of global agricultural markets in a way that is, potentially, unfavourable to small-scale food producers. See SDG2 (McCollum et al., 2018).					Large-scale bioenergy production could lead to the creation of agricultural jobs, as well as 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 labour. However, large-scale bioenergy production could alter the structure of global agricultural markets in a way that is, potentially, unfavourable to small-scale food producers. The distributional effects of bioenergy production are underexplored in the literature (McCollum et al., 2018).					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 power plants, but could be significant when switching from outdated coal combustion technologies to state-of-the-art biogas power generation.									
		Balishter and Singh, 1991; Gohin, 2008; de Moraes et al., 2010; van der Horst and Vermeylen, 2011; Corbera and Pascual, 2012; Rud, 2012; Creutzig et al., 2013; Davis et al., 2013; Satolo and Bacchi, 2013; Muys et al., 2014; Ertem et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Balishter and Singh, 1991; Gohin, 2008; de Moraes et al., 2010; van der Horst and Vermeylen, 2011; Corbera and Pascual, 2012; Rud, 2012; Creutzig et al., 2013; Davis et al., 2013; Satolo and Bacchi, 2013; Muys et al., 2014; Ertem et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					IPCC, 2005, 2014; Miller et al., 2007; Hertwich et al., 2008; de Best-Waldhober et al., 2009; Shackley et al., 2009; Wallquist et al., 2009, 2010; Wong-Parodi and Ray, 2009; Chan and Griffiths, 2010; Veltman et al., 2010; Epstein et al., 2011; Koornneef et al., 2011; Reiner and Nuttall, 2011; Singh et al., 2011; Ashworth et al., 2012; Burgherr et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2012; Asfaw et al., 2013; Corsten et al., 2013; Einsiedel et al., 2013									

Social-Supply (continued)

		1 NO POVERTY					2 ZERO HUNGER					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
Replacing Coal	Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear	No direct interaction	[0]				No direct interaction	[0]				**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)** ↓ [-1] 📖📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ 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* on this issue). Abdelouas, 2006; Cardis et al., 2006; Kaatsch et al., 2008; Al-Zoughool and Krewski, 2009; Heinävaara et al., 2010; Schnelzer et al., 2010; Brugge and Buchner, 2011; Møller and Mousseau, 2011; Møller et al., 2011, 2012; Moomaw et al., 2011; UNSCEAR, 2011; Sermage-Faure et al., 2012; Ten Hoeve and Jacobson, 2012; Tirmarche et al., 2012; Hiyama et al., 2013; Mousseau and Møller, 2013; Smith et al., 2013; WHO, 2013; IPCC, 2014; von Stechow et al., 2016					No direct interaction	[0]			
	CCS: Bioenergy	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-2] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★ See effects of increased bioenergy use.					**Farm Employment and Incomes (2.3)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-2] 📖📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ 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. On the other hand, competition for land use may increase food prices and thereby increase risk of hunger. Use of agricultural residue for bioenergy can reduce soil carbon, thereby threatening agricultural productivity. See literature on increased biomass use: IPCC, 2014; Muratori et al., 2016; Dooley and Kartha, 2018					**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-1] 📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ See positive impacts of increased biomass use. At the same time, there is a non-negligible risk of CO_2 leakage both from geological formations as well as from the transportation infrastructure from source to sequestration locations. Wang and Jaffe, 2004; Hertwich et al., 2008; Apps et al., 2010; Veltman et al., 2010; Koornneef et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2011; Siirila et al., 2012; Atchley et al., 2013; Corsten et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014					[0] No direct interaction				
Advanced Coal	CCS: Fossil	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**Disease and Mortality (3.1/3.2/3.3/3.4)** ↓ [-1] 📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ The use of fossil CCS implies 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, there is a non-negligible risk of CO_2 leakage from geological storage or the CO_2 transport infrastructure from source to sequestration location. Wang and Jaffe, 2004; Hertwich et al., 2008; Apps et al., 2010; Veltman et al., 2010; Koornneef et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2011; Siirila et al., 2012; Atchley et al., 2013; Corsten et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014					[0] No direct interaction				

Social-Other

		1 NO POVERTY	2 ZERO HUNGER	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
Agriculture and 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 Sub-Saharan Africa. IPCC, 2014	**Food Security, Promoting 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. Garnett, 2011; Beddington et al., 2012; Kummu et al., 2012; Smith, 2013; Bajželj et al., 2014; Tilman and Clark, 2014; West et al., 2014; Lamb et al., 2016	**Tobacco Control (3.a/3.a.1)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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, 2011; Bustamante et al., 2014	[0] No direct interaction
	Land-based GHG Reduction and Soil Carbon Sequestration	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖📖📖 ☺☺☺☺ ★★★★ Many CSA 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). Branca et al., 2011; Bogdanski, 2012; Scherr et al., 2012; Vermeulen et al., 2012; Campbell et al., 2014; Lipper et al., 2014; Mbow et al., 2014; Steenwerth et al., 2014; Hammond et al., 2017	**Food Security, Promoting Sustainable Agriculture (2.1/2.4/2a)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖📖📖 ☺☺☺☺ ★★★★ Safe application of biotechnology, both conventional and modern methods, can help to improve agricultural productivity, improving crop adaptability and thereby catering to food security. Reducing tillage, eliminating fallow and keeping the soil covered with residue, cover crops or perennial vegetation helps prevent soil erosion and has the potential to increase soil organic matter. Efficient land-management techniques can help in increasing crop yields, and so 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 and Garnett, 2014). Improving cropland management is the key to increase crop productivity without further degrading soil and water resources (Branca et al., 2011). CSA practices increase productivity and prioritize food security. Evenson, 1999; West and Post, 2002; Johnson et al., 2007; Branca et al., 2011; McCarthy et al., 2011; Behnassi et al., 2014; Campbell et al., 2014; Godfray and Garnett, 2014; Harvey et al., 2014; Lipper et al., 2014	**Ensure Healthy Lives (3.c)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-2] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ Growing crops such as cassava, sorghum and millet, even in harsh conditions, is important to the diets of very poor people. Policy scenarios show that reduced research support, delayed industrialization, delayed biotechnology and climate change will delay progress in reducing childhood malnutrition. The global effects are small, but local effects for some countries, e.g., Bangladesh and Nigeria, are significant (Evenson, 1999). Evenson, 1999; Godfray and Garnett, 2014	**Ensure Inclusive and Quality Education (4.4/4.7)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-2] 📖📖 ☺ ★ Science-based action 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 et al., 2014). Low commodity prices have led to declining investment in research and development, farmer education, etc. (Lamb et al., 2016). Steenwerth et al., 2014; 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] & J « With mixed-farming systems farmers can not only 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. Sansoucy, 1995	**Food Security, Promoting Sustainable Agriculture (2.1/2.4/2a)** ↑ [+2] &&&& JJJJ «««« Fostering transitions towards more productive livestock production systems targeting land-use change appears to be the most efficient lever to deliver food availability outcomes. 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: such as improving productivity and the 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 used for livestock, soil erosion potential reduces by 12%. Thornton, 2010, 2013; Herrero and Thornton, 2013; Havlik et al., 2014; Steenwerth et al., 2014; Schader et al., 2015	**Ensure Healthy Lives (3.c)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-2] && JJ «« Biodigestion, which has positive public health aspects, particularly where toilets are coupled with the biodigester; anaerobic conditions kill pathogenic organisms as well as digestive toxins. Separation processes can improve or worsen health risks related to food crops or to livestock. Sansoucy, 1995; Burton, 2007	[0] No direct interaction

Social-Other (continued)

		1 NO POVERTY	2 ZERO HUNGER	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
Forest	Reduced Deforestation, REDD+	**Poverty Reduction (1.5)** ↑ [+2] 🕮 ☺ ★ 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	**Food Security, Promoting Sustainable Agriculture (2.1/2.4/2a)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-2] 🕮🕮 ☺ ★ 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 . 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. Turpie et al., 2015; Epstein and Theuer, 2017; Katila et al., 2017; Dooley and Kartha, 2018	[0] No direct interaction	**Ensure Inclusive and Quality Education (4.4/4.7)** ↑ [+1] 🕮 ☺ ★ Local forest users learn to understand laws, regulations and policies which facilitate their participation in society. Education and capacity building provide technical skill and knowledge (Katila et al., 2017). Katila et al., 2017
	Afforestation and Reforestation	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.3/1.4)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-2] 🕮🕮 ☺☺ ★★★ Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) can have different implications on local community livelihoods. For example, 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 ; land sparing would have far reaching implications for the UK countryside and would affect landowners and rural communities ; and livelihoods could be threatened if subsistence agriculture is targeted . Zomer et al., 2008; Schirmer and Bull, 2014; Lamb et al., 2016; Dooley and Kartha, 2018	**Food Security (2.1)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 🕮 ☺ ★ CDM can have different implications on local to regional food security and local community livelihoods. Zomer et al., 2008; Dooley and Kartha, 2018	**Ensure Healthy Lives (3.c)** ↑ [+1] 🕮 ☺ ★ Urban trees are increasingly seen as a way to reduce harmful air pollutants and therefore improve cardio-respiratory health. Jones and McDermott, 2018	**Promote Knowledge and Skill to Promote SD (4.7)** ↓ [-1] 🕮 ☺ ★ 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
	Behavioural Response (Responsible	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction
Oceans	Ocean Iron Fertilization	[0] No direct interaction	**Food Security (2.2/2.3)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 🕮🕮 ☺ ★ OIF can have different implications on fish stocks and aquaculture, and 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. Lampitt et al., 2008; Smetacek and Naqvi, 2008; Williamson et al., 2012	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction
	Blue Carbon	**Poverty and Development (1.1/1.2/1.5)** ↑ [+3] 🕮🕮🕮 ☺☺☺ ★★★ Avoiding loss of mangroves and maintaining the 2000 stock could save a value of ecosystem services from mangroves in South East Asia of approximately 2.16 billion USD until 2050 (2007 prices), with a 95% prediction interval of 1.58–2.76 billion USD (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	**Food Production (2.3/2.4)** ↑ [+3] 🕮🕮🕮 ☺☺☺ ★★★ Avoiding loss of mangroves and maintaining the 2000 stock could save a value of ecosystem services from mangroves in South East 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; and mariculture is a promising approach for China. Brander et al., 2012; Ahmed et al., 2017a, 2017b; Duarte et al., 2017; Sondak et al., 2017; Vierros, 2017; Zhang et al., 2017	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction
	Enhanced Weathering	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction

Social 2-Demand

		5					10					16					17				
		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	No direct interaction	[0]				**Knowledge and Skills Needed to Promote SD (4.7)** ↑ There is need for skill in managing in-house energy efficiency. Sometimes ESCOs also help. Energy audits, but many times absence of skill acts as barrier for energy efficiency improvement. In many countries, especially developing countries, these act as barriers. Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Johansson and Thollander, 2018	[+1]	📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction	[0]				**Global Partnership (17.6/17.7)** ↑ A driving force for energy efficiency is collaboration among companies, networks, experience sharing and management tools. Sharing among countries can help accelerate managerial action. Absence of information, budgetary funding, lack of access to capital, etc. are Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Griffin et al., 2018; Johansson and Thollander, 2018; Lawrence et al., 2018	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
	Low-carbon Fuel Switch	No direct interaction	[0]				No direct interaction	[0]				No direct interaction	[0]				**Global Partnership (17.6/17.7)** ↑ Ultra-low carbon steel making and breakthrough technologies are under trial across many countries and helping in enhancing the learning. Abdul Quader et al., 2016	[+2]	📖	☺☺	★★
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	No direct interaction	[0]				No direct interaction	[0]				No direct interaction	[0]				**Global Partnership (17.6/17.7)** ↑ EPI plants are capital intensive and are mostly operated by multinationals with long investment cycles. In developed countries new innovation investments are happening in brown fields. Such large innovation investments need strong collaboration among partners/competitors which can be facilitated by public funds. They happen at national and supranational scales and across sectors, needs fresh revisit at Intellectual Property Rights issues. Global production of bio-based polymers increasingly need public support and incentives to push forward. Wesseling et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018	[+2]	📖	☺☺☺	★★★

Social 2-Demand (continued)

		5 Gender Equality					10 Reduced Inequalities					16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions					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
Buildings	Behavioural Response	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**Environmental Justice (16.7)** ↑ [+2] 🕮 ☺ ★ Consumption perspectives strengthen 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	**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (5.1/5.4)** ↑ [+1] 🕮 ☺☺ ★★ Efficient stoves lead to empowerment of rural and indigenous women. Bhojvaid et al., 2014; Berrueta et al., 2017					**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. Dinkelman, 2011; Casillas and Kammen, 2012; Pachauri et al., 2012; Cayla and Osso, 2013; Hirth and Ueckerdt, 2013; Pueyo et al., 2013; Jakob and Steckel, 2014; Fay et al., 2015; Cameron et al., 2016; Hallegatte et al., 2016b; McCollum et al., 2018					**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, UN organizations, WTO, regional development banks and beyond) will be important for issues related to energy trade, foreign direct investment, labour 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. Acemoglu, 2009; Tabellini, 2010; Acemoglu et al., 2014; ICSU and ISSC, 2015; McCollum et al., 2018					**Enhance Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (17.4)** ↑ [+2] 🕮 ☺ ★ 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 and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy	**Women's Safety and Worth (5.1/5.2/5.4)/Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)** ↑ [+1] 🕮🕮 ☺☺ ★★ Improved access to electric lighting can improve women's safety and girls' school enrolment. Cleaner cooking fuel and lighting access can reduce health risks and drudgery, which women disproportionately face. 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. Chowdhury, 2010; Dinkelman, 2011; Kaygusuz, 2011; Köhlin et al., 2011; Clancy et al., 2012; Haves, 2012; Matinga, 2012; Anenberg et al., 2013; Pachauri and Rao, 2013; Burney et al., 2017; McCollum et al.,					[0] No direct interaction					**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, UN organizations, WTO, regional development banks and beyond) will be important for issues related to energy trade, foreign direct investment, labour 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. Acemoglu, 2009; Tabellini, 2010; Acemoglu et al., 2014; ICSU and ISSC, 2015; McCollum et al., 2018					**Promote Transfer and Diffusion of Technology (17.6/17.7)** ↑ [+2] 🕮 ☺ ★ Green building technology in Kazakhstan was based on transfer of knowledge among various parties. Kim and Sun, 2017				

Social 2-Demand (continued)

		5 Gender Equality					10 Reduced Inequalities					16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions					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
Transport	Behavioural response	**Recognize Women's Unpaid Work (5.1/5.4)/Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)**	↑	[+1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	**Reduce Inequality (10.2)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	**Accountable and Transparent Institutions at All Levels (16.6/16.8)**	↑ / ↓	[+1, -1]	📖	☺	★	**Help Promote Global Partnership (17.1/17.3/17.5/17.6/17.7)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★
		The woman's average trip to work differs markedly from the man's average trip. Working-poor women 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 .						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 policymaking. Managing transport energy demand growth will have to be advanced alongside efforts in passenger travel towards 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 under-priced space for cars, in extreme cases like Los Angeles, USA, 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						With behavioural change towards walking for short distances, pedestrian safety on the road might reduce, unless public policy is appropriately formulated. Prevalence of high levels of triple forms of informality, in jobs, housing and transportation, are responsible for low productivity and low standards of living, and are a major challenge for policies targeting urban growth in Latin America.						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 multi-stakeholder coalitions.				
		Crane, 2007; Rogalsky, 2010						Figueroa et al., 2014; Lucas and Pangbourne, 2014; Walks, 2015; Manville, 2017; Belton Chevallier et al., 2018						CAF, 2017; SLoCaT, 2017						SLoCaT, 2017				
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	[0]						[0]						**Responsive, Inclusive, Participatory Decision-making (16.7)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	**Help Promote Global Partnership (17.1/17.3/17.5/17.6/17.7)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★
		No direct interaction						No direct interaction						In transport mitigation it is necessary to conduct needs assessments and stakeholder consultation to determine plausible challenges, prior to introducing desired planning reforms. Further, the involved personnel should actively engage transport-based stakeholders during policy identification and its implementation to achieve the desired results. User behaviour and stakeholder integration are key for successful transport policy implementation.						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 multi-stakeholder coalitions.				
												Aggarwal, 2017; AlSabbagh et al., 2017						SLoCaT, 2017				
	Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy	[0]					**Reduce Inequality (10.2)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★		**Responsive, Inclusive, Participatory Decision-making (16.7)**	↑ / ↓	[+1, -1]	📖	☺	★	**Help Promote Global Partnership (17.1/17.3/17.5/17.6/17.7)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★
		No direct interaction					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 policymaking. Managing transport energy demand growth will have to be advanced alongside efforts in passenger travel towards reducing the deep inequalities in access to transport services that currently affect the poor worldwide.						Formal transport infrastructure improvement in many cities in developing countries leads to eviction from informal settlements; need for appropriate redistributive policies and cooperation and partnerships with all stakeholders.						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 multi-stakeholder coalitions.				
								Figueroa et al., 2014; Lucas and Pangbourne, 2014						Colenbrander et al., 2016						SLoCaT, 2017				

Social 2-Supply

		Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (5.1/5.4)	Empowerment and Inclusion (10.1/10.2/10.3/10.4)	Energy Justice	International Cooperation (All Goals)
		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	↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 and Sy, 2017	↑ [+1] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ 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. Walker and Devine-Wright, 2008; Cass et al., 2010; Cumbers, 2012; Kunze and Becker, 2015; McCollum et al., 2018	↑ [+2] 📖 ☺ ★ 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) state 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	↑ / ~ [+2,0] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ 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 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). UN, 1989; Ramaker et al., 2003; Clarke et al., 2009; NCE, 2015; Riahi et al., 2015, 2017; Eis et al., 2016; O'Neill et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018
	Increased use of Biomass	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction
	Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear	[0] No direct interaction	[0] No direct interaction	**Reduce Illicit Arms Trade (16.4)** ↓ [-1] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ Continued use of nuclear power poses a constant risk of proliferation. Adamantiades and Kessides, 2009; Rogner, 2010; Sagan, 2011; von Hippel et al., 2011, 2012; Yim and Li, 2013; IPCC, 2014	[0] No direct interaction
	CCS: Bioenergy	[0] No direct interaction	[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	[0] No direct interaction

Social 2-Other

		5					10					16					17				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Agriculture and Livestock	Behavioural Response: Sustainable Healthy Diets and Reduced Food Waste	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**making (16.6/16.7/16.a)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 📖📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ Appropriate incentives to reduce food waste may require some policy innovation and experimentation, but a strong commitment for devising and monitoring them seems essential. A financial incentive to minimize 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 policymakers demonstrate little regarding the need to have strategies to reduce meat consumption and to encourage more sustainable eating practices. Garnett, 2011; Dagevos and Voordouw, 2013; Bajželj et al., 2014; Lamb et al., 2016					**Resource Mobilization and Strengthen Partnership** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 policymakers demonstrate little regarding the need to have strategies to reduce meat consumption and to encourage more sustainable eating practices . Garnett, 2011; Dagevos and Voordouw, 2013				
	Land-based Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Soil Carbon Sequestration	**Equal Access, Empowerment of Women (5.5)** ↑ / ~ [+2,0] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★★ Many programmes for CSA 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). Denton, 2002; Nelson et al., 2002; Morton, 2007; Demetriades and Esplen, 2009; Terry, 2009; Bernier et al., 2013; Jost et al., 2016					**Empower Economic and Political Inclusion of All, Irrespective of Sex (10.2)** ↑ / ~ [+1,0] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ In many rural societies women are side-lined 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 fertilizer. 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 recognized in agricultural and economic policymaking; nor is the importance of biodiversity to sustainable rural livelihoods in the face of predicted climate changes (Nelson et al., 2002). Nelson et al., 2002; Demetriades and Esplen, 2009; Terry, 2009					**Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions (16.6/16.7/16.8)** ~ / ↓ [0,-1] 📖📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ Action is needed throughout the food system for improving governance and producing more food (Godfray and Garnett, 2014). CSA requires policy intervention for careful adjustment of agricultural practices to natural conditions, a knowledge-intensive approach, huge financial investment, etc., so having strong institutional frameworks is very important. The main source of climate finance for CSA in developing countries is the public sector. Lack of institutional capacity (as a means for securing creation of equal institutions among social groups and individuals) can reduce feasibility of AFOLU mitigation measures in the near future, especially in areas where small-scale farmers or forest users are the main stakeholders (Bustamante et al., 2014). Behnassi et al., 2014; Bustamante et al., 2014; Godfray and Garnett, 2014; Lipper et al., 2014; Steenwerth et al., 2014					**Resource Mobilization and Strengthen Multi-stakeholder Partnership (17.1/ 17.3/17.5/17.17)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ CSA requires more careful adjustment of agricultural practices to natural conditions, a knowledge-intensive approach, huge financial investment and policy and institutional innovation, etc. Besides private investment, quality of public investment is also important (Behnass et al., 2014). Sources of climate finance for CSA in developing countries include bilateral donors and multilateral financial institutions, besides public sector finance. CSA is committed to new ways of engaging in participatory research and partnerships with producers (Steenwerth et al., 2014). Behnassi et al., 2014; Lipper et al., 2014; Steenwerth et al., 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] 📖 ☺ ★ Most of the animal farming activities such as fodder collection and feeding are performed by women. Alongside the considerable involvement and contribution of women, gender inequalities are pervasive 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 the farming sector. Efforts are needed to increase the capacity of women to negotiate with confidence and meet their strategic needs. Access to and 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. Patel et al., 2016					**Empower Economic and Political Inclusion of All, Irrespective of Sex (10.2)** ↑ / ~ [+1,0] 📖 ☺ ★ Livestock ownership is increasing women's decision-making and economic power within both the household and the community. Access to and 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. Patel et al., 2016					**Responsible Decision-making (16.7)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ To minimize the economic and social cost, policies should target emissions at their source—on the supply side—rather than on the demand side as supply-side policies have lower calorie cost than demand-side policies. The role of livestock system transitions in emission reductions depends on the level of the carbon price and which emissions sector is targeted by the policies. Havlík et al., 2014					**Improve Domestic Capacity for Tax Collection (17.1)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ The role of livestock system transitions in emission reductions depends on the level of the carbon price and which emissions sector is targeted by the policies (Havlík et al., 2014). Mechanisms for affecting behavioural 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). Herrero and Thornton, 2013; Havlík et al., 2014				

Social 2-Other (continued)

		5 Gender Equality					10 Reduced Inequalities					16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions					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
Forest	Reduced Deforestation, REDD+	**Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 pharmaceutical. Their empowerment contributes to sustainable forestry as well as reducing inequality .					**Reduced Inequality, Empowerment and Inclusion (10.1/10.2/10.3/10.4)** ↑ [+2] 📖 ☺ ★ Urges developed countries to support, through multilateral and bilateral channels, the development of REDD+ national strategies or action plans and implementation . 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 .					**Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions, Responsible Decision-making (16.6/16.7/16.8)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ Institutional building (National Forest Monitoring Systems, Safeguard Information Systems, etc.), with full and effective participation of all relevant countries . REDD+ actions also deliver non-carbon benefits (e.g. local socioeconomic benefits, governance improvements). Forest governance is another central aspect in recent studies, including the debate on decentralization of forest management, logging concessions in public-owned commercially valuable forests and timber certification, primarily in temperate forests .					**Resource Mobilization and Strengthen Multi-stakeholder Partnership (17.1/ 17.3/17.5/17.17)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 . 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 . 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 . Partnerships between local forest managers, community enterprises and private sector companies can support local economies and livelihoods and boost regional and national economic growth .				
		Brown, 2011; Larson et al., 2014; Katila et al., 2017					Bastos Lima et al., 2017; Katila et al., 2017					Bustamante et al., 2014; Bastos Lima et al., 2015, 2017					Miles and Kapos, 2008; Bustamante et al., 2014; Andrew, 2017; Bastos Lima et al., 2017; Katila et al., 2017				
	Afforestation and Reforestation	**Opportunities for Women (5.1/5.5)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ Many women in developing countries are already prominently engaged in economic sectors related to climate adaptation and mitigation efforts such as agriculture, renewable energy and forest management and are important drivers and leaders in climate responses that are innovative and effective, benefitting not only their families but also their wider communities. 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.					**Empower Economic and Political Inclusion of All, Irrespective of Sex (10.2)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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.					**Responsible Decision-making (16.7)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 and Theur, 2017)					**Resource Mobilization and Strengthen Partnership (17.1/17.14)** ↑ [+2] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ Financing at the national and international level is required to grow more seedlings/sapling, restore land, create awareness and education factsheets, provide training to 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, the Joint Forest Management Programme initiated in 1990, afforestation under National Afforestation and Eco-development Board 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 by 11% by 2030 (Ravindranath et al., 2008)				
		UN-Women et al., 2015					UN-Women et al., 2015					Epstein and Theuer, 2017					Ravindranath et al., 2008; Kibria, 2015; Montanarella and Alva, 2015				
	Behavioural Response (Responsible Sourcing)	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**Responsible Decision-making (16.7)** ↑ [+1] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ 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 et al., 2013).					**Finance and Trade (17.1/17.10)** ↑ [+1] 📖📖 ☺☺ ★★ 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 et al., 2013).				
												Bartley, 2010; Huang et al., 2013					Huang et al., 2013; Sikkema et al., 2014				

Social 2-Other (continued)

		5					10					16					17				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Oceans	Ocean Iron Fertilization	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				
	Blue Carbon	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				
	Enhanced Weathering	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				

Environment-Demand

		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)**					**Sustainable and Efficient Resource (12.2/12.5/12.6/12.7/12.a)**														
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]					[0]			
		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 waste water, 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.					Once started leads to chain of actions within the sector and policy space to sustain the effort. Helps in expansion of sustainable industrial production (Ghana).					No direct interaction					No direct interaction				
		Vassolo and Döll, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2014; Holland et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016					Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Fernando et al., 2017														
	Low-carbon Fuel Switch	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Sustainable Production (12.2/12.3/12.a)**										**Sustainable Production (15.1/15.5/15.9/15.10)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★		[0]				↑	[+1,-1]	📖	☺	★
		A switch to low-carbon fuels can lead to a reduction in water demand and waste water 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, for example, biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock.					A circular economy instead of linear global economy can achieve climate goals and can help in economic growth through industrialization which saves on resources, the environment and supports small, medium and even large industries, and can lead to employment generation. So new regulations, incentives and a tax regime can help in achieving the goal, especially in newly emerging developing countries - although also applicable for large industrialized countries.					No direct interaction					A circular economy help in managing local biodiversity better by having less resource use footprint				
		Hejazi et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016					Liu and Bai, 2014; Lieder and Rashid, 2016; Stahel, 2016; Supino et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2017; Zeng et al., 2017										Shi et al., 2017				
	Decarbonisation/CCS/CCU	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Sustainable Production and Consumption (12.1/12.6/12.a)**					**Conserve and Sustainably Use Ocean (14.1/14.5)**									
		↑ / ↓	[+1,-1]	📖📖📖	☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★	↓	[-1]	📖	☺	★		[0]			
		CCU/S requires access to water for cooling and processing which could contribute to localized water stress. CCS/U processes 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 multinationals 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 is essential for encouraging these large risky investments.					CCU/S in the chemical industry faces challenges for transport costs and storage. In the UK cluster region have been identified for storage under sea.					No direct interaction				
		Meldrum et al., 2013; Byers et al., 2016; Fricko et al., 2016; Brandl et al., 2017					Wesseling et al., 2017					Griffin et al., 2018									

Environment-Demand (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Buildings	Behavioural Response	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Responsible and Sustainable Consumption**														
		↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]					[0]			
		Behavioural 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 waste water, 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) found that building technology and occupant behaviours interact with each other and finally affect energy consumption from home. They found that occupant habits could not take advantage of more than 50% of energy efficiency potential allowed by an efficient building. In the electronic segment, product obsolescence represents a key challenge for sustainability. Echegaray (2016) 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 et al. (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).						No direct interaction					No direct interaction			
		Bartos and Chester (2014); Fricko et al. (2016); Holland et al. (2016)					Sweeney et al., 2013; Webb et al., 2013; Allen et al., 2015; Echegaray (2015); He et al., 2016; Hult and Larsson, 2016; Isenhour and Feng, 2016; van Sluisveld et al., 2016; Zhao et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017; Sommerfeld et al., 2017														
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Sustainable Practices and Lifestyles (12.6/12.7/12.8)**										**Reduced Deforestation (15.2)**				
		↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]				↑	[+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 waste water, 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 waste water 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, for example, 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 waste water, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment. Subsidies for renewables are anticipated to lead to the benefits and trade-offs 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).						No direct interaction					Improved stoves has helped halt deforestation in rural India.			
		Bilton et al., 2011; Scott, 2011; Kumar et al., 2012; Meldrum et al., 2013; Bartos and Chester, 2014; Hendrickson and Horvath, 2014; Kern et al., 2014; Holland et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2017					Stefan and Paul, 2008; ECF, 2014; CDP, 2015; Khan et al., 2015; NCE, 2015; McCollum et al., 2018										Bhojvaid et al., 2014				

Environment-Demand (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Buildings	Improved Access and 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)**					**Sustainable Use and Management of Natural Resource (12.2)**										**Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★★		[0]				↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
		A switch to low-carbon fuels in the residential sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and waste water 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, for example, 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 trade-offs with water efficiency targets.					A switch to low-carbon fuels in the residential sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and waste water 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, for example, 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 trade-offs with water efficiency targets.						No direct interaction				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 (McCollum et al., 2018).				
		Hejazi et al., 2015; Cibin et al., 2016; Fricko et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; Rao and Pachauri, 2017					Hejazi et al., 2015; Cibin et al., 2016; Fricko et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; Rao and Pachauri, 2017										Bazilian et al., 2011; Karekezi et al., 2012; Bailis et al., 2015; Winter et al., 2015; McCollum et al., 2018				
Transport	Behavioural Response	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Ensure Sustainable Consumption amd Production Patterns (12.3)**														
		↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★		[0]					[0]			
		Behavioural 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 waste water, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.					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 CO_2 clusters that dominate CO_2 emissions in global supply chains, because they offer insights on where climate policy can be effectively directed.						No direct interaction					No direct interaction			
		Vidic et al., 2013; Holland et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Tiedeman et al., 2016					Kagawa et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2015; Creutzig et al., 2016														
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Sustainable Consumption (12.2/12.8)**														
		↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]					[0]			
		Similar to behavioural 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 waste water, resulting in more clean water for other sectors and the environment.					Relational complex transport behaviour 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 non-progress on transport decarbonization. Consumption choices and individual lifestyles are situated and tied to the form of the surrounding urbanization. Major behavioural changes and emissions reductions require 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.						No direct interaction					No direct interaction			
		Vidic et al., 2013; Holland et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Tiedeman et al., 2016					Stanley et al., 2011; Gallego et al., 2013; Heinonen et al., 2013; Aamaas and Peters, 2017; Azevedo and Leal, 2017; Gössling and Metzler, 2017														

Environment-Demand (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Transport	**Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy**	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Ensure Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns (12.3)**					**[0]**					**[0]**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction					No direct interaction				
		A switch to low-carbon fuels in the transport sector can lead to a reduction in water demand and waste water 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, for example, biofuel could increase water use compared to existing conditions if the biofuel comes from a water-intensive feedstock. Transport electrification could lead to trade-offs with water use if the electricity is provided with water intensive power generation.					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 structures.													
		Hejazi et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016					Figueroa et al., 2014; IPCC, 2014; Pietzcker et al., 2014; Creutzig et al., 2015														

Environement-Supply

		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 (6.1/6.2)**	↑ / ↓ [+2,-2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		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.				
		Bilton et al., 2011; Scott et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2012; Ziv et al., 2012; Meldrum et al., 2013; Kern et al., 2014; Grill et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Grubert, 2016; De Stefano et al., 2017				
	Increased Use of Biomass	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**	↑ / ↓ [+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.				
		Hejazi et al., 2015; Bonsch et al., 2016; Cibin et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; Gao and Bryan, 2017; Griffiths et al., 2017; Ha and Wu, 2017; Taniwaki et al., 2017; Woodbury et al., 2018				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Replacing Coal	Non-biomass Renewables - solar, wind hydro	**Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)**	↑ [+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★
		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)				
		Banerjee et al., 2012; Riahi et al., 2012; Schwanitz et al., 2014; Bhattacharyya et al., 2016; Cameron et al., 2016; McCollum et al., 2018				
	Increased Use of Biomass	**Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)**	↑ [+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★
		Switching to renewable energy reduces the depletion of finite natural resources.				
		Banerjee et al., 2012; Riahi et al., 2012; Schwanitz et al., 2014; Bhattacharyya et al., 2016; Cameron et al., 2016; McCollum et al., 2018				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Replacing Coal	Non-biomass Renewables - solar, wind hydro	**Marine Economies (14.7)/ Marine Protection (14.1/14.2/14.4/14.5)**	↑ / ↓ [2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
		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 impacts the productivity of inland waters and their fisheries.				
		Inger et al., 2009; Michler-Cieluch et al., 2009; Buck and Krause, 2012; WBGU, 2013; Cooke et al., 2016; Matthews and McCartney, 2018; McCollum et al., 2018				
	Increased Use of Biomass	[0]				
		No direct interaction				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Replacing Coal	Non-biomass Renewables - solar, wind hydro	**Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)**	↓ [-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
		Landscape and wildlife impact for wind; habitat impact for hydropower.				
		Alho, 2011; Garvin et al., 2011; Grodsky et al., 2011; Jain et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2011; Kunz et al., 2011; Wiser et al., 2011; Dahl et al., 2012; de Lucas et al., 2012; Ziv et al., 2012; Lovich and Ennen, 2013; Smith et al., 2013; Matthews and McCartney, 2018				
	Increased Use of Biomass	**Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)**	↑ / ↓ [+1,-2]	📖	☺☺☺	★★
		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).				
		Smith et al., 2010, 2014; Acheampong et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018				

Environement-Supply (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Replacing Coal	Nuclear/Advanced Nuclear	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**															**Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	&&	JJJ	««		[0]					[0]				↓	[-1]	&&	JJ	««
		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 from uranium mining and milling.				
		Webster et al., 2013; Holland et al., 2015; Fricko et al., 2016; Raptis et al., 2016															Bickerstaff et al., 2008; Sjoberg and Sjoberg, 2009; Ahearne, 2011; Corner et al., 2011; Visschers and Siegrist, 2012; IPCC, 2014				
	CCS: Bioenergy	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Natural Resource Protection (12.2/12.3/12.4/12.5)**										**Healthy Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.1/15.2/15.4/15.5/15.8)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+1,-2]	📖📖	☻	★★	↑	[+1]	📖📖	☻☻	★★		[0]				↑ / ↓	[+1,-2]	📖	☻☻☻	★★
		CCU/S requires access to water for cooling and processing which could contribute to localized water stress. However, CCS/U processes can potentially be configured for increased water efficiency compared to a system without carbon capture via process integration. The bioenergy component adds the additional trade-offs associated with bioenergy use. Large-scale bioenergy increases input demand, resulting in environmental degradation and water stress.					Switching to renewable energy reduces the depletion of finite natural resources. On the other hand, the availability 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; Byers et al., 2016; Fricko et al., 2016; Brandl et al., 2017; Dooley and Kartha, 2018					Banerjee et al., 2012; Riahi et al., 2012; Schwanitz et al., 2014; Bhattacharyya et al., 2016; Cameron et al., 2016; McCollum et al., 2018										Smith et al., 2010, 2014; Acheampong et al., 2017; Dooley and Kartha, 2018, McCollum et al., 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 processes 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, waste water and land-use requirements.					No direct interaction					No direct interaction					No direct interaction				
		Meldrum et al., 2013; Byers et al., 2016; Fricko et al., 2016; Brandl et al., 2017																			

Environement-Other

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Agriculture and Livestock	Behavioural Response: Sustainable Healthy Diets and Reduced Food Waste	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Ensure Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, Sustainable Practices and Lifestyle (12.3/12.4/12.6/12.7/12.8)**										**Conservation of Biodiversity and Restoration of Land (15.1/15.5/15.9)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★		[0]				↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★
		Reduced food waste avoids direct water demand and waste water 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 in 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 and 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, could have a dramatic effect on land use. Up to 2,700 Mha of pasture and 100 Mha of crop land could be abandoned (Quoted from Stehfest et al., 2009)				
		Khan et al., 2009; Ingram, 2011; Kummu et al., 2012; Haileselassie et al., 2013; Bajželj et al., 2014; Tilman and Clark, 2014; Walker et al., 2014; Ran et al., 2016					Stehfest et al., 2009; Steinfeld and Gerber, 2010; Garnett, 2011; Ingram, 2011; Beddington et al., 2012; Kummu et al., 2012; Bellarby et al., 2013; Dagevos and Voordouw, 2013; Smith, 2013; Bajželj et al., 2014; Hedenus et al., 2014; Tilman and Clark, 2014; West et al., 2014; Hiç et al., 2016; Lamb et al., 2016										Stehfest et al., 2009; Kummu et al., 2012				
	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)**										**Conservation of Biodiversity and Restoration of Land (15.1/15.5/15.9)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+1,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★		[0]				↑ / ↓	[+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. CSA enrich linkages across sectors including management of water resources. Minimum tillage systems have been reported to reduce water erosion and thus sedimentation of water courses (Bustamante et al., 2014).					Millet or sorghum yield can double as compared with unimproved land by 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 reduce demand for cultivated land. Adaptation 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 farm land (Lamb et al., 2016).				
		Behnassi et al., 2014; Bustamante et al., 2014; P. Smith et al., 2016b					Campbell et al., 2014; Lakshmi et al., 2015										Lybbert and Sumner, 2010; Behnassi et al., 2014; Harvey et al., 2014; IPCC, 2014; Lamb et al., 2016)				

Environement-Other (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Agriculture and Livestock	Greenhouse Gas Reduction from Improved Livestock Production and Manure Management Systems	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Ensure Sustainable Production Patterns and Restructing Taxation (12.3/12c)**					[0]					**Restoration of Land (15.1)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	No direct interaction					↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★
		Livestock efficiency measures are expected to reduce water required for livestock systems as well as associated livestock waste water flows. However, efficiency measures that include agricultural intensification could increase water demands locally, leading to increased water stress if the intensification is mismanaged. In 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 behavioural 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).										Grasslands are valuable, but improved management is required as grass accounts for close to 50% of feed use in livestock systems . 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 .				
		Haileselassie et al., 2013; Schader et al., 2015; Kong et al., 2016; Ran et al., 2016					Thornton, 2010; Herrero and Thornton, 2013; Herrero et al., 2013; Schader et al., 2015										Herrero et al., 2013; Schader et al., 2015				
Forest	Reduced Deforestation, REDD+	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)**					**Ensure Sustainable Consumption (12.3)**					[0]					**Conservation of Biodiversity, Sustainability of Terrestrial Ecosystems (15.2/15.3/15.4/15.5/15.9)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+1,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	No direct interaction					↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
		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 help in water purification.					Reduce the human pressure on forests, including actions to address drivers of deforestation.										Policies and programmes 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 pollination valued at 2.5% of the country's GDP.				
		Zomer et al., 2008; Kibria, 2015; Bonsch et al., 2016; Gao and Bryan, 2017; Griffiths et al., 2017; Katila et al., 2017					Bastos Lima et al., 2017										Miles and Kapos, 2008; IPCC, 2014; Bastos Lima et al., 2015; Turpie et al., 2015; Epstein and Theuer, 2017; Katila et al., 2017				
	Afforestation and Reforestation	**Enhance Water Quality (6.3)**					[0]					**Marine Economies (14.7)/Marine Protection and Income Generation (14.1/14.2/14.4/14.5)**					**Conservation of Biodiversity and Restoration of Land (15.1/15.5/15.9)**				
		↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	No direct interaction					↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		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 on 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).										Mangroves would help to enhance fisheries and tourism businesses.					Identified large amounts of land (749 Mha) globally as biophysically suitable and meeting the CDM eligibility criteria . Forest landscape restoration can conserve biodiversity and reduce land degradation. Mangroves reduce impacts of disasters (cyclones/storms/floods) acting as live seawalls and enhance forest resources/biodiversity. Forest 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 that 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 . 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 .				
		Zomer et al., 2008; Bustamante et al., 2014; Kibria, 2015; Lamb et al., 2016; Dooley and Kartha, 2018										Kibria, 2015					Zomer et al., 2008; Bustamante et al., 2014; IPCC, 2014; Kibria, 2015; Lamb et al., 2016; Epstein and Theuer, 2017; Dooley and Kartha, 2018				

Environement-Other (continued)

		6					12					14					15				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Forest	Behavioural Response (Responsible Sourcing)	**Water Efficiency and Pollution Prevention (6.3/6.4/6.6)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-1] 📖 ☺☺ ★★ 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 provide freshwater supplies. van Oel and Hoekstra, 2012; Launiainen et al., 2014; Hontelez, 2016					**Ensure Sustainable Production Patterns (12.3)** ↑ [+1] 📖 ☺ ★ At local levels, forest certification programmes and practicing sustainable forest management provide the provision of raw materials for a 'low ecological footprint' economy. Hontelez, 2016					[0] No direct interaction					**Sustainability and Conservation (15.1/15.2/15.3)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-1] 📖 ☺ ★ 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 help in biodiversity protection. Bartley, 2010; Hontelez, 2016				
Oceans	Ocean Iron Fertilization	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**Nutrient Pollution, Ocean Acidification, Fish Stocks, MPAs, SISD (14.1/14.3/14.4/14.5/14.7)** ↑ / ↓ [+1,-2] 📖📖📖 ☺☺ ★ OIF could exacerbate or reduce nutrient pollution, increase the likelihood of mid-water deoxygenation, increase ocean acidification, might contribute to the rebuilding of fish stocks in producing plankton, therefore generating benefits for SISD, but might also be in conflict with designing MPAs. Gnanadesikan et al., 2003; Jin and Gruber, 2003; Denman, 2008; Lampitt et al., 2008; Smetacek and Naqvi, 2008; Güssow et al., 2010; Oschlies et al., 2010; Trick et al., 2010; Williamson et al., 2012					[0] No direct interaction				
Oceans	Blue Carbon	**Integrated Water Resources Management (6.3/6.5)** ↑ [+2] 📖 ☺ ★ Development of blue carbon resources (coastal and marine vegetated ecosystems) can lead to coordinated management of water in coastal areas. Vierros et al., 2015					[0] No direct interaction					**Ocean Acidification, Nutrient Pollution (14.3/14.1)** ↑ / ~ [+2,0] 📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ Mangroves could buffer acidification in their immediate vicinity; seaweeds have not been able to mitigate the effect on ocean foraminifera. Pettit et al., 2015; Sippo et al., 2016					**Conservation of Biodiversity and Restoration of Land (15.1/15.2/15.3/15.4/15.9)** ↑ [+3] 📖 ☺☺☺☺ ★★★★ 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. Alongi, 2012; Potouroglou et al., 2017				
Oceans	Enhanced Weathering	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					**Ocean Acidification, Nutrient Pollution (14.3/14.1)** ↑ / ↓ [+2,-1] 📖📖📖 ☺☺☺ ★★★ 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 ." However, marine biology would also be affected, in particular if spreading olivine is used, which works like ocean (iron) fertilization. Köhler et al., 2010, 2013; Hartmann et al., 2013; Paquay and Zeebe, 2013; P. Smith et al., 2016a; Taylor et al., 2016					**Protect Inland Freshwater Systems (14.1)** ↓ [-2] 📖 ☺ ★ 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). Hartmann et al., 2013				

Economic-Demand

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Industry	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Energy Savings (7.1/7.3/7.a/7.b)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★
		Energy efficiency leads to reduced 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 maintenance culture, switching off idle equipment helps in saving energy (e.g Ghana).				
		Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Chakravarty et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014; Karner et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2015; Li et al., 2016; Fernando et al., 2017; Wesseling et al., 2017				
	Low-Carbon Fuel Switch	**Sustainable and Modern (7.2/7.a)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☻	★
		Industries are becoming suppliers of energy, waste heat, water and roof tops used for solar energy generation, and therefore helping to reduce primary energy demand. CHP in chemical industries can help in providing surplus power in the grid.				
		Karner et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2018				
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	**Affordable and Sustainable Energy Sources**	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★
		CCS for EPIs can be incremental, but need additional space and can need additional energy, sometimes compensating for higher efficiency. For example, recirculating blast R furnace and CCS for iron steel means high energy demand; electric melting in glass can mean higher electricity prices; in the paper industry, new separation and drying technologies are key to reducing the energy intensity, allowing for carbon neutral operation in the future; bio-refineries can reduce petro-refineries; DRI in iron and steel with H2 encourages innovation in hydrogen infrastructure; and the chemicals industry also encourage renewable electricity and hydrogen as bio-based polymers can increase biomass price.				
		Griffin et al., 2017; Wesseling et al., 2017				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Industry	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**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 managing energy efficiency opens up opportunities in energy service delivery sector.				
		Altieri et al., 2016; Fernando et al., 2017; Johansson and Thollander, 2018				
	Low-Carbon Fuel Switch	**Economic Growth with Decent Employment (8.1/8.2/8.3/8.4)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		The circular economy instead of linear global economy can achieve climate goals and can help in economic growth through industrialization, which saves on resources and the environment and supports small, medium and even large industries, which can lead to employment generation. So new regulations, incentives and a revised tax regime can help in achieving the goal.				
		Stahel, 2013, 2017; Liu et al., 2014; Leider et al., 2015; Supino et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2017				
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	**Decouple Growth from Environmental Degradation (8.1/8.2/8.4)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★
		EPI s are important players for economic growth. Deep decarbonization of EPIs through radical innovation is consistent with well-below 2°C scenarios.				
		Denis-Ryan et al., 2016; Åhman et al., 2017; Wesseling et al., 2017				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Industry	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Infrastructure Renewal (9.1/9.3/9.5/9.a)**	↑	[+1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★
		Transitioning to a more renewables-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. At the same time, infrastructure upgrades in other parts of the economy, such as modernized telecommunications 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).				
		Riahi et al., 2012; Apeaning and Thollander, 2013; Goldthau, 2014; Bhattacharyya et al., 2016; Meltzer, 2016; McCollum et al., 2018				
	Low-Carbon Fuel Switch	**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.3/9.4/9.5/9.a)**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		A circular economy instead of linear global economy is helping new innovation, and infrastructure can achieve climate goals and can help in economic growth through industrialization which saves on resources and the environment and supports small, medium and even large industries, which can lead to employment generation. So new regulations, incentives and revised tax regime can help in achieving the goal.				
		Stahel, 2013, 2017; Liu et al., 2014; Leider et al., 2015; Supino et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2017				
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		Deep decarbonization through radical technological change in EPI will lead to radical innovations, for example, in completely changing industries' innovation strategies, plants and equipment, skills, production techniques, design, etc. Radical CCS will need new infrastructure to transport CO_2.				
		Denis-Ryan et al., 2016; Åhman et al., 2017; Wesseling et al., 2017; Griffin et al., 2018				

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Industry	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	**Sustainable Cities (15.6/15.8/15.9)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☻	★
		Industries are becoming suppliers of energy, waste heat and water to neighbourial human settlements, and therefore there is a reduced primary energy demand, which also makes towns and cities grow sustainably.				
		Karner et al., 2015				
	Low-Carbon Fuel Switch	**Sustainable Cities (15.6/15.8/15.9)**	↑	[+2]	📖	☻	★
		Industries are becoming suppliers of energy, waste heat, water and roof tops used for solar energy generation, and supply to neighbourial human settlements, therefore reducing primary energy demand, which also makes towns and cities grow sustainably.				
		Karner et al., 2015				
	Decarbonization/CCS/CCU	[0]				
		No direct interaction				

Economic-Demand (continued)

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
		Saving Energy, Improvement in Energy Efficiency (7.3/7.a/7.b)					**Progressively Improve Resource Efficiency (8.4), Employment Opportunities (8.2/8.3/8.5/8.6)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**					**Sustainable Cities (15.6/15.8/15.9)**				
Buildings	**Behavioural Response**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★
		Lifestyle change measures and adoption behaviour 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 effects unless managed appropriately or accounted for welfare improvement. Adjusting thermostats helps in saving energy. Uptake of energy efficient appliances by households with an introduction to appliance standards, training, promotional material dissemination and the desire to save on energy bills are helping to change acquisition behaviour.					Behavioural change programmes help in sustaining energy savings through new infrastructure developments.					Adoption of smart meters and smart grids following community-based social marketing help with infrastructure expansion. People are adopting solar rooftops, white roof/vertical garden/green roofs at much faster rates due to new innovations and regulations.					Behavioural change programmes help in making cities more sustainable.				
		Chakravarty et al., 2013; Gyamfi et al., 2013; Hori et al., 2013; Huebner et al., 2013; Jain et al., 2013; Sweeney et al., 2013; Webb et al., 2013; Yue et al., 2013; Anda and Temmen, 2014; Allen et al., 2015; Noonan et al., 2015; de Koning et al., 2016; Isenhour and Feng, 2016; Santarius et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; van Sluisveld et al., 2016; Sommerfeld et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2017; Roy et al., 2018					Anda and Temmen, 2014					Anda and Temmen, 2014; Roy et al., 2018					Anda and Temmen, 2014; Roy et al., 2018				
		Increase in Energy Savings (7.3)					**Employment Opportunities (8.2/8.3/8.5/8.6)/Strong Financial Institutions (8.10)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**					**Urban Environmental Sustainability (11.3/11.6/11.b/11.c)**				
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★
		There is high agreement among researchers based on a great deal of evidence across various countries that energy efficiency improvement reduces energy consumption and therefore leads to energy savings (e.g., efficient stoves save bioenergy). Countries with higher hours of use due to higher ambient temperatures or more carbon intensive electricity grids benefit more from available improvements in energy efficiency and use of refrigerant transition.					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).					Adoption of smart meters and smart grids following community-based social marketing help in infrastructure expansion. Statutory norms to enhance energy and resource efficiency in buildings is encouraging green building projects.					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.				
		McLeod et al., 2013; Noris et al., 2013; Bhojvaid et al., 2014; Holopainen et al., 2014; Kwong et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2014; Cameron et al., 2015; Liddell and Guiney, 2015; Shah et al., 2015; Berrueta et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2017; Salvalai et al., 2017					Babiker and Eckaus, 2007; Fankhauser and Tepic, 2007; Gohin, 2008; Frondel et al., 2010; Dinkelman, 2011; Guivarch et al., 2011; Jackson and Senker, 2011; Borenstein, 2012; Creutzig et al., 2013; Blyth et al., 2014; Clarke et al., 2014; Dechezleprêtre and Sato, 2014; Bertram et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2015; IRENA, 2016; A. Smith et al., 2016; Berrueta et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Anda and Temmen, 2014; Roy et al., 2018					Creutzig et al., 2012; Kahn Ribeiro et al., 2012; Riahi et al., 2012; Bongardt et al., 2013; Grubler and Fisk, 2013; Raji et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018				

Economic-Demand (continued)

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
		Meeting Energy Demand					**Sustainable Economic Growth and Employment**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**					**Housing (11.1)**				
Buildings	**Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+3]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★
		Renewable energies could potentially serve as the main source to meet energy demand in rapidly growing developing country cities. Ali et al. (2015) estimated the potential of solar, wind and biomass renewable energy options to meet part of the electricity demand in Karachi, Pakistan.					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).					Adoption of smart meters and smart grids following community-based social marketing help in infrastructure expansion. Statutory norms to enhance energy and resource efficiency in buildings is encouraging green building projects. Introduction of incentives and norms for solar rooftops/white/green roofs in cities are helping to accelerate innovation and the expansion of infrastructure.					Ensuring access to basic housing services implies that households have access to modern energy forms. (Quote from McCollum et al., 2018) Solar roof tops 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.				
		Li et al., 2013; Peng and Lu, 2013; Pietzcker, 2013; Pode, 2013; Yanine and Sauma, 2013; Zulu and Richardson, 2013; Connolly et al., 2014; Creutzig et al., 2014; Pietzcker et al., 2014; Ali et al., 2015; O'Mahony and Dufour, 2015; Abanda et al., 2016; Mittlefehldt, 2016; Biligii et al., 2017; Byravan et al., 2017; Islar et al., 2017; Ozturk et al., 2017					Grogan and Sadanand, 2013; Pueyo et al., 2013; Rao et al., 2013; Chakravorty et al., 2014; Creutzig et al., 2014; Ali et al., 2015; Bernard and Torero, 2015; Byravan et al., 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Roy et al., 2018; Anda and Temmen, 2014					Bhattacharyya et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; UN, 2016; McCollum et al., 2018; Roy et al., 2018				
		Energy Savings (7.3/7.a/7.b)					**Promote Sustained, Inclusive Economic Growth (8.3)**					**Build Resilient Infrastructure (9.1)**					**Make Cities and Human Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient**				
Transport	**Behavioural Response**	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↓	[-2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★
		Behavioural responses will reduce the volume of transport needs and, by extension, energy demand.					Policy contradictions (e.g., standards, efficient technologies leading to increased electricity prices leading the poor to switch away from clean(er) fuels) and unintended outcomes (e.g., redistribution of income generated by carbon taxes) results in contradictions of the primary aims of (productive) job creation and poverty alleviation, and in trade-offs between mitigation, adaptation and development policies. Detailed assessments of mitigation policies consequences 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.					As people prefer more mass transportation – train lines, tram lines, BRTs, gondola lift systems, bicycle-sharing systems and hybrid buses – and telecommuting, the need for new infrastructure increases.					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.				
		Figueroa and Ribeiro, 2013; Ahmad and Puppim de Oliveira, 2016					Lucas and Pangbourne, 2014; Suckall et al., 2014; Klausbruckner et al., 2016					Dulac, 2013; Aamaas and Peters, 2017; Martínez-Jaramillo et al., 2017; Xylia and Silveira, 2017					Ahmad and Puppim de Oliveira, 2016; Hallegatte et al., 2016a				
		Energy Savings (7.3/7.a/7.b)					**Promote Sustained, Inclusive Economic Growth (8.3)**					**Build Resilient Infrastructure (9.1)**					**Make Cities Sustainable (11.2/11.3)**				
	Accelerating Energy Efficiency Improvement	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★
		Accelerating efficiency in tourism transport reduces energy demand (China).					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.					Combining promotion of mass transportation – train lines, tram lines, BRTs, gondola lift systems, bicycle-sharing systems and hybrid buses – and telecommuting reduces traffic and significantly contributes to meeting climate targets. A comprehensive package of complementary mitigation options is necessary for deep and sustained emissions reductions. In Sweden, a public bus fleet is aiming more towards decarbonization than efficiency.					The two most important elements of making cities sustainable are efficient buildings and transport (e.g., Macau).				
		Shukxin et al., 2016					Gouldson et al., 2015; Karkatsoulis et al., 2016					Dulac, 2013; Aamaas and Peters, 2017; Martínez-Jaramillo et al., 2017; Xylia and Silveira, 2017					Song et al., 2016				
		Increase Share of Renewable (7.2)					**Promote Sustained, Inclusive Economic Growth (8.3)**					**Help Building Inclusive Infrastructure (9.1/9.a)**					**Make Cities and Human Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient**				
	Improved Access and Fuel Switch to Modern Low-carbon Energy	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★
		Biofuel increases share of the 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, it is important to consider the results 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 trolley buses, metros, trams and electro buses, as well as promote walking and biking, especially for short distances, need consideration.					The decarbonization of the freight sector tends to occur in the second part of the century, and the sector decarbonizes by a lower extent than the rest of the economy. Decarbonizing road freight on a global scale remains a challenge even when notable progress in biofuels and electric vehicles has been accounted for.					Lack of appropriate infrastructure leads to limited access to jobs for the urban poor (Africa, Latin America, India).					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 and plug-in electric vehicles, there is the emergence of new concepts in transportation, such as electric highways.				
		Ajanovic, 2015; Månsson, 2016; Alahakoon, 2017; Wolfram et al., 2017					IPCC, 2014; Creutzig et al., 2015; Carrara and Longden, 2017					Figueroa et al., 2013; Gouldson et al., 2015; Vasconcellos and Mendonça, 2016; Lall et al., 2017					Figueroa et al., 2013; Gouldson et al., 2015; Vasconcellos and Mendonça, 2016; Alahakoon, 2017				

Economic-Supply

		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
		Sustainable and Modern Energy (7.2/7.a)					**Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4)**					**Inclusive and Sustainable Industrialization (9.2/9.4)**					**Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (11.5)**				
Replacing Coal	**Non-biomass Renewables - solar, wind, hydro**	↑	[+3]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★★	~	[0]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	~ / ↓	[0,-1]	📖📖	☺☺☺	★★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺	★★★
		Decarbonization of the energy system through an upscaling 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 upscaling 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 upscaling 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).				
		Rogelj et al., 2013; Cherian, 2015; Jingura and Kamusoko, 2016					Jackson and Senker, 2011; Bonan et al., 2014; Clarke et al., 2014; NCE, 2014; OECD, 2017; York and McGee, 2017; McCollum et al., 2018					Fankhaeser et al., 2008; McCollum et al., 2008; Guivarch et al., 2011; Bertram et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2015					Tully, 2006; Riahi et al., 2012; Daut et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014; Hallegatte et al., 2016b; McCollum et al., 2018				
		Sustainable and Modern Energy (7.2/7.a)					**Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**									
	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 upscaling 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				
		Rogelj et al., 2013; Cherian, 2015; Jingura and Kamusoko, 2016					Jingura and Kamusoko, 2016					Jingura and Kamusoko, 2016; Shahbaz et al., 2016									
		Sustainable and Modern Energy (7.2/7.a)					**Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**									
	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.					Legacy cost of waste and abandoned reactors.					No direct interaction				
		IPCC, 2014					IPCC, 2014					Marra and Palmer, 2011; Greenberg et al., 2013; Schwenk-Ferrero, 2013; Skipperud et al., 2013; Tyler et al., 2013; IPCC, 2014									
		Sustainable and Modern Energy (7.2/7.a)					**Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**									
	CCS: Bioenergy	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★		[0]			
		Increased use of modern biomass will facilitate access to clean, affordable and reliable energy.					See positive impacts of bioenergy use.					See positive impacts of bioenergy use and CCS/CCU in industrial demand.					No direct interaction				
		IPCC, 2014																			
		Ensure energy access and promote investment in new technologies (7.1/7.b)					**Innovation and Growth (8.1/8.2/8.4)**					**Innovation and New Infrastructure (9.2/9.4/9.5)**									
Advanced Coal	**CCS: Fossil**	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↓	[-1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★		[0]			
		Advanced and cleaner fossil fuel technology is in line with the targets of SDG7.					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, 2014					IPCC, 2005, 2014; Benson and Cole, 2008; Fankhaeser et al., 2008; Vergragt et al., 2011; Markusson et al., 2012; Shackley and Thompson, 2012; Bertram et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2015														

Economic-Other

		7					8					9					11				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Agriculture and Livestock	Behavioural Response: Sustainable Healthy Diets and Reduced Food Waste	**Energy Efficiency, Universal Access (7.1/7.3)**					**Sustained and Inclusive Economic Growth (8.2)**					**Infrastructure Building and Promotion of Inclusive Industrialization (9.1/9.2)**									
		↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]			
		Reducing global food supply chain losses have several important secondary benefits like conserving energy.					23–24% of total cropland and fertilizers are used to produce losses. So reduction in food losses will help to diversify these valuable resources into other productive activities.					By targeting infrastructure, processing and distribution losses, wastage in food systems can be minimized. 23–24% of total cropland and fertilizers are used to produce losses. So reduction in food losses will help to diversify these valuable resources into other productive activities.					No interaction				
		Kummu et al., 2012					Kummu et al., 2012; Hiç et al., 2016					Ingram, 2011; Beddington et al., 2012; Kummu et al., 2012; Hiç et al., 2016; Lamb et al., 2016									
	Land-based Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Soil Carbon Sequestration	**Sustainable and Modern Energy (7.b)**					**Sustainable Growth (8.2)**					**Infrastructure Building, Promotion of Inclusive Industrialization and Innovation (9.1/9.2/9.5/9.b)**									
		↑	[+1]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-1]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	↑ / ↓	[+2,-2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]			
		Conventional agricultural biotechnology methods such as energy efficient farming can help in sequestration of soil carbon. Modern biotechnologies such as green energy and N-efficient GM crops can also help in C-sequestration. Biotech crops allow farmers to use less – and environmentally friendly – energy and practice soil carbon sequestration. Biofuels, both from traditional and GMO crops, such as sugar cane, oilseed, rapeseed and jatropha, can be produced. Green energy programmes through plantations of perennial nonedible oilseed producing plants and production of biodiesel for direct use in the energy sector or blending biofuels with fossil fuels in certain proportions can thereby minimize fossil fuel use. (Quoted from Lakshmi et al., 2015) GM crops reduce demand for fossil fuel-based inputs.					Many developing countries including Gulf States will benefit from CSA given the central role of agriculture in their economic and social development. (Quoted from Behnassi et al. 2014). Low commodity prices have reduced the incentive to invest in yield growth and have led to declining farm labour and farm capital investment. (Quoted from Lamb et al., 2016)					Reduced research support and delayed industrialization will have an adverse effect on food security and nourishment of children. Organic farming technologies utilizing bio-based fertilizers (composted human and animal manure) are some of the conventional biotechnological options for reducing artificial fertilizer use (Lakshmi et al., 2015). CSA requires huge financial investment and institutional innovation. CSA is committed to new ways of engaging in participatory research and partnerships with producers (Steenwerth et al., 2014). Technologies used on-farm and during food processing to increase productivity which also helps in adaptation and/or mitigation are new, so convincing potential customers is difficult. Also, low-awareness of CSA, inaccessible language, high costs, lack of verified impact of technologies, hard to reach and train farmers, low consumer demand and unequal distribution of costs/benefits across supply chains are barriers to CSA technology adoption (Long et al., 2016). Low commodity prices have reduced the incentive to invest in yield growth and have led to declining investment in research and development (Lamb et al.,					no direct interaction				
		Johnson et al., 2007; Sarin et al., 2007; Treasury, 2009; Jain and Sharma, 2010; Lybbert and Sumner, 2010; Mtui, 2011; Lakshmi et al., 2015					Behnassi et al., 2014; Lamb et al., 2016					Evenson, 1999; Behnassi et al., 2014; Steenwerth et al., 2014; Lakshmi et al., 2015; Lamb et al., 2016; Long et al., 2016									
	Greenhouse Gas Reduction from Improved Livestock Production and Manure	**Energy Efficiency (7.3)**					**Sustainable Economic Growth (8.4)**					**Technological Upgradation and Innovation (9.2)**									
		↑	[+1]	&	J	«	↑	[+1]	&	J	«	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖	☺☺☺	★★★		[0]			
		Scenarios where zero human-edible concentrate feed is used for livestock, non-renewable energy use is reduced by 36%.					Exploiting the increasingly decoupled interactions between crops and livestock could be beneficial for promoting structural changes in the livestock sector and is a prerequisite for the sustainable growth of the sector. (Quoted from Herrero et al., 2013)					Complete genome maps for poultry and cattle now exist, and these open up the way to possible advances in evolutionary biology, animal breeding and animal models for human diseases. Genomic selection should be able to at least double the rate of genetic gain in the dairy industry. (Quoted from Thornton, 2010) Nanotechnology, biogas technology and separation technologies are disruptive technologies that enhance biogas production from anaerobic digesters or to reduce odours					No direct interaction				
		Schader et al., 2015					Herrero and Thornton, 2013; Herrero et al., 2013					Sansoucy, 1995; Burton, 2007; Thornton, 2010									

Economic-Other (continued)

		7					8					9					11				
		Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence	Interaction	Score	Evidence	Agreement	Confidence
Forest	Reduced Deforestation, REDD+	**Energy Efficiency (7.3)**					**Sustainable Economic Growth (8.4)**					**Infrastructure, Promotion of Inclusive Industrialization (9.1/9.2/9.5)**									
		↑ / ↓	[+1,-1]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	↑ / ↓	[+1,-1]	📖	☺	★	[0]				
		Consider the entire sinks and reservoirs of GHG while developing the nationally appropriate mitigation actions. For countries with a significant contribution of forest degradation (and GHG emissions) from wood fuels, this should be considered. (Quoted from Bastos Lima et al., 2017). Biomass for energy is recognized as often being inefficient, and is often harvested in an unsustainable manner, but is a renewable energy source.					Efforts by the Government of Zambia to reduce emissions by REDD+ have contributed to erosion control, ecotourism and pollination valued at 2.5% of the country's GDP. Partnerships between local forest managers, community enterprises and private sector companies can support local economies and livelihoods, and boost regional and national economic growth.					Expanding road networks are recognized as one of the main drivers of deforesting and forest degradation, diminishing forest benefits to communities, On the other hand, roads can enhance market access, thereby boosting local benefits (SDG 1) from the commercialization of forest products. (Quoted from Katila et al., 2017). Efforts by the Government of Zambia to reduce emissions by REDD+ have contributed to erosion control, ecotourism and pollination valued at 2.5% of the country's GDP					No direct interaction				
		Bastos Lima et al., 2017; Katila et al., 2017					Turpie et al., 2015; Epstein and Theuer, 2017; Katila et al., 2017					Turpie et al., 2015; Epstein and Theuer, 2017; Katila et al., 2017									
	Afforestation and Reforestation	**Energy Conservation (7.3/7.b)**					**Decent Job Creation and Sustainable Economic Growth (8.3/8.4)**										**Improving Air Quality, Green and Public Spaces (11.6/11.7/11.a/11.b)**				
		↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★★	[0]					↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		The US Forest Service estimates that an average NYC street tree (urban afforestation) produces 209 USD in annual benefits, which is primarily driven by aesthetic (90 USD per tree) and energy savings (from shade) benefits (47.63 USD per tree).					Many tree plantations worldwide have higher growth rates which can provide higher rates of returns for investors. Agroforestry initiatives that offer significant opportunities for projects to provide benefits to smallholder farmers can also help address land degradation through community-based efforts in more marginal areas. Mangroves reduce impacts of disasters (cyclones/storms/floods) and enhance water quality, fisheries, tourism businesses and livelihoods.					No direct interaction					Many urban tree plantations worldwide are created with a focus on multiple benefits, like air quality improvement, cultural preference for green nature, healthy community interaction as well as temperature control and biodiversity enhancement goals.				
		Jones and McDermott, 2018					Zomer et al., 2008; Kibria, 2015										Chen and Qi, 2018; Fu et al., 2018; Kowarik, 2018; McKinney and Ingo, 2018; McPherson et al., 2018; Pei et al., 2018				
	Behavioural Response (Responsible Sourcing)	**Universal Access (7.3)**					**Decent Job Creation and Sustainable Economic Growth (8.3/8.4)**					**Technological Upgradation and Innovation, Promotion of Inclusive Industrialization (9.1/9.2/9.5)**					**Improving Air Quality, Green and Public Spaces, Peri-urban Spaces (11.6/11.7/11.a/11.b)**				
		↑	[+1]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖	☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖	☺☺	★	↑	[+2]	📖📖📖📖	☺☺☺☺	★★★★
		The trade of wood pellets from clean wood waste should be facilitated with less administrative import barriers by the EU, in order to have this new option seriously accounted for as a future resource for energy. (Quoted from Sikkema et al., 2014) Recommends further harmonization of legal harvesting, sustainable sourcing and cascaded use requirements for woody biomass for energy with the current requirements of voluntary SFM certification schemes.					Some standards seek primarily to coordinate global trade, many purport to promote ecological sustainability and social justice or to institutionalize CSR, for example, labour standards developed in the wake of sweatshops and child labour scandals. Environmental standards for pollution control, etc. 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 promoting the country as a responsible sourcing location.					Capacity for processing certified timber is often underutilized, due to the limited supply available. As a result, manufacturing firms that are seeking to tap into green markets often turn to other sources of timber. (Quoted from Bartley, 2010) Responsible sourcing, when integrated into business practices, can enable retailers to better manage brand value and reputation by avoiding negative public relations, as well as maintaining and enhancing brand integrity (Huang et al., 2013).					Many urban tree plantations worldwide are created with a focus on multiple benefits, like air quality improvement, cultural preference for green nature, healthy community interaction as well as temperature control and biodiversity enhancement goals. People's preference for urban forest gardens are encouraging new urban green spaces, and tree selection helps in building resilience to disaster.				
		Sikkema et al., 2014					Bartley, 2010					Bartley, 2010; Huang et al., 2013					Chen and Qi, 2018; Fu et al., 2018; Kowarik, 2018; McKinney and Ingo, 2018; McPherson et al., 2018; Pei et al., 2018				
Oceans	Ocean Iron Fertilization	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				
	Blue Carbon	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				
	Enhanced Weathering	[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction					[0] No direct interaction				

References

Note that this reference list does not account for the references in Table 5.2, for which a separate reference list is provided.

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 on 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**, 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, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-50094-2_13.

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, www.ripublication.com/volume/ijaerv11n3.htm.

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, https://journal.gnest.org/sites/default/files/submissions/gnest_02269/gnest_02269_published.pdf.

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:10.1016/j.envsoft.2011.07.012.

Anand, R., 2004: *International environmental justice: A North-South Dimension*. Routledge, London, UK, 161 pp.

Andonova, L.B., T.N. Hale, and C.B. Roger, 2017: National policy and transnational governance of climate change: substitutes or complements? *International Studies Quarterly*, **61(2)**, 253–268, doi:10.1093/isq/sqx014.

Ansuategi, A. et al., 2015: *The impact of climate change on the achievement of the post-2015 sustainable development goals*. Metroeconomica, HR Wallingford and CDKN, 84 pp.

Antwi-Agyei, P., A.J. Dougill, and L.C. Stringer, 2015: Impacts of land tenure arrangements on the adaptive capacity of marginalized groups: The case of Ghana's Ejura Sekyedumase and Bongo districts. *Land Use Policy*, **49**, 203–212, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.08.007.

Antwi-Agyei, P., A. Dougill, and L. Stringer, 2017a: Assessing Coherence between Sector Policies and Climate Compatible Development: Opportunities for Triple Wins. *Sustainability*, **9(11)**, 2130, doi:10.3390/su9112130.

Antwi-Agyei, P., A.J. Dougill, L.C. Stringer, and S.N.A. Codjoe, 2018: Adaptation opportunities and maladaptive outcomes in climate vulnerability hotspots of northern Ghana. *Climate Risk Management*, **19**, 83–93, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2017.11.003.

Antwi-Agyei, P. et al., 2017b: Perceived stressors of climate vulnerability across scales in the Savannah zone of Ghana: a participatory approach. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(1)**, 213–227, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0993-4.

Apgar, M.J., W. Allen, K. Moore, and J. Ataria, 2015: Understanding adaptation and transformation through indigenous practice: the case of the Guna of Panama. *Ecology and Society*, **20(1)**, 45, doi:10.5751/es-07314-200145.

Arakelyan, I., D. Moran, and A. Wreford, 2017: Climate smart agriculture: a critical review. In: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 66–86.

Arbuthnott, K., S. Hajat, C. Heaviside, and S. Vardoulakis, 2016: Changes in population susceptibility to heat and cold over time: assessing adaptation to climate change. *Environmental Health*, **15(S1)**, S33, doi:10.1186/s12940-016-0102-7.

Archer, D. et al., 2014: Moving towards inclusive urban adaptation: approaches to integrating community-based adaptation to climate change at city and national scale. *Climate and Development*, **6(4)**, 345–356, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.918868.

Armitage, D.R., 2015: Social-ecological change in Canada's Arctic: coping, adapting, learning for an uncertain future. In: *Climate Change and the Coast: Building Resilient Communities* [Glavovic, B., M. Kelly, R. Kay, and A. Travers (eds.)]. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, pp. 103–124.

Arnell, N.W. and S.N. Gosling, 2016: The impacts of climate change on river flood risk at the global scale. *Climatic Change*, **134(3)**, 387–401, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1084-5.

Arnell, N.W. et al., 2015: *The global impacts of climate change under pathways that reach 2°, 3° and 4°C above pre-industrial levels*. Report from AVOID2 project to the Committee on Climate Change, 34 pp.

Arriagada, R.A., E.O. Sills, P.J. Ferraro, and S.K. Pattanayak, 2015: Do payments pay off? Evidence from participation in Costa Rica's PES program. *PLOS ONE*, **10(7)**, 1–17, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131544.

Arthurson, K. and S. Baum, 2015: Making space for social inclusion in conceptualising climate change vulnerability. *Local Environment*, **20(1)**, 1–17, doi:10.1080/13549839.2013.818951.

Arts, K., 2017: Inclusive sustainable development: a human rights perspective. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **24**, 58–62, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.02.001.

Atalay, Y., F. Biermann, and A. Kalfagianni, 2016: Adoption of renewable energy technologies in oil-rich countries: explaining policy variation in the Gulf Cooperation Council states. *Renewable Energy*, **85**, 206–214, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2015.06.045.

Ayers, J.M., S. Huq, H. Wright, A.M. Faisal, and S.T. Hussain, 2014: Mainstreaming climate change adaptation into development in Bangladesh. *Climate and Development*, **6(4)**, 293–305, doi:10.1002/wcc.226.

Babiker, M.H., 2016: Options for climate change policy in MENA countries after Paris. Policy Perspective No. 18, The Economic Research Forum (ERF), Giza, Egypt, 7 pp.

Bado, B.V., P. Savadogo, and M.L.S. Manzo, 2016: *Restoration of Degraded Lands in West Africa Sahel: Review of experiences in Burkina Faso and Niger*. CGIAR, 16 pp.

Bai, X. et al., 2016: Plausible and desirable futures in the Anthropocene: A new research agenda. *Global Environmental Change*, **39**, 351–362, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.09.017.

Bai, X. et al., 2018: Six research priorities for cities and climate change. *Nature*, **555**, 23–25, doi:10.1038/d41586-018-02409-z.

Bajželj, B. et al., 2014: Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(10)**, 924–929, doi:10.1038/nclimate2353.

Baldacchino, G., 2017: Seizing history: development and non-climate change in Small Island Developing States. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 10(2), 217–228, doi:10.1108/ijccsm-02-2017-0037.

Banda, M.L. and S. Fulton, 2017: Litigating Climate Change in National Courts: Recent Trends and Developments in Global Climate Law. *Environmental Law Reporter*, **47(10121)**, 10121–10134, www.eli.org/sites/default/files/elr/featuredarticles/47.10121.pdf.

Barnes, P., 2015: The political economy of localization in the transition movement. *Community Development Journal*, **50(2)**, 312–326, doi:10.1093/cdj/bsu042.

Barnett, J. and E. Walters, 2016: Rethinking the Vulnerability of Small Island States: Climate Change and Development in the Pacific Islands. In: *The Palgrave Handbook of International Development* [Grugel, J. and D. Hammett (eds.)]. Palgrave, London, UK, pp. 731–748, doi:10.1057/978-1-137-42724-3_40.

Barnett, J., P. Tschakert, L. Head, and W.N. Adger, 2016: A science of loss. *Nature Climate Change*, **6**, 976–978, doi:10.1038/nclimate3140.

Barnett, J. et al., 2014: A local coastal adaptation pathway. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(12)**, 1103–1108, doi:10.1038/nclimate2383.

Barrett, S., 2013: Local level climate justice? Adaptation finance and vulnerability reduction. *Global Environmental Change*, **23(6)**, 1819–1829, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.07.015.

Barrington-Leigh, C., 2016: Sustainability and Well-Being: A Happy Synergy. *Development*, **59**, 292–298, doi:10.1057/s41301-017-0113-x.

Bartos, M.D. and M. Chester, 2014: The Conservation Nexus: Valuing Interdependent Water and Energy Savings in Arizona. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **48(4)**, 2139–2149, doi:10.1021/es4033343.

Bathiany, S., V. Dakos, M. Scheffer, and T.M. Lenton, 2018: Climate models predict increasing temperature variability in poor countries. *Science Advances*, **4(5)**, eaar5809, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aar5809.

Bauer, N. et al., 2016: Global fossil energy markets and climate change mitigation – an analysis with REMIND. *Climatic Change*, **136(1)**, 69–82, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0901-6.

Bayram, H. and A.B. Öztürk, 2014: Global climate change, desertification, and its consequences in Turkey and the Middle East. In: *Global Climate Change and Public Health* [Pinkerton, K.E. and W.N. Rom (eds.)]. Springer, New York, NY, USA, pp. 293–305, doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-8417-2_17.

Bebbington, J. and C. Larrinaga, 2014: Accounting and sustainable development: an exploration. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, **39(6)**, 395–413, doi:10.1016/j.aos.2014.01.003.

Beilin, R. and C. Wilkinson, 2015: Introduction: Governing for urban resilience. *Urban Studies*, **52(7)**, 1205–1217, doi:10.1177/0042098015574955.

Bell, K., 2015: Can the capitalist economic system deliver environmental justice? *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(12)**, 125017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/125017.

Berger, M., S. Pfister, V. Bach, and M. Finkbeiner, 2015: Saving the planet's climate or water resources? The trade-off between carbon and water footprints of European biofuels. *Sustainability*, **7(6)**, 6665–6683, doi:10.3390/su7066665.

Berner, J. et al., 2016: Adaptation in Arctic circumpolar communities: food and water security in a changing climate. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, **75(1)**, 33820, doi:10.3402/ijch.v75.33820.

Berrueta, V.M., M. Serrano-Medrano, C. Garcia-Bustamante, M. Astier, and O.R. Masera, 2017: Promoting sustainable local development of rural communities and mitigating climate change: the case of Mexico's Patsari improved cookstove project. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 63–77, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1523-y.

Bertram, C. et al., 2018: Targeted policies can compensate most of the increased sustainability risks in 1.5°C mitigation scenarios. *Environmental Research Letters*, **13(6)**, 064038, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aac3ec.

Betts, R.A. et al., 2018: Changes in climate extremes, fresh water availability and vulnerability to food insecurity projected at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming with a higher-resolution global climate model. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160452, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0452.

Betzold, C. and F. Weiler, 2017: Allocation of aid for adaptation to climate change: do vulnerable countries receive more support? *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **17**, 17–36, doi:10.1007/s10784-016-9343-8.

Bexell, M. and K. Jönsson, 2017: Responsibility and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. *Forum for Development Studies*, **44(1)**, 13–29, doi:10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424.

Bickersteth, S. et al., 2017: *Mainstreaming climate compatible development: Insights from CDKN's first seven years*. Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN), London, 199 pp.

Biermann, F. and I. Boas, 2017: Towards a global governance system to protect climate migrants: taking stock. In: *Research Handbook on Climate Change, Migration and the Law* [Mayer, B. and F. Crepeau (eds.)]. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA, pp. 405–419, doi:10.4337/9781785366598.00026.

Biermann, M., K. Hillmer-Pegram, C.N. Knapp, and R.E. Hum, 2016: Approaching a critical turn? A content analysis of the politics of resilience in key bodies of resilience literature. *Resilience*, **4(2)**, 59–78, doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1094170.

Binam, J.N., F. Place, A.A. Djalal, and A. Kalinganire, 2017: Effects of local institutions on the adoption of agroforestry innovations: evidence of farmer managed natural regeneration and its implications for rural livelihoods in the Sahel. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, **5(1)**, 2, doi:10.1186/s40100-017-0072-2.

Blanco, V., C. Brown, S. Holzhauer, G. Vulturius, and M.D.A. Rounsevell, 2017: The importance of socio-ecological system dynamics in understanding adaptation to global change in the forestry sector. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **196**, 36–47, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.02.066.

Blondeel, M. and T. van de Graaf, 2018: Toward a global coal mining moratorium? A comparative analysis of coal mining policies in the USA, China, India and Australia. *Climatic Change*, 1–13, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2135-5.

Blyth, W., R. McCarthy, and R. Gross, 2015: Financing the UK power sector: is the money available? *Energy Policy*, **87**, 607–622, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2015.08.028.

Boke, C., 2015: Resilience's problem of the present: reconciling social justice and future-oriented resilience planning in the Transition Town movement. *Resilience*, **3(3)**, 207–220, doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1072313.

Bonsch, M. et al., 2016: Trade-offs between land and water requirements for large-scale bioenergy production. *GCB Bioenergy*, **8(1)**, 11–24, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12226.

Boonstra, W.J., E. Björkvik, L.J. Haider, and V. Masterson, 2016: Human responses to social-ecological traps. *Sustainability Science*, **11(6)**, 877–889, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0397-x.

Bosomworth, K., P. Leith, A. Harwood, and P.J. Wallis, 2017: What's the problem in adaptation pathways planning? The potential of a diagnostic problem-structuring approach. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **76**, 23–28, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.007.

Bowyer, P., M. Schaller, S. Bender, and D. Jacob, 2015: Adaptation as ClimateRisk Management: Methods and Approaches. In: *Handbook of Climate Change Adaptation* [Filho, L. (ed.)]. Springer, Berlin and Heidelberg, Germany, pp. 71–92, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-38670-1_28.

Boyd, E., R.A. James, R.G. Jones, H.R. Young, and F.E.L. Otto, 2017: A typology of loss and damage perspectives. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(10)**, 723–729, doi:10.1038/nclimate3389.

Boyle, J. et al., 2013: *Exploring Trends in Low-Carbon, Climate-Resilient Development*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), 37 pp.
Boysen, L.R., W. Lucht, and D. Gerten, 2017: Trade-offs for food production, nature conservation and climate limit the terrestrial carbon dioxide removal potential. *Global Change Biology*, **23(10)**, 4303–4317, doi:10.1111/gcb.13745.
Brink, E. et al., 2016: Cascades of green: A review of ecosystem-based adaptation in urban areas. *Global Environmental Change*, **36**, 111–123, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.11.003.
Brockington, D. and S. Ponte, 2015: The Green Economy in the global South: experiences, redistributions and resistance. *Third World Quarterly*, **36(12)**, 2197–2206, doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1086639.
Brohé, A., 2014: Whither the CDM? Investment outcomes and future prospects. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **16(2)**, 305–322, doi:10.1007/s10668-013-9478-5.
Brown, D. and G. McGranahan, 2016: The urban informal economy, local inclusion and achieving a global green transformation. *Habitat International*, **53**, 97–105, doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.11.002.
Brown, E., J. Cloke, D. Gent, P.H. Johnson, and C. Hill, 2014: Green growth or ecological commodification: debating the green economy in the global south. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography*, **96(3)**, 245–259, doi:10.1111/geob.12049.
Bryan, E., Q. Bernier, M. Espinal, and C. Ringler, 2017: Making climate change adaptation programmes in sub-Saharan Africa more gender responsive: insights from implementing organizations on the barriers and opportunities. *Climate and Development*, 1–15, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1301870.
Buch-Hansen, H., 2018: The Prerequisites for a Degrowth Paradigm Shift: Insights from Critical Political Economy. *Ecological Economics*, **146**, 157–163, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.10.021.
Bulkeley, H., G.A.S. Edwards, and S. Fuller, 2014: Contesting climate justice in the city: examining politics and practice in urban climate change experiments. *Global Environmental Change*, **25(1)**, 31–40, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.01.009.
Bulkeley, H., J.A. Carmin, V. Castán Broto, G.A.S. Edwards, and S. Fuller, 2013: Climate justice and global cities: mapping the emerging discourses. *Global Environmental Change*, **23(5)**, 914–925, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.010.
Buntaine, M.T. and L. Prather, 2018: Preferences for Domestic Action Over International Transfers in Global Climate Policy. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1–15, doi:10.1017/xps.2017.34.
Burke, M., S.M. Hsiang, and E. Miguel, 2015: Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*, **527(7577)**, 235–239, doi:10.1038/nature15725.
Burns, W. and S. Nicholson, 2017: Bioenergy and carbon capture with storage (BECCS): the prospects and challenges of an emerging climate policy response. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, **7(4)**, 527–534, doi:10.1007/s13412-017-0445-6.
Bustamante, M. et al., 2014: Co-benefits, trade-offs, barriers and policies for greenhouse gas mitigation in the agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) sector. *Global Change Biology*, **20(10)**, 3270–3290, doi:10.1111/gcb.12591.
Butler, C., K.A. Parkhill, and N.F. Pidgeon, 2016: Energy consumption and everyday life: choice, values and agency through a practice theoretical lens. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, **16(3)**, 887–907, doi:10.1177/1469540514553691.
Butler, J.R.A. et al., 2016: Scenario planning to leap-frog the Sustainable Development Goals: an adaptation pathways approach. *Climate Risk Management*, **12**, 83–99, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2015.11.003.
Butt, N. et al., 2016: Challenges in assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change to inform conservation actions. *Biological Conservation*, **199**, 10–15, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.04.020.
Byers, E.A., J.W. Hall, and J.M. Amezaga, 2014: Electricity generation and cooling water use: UK pathways to 2050. *Global Environmental Change*, **25**, 16–30, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.01.005.
Byers, E.A. et al., 2018: Global exposure and vulnerability to multi-sector development and climate change hotspots. *Environmental Research Letters*, **13(5)**, 055012, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabf45.
Byrne, J. et al., 2016: Could urban greening mitigate suburban thermal inequity?: the role of residents' dispositions and household practices. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 095014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095014.
Byrnes, W.M., 2014: Climate justice, Hurricane Katrina, and African American environmentalism. *Journal of African American Studies*, **18(3)**, 305–314, doi:10.1007/s12111-013-9270-5.
Cabezon, E., L. Hunter, P. Tumbarello, K. Washimi, and Yiqun Wu, 2016: Strengthening Macro-Fiscal Resilience to Natural Disasters and Climate Change in the Small States of the Pacific. In: *Resilience and Growth in the Small States of the Pacific* [Khor, H.E., R.P. Kronenberg, and P. Tumbarello (eds.)]. International Monetary Fund (IMF), Washington DC, USA, pp. 71–94.
Caldecott, B., O. Sartor, and T. Spencer, 2017: *Lessons from previous 'coal transitions': High-level summary for decision-makers*. IDDRI and Climate Strategies, 24 pp.
Callen, T., R. Cherif, F. Hasanov, A. Hegazy, and P. Khandelwal, 2014: Economic Diversification in the GCC: Past, Present, and Future. IMF Staff Discussion Note SDN/14 /12, International Monetary Fund (IMF), 32 pp.
Calliari, E., 2016: Loss and damage: a critical discourse analysis of Parties' positions in climate change negotiations. *Journal of Risk Research*, **9877**, 1–23, doi:10.1080/13669877.2016.1240706.
Calvet-Mir, L., E. Corbera, A. Martin, J. Fisher, and N. Gross-Camp, 2015: Payments for ecosystem services in the tropics: a closer look at effectiveness and equity. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **14**, 150–162, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.06.001.
Calvin, K. et al., 2017: The SSP4: A world of deepening inequality. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 284–296, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.010.
Cameron, C. et al., 2016: Policy trade-offs between climate mitigation and clean cook-stove access in South Asia. *Nature Energy*, **1**, 1–5, doi:10.1038/nenergy.2015.10.
Cameron, R.W.F., J. Taylor, and M. Emmett, 2015: A Hedera green facade – energy performance and saving under different maritime-temperate, winter weather conditions. *Building and Environment*, **92**, 111–121, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.04.011.
Campbell, B.M. et al., 2016: Reducing risks to food security from climate change. *Global Food Security*, **11**, 34–43, doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2016.06.002.
Câmpeanu, C.N. and I. Fazey, 2014: Adaptation and pathways of change and response: a case study from Eastern Europe. *Global Environmental Change*, **28**, 351–367, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.010.
Campiglio, E., 2016: Beyond carbon pricing: The role of banking and monetary policy in financing the transition to a low-carbon economy. *Ecological Economics*, **121**, 220–230, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.03.020.
Carr, E.R. and M.C. Thompson, 2014: Gender and climate change adaptation in agrarian settings. *Geography Compass*, **8(3)**, 182–197, doi:10.1111/gec3.12121.
Carr, E.R. and K.N. Owusu-Daaku, 2015: The shifting epistemologies of vulnerability in climate services for development: The case of Mali's agrometeorological advisory programme. *Area*, 7–17, doi:10.1111/area.12179.
Carr, E.R. and S.N. Onzere, 2018: Really effective (for 15% of the men): Lessons in understanding and addressing user needs in climate services from Mali. *Climate Risk Management*, **22**, 82–95, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2017.03.002.
Carter, T.R. et al., 2016: Characterising vulnerability of the elderly to climate change in the Nordic region. *Regional Environmental Change*, **16(1)**, 43–58, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0688-7.
Castán Broto, V., 2017: Urban Governance and the Politics of Climate change. *World Development*, **93**, 1–15, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.12.031.
Castro, P., 2016: Common but differentiated responsibilities beyond the nation state: how is differential treatment addressed in transnational Climate governance initiatives? *Transnational Environmental Law*, **5(02)**, 379–400, doi:10.1017/s2047102516000224.
Cavanagh, C. and T.A. Benjaminsen, 2014: Virtual nature, violent accumulation: The 'spectacular failure' of carbon offsetting at a Ugandan National Park. *Geoforum*, **56**, 55–65, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.013.
Cervigni, R. and M. Morris (eds.), 2016: *Confronting Drought in Africa's Drylands: Opportunities for Enhancing Resilience*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 299 pp.
Chakrabarti, S. and E.J. Shin, 2017: Automobile dependence and physical inactivity: insights from the California Household Travel Survey. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6**, 262–271, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.002.
Chakravarty, D. and M. Tavoni, 2013: Energy poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation: Is there a trade off? *Energy Economics*, **40**, S67–S73, doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2013.09.022.
Chakravarty, D. and J. Roy, 2016: The Global South: New Estimates and Insights from Urban India. In: *Rethinking Climate and Energy Policies: New Perspectives on the Rebound Phenomenon* [Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and A. Carlo (eds.)]. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 55–72, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38807-6_4.
Chakravarty, D., S. Dasgupta, and J. Roy, 2013: Rebound effect: how much to worry? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 216–228, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.03.001.

Chan, K.M.A., E. Anderson, M. Chapman, K. Jespersen, and P. Olmsted, 2017: Payments for ecosystem services: rife with problems and potential-for transformation towards sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, **140**, 110–122, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.029.

Chancel, L. and T. Picketty, 2015: *Carbon and inequality: from Kyoto to Paris. Trends in the global inequality of carbon emissions (1998–2013) & prospects for an equitable adaptation fund*. Paris School of Economics, Paris, France, 50 pp.

Chapin, F.S., C.N. Knapp, T.J. Brinkman, R. Bronen, and P. Cochran, 2016: Community-empowered adaptation for self-reliance. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **19**, 67–75, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.12.008.

Chaturvedi, V. and P.R. Shukla, 2014: Role of energy efficiency in climate change mitigation policy for India: assessment of co-benefits and opportunities within an integrated assessment modeling framework. *Climatic Change*, **123(3)**, 597–609, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0898-x.

Chelleri, L., G. Minucci, and E. Skrimizea, 2016: Does community resilience decrease social-ecological vulnerability? Adaptation pathways trade-off in the Bolivian Altiplano. *Regional Environmental Change*, **16(8)**, 2229–2241, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1046-8.

Chen, X., X. Liu, and D. Hu, 2015: Assessment of sustainable development: A case study of Wuhan as a pilot city in China. *Ecological Indicators*, **50**, 206–214, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.11.002.

Cheung, W.W.L., G. Reygondeau, and T.L. Frölicher, 2016: Large benefits to marine fisheries of meeting the 1.5°C global warming target. *Science*, **354(6319)**, 1591–1594, doi:10.1126/science.aag2331.

Chief, K., A. Meadow, and K. Whyte, 2016: Engaging southwestern tribes in sustainable water resources topics and management. *Water*, **8(8)**, 1–21, doi:10.3390/w8080350.

Chong, J., 2014: Ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation: progress and challenges. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **14(4)**, 391–405, doi:10.1007/s10784-014-9242-9.

Chu, E., I. Anguelovski, and D. Roberts, 2017: Climate adaptation as strategic urbanism: assessing opportunities and uncertainties for equity and inclusive development in cities. *Cities*, **60**, 378–387, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.10.016.

Chung Tiam Fook, T., 2017: Transformational processes for community-focused adaptation and social change: a synthesis. *Climate and Development*, **9(1),** 5–21, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1086294.

Clarke, L.E. et al., 2014: Assessing transformation pathways. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 413–510.

Clements, R., 2009: *The Economic Cost of Climate Change in Africa*. Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA), 52 pp.

Cobbinah, P.B. and G.K. Anane, 2016: Climate change adaptation in rural Ghana: indigenous perceptions and strategies. *Climate and Development*, **8(2)**, 169–178, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1034228.

Coe, R., F. Sinclair, and E. Barrios, 2014: Scaling up agroforestry requires research 'in' rather than 'for' development. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **6(1)**, 73–77, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.013.

Coe, R., J. Njoloma, and F. Sinclair, 2017: To control or not to control: how do we learn more about how agronomic innovations perform on farms? *Experimental Agriculture*, 1–7, doi:10.1017/s0014479717000102.

Cohen, M.G. (ed.), 2017: *Climate change and gender in rich countries: work, public policy and action*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 322 pp.

Cole, M.J., R.M. Bailey, and M.G. New, 2017: Spatial variability in sustainable development trajectories in South Africa: provincial level safe and just operating spaces. *Sustainability Science*, **12(5)**, 829–848, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0418-9.

Colenbrander, S., D. Dodman, and D. Mitlin, 2017: Using climate finance to advance climate justice: the politics and practice of channelling resources to the local level. *Climate Policy*, 1–14, doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1388212.

Colenbrander, S. et al., 2016: Can low-carbon urban development be pro-poor? The case of Kolkata, India. *Environment and Urbanization*, **29(1)**, 139–158, doi:10.1177/0956247816677775.

Colloff, M.J. et al., 2017: An integrative research framework for enabling transformative adaptation. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **68**, 87–96, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.007.

Conservation International, 2016: *Ecosystem Based Adaptation: Essential for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals*. Conservation International, Arlington, VA, USA, 4 pp.

Conway, D. et al., 2015: Climate and southern Africa's water-energy-food nexus. *Nature Climate Change*, **5(9)**, 837–846, doi:10.1038/nclimate2735.

Corbera, E., C. Hunsberger, and C. Vaddhanaphuti, 2017: Climate change policies, land grabbing and conflict: perspectives from Southeast Asia. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, **38(3)**, 297–304, doi:10.1080/02255189.2017.1343413.

Cretney, R.M., A.C. Thomas, and S. Bond, 2016: Maintaining grassroots activism: Transition Towns in Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*, **72(2)**, 81–91, doi:10.1111/nzg.12114.

Creutzig, F. et al., 2015: Bioenergy and climate change mitigation: an assessment. *GCB Bioenergy*, **7(5)**, 916–944, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12205.

Croce, D., C. Kaminker, and F. Stewart, 2011: he Role of Pension Funds in Financing Green Growth Initiatives. OECD Working Papers on Finance, Insurance and Private Pensions No. 10, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Publishing, Paris, France, doi:10.1787/5kg58j1lwdjd-en.

Crosland, T., A. Meyer, and M. Wewerinke-singh, 2016: The Paris Agreement Implementation Blueprint: a practical guide to bridging the gap between actions and goal and closing the accountability deficit (Part 1). *Environmental liability*, **25(2)**, 114–125, https://ssrn.com/abstract=2952215.

CSO Equity Review, 2015: *Fair Shares: A Civil Society Equity Review of INDCs*. CSO Equity Review Coalition, Manila, London, Cape Town, Washington, et al. 36 pp.

Cugurullo, F., 2013: How to build a sandcastle: an analysis of the genesis and development of Masdar City. *Journal of Urban Technology*, **20(1)**, 23–37, doi:10.1080/10630732.2012.735105.

Cundill, G. et al., 2014: *Social learning for adaptation: a descriptive handbook for practitioners and action researchers*. IRDC, Rhodes University, Ruliv, 118 pp.

Cutter, S.L., 2016: Resilience to What? Resilience for Whom? *Geographical Journal*, **182(2)**, 110–113, doi:10.1111/geoj.12174.

Cvitanovic, C. et al., 2016: Linking adaptation science to action to build food secure Pacific Island communities. *Climate Risk Management*, **11**, 53–62, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2016.01.003.

Daigneault, A., P. Brown, and D. Gawith, 2016: Dredging versus hedging: Comparing hard infrastructure to ecosystem-based adaptation to flooding. *Ecological Economics*, **122**, 25–35, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.11.023.

Dasgupta, P., 2016: *Climate Sensitive Adaptation in Health: Imperatives for India in a Developing Economy Context*. Springer India, 194 pp.

Dasgupta, P., K. Ebi, and I. Sachdeva, 2016: Health sector preparedness for adaptation planning in India. *Climatic Change*, **138(3–4)**, 551–566, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1745-7.

Dasgupta, S., M. Huq, M.G. Mustafa, M.I. Sobhan, and D. Wheeler, 2017: The impact of aquatic salinization on fish habitats and poor communities in a changing climate: evidence from southwest coastal Bangladesh. *Ecological Economics*, **139**, 128–139, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.009.

Datta, N., 2015: Evaluating impacts of watershed development program on agricultural productivity, income, and livelihood in bhalki watershed of Bardhaman District, West Bengal. *World Development*, **66**, 443–456, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.08.024.

Davies, K., 2015: Kastom, climate change and intergenerational democracy: experiences from Vanuatu. In: *Climate change in the Asia-Pacific region* [Leal Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 49–66, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-14938-7_4.

Davies, T.E., N. Pettorelli, W. Cresswill, and I.R. Fazey, 2014: Who are the poor? Measuring wealth inequality to aid understanding of socioeconomic contexts for conservation: a case-study from the Solomon Islands. *Environmental Conservation*, **41(04)**, 357–366, doi:10.1017/s0376892914000058.

de Coninck, H.C. and D. Puig, 2015: Assessing climate change mitigation technology interventions by international institutions. *Climatic Change*, **131(3)**, 417–433, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1344-z.

de Coninck, H.C. and A. Sagar, 2015: Making sense of policy for climate technology development and transfer. *Climate Policy*, **15(1)**, 1–11, doi:10.1080/14693062.2014.953909.

de Coninck, H.C. and A. Sagar, 2017: Technology development and transfer (Article 10). In: *The Paris Agreement on Climate Change* [Klein, D., M.P. Carazo, M. Doelle, J. Bulmer, and A. Higham (eds.)]. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 258–276.

De Stefano, L., J.D. Petersen-Perlman, E.A. Sproles, J. Eynard, and A.T. Wolf, 2017: Assessment of transboundary river basins for potential hydro-political tensions. *Global Environmental Change*, **45**, 35–46, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.04.008.

Dearing, J.A. et al., 2014: Safe and just operating spaces for regional social-ecological systems. *Global Environmental Change*, **28(1)**, 227–238, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.06.012.
Death, C., 2014: The Green Economy in South Africa: Global Discourses and Local Politics. *Politikon*, **41(1)**, 1–22, doi:10.1080/02589346.2014.885668.
Death, C., 2015: Four discourses of the green economy in the global South. *Third World Quarterly*, **36(12)**, 2207–2224, doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1068110.
Death, C., 2016: Green states in Africa: beyond the usual suspects. *Environmental Politics*, **25:1**, 116–135, doi:10.1080/09644016.2015.1074380.
DeCaro, D.A., C. Anthony, T. Arnold, E.F. Boamah, and A.S. Garmestani, 2017: Understanding and applying principles of social cognition and decision making in adaptive environmental governance. *Ecology and Society*, **22(1)**, 33, doi:10.5751/es-09154-220133.
DeClerck, F.A.J. et al., 2016: Agricultural ecosystems and their services: the vanguard of sustainability? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **23**, 92–99, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2016.11.016.
Delponte, I., I. Pittaluga, and C. Schenone, 2017: Monitoring and evaluation of Sustainable Energy Action Plan: practice and perspective. *Energy Policy*, **100**, 9–17, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.10.003.
Dennig, F., M.B. Budolfson, M. Fleurbaey, A. Siebert, and R.H. Socolow, 2015: Inequality, climate impacts on the future poor, and carbon prices. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112(52)**, 15827–15832, doi:10.1073/pnas.1513967112.
Denton, F. et al., 2014: Climate-resilient pathways: adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development. 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 on 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. 1101–1131.
Derbez, M. et al., 2014: Indoor air quality and comfort in seven newly built, energy-efficient houses in France. *Building and Environment*, **72**, 173–187, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.10.017.
Di Gregorio, M. et al., 2017: Climate policy integration in the land use sector: Mitigation, adaptation and sustainable development linkages. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **67**, 35–43, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.004.
Dilling, L., M.E. Daly, W.R. Travis, O. Wilhelmi, and R.A. Klein, 2015: The dynamics of vulnerability: why adapting to climate variability will not always prepare us for climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **6(4)**, 413–425, doi:10.1002/wcc.341.
Ding, H. et al., 2016: *Climate Benefits, Tenure Costs: The Economic Case For Securing Indigenous Land Rights in the Amazon*. World Resources Institute, Washington DC, USA, 98 pp.
Dinku, T. et al., 2014: Bridging critical gaps in climate services and applications in Africa. *Earth Perspectives*, **1(1)**, 15, doi:10.1186/2194-6434-1-15.
Dodman, D., H. Leck, M. Rusca, and S. Colenbrander, 2017: African urbanisation and urbanism: implications for risk accumulation and reduction. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, **26**, 7–15, doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.06.029.
Doswald, N. et al., 2014: Effectiveness of ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation: review of the evidence-base. *Climate and Development*, **6(2)**, 185–201, doi:10.1080/17565529.2013.867247.
Douxchamps, S. et al., 2016: Linking agricultural adaptation strategies, food security and vulnerability: evidence from West Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, **16(5)**, 1305–1317, doi:10.1007/s10113-015-0838-6.
Dovie, D.B.K., M. Dzodzomenyo, and O.A. Ogunseitan, 2017: Sensitivity of health sector indicators' response to climate change in Ghana. *Science of the Total Environment*, **574**, 837–846, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.066.
Dow, K. et al., 2013: Limits to adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, **3(4)**, 305–307, doi:10.1038/nclimate1847.
Dual Citizen LLC, 2016: *The Global Green Economy Index – GGEI 2016: Measuring National Performance in the Green Economy*. Dual Citizen LLC, Washington DC, USA and New York, NY, USA, 58 pp.
Duarte, C.M., J. Wu, X. Xiao, A. Bruhn, and D. Krause-Jensen, 2017: Can Seaweed Farming Play a Role in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation? *Frontiers in Marine Science*, **4**, 100, doi:10.3389/fmars.2017.00100.
Duguma, L.A., P.A. Minang, and M. Van Noordwijk, 2014: Climate change mitigation and adaptation in the land use sector: from complementarity to synergy. *Environmental Management*, **54(3)**, 420–432, doi:10.1007/s00267-014-0331-x.
Dumont, E.S., S. Bonhomme, T.F. Pagella, and F.L. Sinclair, 2017: Structured stakeholder engagement leads to development of more diverse and inclusive agroforestry options. *Experimental Agriculture*, 1–23, doi:10.1017/s0014479716000788.
Eakin, H.C., M.C. Lemos, and D.R. Nelson, 2014: Differentiating capacities as a means to sustainable climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, **27(27)**, 1–8, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.013.
Ebi, K.L. and M. Otmani del Barrio, 2017: Lessons Learned on Health Adaptation to Climate Variability and Change: Experiences Across Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, **125(6)**, 065001, doi:10.1289/ehp405.
Ebi, K.L. et al., 2014: A new scenario framework for climate change research: background, process, and future directions. *Climatic Change*, **122(3)**, 363–372, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0912-3.
Echegaray, F., 2016: Consumers' reactions to product obsolescence in emerging markets: the case of Brazil. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134**, 191–203, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.119.
Ehresman, T.G. and C. Okereke, 2015: Environmental justice and conceptions of the green economy. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **15(1)**, 13–27, doi:10.1007/s10784-014-9265-2.
Ekwurzel, B. et al., 2017: The rise in global atmospheric CO_2, surface temperature, and sea level from emissions traced to major carbon producers. *Climatic Change*, 1–12, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-1978-0.
Enqvist, J., M. Tengö, and W.J. Boonstra, 2016: Against the current: rewiring rigidity trap dynamics in urban water governance through civic engagement. *Sustainability Science*, **11(6)**, 919–933, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0377-1.
Ensor, J., 2016: Adaptation and resilience in Vanuatu: Interpreting community perceptions of vulnerability, knowledge and power for community-based adaptation programming. Report by SEI for Oxfam Australia, Carlton, 32 pp.
Ensor, J. and B. Harvey, 2015: Social learning and climate change adaptation: evidence for international development practice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **6(5)**, 509–522, doi:10.1002/wcc.348.
Entzinger, H. and P. Scholten, 2016: *Adapting to Climate Change through Migration. A case study of the Vietnamese Mekong River Delta*. International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland, 62 pp.
Epule, T.E., J.D. Ford, S. Lwasa, and L. Lepage, 2017: Climate change adaptation in the Sahel. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **75**, 121–137, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.05.018.
Eriksen, S., L.O. Naess, R. Haug, L. Lenaerts, and A. Bhonagiri, 2017: Courting catastrophe? Can humanitarian actions contribute to climate change adaptation? *IDS Bulletin*, **48(4)**, doi:10.19088/1968-2017.149.
Eriksson, H. et al., 2017: The role of fish and fisheries in recovering from natural hazards: lessons learned from Vanuatu. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **76**, 50–58, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.012.
Estrella, M., F.G. Renaud, K. Sudmeier-Rieux, and U. Nehren, 2016: Defining New Pathways for Ecosystem-Based Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation in the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda. In: *Ecosystem-Based Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation in Practice* [Renaud, F.G., K. Sudmeier-Rieux, M. Estrella, and U. Nehren (eds.)]. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 553–591, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-43633-3.
Evans, G. and L. Phelan, 2016: Transition to a post-carbon society: linking environmental justice and just transition discourses. *Energy Policy*, **99**, 329–339, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.05.003.
Evans, J.P., R.B. Smith, and R.J. Oglesby, 2004: Middle East climate simulation and dominant precipitation processes. *International Journal of Climatology*, **24(13)**, 1671–1694, doi:10.1002/joc.1084.
Falcone, P.M., P. Morone, and E. Sica, 2018: Greening of the financial system and fuelling a sustainability transition: a discursive approach to assess landscape pressures on the Italian financial system. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **127**, 23–37, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.05.020.
Fan, Y., Q. Qiao, L. Fang, and Y. Yao, 2017: Energy analysis on industrial symbiosis of an industrial park: a case study of Hefei economic and technological development area. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **141**, 791–798, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.159.
Fankhauser, S. and T.K.J. McDermott, 2014: Understanding the adaptation deficit: Why are poor countries more vulnerable to climate events than rich countries? *Global Environmental Change*, **27**, 9–18, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.014.
Fankhauser, S. and N. Stern, 2016: Climate change, development, poverty and economics. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment Working Paper No. 253, Grantham Research Institute, London, UK, 25 pp.
FAO, 2015: *Adaptation to climate risk and food security: Evidence from smallholder farmers in Ethiopia*. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Rome, Italy, 50 pp.
FAO and NZAGRC, 2017a: *Low emissions development of the beef cattle sector in Uruguay – reducing enteric methane for food security and livelihoods*. Food and

Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre (NZAGRC), Rome, Italy, 34 pp.
FAO and NZAGRC, 2017b: *Supporting low emissions development in the Ethiopian dairy cattle sector – reducing enteric methane for food security and livelihoods*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre (NZAGRC), Rome, Italy, 34 pp.
Fatima, R., A.J. Wadud, and S. Coelho, 2014: *Human Rights, Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Migration: A New Paradigm*. International Organization for Migration and Migration Policy Institute, Bangkok, Thailand and Washington DC, USA, 12 pp.
Fay, M. et al., 2015: *Decarbonizing Development: Three Steps to a Zero-Carbon Future*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 185 pp, doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0479-3.
Fazey, I. et al., 2016: Past and future adaptation pathways. *Climate and Development*, **8(1)**, 26–44, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.989192.
Fazey, I. et al., 2018: Community resilience for a 1.5°C world. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 30–40, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.006.
Feola, G. and R. Nunes, 2014: Success and failure of grassroots innovations for addressing climate change: The case of the Transition Movement. *Global Environmental Change*, **24**, 232–250, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.011.
Ferguson, P., 2015: The green economy agenda: business as usual or transformational discourse? *Environmental Politics*, **24(1)**, 17–37, doi:10.1080/09644016.2014.919748.
Fernandes-Jesus, M., A. Carvalho, L. Fernandes, and S. Bento, 2017: Community engagement in the Transition movement: views and practices in Portuguese initiatives. *Local Environment*, **22(12)**, 1546–1562, doi:10.1080/13549839.2017.1379477.
Few, R., A. Martin, and N. Gross-Camp, 2017: Trade-offs in linking adaptation and mitigation in the forests of the Congo Basin. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(3)**, 851–863, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1080-6.
Ficklin, L., L.C. Stringer, A.J. Dougill, and S.M. Sallu, 2018: Climate compatible development reconsidered: calling for a critical perspective. *Climate and Development*, **10(3)**, 193–196, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1372260.
Field, C.B. et al., 2014: Technical Summary. 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 on 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. 35–94.
Filho, L. and J. Nalau (eds.), 2018: *Limits to climate change adaptation*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, 410 pp., doi:10.1007/978-3-319-64599-5.
Fincher, R., J. Barnett, S. Graham, and A. Hurlimann, 2014: Time stories: making sense of futures in anticipation of sea-level rise. *Geoforum*, **56**, 201–210, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.07.010.
Fleurbaey, M. et al., 2014: Sustainable development and equity. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 283–350.
Ford, J.D. et al., 2016: Community-based adaptation research in the Canadian Arctic. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(2)**, 175–191, doi:10.1002/wcc.376.
Francis, R., P. Weston, and J. Birch, 2015: *The social, environmental and economics benefits of Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR)*. World Vision Australia, Melbourne, Australia, 44 pp.
Frank, S. et al., 2017: Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture without compromising food security? *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(10)**, 105004, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa8c83.
Fricko, O. et al., 2016: Energy sector water use implications of a 2°C degree climate policy. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(3)**, 034011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034011.
Frumhoff, P.C., R. Heede, and N. Oreskes, 2015: The climate responsibilities of industrial carbon producers. *Climatic Change*, **132(2)**, 157–171, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1472-5.
Fuchs, D. et al., 2016: Power: the missing element in sustainable consumption and absolute reductions research and action. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **132**, 298–307, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.006.
Fuglestvedt, J.S. and S. Kallbekken, 2016: Climate responsibility: fair shares? *Nature Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 19–20, doi:10.1038/nclimate2791.
Fuhr, H., T. Hickmann, and K. Kern, 2018: The role of cities in multi-level climate governance: local climate policies and the 1.5°C target. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 1–6, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.10.006.
Fujimori, S., N. Hanasaki, and T. Masui, 2017a: Projections of industrial water withdrawal under shared socioeconomic pathways and climate mitigation scenarios. *Sustainability Science*, **12**, 275–292, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0392-2.
Fujimori, S. et al., 2017b: SSP3: AIM implementation of Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 268–283, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.009.
Fukuda-Parr, S., A.E. Yamin, and J. Greenstein, 2014: The power of numbers: a critical review of Millennium Development Goal targets for human development and human rights. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, **15(2–3)**, 105–117, doi:10.1080/19452829.2013.864622.
Fuller, R. and J. Lain, 2017: *Building Resilience: A meta-analysis of Oxfam's resilience*. Oxfam Effectiveness Reviews, Oxfam, 35 pp.
Gajjar, S.P., C. Singh, and T. Deshpande, 2018: Tracing back to move ahead: a review of development pathways that constrain adaptation futures. *Climate and Development*, 1–15, doi:10.1080/17565529.2018.1442793.
Galgóczi, B., 2014: The Long and Winding Road from Black to Green: Decades of Structural Change in the Ruhr Region. *International Journal of Labour Research*, **6(2)**, 217–240, www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---actrav/documents/publication/wcms_375223.pdf.
Garg, A., P. Mohan, S. Shukla, B. Kankal, and S.S. Vishwanathan, 2017: *High impact opportunities for energy efficiency in India*. UNEP DTU Partnerhsip, Copenhagen, Denmark, 49 pp.
Gebrehaweria, G., A. Dereje Assefa, G. Girmay, M. Giordano, and L. Simon, 2016: An assessment of integrated watershed management in Ethiopia. IWMI Working Paper 170, International Water Management Institute (IWMI), Colombo, Sri Lanka, 28 pp., doi:10.5337/2016.214.
Georgeson, L., M. Maslin, and M. Poessinouw, 2017a: Global disparity in the supply of commercial weather and climate information services. *Science Advances*, **3**, e1602632, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1602632.
Georgeson, L., M. Maslin, and M. Poessinouw, 2017b: The global green economy: a review of concepts, definitions, measurement methodologies and their interactions. *Geo: Geography and Environment*, **4(1)**, e00036, doi:10.1002/geo2.36.
Gero, A. et al., 2013: *Understanding the Pacific's adaptive capacity to emergencies in the context of climate change: Country Report – Vanuatu*. Report prepared for NCCARF by the Institute for Sustainable Futures, and WHO Collaborating Centre, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia, 36 pp.
Gillard, R., A. Gouldson, J. Paavola, and J. Van Alstine, 2016: Transformational responses to climate change: beyond a systems perspective of social change in mitigation and adaptation. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(2)**, 251–265, doi:10.1002/wcc.384.
Gillingham, K., D. Rapson, and G. Wagner, 2016: The rebound effect and energy efficiency policy. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, **10(1)**, 68–88, doi:10.1093/reep/rev017.
Giwa, A., A. Alabi, A. Yusuf, and T. Olukan, 2017: A comprehensive review on biomass and solar energy for sustainable energy generation in Nigeria. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **69,** 620–641, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.160.
Glazebrook, G. and P. Newman, 2018: The City of the Future. *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 1–20, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1247.
Godfrey-Wood, R. and L.O. Naess, 2016: Adapting to Climate Change: Transforming Development? *IDS Bulletin*, **47(2)**, 49–62, doi:10.19088/1968-2016.131.
Gomez-Echeverri, L., 2018: Climate and development: enhancing impact through stronger linkages in the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160444, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0444.
Gorddard, R., M.J. Colloff, R.M. Wise, D. Ware, and M. Dunlop, 2016: Values, rules and knowledge: Adaptation as change in the decision context. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **57**, 60–69, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.004.
Gore, C., 2015: Climate Change Adaptation and African Cities: Understanding the Impact of Government and Governance on Future Action. In: *The Urban Climate Challenge: Rethinking the Role of Cities in the Global Climate Regime* [Johnson, C., N. Toly, and H. Schroeder (eds.)]. Routledge, New York, NY, USA and London, UK, pp. 205–226.
Government of Kiribati, 2016: *Kiribati development plan 2016–19*. Government of Kiribati, 75 pp.

Granderson, A.A., 2017: Value conflicts and the politics of risk: challenges in assessing climate change impacts and risk priorities in rural Vanuatu. *Climate and Development*, 1–14, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1318743.
Grantham, R.W. and M.A. Rudd, 2017: Household susceptibility to hydrological change in the Lower Mekong Basin. *Natural Resources Forum*, **41(1)**, 3–17, doi:10.1111/1477-8947.12113.
Gray, E., N. Henninger, C. Reij, R. Winterbottom, and P. Agostini, 2016: *Integrated landscape approaches for Africa's drylands*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 184 pp., doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0826-5.
Green, F., 2018: Anti-fossil fuel norms. *Climatic Change*, 1–14, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2134-6.
Griffiths, S., 2017a: A review and assessment of energy policy in the Middle East and North Africa region. *Energy Policy*, **102**, 249–269, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.12.023.
Griffiths, S., 2017b: Renewable energy policy trends and recommendations for GCC countries. *Energy Transitions*, **1(1)**, 3, doi:10.1007/s41825-017-0003-6.
Grill, G. et al., 2015: An index-based framework for assessing patterns and trends in river fragmentation and flow regulation by global dams at multiple scales. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(1)**, 015001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/1/015001.
Grist, N. et al., 2017: Framing innovations for climate resilience for farmers in Sahel. *Resilience Intel*, **9**, 20, www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11647.pdf.
Grossmann, M. and E. Creamer, 2017: Assessing diversity and inclusivity within the Transition Movement: an urban case study. *Environmental Politics*, **26(1)**, 161–182, doi:10.1080/09644016.2016.1232522.
Grubert, E.A., A.S. Stillwell, and M.E. Webber, 2014: Where does solar-aided seawater desalination make sense? A method for identifying sustainable sites. *Desalination*, **339**, 10–17, doi:10.1016/j.desal.2014.02.004.
Grubler, A. et al., 2018: A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5°C target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nature Energy*, **3(6)**, 515–527, doi:10.1038/s41560-018-0172-6.
Gupta, J. and K. Arts, 2017: Achieving the 1.5°C objective: just implementation through a right to (sustainable) development approach. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9376-7.
Gupta, J. and N. Pouw, 2017: Towards a trans-disciplinary conceptualization of inclusive development. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **24**, 96–103, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.03.004.
Gustafson, S. et al., 2017: Merging science into community adaptation planning processes: a cross-site comparison of four distinct areas of the Lower Mekong Basin. *Climatic Change*, 1–16, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1887-7.
Gwimbi, P., 2017: Mainstreaming national adaptation programmes of action into national development plans in Lesotho: lessons and needs. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **9(3)**, 299–315, doi:10.1108/ijccsm-11-2015-0164.
Hackmann, B., 2016: Regime learning in global environmental governance. *Environmental Values*, **25(6)**, 663–686, doi:10.3197/096327116x14736981715625.
Haider, L.J., W.J. Boonstra, G.D. Peterson, and M. Schlüter, 2018: Traps and Sustainable Development in Rural Areas: A Review. *World Development*, **101(2013)**, 311–321, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.038.
Hajer, M. et al., 2015: Beyond cockpit-ism: Four insights to enhance the transformative potential of the sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, **7(2)**, doi:10.3390/su7021651.
Hale, T., 2016: "All Hands on Deck": The Paris Agreement and Nonstate Climate Action. *Global Environmental Politics*, **16(3)**, 12–22, doi:10.1162/glep_a_00362.
Hallegatte, S. and J. Rozenberg, 2017: Climate change through a poverty lens. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(4)**, 250–256, doi:10.1038/nclimate3253.
Hallegatte, S. et al., 2014: Climate Change and Poverty – An Analytical Framework. WPS7126, World Bank Group, Washington DC, USA, 47 pp.
Hallegatte, S. et al., 2016: *Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*. The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 227 pp., doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0673-5.
Halonen, M. et al., 2017: *Mobilizing climate finance flows: Nordic approaches and opportunities*. TemaNord 2017:519, Nordic Council of Ministers, 151 pp., doi:10.6027/TN2017-519.
Hammill, B.A. and H. Price-Kelly, 2017: *Using NDCs, NAPs and the SDGs to Advance Climate-Resilient Development*. NDC Expert perspectives, NDC Partnership, Washington DC, USA and Bonn, Germany, 10 pp.
Handmer, J. and H. Iveson, 2017: Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu: Learning from the low death toll. *Australian jouranl of Emergency Management*, **22(2)**, 60–65, https://ajem.infoservices.com.au/items/ajem-32-02-22.
Hanna, R. and P. Oliva, 2016: Implications of Climate Change for Children in Developing Countries. *The Future of Children*, **26(1)**, 115–132, doi:10.1353/foc.2016.0006.
Hansen, G. and D. Stone, 2016: Assessing the observed impact of anthropogenic climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(5)**, 532–537, doi:10.1038/nclimate2896.
Harris, L.M., E.K. Chu, and G. Ziervogel, 2017: Negotiated resilience. *Resilience*, **3293**, 1–19, doi:10.1080/21693293.2017.1353196.
Hartzell-Nichols, L., 2017: *A Climate of Risk: Precautionary Principles, Catastrophes, and Climate Change*. Routledge, New York, NY, USA, 168 pp.
Hasegawa, T. et al., 2014: Climate change impact and adaptation assessment on food consumption utilizing a new scenario framework. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **48(1)**, 438–445, doi:10.1021/es4034149.
Hasegawa, T. et al., 2015: Consequence of climate mitigation on the risk of hunger. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **49(12)**, 7245–7253, doi:10.1021/es5051748.
Hashemi, S., A. Bagheri, and N. Marshall, 2017: Toward sustainable adaptation to future climate change: insights from vulnerability and resilience approaches analyzing agrarian system of Iran. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **19(1)**, 1–25, doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9721-3.
Hatfield-Dodds, S. et al., 2015: Australia is 'free to choose' economic growth and falling environmental pressures. *Nature*, **527(7576)**, 49–53, doi:10.1038/nature16065.
Havlík, P. et al., 2014: Climate change mitigation through livestock system transitions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **111(10)**, 3709–14, doi:10.1073/pnas.1308044111.
Hayashi, A., F. Akimoto, F. Sano, and T. Tomoda, 2015: Evaluation of global energy crop production potential up to 2100 under socioeconomic development and climate change scenarios. *Journal of the Japan Institute of Energy*, **94(6)**, 548–554, doi:10.3775/jie.94.548.
Hayashi, A., F. Sano, Y. Nakagami, and K. Akimoto, 2018: Changes in terrestrial water stress and contributions of major factors under temperature rise constraint scenarios. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 1–27, doi:10.1007/s11027-018-9780-5.
Häyhä, T., P.L. Lucas, D.P. van Vuuren, S.E. Cornell, and H. Hoff, 2016: From Planetary Boundaries to national fair shares of the global safe operating space – How can the scales be bridged? *Global Environmental Change*, **40**, 60–72, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.008.
Hayward, B., 2017: *Sea change: climate politics and New Zealand*. Bridget Williams Books, Wellington, NZ, 120 pp.
He, J., Y. Huang, and F. Tarp, 2014: Has the clean development mechanism assisted sustainable development? *Natural Resources Forum*, **38(4)**, 248–260, doi:10.1111/1477-8947.12055.
Healy, N. and J. Barry, 2017: Politicizing energy justice and energy system transitions: Fossil fuel divestment and a "just transition". *Energy Policy*, **108**, 451–459, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.06.014.
Heard, B.P., B.W. Brook, T.M.L. Wigley, and C.J.A. Bradshaw, 2017: Burden of proof: A comprehensive review of the feasibility of 100% renewable-electricity systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **76**, 1122–1133, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.114.
Heede, R., 2014: Tracing anthropogenic carbon dioxide and methane emissions to fossil fuel and cement producers, 1854–2010. *Climatic Change*, **122(1–2)**, 229–241, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0986-y.
Helliwell, J., R. Layard, and J. Sachs (eds.), 2018: *World Happiness Report*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York, NY, USA, 167 pp.
Hemstock, S.L. et al., 2017: A Case for Formal Education in the Technical, Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Sector for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction in the Pacific Islands Region. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific Countries: Fostering Resilience and Improving the Quality of Life* [Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer Nature, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 309–324, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-50094-2_19.
Hess, J.J. and K.L. Ebi, 2016: Iterative management of heat early warning systems in a changing climate. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1382(1)**, 21–30, doi:10.1111/nyas.13258.
Heyward, C. and D. Roser (eds.), 2016: *Climate justice in a non-ideal world*. Oxford University Press, Oxford UK, 352 pp.
Hiç, C., P. Pradhan, D. Rybski, and J.P. Kropp, 2016: Food Surplus and Its Climate Burdens. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(8)**, 4269–4277, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05088.

Hildingsson, R. and B. Johansson, 2015: Governing low-carbon energy transitions in sustainable ways: potential synergies and conflicts between climate and environmental policy objectives. *Energy Policy*, **88**, 245–252, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2015.10.029.

HLCCP, 2017: *Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices*. High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices (HLCCP). World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 61 pp.

Holden, E., K. Linnerud, and D. Banister, 2017: The imperatives of sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, **25(3)**, 213–226, doi:10.1002/sd.1647.

Holz, C., S. Kartha, and T. Athanasiou, 2018: Fairly sharing 1.5: national fair shares of a 1.5°C-compliant global mitigation effort. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **18(1)**, 117–134, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9371-z.

Horstmann, B. and J. Hein, 2017: *Aligning climate change mitigation and sustainable development under the UNFCCC: A critical assessment of the Clean Development Mechanism, the Green Climate Fund and REDD+*. German Development Institute, Bonn, 154 pp.

Howarth, C. and I. Monasterolo, 2017: Opportunities for knowledge co-production across the energy-food-water nexus: making interdisciplinary approaches work for better climate decision making. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **75**, 103–110, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.05.019.

Howarth, N., M. Galeotti, A. Lanza, and K. Dubey, 2017: Economic development and energy consumption in the GCC: an international sectoral analysis. *Energy Transitions*, **1(2)**, 6, doi:10.1007/s41825-017-0006-3.

Howell, R. and S. Allen, 2017: People and Planet: values, motivations and formative influences of individuals acting to mitigate climate change. *Environmental Values*, **26(2)**, 131–155, doi:10.3197/096327117x14847335385436.

Hubacek, K., G. Baiocchi, K. Feng, and A. Patwardhan, 2017: Poverty eradication in a carbon constrained world. *Nature Communications*, **8(1)**, 1–8, doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00919-4.

Huggel, C., I. Wallimann-Helmer, D. Stone, and W. Cramer, 2016: Reconciling justice and attribution research to advance climate policy. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(10)**, 901–908, doi:10.1038/nclimate3104.

Hughes, S., E.K. Chu, and S.G. Mason (eds.), 2018: *Climate Change in Cities: Innovations in Multi-Level Governance*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, 378 pp.

Hunsberger, C., S. Bolwig, E. Corbera, and F. Creutzig, 2014: Livelihood impacts of biofuel crop production: implications for governance. *Geoforum*, **54**, 248–260, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.09.022.

Huq, N., A. Bruns, L. Ribbe, and S. Huq, 2017: Mainstreaming ecosystem services based climate change adaptation (EbA) in bangladesh: status, challenges and opportunities. *Sustainability*, **9(6)**, 926, doi:10.3390/su9060926.

Hwang, J., K. Joh, and A. Woo, 2017: Social inequalities in child pedestrian traffic injuries: Differences in neighborhood built environments near schools in Austin, TX, USA. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6**, 40–49, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.003.

Griggs, D.J., M. Nilsson, A. Stevance, and D. McCollum (eds.), 2017: *A Guide to SDG interactions: from Science to Implementation*. International Council for Science (ICSU), Paris, France, 239 pp., doi:10.24948/2017.01.

IEA, 2015: *India Energy Outlook*. International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris, France, 187 pp.

IEA, 2016: *Energy and Air Pollution: World Energy Outlook Special Report*. International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris, France, 266 pp.

IEA, 2017: *Energy Access Outlook 2017: From Poverty to Prosperity*. International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris, France, 144 pp., doi:10.1787/9789264285569-en.

IEA and World Bank, 2017: *Sustainable Energy for All 2017 – Progress towards Sustainable Energy*. International Energy Agency (IEA) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 208 pp., doi:10.1596/ 978-1-4648-1084-8.

INC, 1991: *Vanuatu: Draft annex relating to Article 23 (Insurance) for inclusion in the revised single text on elements relating to mechanisms (A/AC.237/WG.II/ Misc.13) submitted by the Co-Chairmen of Working Group II*. A/AC.237/WG.II/ CRP.8, Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change: Working Group II.

IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp.

IPCC, 2014a: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1454 pp.

IPCC, 2014b: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 1–30.

IRENA, 2016: *Renewable Energy Market Analysis: The GCC Region*. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 96 pp.

Ishida, H. et al., 2014: Global-scale projection and its sensitivity analysis of the health burden attributable to childhood undernutrition under the latest scenario framework for climate change research. *Environmental Research Letters*, **9(6)**, 064014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/6/064014.

Islam, M.R. and M. Shamsuddoha, 2017: Socioeconomic consequences of climate induced human displacement and migration in Bangladesh. *International Sociology*, **32(3)**, 277–298, doi:10.1177/0268580917693173.

Jägermeyr, J., A. Pastor, H. Biemans, and D. Gerten, 2017: Reconciling irrigated food production with environmental flows for Sustainable Development Goals implementation. *Nature Communications*, **8**, 1–9, doi:10.1038/ncomms15900.

Jaglin, S., 2014: Regulating service delivery in southern cities: rethinking urban heterogeneity. In: *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South* [Parnell, S. and S. Oldfield (eds.)]. pp. 434–447, doi:10.4324/9780203387832.ch37.

Jakob, M. and J. C. Steckel, 2016: Implications of climate change mitigation for sustainable development. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(10)**, 104010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/10/104010.

Janetos, A.C., E. Malone, E. Mastrangelo, K. Hardee, and A. de Bremond, 2012: Linking climate change and development goals: framing, integrating, and measuring. *Climate and Development*, **4(2)**, 141–156, doi:10.1080/17565529.2012.726195.

Jha, C.K., V. Gupta, U. Chattopadhyay, and B. Amarayil Sreeraman, 2017: Migration as adaptation strategy to cope with climate change: A study of farmers' migration in rural India. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 10(1), 121–141, doi:10.1108/ijccsm-03-2017-0059.

Jiang, L. and B.C. O'Neill, 2017: Global urbanization projections for the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 193–199, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.008.

Johansson, E.L., M. Fader, J.W. Seaquist, and K.A. Nicholas, 2016: Green and blue water demand from large-scale land acquisitions in Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113(41)**, 11471–11476, doi:10.1073/pnas.1524741113.

Johnson, C.A., 2017: Resilient cities? The global politics of urban climate adaptation. In: *The Power of Cities in Global Climate Politics* [Johnson, C.A. (ed.)]. Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK, pp. 91–146, doi:10.1057/978-1-137-59469-3_4.

Johnson, N. et al., 2015: Stranded on a low-carbon planet: implications of climate policy for the phase-out of coal-based power plants. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90(Part A)**, 89–102, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.02.028.

Jones, L. and T. Tanner, 2017: 'Subjective resilience': using perceptions to quantify household resilience to climate extremes and disasters. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(1)**, 229–243, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0995-2.

Jordaan, S.M. et al., 2017: The role of energy technology innovation in reducing greenhouse gas emissions: a case study of Canada. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **78**, 1397–1409, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.162.

Kagawa, S. et al., 2015: CO_2 emission clusters within global supply chain networks: Implications for climate change mitigation. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 486–496, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.04.003.

Kaijser, A. and A. Kronsell, 2014: Climate change through the lens of intersectionality. *Environmental Politics*, **23(3)**, 417–433, doi:10.1080/09644016.2013.835203.

Kalafatis, S., 2017: Identifying the Potential for Climate Compatible Development Efforts and the Missing Links. *Sustainability*, **9(9)**, 1642, doi:10.3390/su9091642.

Karlsson, L., A. Nightingale, L.O. Naess, and J. Thompson, 2017: 'Triple wins' or 'triple faults'? Analysing policy discourse on climate-smart agriculture (CSA).

Working Paper no.197, CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), Copenhagen, Denmark, 43 pp.
Karner, K., M. Theissing, and T. Kienberger, 2015: Energy efficiency for industries through synergies with urban areas. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **2020**, 1–11, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.010.
Kartha, S. et al., 2018: Inequitable mitigation: cascading biases against poorer countries. *Nature Climate Change*, **8**, 348–349, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0152-7.
Kassie, M., H. Teklewold, M. Jaleta, P. Marenya, and O. Erenstein, 2015: Understanding the adoption of a portfolio of sustainable intensification practices in eastern and southern Africa. *Land Use Policy*, **42**, 400–411, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.08.016.
Keairns, D.L., R.C. Darton, and A. Irabien, 2016: The energy-water-food nexus. *Annual Review of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering*, **7(1)**, 239–262, doi:10.1146/annurev-chembioeng-080615-033539.
Kelman, I., 2017: Linking disaster risk reduction, climate change, and the sustainable development goals. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, **26(3)**, 254–258, doi:10.1108/dpm-02-2017-0043.
Kenis, A., 2016: Ecological citizenship and democracy: Communitarian versus agonistic perspectives. *Environmental Politics*, **4016**, 1–22, doi:10.1080/09644016.2016.1203524.
Kenis, A. and E. Mathijs, 2014: (De)politicising the local: The case of the Transition Towns movement in Flanders (Belgium). *Journal of Rural Studies*, **34**, 172–183, doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.013.
Keohane, R.O. and D.G. Victor, 2016: Cooperation and discord in global climate policy. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(6)**, 570–575, doi:10.1038/nclimate2937.
Khanna, N., D. Fridley, and L. Hong, 2014: China's pilot low-carbon city initiative: A comparative assessment of national goals and local plans. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, **12**, 110–121, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2014.03.005.
Khosla, R., A. Sagar, and A. Mathur, 2017: Deploying Low-carbon Technologies in Developing Countries: A view from India's buildings sector. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, **27(2)**, 149–162, doi:10.1002/eet.1750.
Khreis, H., A.D. May, and M.J. Nieuwenhuijsen, 2017: Health impacts of urban transport policy measures: a guidance note for practice. *Journal of Transport & Health*, **6**, 209–227, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.06.003.
Kim, S.-Y. and E. Thurbon, 2015: Developmental Environmentalism: Explaining South Korea's Ambitious Pursuit of Green Growth. *Politics & Society*, **43(2)**, 213–240, doi:10.1177/0032329215571287.
Kim, Y. et al., 2017: A perspective on climate-resilient development and national adaptation planning based on USAID's experience. *Climate and Development*, **9(2)**, 141–151, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1124037.
King, A.D., D.J. Karoly, and B.J. Henley, 2017: Australian climate extremes at 1.5°C and 2°C of global warming. *Nature Climate Change*, **7**, 412–416, doi:10.1038/nclimate3296.
Kirby, P. and T. O'Mahony, 2018: Development Models: Lessons from International Development. In: *The Political Economy of the Low-Carbon Transition: Pathways Beyond Techno-Optimism*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 89–114, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-62554-6_4.
Klausbruckner, C., H. Annegarn, L.R.F. Henneman, and P. Rafaj, 2016: A policy review of synergies and trade-offs in South African climate change mitigation and air pollution control strategies. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **57**, 70–78, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.001.
Klein, R.J.T. et al., 2014: Adaptation opportunities, constraints, and limits. 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 on 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. 899–943.
Klimont, Z. et al., 2017: Bridging the gap – the role of short-lived climate pollutants. In: *The Emissions Gap Report 2017: A UN Environmental Synethesis Report*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, pp. 48–57.
Klinsky, S. and A. Golub, 2016: Justice and Sustainability. In: *Sustainability Science: An introduction* [Heinrichs, H., P. Martens, G. Michelsen, and A. Wiek (eds.)]. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 161–173, doi:10.1007/978-94-017-7242-6.
Klinsky, S. and H. Winkler, 2018: Building equity in: strategies for integrating equity into modelling for a 1.5°C world. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160461, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0461.
Klinsky, S., D. Waskow, E. Northrop, and W. Bevins, 2017a: Operationalizing equity and supporting ambition: identifying a more robust approach to 'respective capabilities'. *Climate and Development*, **9(4)**, 1–11, doi:10.1080/17565529.2016.1146121.
Klinsky, S. et al., 2017b: Why equity is fundamental in climate change policy research. *Global Environmental Change*, **44**, 170–173, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.08.002.
Kongsager, R. and E. Corbera, 2015: Linking mitigation and adaptation in carbon forestry projects: Evidence from Belize. *World Development*, **76**, 132–146, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.07.003.
Kongsager, R., B. Locatelli, and F. Chazarin, 2016: Addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation together: a global assessment of agriculture and forestry projects. *Environmental Management*, **57(2)**, 271–282, doi:10.1007/s00267-015-0605-y.
Kreibich, N., L. Hermwille, C. Warnecke, and C. Arens, 2017: An update on the Clean Development Mechanism in Africa in times of market crisis. *Climate and Development*, **9(2)**, 178–190, doi:10.1080/17565529.2016.1145102.
Kumar, N.S. et al., 2014: *Climatic Risks and Strategizing Agricultural Adaptation in Climatically Challenged Regions*. TB-ICN: 136/2014, Indian Agriculture Research Institute, New Delhi, India, 106 pp.
Kuramochi, T. et al., 2018: Ten key short-term sectoral benchmarks to limit warming to 1.5°C. *Climate Policy*, **18(3)**, 287–305, doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1397495.
Kuruppu, N. and R. Willie, 2015: Barriers to reducing climate enhanced disaster risks in least developed country-small islands through anticipatory adaptation. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, **7**, 72–83, doi:10.1016/j.wace.2014.06.001.
Kusumaningtyas, S.D.A. and E. Aldrian, 2016: Impact of the June 2013 Riau province Sumatera smoke haze event on regional air pollution. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(7)**, 075007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/075007.
La Rovere, E.L., 2017: Low-carbon development pathways in Brazil and 'Climate Clubs'. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **8(1)**, 1–7, doi:10.1002/wcc.439.
Labordena, M., A. Patt, M. Bazilian, M. Howells, and J. Lilliestam, 2017: Impact of political and economical barriers for concentrating solar power in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Policy*, **102**, 52–72, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.12.008.
Labriet, M., C. Fiebig, and M. Labrousse, 2015: *Working towards a Smart Energy Path: Experience from Benin, Mali and Togo*. Inside Stories on climate compatible development, Climate and Development Knowlegdge Network (CDKN), 6 pp.
Lade, S.J., L.J. Haider, G. Engström, and M. Schlüter, 2017: Resilience offers escape from trapped thinking on poverty alleviation. *Science Advances*, **3(5)**, e1603043, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1603043.
Lahn, B., 2018: In the light of equity and science: scientific expertise and climate justice after Paris. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **18(1)**, 29–43, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9375-8.
Lamb, A. et al., 2016: The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Nature Climate Change*, **6**, 488–492, doi:10.1038/nclimate2910.
Langford, M., A. Sumner, and A.E. Yamin (eds.), 2013: *The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights: Past, Present and Future*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 571 pp.
Lasage, R. et al., 2015: A Stepwise, participatory approach to design and implement community based adaptation to drought in the Peruvian Andes. *Sustainability*, **7(2)**, 1742–1773, doi:10.3390/su7021742.
Lawrence, J. and M. Haasnoot, 2017: What it took to catalyse uptake of dynamic adaptive pathways planning to address climate change uncertainty. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **68**, 47–57, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.12.003.
Lechtenboehmer, S. and K. Knoop, 2017: *Realising long-term transitions towards low carbon societies. Impulses from the 8th Annual Meeting of the International Research Network for Low Carbon Societies*. Wuppertal Spezial no. 53, Wuppertal Institut für Klima, Umwelt, Energie, Wuppertal, Germany, 100 pp.
Lefale, P., P. Faiva, and A. C, 2017: *Living with Change (LivC): An Integrated National Strategy for Enhancing the Resilience of Tokelau to Climate Change and Related Hazards, 2017–2030*. Government of Tokelau, Apia, Soamoa, 16 pp.
Leichenko, R. and J.A. Silva, 2014: Climate change and poverty: vulnerability, impacts, and alleviation strategies. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **5(4)**, 539–556, doi:10.1002/wcc.287.
Lemoine, D. and S. Kapnick, 2016: A top-down approach to projecting market impacts of climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 51–55, doi:10.1038/nclimate2759.

Lemos, C.M., Y. Lo, D.R. Nelson, H. Eakin, and A.M. Bedran-Martins, 2016: Linking development to climate adaptation: Leveraging generic and specific capacities to reduce vulnerability to drought in NE Brazil. *Global Environmental Change*, **39**, 170–179, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.001.

Ley, D., 2017: Sustainable Development, Climate Change, and Renewable Energy in Rural Central America. In: *Evaluating Climate Change Action for Sustainable Development* [Uitto, J. I., J. Puri, and R. D. van den Berg (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 187–212, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-43702-6.

Li, T. et al., 2016: Aging will amplify the heat-related mortality risk under a changing climate: projection for the elderly in Beijing, China. *Scientific Reports*, **6(1)**, 28161, doi:10.1038/srep28161.

Liddell, C. and C. Guiney, 2015: Living in a cold and damp home: Frameworks for understanding impacts on mental well-being. *Public Health*, **129(3)**, 191–199, doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2014.11.007.

Lilliestam, J. and A. Patt, 2015: Barriers, risks and policies for renewables in the Gulf states. *Energies*, **8(8)**, 8263–8285, doi:10.3390/en8088263.

Lin, B.B. et al., 2017: Adaptation Pathways in Coastal Case Studies: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. *Coastal Management*, **45(5)**, 384–405, doi:10.1080/08920753.2017.1349564.

Lin, J., Y. Hu, S. Cui, J. Kang, and A. Ramaswami, 2015: Tracking urban carbon footprints from production and consumption perspectives. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(5)**, 054001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/5/054001.

Lipper, L. et al., 2014: Climate-smart agriculture for food security. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(12)**, 1068–1072, doi:10.1038/nclimate2437.

Lorek, S. and J.H. Spangenberg, 2014: Sustainable consumption within a sustainable economy – Beyond green growth and green economies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **63**, 33–44, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.08.045.

Lotze-Campen, H. et al., 2014: Impacts of increased bioenergy demand on global food markets: an AgMIP economic model intercomparison. *Agricultural Economics*, **45(1)**, 103–116, doi:10.1111/agec.12092.

Lucas, K. and K. Pangbourne, 2014: Assessing the equity of carbon mitigation policies for transport in Scotland. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, **2(2)**, 70–80, doi:10.1016/j.cstp.2014.05.003.

Lucon, O. et al., 2014: Buildings. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, S. I. Baum, P. Brunner, B. Eickemeier, J. Kriemann, S. Savolainen, C. Schlömer, V. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 671–738.

Luomi, M., 2014: Mainstreaming climate policy in the Gulf Cooperation Council States. OIES Paper: MEP 7, The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, Oxford, UK, 73 pp.

Lwasa, S., K. Buyana, P. Kasaija, and J. Mutyaba, 2018: Scenarios for adaptation and mitigation in urban Africa under 1.5°C global warming. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 52–58, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.012.

Lyon, C., 2018: Complexity ethics and UNFCCC practices for 1.5°C climate change. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 48–55, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.008.

Mace, M.J., 2016: Mitigation commitments under the Paris Agreement and the way forward. *Climate Law*, **6(1–2)**, 21–39, doi:10.1163/18786561-00601002.

Macintyre, T., H. Lotz-Sisitka, A. Wals, C. Vogel, and V. Tassone, 2018: Towards transformative social learning on the path to 1.5°C degrees. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 80–87, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.003.

Maclellan, N., 2015: *Yumi stap redi long klaemet jenis: Lessons from the Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program*. Oxfam Australia, 48 pp.

Maidment, C.D., C.R. Jones, T.L. Webb, E.A. Hathway, and J.M. Gilbertson, 2014: The impact of household energy efficiency measures on health: A meta-analysis. *Energy Policy*, **65**, 583–593, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.054.

Maor, M., J. Tosun, and A. Jordan, 2017: Proportionate and disproportionate policy responses to climate change: core concepts and empirical applications. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 1–13, doi:10.1080/1523908x.2017.1281730.

Mapfumo, P. et al., 2017: Pathways to transformational change in the face of climate impacts: an analytical framework. *Climate and Development*, **9(5)**, 439–451, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1040365.

Marjanac, S. and L. Patton, 2018: Extreme weather event attribution science and climate change litigation: an essential step in the causal chain? *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 1–34, doi:10.1080/02646811.2018.1451020.

Markandya, A. et al., 2018: Health co-benefits from air pollution and mitigation costs of the Paris Agreement: a modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, **2(3)**, e126–e133, doi:10.1016/s2542-5196(18)30029-9.

Marsh, J., 2015: Mixed motivations and complex causality in the Mekong. *Forced Migration Review*, 68–69, www.fmreview.org/climatechange-disasters/marsh.

Martinez-Baron, D., G. Orjuela, G. Renzoni, A.M. Loboguerrero Rodríguez, and S.D. Prager, 2018: Small-scale farmers in a 1.5°C future: the importance of local social dynamics as an enabling factor for implementation and scaling of climate-smart agriculture. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 112–119, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.013.

Mathur, V.N., S. Afionis, J. Paavola, A.J. Dougill, and L.C. Stringer, 2014: Experiences of host communities with carbon market projects: towards multi-level climate justice. *Climate Policy*, **14(1)**, 42–62, doi:10.1080/14693062.2013.861728.

Maupin, A., 2017: The SDG13 to combat climate change: an opportunity for Africa to become a trailblazer? *African Geographical Review*, **36(2)**, 131–145, doi:10.1080/19376812.2016.1171156.

Mayer, B., 2016: The relevance of the no-harm principle to climate change law and politics. *Asia Pacific Journal of Environmental Law*, **19(1)**, 79–104, doi:10.4337/apjel.2016.01.04.

Mbow, C., C. Neely, and P. Dobie, 2015: How can an integrated landscape approach contribute to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and advance climate-smart objectives? In: *Climate-Smart Landscapes: Multifunctionality in Practice* [Minang, P.A., M. van Noordwijk, C. Mbow, J. de Leeuw, and D. Catacutan (eds.)]. World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Nairobi, Kenya, pp. 103–117.

McCollum, D.L. et al., 2018a: Connecting the Sustainable Development Goals by their energy inter-linkages. *Environmental Research Letters*, **13(3)**, 033006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaafe3.

McCollum, D.L. et al., 2018b: Energy investment needs for fulfilling the Paris Agreement and achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature Energy*, **3(7)**, 589–599, doi:10.1038/s41560-018-0179-z.

McCubbin, S., B. Smit, and T. Pearce, 2015: Where does climate fit? Vulnerability to climate change in the context of multiple stressors in Funafuti, Tuvalu. *Global Environmental Change*, **30**, 43–55, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.10.007.

McGlade, C. and P. Ekins, 2015: The geographical distribution of fossil fuels unused when limiting global warming to 2°C. *Nature*, **517(7533)**, 187–190, doi:10.1038/nature14016.

McGranahan, G., D. Schensul, and G. Singh, 2016: Inclusive urbanization: can the 2030 Agenda be delivered without it? *Environment and Urbanization*, **28(1)**, 13–34, doi:10.1177/0956247815627522.

McKay, B., S. Sauer, B. Richardson, and R. Herre, 2016: The political economy of sugarcane flexing: initial insights from Brazil, Southern Africa and Cambodia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, **43(1)**, 195–223, doi:10.1080/03066150.2014.992016.

McNamara, K.E., 2015: Cross-border migration with dignity in Kiribati. *Forced Migration Review*, **49**, 62, www.fmreview.org/climatechange-disasters/mcnamara.

McNamara, K.E. and S.S. Prasad, 2014: Coping with extreme weather: Communities in Fiji and Vanuatu share their experiences and knowledge. *Climatic Change*, **123(2)**, 121–132, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-1047-2.

Mechler, R. and T. Schinko, 2016: Identifying the policy space for climate loss and damage. *Science*, **354(6310)**, 290–292, doi:10.1126/science.aag2514.

Mechler, R., L.M. Bouwer, T. Schinko, S. Surminski, and J. Linnerooth-Bayer (eds.), 2019: *Loss and Damage from Climate Change: Concepts, Methods and Policy Options*. Springer International Publishing, 561 pp, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-72026-5.

Meerow, S. and J.P. Newell, 2016: Urban resilience for whom, what, when, where, and why? *Urban Geography*, 1–21, doi:10.1080/02723638.2016.1206395.

Mehmood, A., 2016: Of resilient places: planning for urban resilience. *European Planning Studies*, **24(2)**, 407–419, doi:10.1080/09654313.2015.1082980.

Meinshausen, M. et al., 2015: National post-2020 greenhouse gas targets and diversity-aware leadership. *Nature Climate Change*, **5(12)**, 1098–1106, doi:10.1038/nclimate2826.

Melica, G. et al., 2018: Multilevel governance of sustainable energy policies: The role of regions and provinces to support the participation of small local authorities in the Covenant of Mayors. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, **39**, 729–739, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.01.013.

Michaelowa, A., M. Allen, and F. Sha, 2018: Policy instruments for limiting global temperature rise to 1.5°C – can humanity rise to the challenge? *Climate Policy*, **18(3)**, 275–286, doi:10.1080/14693062.2018.1426977.

Millar, R.J. et al., 2017: Emission budgets and pathways consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C. *Nature Geoscience*, 1–8, doi:10.1038/ngeo3031.

Millard-Ball, A., 2013: The limits to planning: causal impacts of city climate action plans. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **33(1)**, 5–19, doi:10.1177/0739456x12449742.
Mishra, V., S. Mukherjee, R. Kumar, and D. Stone, 2017: Heat wave exposure in India in current, 1.5°C, and 2.0°C worlds. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12**, 124012, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa9388.
Mitchell, D. et al., 2016: Attributing human mortality during extreme heat waves to anthropogenic climate change. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(7)**, 074006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/074006.
MoCC, 2016: *Corporate Plan 2016–2018*. Ministry of Climate Chanage and Adaptation (MoCC), Government of Vanuatu, Vanuatu, 98 pp.
Moellendorf, D., 2015: Climate change justice. *Philosophy Compass*, **10**, 173–186, doi:10.3197/096327111x12997574391887.
Morita, K. and K. Matsumoto, 2015: Enhancing Biodiversity Co-benefits of Adaptation to Climate Change. In: *Handbook of Climate Change Adaptation* [Filho, W.L. (ed.)]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 953–972, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-38670-1_21.
Mouratiadou, I. et al., 2018: Water demand for electricity in deep decarbonisation scenarios: a multi-model assessment. *Climatic Change*, **147(1)**, 91–106, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2117-7.
MRFCJ, 2015a: *Women's Participation – An Enabler of Climate Justice*. Mary Robinson Foundation Climate Justice (MRFCJ), Dublin, Ireland, 24 pp.
MRFCJ, 2015b: *Zero Carbon, Zero Poverty The Climate Justice Way: Achieving an equitable phase-out of carbon emissions by 2050 while protecting human rights*. Mary Robinson Foundation Climate Justice (MRFCJ), Dublin, Ireland, 70 pp.
Muratori, M., K. Calvin, M. Wise, P. Kyle, and J. Edmonds, 2016: Global economic consequences of deploying bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS). *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 1–9, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095004.
Murphy, D.J., L. Yung, C. Wyborn, and D.R. Williams, 2017: Rethinking climate change adaptation and place through a situated pathways framework: a case study from the Big Hole Valley, USA. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **167**, 441–450, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.07.016.
Murphy, K., G.A. Kirkman, S. Seres, and E. Haites, 2015: Technology transfer in the CDM: an updated analysis. *Climate Policy*, **15(1)**, 127–145, doi:10.1080/14693062.2013.812719.
Murtinho, F., 2016: What facilitates adaptation? An analysis of community-based adaptation to environmental change in the Andes. *International Journal of the Commons*, **10(1)**, 119–141, doi:10.18352/ijc.585.
Muttarak, R. and W. Lutz, 2014: Is education a key to reducing vulnerability to natural disasters and hence unavoidable climate change? *Ecology and Society*, **19(1)**, 42, doi:10.5751/es-06476-190142.
Myers, S.S. et al., 2017: Climate Change and Global Food Systems: Potential Impacts on Food Security and Undernutrition. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 1–19, doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031816-044356.
Naess, L.O. et al., 2015: Climate policy meets national development contexts: insights from Kenya and Mozambique. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 534–544, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.015.
Nagoda, S., 2015: New discourses but same old development approaches? Climate change adaptation policies, chronic food insecurity and development interventions in northwestern Nepal. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 570–579, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.014.
Nalau, J., J. Handmer, and M. Dalesa, 2017: The role and capacity of government in a climate crisis: Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific Countries: Fostering Resilience and Improving the Quality of Life* [Leal Filho, W. (ed.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 151–161, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-50094-2_9.
Nalau, J. et al., 2016: The practice of integrating adaptation and disaster risk reduction in the south-west Pacific. *Climate and Development*, **8(4)**, 365–375, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1064809.
NASEM, 2016: *Attribution of Extreme Weather Events in the Context of Climate Change*. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM). The National Academies Press, Washington DC, USA, 186 pp., doi:10.17226/21852.
Nelson, D.R., M.C. Lemos, H. Eakin, and Y.-J. Lo, 2016: The limits of poverty reduction in support of climate change adaptation. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 094011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/094011.
Newell, P. et al., 2014: The Political Economy of Low Carbon Energy in Kenya. IDS Working Papers Vol 2014 No 445, Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Brighton, UK, 38 pp., doi:10.1111/j.2040-0209.2014.00445.x.
Newman, P., T. Beatley, and H. Boyer, 2017: *Resilient Cities: Overcoming Fossil Fuel Dependence (2nd edition)*. Island Press, Washington DC, USA, 264 pp.
Nguyen, M.T., S. Vink, M. Ziemski, and D.J. Barrett, 2014: Water and energy synergy and trade-off potentials in mine water management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **84(1)**, 629–638, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.063.
Nhamo, G., 2016: New Global Sustainable Development Agenda: A Focus on Africa. *Sustainable Development*, **25**, 227–241, doi:10.1002/sd.1648.
Niang, I. et al., 2014: Africa. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part B: Regional Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Barros, V.R., C.B. Field, D.J. Dokken, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, 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. 1199–1265.
Nicholls, R.J. et al., 2018: Stabilization of global temperature at 1.5°C and 2.0°C: implications for coastal areas. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160448, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0448.
Nicolosi, E. and G. Feola, 2016: Transition in place: Dynamics, possibilities, and constraints. *Geoforum*, **76**, 153–163, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.09.017.
Nilsson, M., D. Griggs, and M. Visback, 2016: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature*, **534(7607)**, 320–322, doi:10.1038/534320a.
Nkomwa, E.C., M.K. Joshua, C. Ngongondo, M. Monjerezi, and F. Chipungu, 2014: Assessing indigenous knowledge systems and climate change adaptation strategies in agriculture: a case study of Chagaka Village, Chikhwawa, Southern Malawi. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*, **67–69**, 164–172, doi:10.1016/j.pce.2013.10.002.
Noble, I. et al., 2014: Adaptation needs and options. 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 on 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. 659–708.
Normann, H.E., 2015: The role of politics in sustainable transitions: The rise and decline of offshore wind in Norway. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, **15(2015)**, 180–193, doi:10.1016/j.eist.2014.11.002.
North, P. and N. Longhurst, 2013: Grassroots localisation? The scalar potential of and limits of the 'transition' approach to climate change and resource constraint. *Urban Studies*, **50(7)**, 1423–1438, doi:10.1177/0042098013480966.
Nunan, F. (ed.), 2017: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 262 pp.
Nunn, P.D., W. Aalbersberg, S. Lata, and M. Gwilliam, 2014: Beyond the core: Community governance for climate-change adaptation in peripheral parts of Pacific Island Countries. *Regional Environmental Change*, **14(1)**, 221–235, doi:10.1007/s10113-013-0486-7.
Nyantakyi-Frimpong, H. and R. Bezner-Kerr, 2015: The relative importance of climate change in the context of multiple stressors in semi-arid Ghana. *Global Environmental Change*, **32**, 40–56, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.003.
O'Brien, K.L., 2016: Climate change and social transformations: is it time for a quantum leap? *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(5)**, 618–626, doi:10.1002/wcc.413.
O'Brien, K.L., 2017: Climate Change Adaptation and Social Transformation. In: *International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Oxford, UK, pp. 1–8, doi:10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0987.
O'Brien, K.L., 2018: Is the 1.5°C target possible? Exploring the three spheres of transformation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 153–160, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.04.010.
O'Brien, K.L., S. Eriksen, T.H. Inderberg, and L. Sygna, 2015: Climate change and development: adaptation through transformation. In: *Climate Change Adaptation and Development: Changing Paradigms and Practices* [Inderberg, T.H., S. Eriksen, K. O'Brien, and L. Sygna (eds.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 273–289.
O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2017a: The roads ahead: narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways describing world futures in the 21st century. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 169–180, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.01.004.
O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2017b: IPCC reasons for concern regarding climate change risks. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(1)**, 28–37, doi:10.1038/nclimate3179.
O'Neill, D.W., A.L. Fanning, W.F. Lamb, and J.K. Steinberger, 2018: A good life for all within planetary boundaries. *Nature Sustainability*, **1(2)**, 88–95, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0021-4.

Ober, K. and P. Sakdapolrak, 2017: How do social practices shape policy? Analysing the field of 'migration as adaptation' with Bourdieu's 'Theory of Practice'. *The Geographical Journal*, **183(4)**, 359–369, doi:10.1111/geoj.12225.
Obersteiner, M. et al., 2016: Assessing the land resource-food price nexus of the Sustainable Development Goals. *Science Advances*, **2(9)**, e1501499–e1501499, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1501499.
OECD, 2017: The Government Role in Mobilising Investment and Innovation in Renewable Energy. *OECD Investment Insights,* August 2017, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris, France, 4 pp.
Oei, P.-Y. and R. Mendelevitch, 2016: European Scenarios of CO_2 Infrastructure Investment until 2050. *The Energy Journal*, **37(01)**, doi:10.5547/01956574.37.si3.poei.
Ojea, E., 2015: Challenges for mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Adaptation into the international climate agenda. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **14**, 41–48, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.03.006.
Okereke, C. and P. Coventry, 2016: Climate justice and the international regime: before, during, and after Paris. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **7(6)**, 834–851, doi:10.1002/wcc.419.
Olawuyi, D.S., 2017: From technology transfer to technology absorption: addressing climate technology gaps in Africa. Fixing Climate Governance Series Paper No. 5, Centre for International Governance Innovation, Waterloo, Canada, 16 pp.
Olsson, L. et al., 2014: Livelihoods and Poverty. 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 on 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. 793–832.
Oosterhuis, F.H. and P. Ten Brink (eds.), 2014: *Paying the Polluter: Environmentally Harmful Subsidies and their Reform*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA, 368 pp.
Oppenheimer, M., M. Campos, and R. Warren, 2014: Emergent risks and key vulnerabilities. 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 on 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. 659–708.
Orindi, V., Y. Elhadi, and C. Hesse, 2017: Democratising climate finance at local levels. In: *Building a Climate Resilient Economy and Society: Challenges and Opportunities* [Ninan, K.N. and M. Inoue (eds.)]. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA, pp. 250–264.
Otto, F.E.L., R.B. Skeie, J.S. Fuglestvedt, T. Berntsen, and M.R. Allen, 2017: Assigning historic responsibility for extreme weather events. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(11)**, 757–759, doi:10.1038/nclimate3419.
Page, E.A. and C. Heyward, 2017: Compensating for climate change Loss and Damage. *Political Studies*, **65(2)**, 356–372, doi:10.1177/0032321716647401.
Pal, J.S. and E.A.B. Eltahir, 2016: Future temperature in southwest Asia projected to exceed a threshold for human adaptability. *Nature Climate Change*, **18203**, 1–4, doi:10.1038/nclimate2833.
Palazzo, A. et al., 2017: Linking regional stakeholder scenarios and shared socioeconomic pathways: Quantified West African food and climate futures in a global context. *Global Environmental Change*, **45**, 227–242, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.12.002.
Pan, X., M. Elzen, N. Höhne, F. Teng, and L. Wang, 2017: Exploring fair and ambitious mitigation contributions under the Paris Agreement goals. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **74**, 49–56, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.04.020.
Pandey, U.C. and C. Kumar, 2018: Emerging Paradigms of Capacity Building in the Context of Climate Change. In: *Climate Literacy and Innovations in Climate Change Education: Distance Learning for Sustainable Development* [Azeiteiro, U.M., W. Leal Filho, and L. Aires (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 193–214, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-70199-8_11.
Parikh, K.S., J.K. Parikh, and P.P. Ghosh, 2018: Can India grow and live within a 1.5 degree CO_2 emissions budget? *Energy Policy*, **120**, 24–37, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.05.014.
Park, J., S. Hallegatte, M. Bangalore, and E. Sandhoefner, 2015: Households and heat stress estimating the distributional consequences of climate change. Policy Research Working Paper no. WPS7479, World Bank Group, Washington, DC, USA, 58 pp.
Parkinson, S.C. et al., 2016: Impacts of Groundwater Constraints on Saudi Arabia's Low-Carbon Electricity Supply Strategy. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(4)**, 1653–1662, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05852.
Parnell, S., 2017: Africa's urban risk and resilience. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, **26**, 1–6, doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.09.050.
Patterson, J.J. et al., 2016: Exploring the governance and politics of transformations towards sustainability. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 1–16, doi:10.1016/j.eist.2016.09.001.
Patterson, J.J. et al., 2018: Political feasibility of 1.5°C societal transformations: the role of social justice. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 1–9, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.002.
Pearce, T., J. Ford, A.C. Willox, and B. Smit, 2015: Inuit Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), subsistence hunting and adaptation to climate change in the Canadian Arctic. *Arctic*, **68(2)**, 233–245, doi:10.2307/43871322.
Pelling, M., T. Abeling, and M. Garschagen, 2016: Emergence and Transition in London's Climate Change Adaptation Pathways. *Journal of Extreme Events*, **3(3)**, 1650012, doi:10.1142/s2345737616500123.
Pelling, M. et al., 2018: Africa's urban adaptation transition under a 1.5° climate. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 10–15, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.005.
Petkova, E.P. et al., 2017: Towards more comprehensive projections of urban heat-related mortality: estimates for New York city under multiple population, adaptation, and climate scenarios. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, **125(1)**, 47–55, doi:10.1289/ehp166.
Pfeiffer, A., R. Millar, C. Hepburn, and E. Beinhocker, 2016: The '2°C carbon stock' for electricity generation: cumulative committed carbon emissions from the electricity generation sector and the transition to a green economy. *Applied Energy*, **179**, 1395–1408, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.093.
Phillips, J., P. Newell, and A. Pueyo, 2017: Triple wins? Prospects for pro-poor, low carbon, climate resilient energy services in Kenya. In: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 114–129.
Popescu, G.H. and F.C. Ciurlau, 2016: Can environmental sustainability be attained by incorporating nature within the capitalist economy? *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, **11(4)**, 75–81.
Popp, A. et al., 2014: Land-use transition for bioenergy and climate stabilization: Model comparison of drivers, impacts and interactions with other land use based mitigation options. *Climatic Change*, **123(3–4)**, 495–509, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0926-x.
Popp, A. et al., 2017: Land-use futures in the shared socio-economic pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 331–345, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.002.
Potouroglou, M. et al., 2017: Measuring the role of seagrasses in regulating sediment surface elevation. *Scientific Reports*, **7(1)**, 1–11, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-12354-y.
Pradhan, A., C. Chan, P.K. Roul, J. Halbrendt, and B. Sipes, 2018: Potential of conservation agriculture (CA) for climate change adaptation and food security under rainfed uplands of India: a transdisciplinary approach. *Agricultural Systems*, **163**, 27–35, doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.002.
Preston, F. and J. Lehne, 2017: *A wider circle? The circular economy in developing countries*. Chatham House: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 24 pp.
Pretis, F., M. Schwarz, K. Tang, K. Haustein, and M.R. Allen, 2018: Uncertain impacts on economic growth when stabilizing global temperatures at 1.5°C or 2°C warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20160460, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0460.
Purdon, M., 2015: Opening the black box of carbon finance "additionality": the political economy of carbon finance effectiveness across Tanzania, Uganda, and Moldova. *World Development*, **74**, 462–478, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.024.
Quan, J., L.O. Naess, A. Newsham, A. Sitoe, and M.C. Fernandez, 2017: The Political Economy of REDD+ in Mozambique: Implications for Climate Compatible Development. In: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 151–181.
Rai, N. and S. Fisher (eds.), 2017: *The Political Economy of Low Carbon Resilient Development: Planning and implementation*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 172 pp.
Rao, N.D., 2014: International and intranational equity in sharing climate change mitigation burdens. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **14(2)**, 129–146, doi:10.1007/s10784-013-9212-7.

Rao, N.D. and J. Min, 2018: Less global inequality can improve climate outcomes. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **9**, e513, doi:10.1002/wcc.513.
Rao, N.D., B.J. van Ruijven, V. Bosetti, and K. Riahi, 2017: Improving poverty and inequality modeling in climate research. *Nature Climate Change*, **7**, 857–862, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0004-x.
Rao, S. et al., 2016: Future Air Pollution in the Shared Socio-Economic Pathways. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 346–358, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.012.
Rasch, R., 2017: Income Inequality and Urban Vulnerability to Flood Hazard in Brazil. *Social Science Quarterly*, **98(1)**, 299–325, doi:10.1111/ssqu.12274.
Rasul, G. and B. Sharma, 2016: The nexus approach to water-energy-food security: an option for adaptation to climate change. *Climate Policy*, **16(6)**, 682–702, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1029865.
Raworth, K., 2017: A Doughnut for the Anthropocene: humanity's compass in the 21st century. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, **1(2)**, e48–e49, doi:10.1016/s2542-5196(17)30028-1.
Redclift, M. and D. Springett (eds.), 2015: *Routledge International Handbook of Sustainable Development*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 448 pp.
Regmi, B.R. and C. Star, 2015: Exploring the policy environment for mainstreaming community-based adaptation (CBA) in Nepal. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, **7(4)**, 423–441, doi:10.1108/ijccsm-04-2014-0050.
Reid, H., 2016: Ecosystem- and community-based adaptation: learning from community-based natural resource management. *Climate and Development*, **8(1)**, 4–9, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1034233.
Reid, H. and S. Huq, 2014: Mainstreaming community-based adaptation into national and local planning. *Climate and Development*, **6(4)**, 291–292, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.973720.
Reij, C. and R. Winterbottom, 2015: *Scaling up Regreening: Six Steps to Success. A Practical Approach to Forest Landscape Restoration*. World Resource Institute (WRI), Washington DC, USA, 72 pp.
Republic of Vanuatu, 2016: *Vanuatu 2030: The People's Plan*. Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, Port Villa, Vanuatu, 28 pp.
Republic of Vanuatu, 2017: *Vanuatu 2030: The People's Plan. National Sustainable Development Plan 2016–2030. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*. The Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, Port Vila, Vanuatu, 48 pp.
Revi, A. et al., 2014: Urban areas. 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 on 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, UK, and New York, NY, USA, pp. 535–612.
Rey, T., L. Le De, F. Leone, and D. Gilbert, 2017: An integrative approach to understand vulnerability and resilience post-disaster: the 2015 cyclone Pam in urban Vanuatu as case study. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, **26(3)**, 259–275, doi:10.1108/dpm-07-2016-0137.
Reyer, C.P.O. et al., 2017a: Climate change impacts in Latin America and the Caribbean and their implications for development. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(6)**, 1601–1621, doi:10.1007/s10113-015-0854-6.
Reyer, C.P.O. et al., 2017b: Turn down the heat: regional climate change impacts on development. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(6)**, 1563–1568, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1187-4.
Riahi, K. et al., 2015: Locked into Copenhagen pledges – Implications of short-term emission targets for the cost and feasibility of long-term climate goals. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90**, 8–23, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.09.016.
Riahi, K. et al., 2017: The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: an overview. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 153–168, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009.
Robertson, M., 2014: *Sustainability Principles and Practice*. Routledge, London, UK, 392 pp., doi:10.4324/9780203768747.
Robinson, M. and T. Shine, 2018: Achieving a climate justice pathway to 1.5°C. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(7)**, 564–569, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0189-7.
Robinson, S. and M. Dornan, 2017: International financing for climate change adaptation in small island developing states. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(4)**, 1103–1115, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1085-1.
Robiou du Pont, Y. et al., 2017: Equitable mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement goals. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(1)**, 38–43, doi:10.1038/nclimate3186.
Rockström, J. et al., 2017: Sustainable intensification of agriculture for human prosperity and global sustainability. *Ambio*, **46(1)**, 4–17, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0793-6.
Rogelj, J. et al., 2018: Scenarios towards limiting global mean temperature increase below 1.5°C. *Nature Climate Change*, 1–8, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0091-3.
Roger, C., T. Hale, and L. Andonova, 2017: The comparative politics of transnational climate governance. *International Interactions*, **43(1)**, 1–25, doi:10.1080/03050629.2017.1252248.
Rose, S.K. et al., 2014: Bioenergy in energy transformation and climate management. *Climatic Change*, **123(3–4)**, 477–493, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0965-3.
Rosenbloom, D., 2017: Pathways: An emerging concept for the theory and governance of low-carbon transitions. *Global Environmental Change*, **43**, 37–50, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.12.011.
Rosenzweig, C. et al., 2018: *Climate Change and Cities: Second Assessment Report of the Urban Climate Change Research Network*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 811 pp., doi:10.1017/9781316563878.
Roser, D. and C. Seidel, 2017: *Climate justice*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK, 230 pp.
Roser, D., C. Huggel, M. Ohndorf, and I. Wallimann-Helmer, 2015: Advancing the interdisciplinary dialogue on climate justice. *Climatic Change*, **133(3)**, 349–359, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1556-2.
Rozenberg, J. and S. Hallegatte, 2016: Modeling the Impacts of Climate Change on Future Vietnamese Households: A Micro-Simulation Approach. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7766, World Bank, 20 pp.
Runhaar, H., B. Wilk, Persson, C. Uittenbroek, and C. Wamsler, 2018: Mainstreaming climate adaptation: taking stock about "what works" from empirical research worldwide. *Regional Environmental Change*, **18(4)**, 1201–1210, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1259-5.
Rutledge, D. et al., 2017: *Identifying Feedbacks, Understanding Cumulative Impacts and Recognising Limits: A National Integrated Assessment. Synthesis Report RA3. Climate Changes, Impacts and Implications for New Zealand to 2100*. CCII (Climate Changes, Impacts & Implications), 84 pp.
Sachs, J., G. Schmidt-Traub, C. Kroll, D. Durand-Delacre, and K. Teksoz, 2017: *SDG Index and Dashboards Report 2017*. Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), New York, NY, USA, 479 pp.
Salleh, A., 2016: Climate, Water, and Livelihood Skills: A Post-Development Reading of the SDGs. *Globalizations*, **13(6)**, 952–959, doi:10.1080/14747731.2016.1173375.
Sánchez, A. and M. Izzo, 2017: Micro hydropower: an alternative for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and development of marginalized local communities in Hispaniola Island. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 79–87, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1865-0.
Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and C. Aall (eds.), 2016: *Rethinking Climate and Energy Policies: New Perspectives on the Rebound Phenomenon*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 294 pp., doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38807-6.
Santos, P., P. Bacelar-Nicolau, M.A. Pardal, L. Bacelar-Nicolau, and U.M. Azeiteiro, 2016: Assessing Student Perceptions and Comprehension of Climate Change in Portuguese Higher Education Institutions. In: *Implementing Climate Change Adaptation in Cities and Communities: Integrating Strategies and Educational Approaches* [Filho, W.L., K. Adamson, R.M. Dunk, U.M. Azeiteiro, S. Illingworth, and F. Alves (eds.)]. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 221–236, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-28591-7_12.
Satterthwaite, D., 2016: Missing the Millennium Development Goal targets for water and sanitation in urban areas. *Environment and Urbanization*, **28(1)**, 99–118, doi:10.1177/0956247816628435.
Satterthwaite, D. et al., 2018: *Responding to climate change in cities and in their informal settlements and economies*. International Institute for Environment and Development, Edmonton, Canada, 61 pp.
Savo, V. et al., 2016: Observations of climate change among subsistence-oriented communities around the world. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(5)**, 462–473, doi:10.1038/nclimate2958.
Schade, J. and W. Obergassel, 2014: Human rights and the Clean Development Mechanism. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, **27(4)**, 717–735, doi:10.1080/09557571.2014.961407.
Schaeffer, M. et al., 2015: *Feasibility of limiting warming to 1.5 and 2°C*. Climate Analytics, Berlin, Germany, 20 pp.
Schaller, N. et al., 2016: Human influence on climate in the 2014 southern England winter floods and their impacts. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(6)**, 627–634, doi:10.1038/nclimate2927.

Schirmer, J. and L. Bull, 2014: Assessing the likelihood of widespread landholder adoption of afforestation and reforestation projects. *Global Environmental Change*, **24**, 306–320, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.009.
Schleussner, C.-F. et al., 2016: Differential climate impacts for policy-relevant limits to global warming: the case of 1.5°C and 2°C. *Earth System Dynamics*, **7(2)**, 327–351, doi:10.5194/esd-7-327-2016.
Schlosberg, D., L.B. Collins, and S. Niemeyer, 2017: Adaptation policy and community discourse: risk, vulnerability, and just transformation. *Environmental Politics*, **26(3)**, 1–25, doi:10.1080/09644016.2017.1287628.
Schwan, S. and X. Yu, 2017: Social protection as a strategy to address climate-induced migration. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 10(1), 43–64, doi:10.1108/ijccsm-01-2017-0019.
Scoones, I. et al., 2017: *Pathways to Sustainable Agriculture*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 132 pp.
Scott, F.L., C.R. Jones, and T.L. Webb, 2014: What do people living in deprived communities in the UK think about household energy efficiency interventions? *Energy Policy*, **66**, 335–349, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.084.
Sealey-Huggins, L., 2017: '1.5°C to stay alive': climate change, imperialism and justice for the Caribbean. *Third World Quarterly*, **6597**, 1–20, doi:10.1080/01436597.2017.1368013.
Serdeczny, O.M., S. Bauer, and S. Huq, 2017: Non-economic losses from climate change: opportunities for policy-oriented research. *Climate and Development*, 1–5, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1372268.
Seto, K.C. et al., 2016: Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **41(1)**, 425–452, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085934.
Sgouridis, S. et al., 2016: RE-mapping the UAE's energy transition: an economy-wide assessment of renewable energy options and their policy implications. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **55**, 1166–1180, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.05.039.
Shackleton, S., G. Ziervogel, S. Sallu, T. Gill, and P. Tschakert, 2015: Why is socially-just climate change adaptation in sub-Saharan Africa so challenging? A review of barriers identified from empirical cases. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **6(3)**, 321–344, doi:10.1002/wcc.335.
Shaffrey, L.C. et al., 2009: U.K. HiGEM: the new U.K. high-resolution global environment model – model description and basic evaluation. *Journal of Climate*, **22(8)**, 1861–1896, doi:10.1175/2008jcli2508.1.
Shah, N., M. Wei, V. Letschert, and A. Phadke, 2015: *Benefits of leapfrogging to superefficiency and low global warming potential refrigerants in room air conditioning*. LBNL-1003671, Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory(LBNL), Berkeley, CA, USA, 58 pp.
Sharpe, R.A., C.R. Thornton, V. Nikolaou, and N.J. Osborne, 2015: Higher energy efficient homes are associated with increased risk of doctor diagnosed asthma in a UK subpopulation. *Environment International*, **75**, 234–244, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.11.017.
Shaw, C., S. Hales, P. Howden-Chapman, and R. Edwards, 2014: Health co-benefits of climate change mitigation policies in the transport sector. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(6)**, 427–433, doi:10.1038/nclimate2247.
Shi, L. et al., 2016: Roadmap towards justice in urban climate adaptation research. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(2)**, 131–137, doi:10.1038/nclimate2841.
Shi, Y., J. Liu, H. Shi, H. Li, and Q. Li, 2017: The ecosystem service value as a new eco-efficiency indicator for industrial parks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **164**, 597–605, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.187.
Shindell, D.T., G. Faluvegi, K. Seltzer, and C. Shindell, 2018: Quantified, localized health benefits of accelerated carbon dioxide emissions reductions. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(4)**, 291–295, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0108-y.
Shindell, D.T. et al., 2017: A climate policy pathway for near- and long-term benefits. *Science*, **356(6337)**, 493–494, doi:10.1126/science.aak9521.
Shine, T., 2017: *Integrating climate action into national development planning – Coherent Implementation of the Paris Agreement and Agenda 2030*. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), Stockholm, Sweden, 26 pp.
Shine, T. and G. Campillo, 2016: The Role of Development Finance in Climate Action Post-2015. OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers, No. 31, OECD Publishing, Paris, France, 38 pp.
Shue, H., 2014: *Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 368 pp.
Shue, H., 2017: Responsible for what? Carbon producer CO_2 contributions and the energy transition. *Climatic Change*, 1–6, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2042-9.
Shue, H., 2018: Mitigation gambles: uncertainty, urgency and the last gamble possible. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **376(2119)**, 20170105, doi:10.1098/rsta.2017.0105.
Shultz, J.M., M.A. Cohen, S. Hermosilla, Z. Espinel, and Andrew McLean, 2016: Disaster risk reduction and sustainable development for small island developing states. *Disaster Health*, **3(1)**, 32–44, doi:10.1080/21665044.2016.1173443.
Sinclair, F.L., 2016: Systems science at the scale of impact: Reconciling bottom-up participation with the production of widely applicable research outputs. In: *Sustainable Intensification in Smallholder Agriculture: An Integrated Systems Research Approach* [Oborn, I., B. Vanlauwe, M. Phillips, R. Thomas, W. Brooijmans, and K. Atta-Krah (eds.)]. Earthscan, London, UK, pp. 43–57.
Singh, C., 2018: Is participatory watershed development building local adaptive capacity? Findings from a case study in Rajasthan, India. *Environmental Development*, **25**, 43–58, doi:10.1016/j.envdev.2017.11.004.
Singh, C. et al., 2017: The utility of weather and climate information for adaptation decision-making: current uses and future prospects in Africa and India. *Climate and Development*, 1–17, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1318744.
Singh, R., K.K. Garg, S.P. Wani, R.K. Tewari, and S.K. Dhyani, 2014: Impact of water management interventions on hydrology and ecosystem services in Garhkundar-Dabar watershed of Bundelkhand region, Central India. *Journal of Hydrology*, **509**, 132–149, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.030.
Skeie, R.B. et al., 2017: Perspective has a strong effect on the calculation of historical contributions to global warming. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(2)**, 024022, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa5b0a.
SLoCaT, 2017: *Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action (MPGCA) Transport Initiatives: Stock-take on action toward implementation of the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development. Second Progress Report*. Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (SLoCaT), Bonn, Germany, 72 pp.
Smith, K.R. and A. Sagar, 2014: Making the clean available: escaping India's Chulha Trap. *Energy Policy*, **75**, 410–414, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.024.
Smith, K.R. et al., 2014: Human health: impacts, adaptation, and co-benefits. 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 on 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. 709–754.
Smith, P. et al., 2014: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 811–922.
Smith, P. et al., 2016: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO_2 emissions. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 42–50, doi:10.1038/nclimate2870.
Smits, M. and C. Middleton, 2014: New Arenas of Engagement at the Water Governance-Climate Finance Nexus? An Analysis of the Boom and Bust of Hydropower CDM Projects in Vietnam. *Water Alternatives*, **7(3)**, 561–583, www.water-alternatives.org/index.php/alldoc/articles/vol7/v8issue3/264-a7-3-7/file.
Smucker, T.A. et al., 2015: Differentiated livelihoods, local institutions, and the adaptation imperative: Assessing climate change adaptation policy in Tanzania. *Geoforum*, **59**, 39–50, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.11.018.
Solecki, W. et al., 2018: City transformations in a 1.5°C warmer world. *Nature Climate Change*, **8(3)**, 177–181, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0101-5.
Sondak, C.F.A. et al., 2017: Carbon dioxide mitigation potential of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs). *Journal of Applied Phycology*, **29(5)**, 2363–2373, doi:10.1007/s10811-016-1022-1.
Sonwa, D.J. et al., 2017: Drivers of climate risk in African agriculture. *Climate and Development*, **9(5)**, 383–398, doi:10.1080/17565529.2016.1167659.
Sorrell, S., 2015: Reducing energy demand: A review of issues, challenges and approaches. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **47**, 74–82, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.03.002.
Sovacool, B.K., B.-O. Linnér, and M.E. Goodsite, 2015: The political economy of climate adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, **5(7)**, 616–618, doi:10.1038/nclimate2665.
Sovacool, B.K., B.-O. Linnér, and R.J.T. Klein, 2017: Climate change adaptation and the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF): qualitative insights from policy implementation in the Asia-Pacific. *Climatic Change*, **140(2)**, 209–226, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1839-2.

SPC, 2015: *Vanuatu climate change and disaster risk reduction policy 2016–2030*. Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Suva, Fiji, 48 pp.
SPC, 2016: *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (FRDP) 2017–2030*. Pacific Community (SPC), Suva, Fiji, 40 pp.
Spencer, T. et al., 2018: The 1.5°C target and coal sector transition: at the limits of societal feasibility. *Climate Policy*, **18(3)**, 335–331, doi:10.1080/14693062.2017.1386540.
Staggenborg, S. and C. Ogrodnik, 2015: New environmentalism and Transition Pittsburgh. *Environmental Politics*, **24(5)**, 723–741, doi:10.1080/09644016.2015.1027059.
Steering Committee on Partnerships for SIDS and UN DESA, 2016: *Partnerships for Small Island Developing States 2016*. The Steering Committee on Partnerships for Small Island Developing States and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 49 pp.
Sterrett, C.L., 2015: *Final evaluation of the Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program*. Climate Concern, 96 pp.
Stevens, C., R. Winterbottom, J. Springer, and K. Reytar, 2014: *Securing Rights, Combating Climate Change: How Strengthening Community Forest Rights Mitigates Climate Change*. World Resources Institute, Washington DC, USA, 64 pp.
Stirling, A., 2014: *Emancipating Transformations: From controlling 'the transition' to culturing plural radical progress*. STEPS Centre (Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability), Brighton, UK, 48 pp.
Striessnig, E. and E. Loichinger, 2015: Future differential vulnerability to natural disasters by level of education. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, **13**, 221–240, www.jstor.org/stable/24770031.
Stringer, L.C., S.M. Sallu, A.J. Dougill, B.T. Wood, and L. Ficklin, 2017: Reconsidering climate compatible development as a new development landscape in southern Africa. In: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 22–43.
Stringer, L.C. et al., 2014: Advancing climate compatible development: Lessons from southern Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, **14(2)**, 713–725, doi:10.1007/s10113-013-0533-4.
Suckall, N., E. Tompkins, and L. Stringer, 2014: Identifying trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and development in community responses to climate and socio-economic stresses: Evidence from Zanzibar, Tanzania. *Applied Geography*, **46**, 111–121, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2013.11.005.
Suckall, N., L.C. Stringer, and E.L. Tompkins, 2015: Presenting Triple-Wins? Assessing Projects That Deliver Adaptation, Mitigation and Development Co-benefits in Rural Sub-Saharan Africa. *Ambio*, **44(1)**, 34–41, doi:10.1007/s13280-014-0520-0.
Suffolk, C. and W. Poortinga, 2016: Behavioural changes after energy efficiency improvements in residential properties. In: *Rethinking Climate and Energy Policies: New Perspectives on the Rebound Phenomenon* [Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and C. Aall (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 121–142, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38807-6_8.
Surminski, S., L.M. Bouwer, and J. Linnerooth-Bayer, 2016: How insurance can support climate resilience. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(4)**, 333–334, doi:10.1038/nclimate2979.
Szabo, S. et al., 2015: Sustainable Development Goals Offer New Opportunities for Tropical Delta Regions. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, **57(4)**, 16–23, doi:10.1080/00139157.2015.1048142.
Tàbara, J.D., A.L. St. Clair, and E.A.T. Hermansen, 2017: Transforming communication and knowledge production processes to address high-end climate change. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **70**, 31–37, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.01.004.
Tàbara, J.D. et al., 2018: Positive tipping points in a rapidly warming world. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 120–129, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.01.012.
Tait, L. and M. Euston-Brown, 2017: What role can African cities play in low-carbon development? A multilevel governance perspective of Ghana, Uganda and South Africa. *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*, **28(3)**, 43–53, doi:10.17159/2413-3051/2017/v28i3a1959.
Tanner, T. et al., 2017: Political economy of climate compatible development: artisanal fisheries and climate change in Ghana. In: *Making Climate Compatible Development Happen* [Nunan, F. (ed.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 223–241, doi:10.1111/j.2040-0209.2014.00446.x.
Taylor, M., 2017: Climate-smart agriculture: what is it good for? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, **45(1)**, 89–107, doi:10.1080/03066150.2017.1312355.
Taylor Aiken, G., 2015: (Local-) community for global challenges: carbon conversations, transition towns and governmental elisions. *Local Environment*, **20(7)**, 764–781, doi:10.1080/13549839.2013.870142.
Taylor Aiken, G., 2016: Prosaic state governance of community low carbon transitions. *Political Geography*, **55**, 20–29, doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2016.04.002.
Taylor Aiken, G., L. Middlemiss, S. Sallu, and R. Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2017: Researching climate change and community in neoliberal contexts: an emerging critical approach. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **8(4)**, e463, doi:10.1002/wcc.463.
Teferi, Z.A. and P. Newman, 2018: Slum upgrading: can the 1.5°C carbon reduction work with SDGs in these settlements? *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 52–63, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1239.
Thomas, A. and L. Benjamin, 2017: Management of loss and damage in small island developing states: implications for a 1.5°C or warmer world. *Regional Environmental Change*, **17(81)**, 1–10, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1184-7.
Thompson-Hall, M., E.R. Carr, and U. Pascual, 2016: Enhancing and expanding intersectional research for climate change adaptation in agrarian settings. *Ambio*, **45(s3)**, 373–382, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0827-0.
Thornton, T.F. and C. Comberti, 2017: Synergies and trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and development. *Climatic Change*, 1–14, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0884-3.
Thorp, T.M., 2014: *Climate Justice: A Voice for the Future*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, New York, 439 pp., doi:10.1057/9781137394644.
Tilman, D. and M. Clark, 2014: Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*, **515(7528)**, 518–522, doi:10.1038/nature13959.
Tokar, B., 2014: *Toward climate justice: perspectives on the climate crisis and social change (2nd edition)*. New Compass Press, Porsgrunn, Norway, 182 pp.
Toole, S., N. Klocker, and L. Head, 2016: Re-thinking climate change adaptation and capacities at the household scale. *Climatic Change*, **135(2)**, 203–209, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1577-x.
Tschakert, P. et al., 2016: Micropolitics in collective learning spaces for adaptive decision making. *Global Environmental Change*, **40**, 182–194, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.07.004.
Tschakert, P. et al., 2017: Climate change and loss, as if people mattered: Values, places, and experiences. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **8(5)**, e476, doi:10.1002/wcc.476.
Tung, R.L., 2016: Opportunities and Challenges Ahead of China's "New Normal". *Long Range Planning*, **49(5)**, 632–640, doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2016.05.001.
UN, 2014: *World urbanisation prospects, 2014 revisions*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, NY, USA.
UN, 2015a: *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. United Nations (UN), New York, NY, USA, 75 pp.
UN, 2015b: *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1, United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), New York, 35 pp.
UN Women, 2016: *Time to Act on Gender, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction: An overview of progress in the Pacific region with evidence from The Republic of Marshall Islands, Vanuatu and Samoa*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand, 92 pp.
UN Women and MRFCJ, 2016: *The Full View: Ensuring a comprehensive approach to achieve the goal of gender balance in the UNFCCC process*. UN Women and Mary Robinson Foundation Climate Justice (MRFCJ), 80 pp.
UNDP, 2016: *Risk Governance: Building Blocks for Resilient Development in the Pacific*. Policy Brief: October 2016, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Pacific Risk Resilience Programme (PRRP), Suva, Fiji, 20 pp.
UNEP, 2017: *The Emissions Gap Report 2017*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 89 pp.
UNFCCC, 2011a: Decision 1/CP.16: *The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 31 pp.
UNFCCC, 2011b: Decision 7/CP.17: Work programme on loss and damage. In: *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventeenth session, held in Durban from 28 November to 11 December 2011. Addendum. Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth session*. FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.2, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), pp. 5–8.
UNFCCC, 2014: Decision 2/CP.19: Warsaw international mechanism for loss and damage associated with climate change impact. In: *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013. Addendum. Part two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its nineteenth session*. FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.1, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), pp. 6–8.

UNFCCC, 2015: *Adoption of the Paris Agreement*. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 32 pp.
UNGA, 2014: *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 14 November 2014: SIDS accelerated modalities of action (SAMOA) pathway*. A/RES/69/15, United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), 30 pp.
UNRISD, 2016: *Policy Innovations for Transformative Change: Implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva, Switzerland, 248 pp.
UNU-EHS, 2016: *World Risk Report 2016. Focus: Logistics and infrastructure*. United Nations University, Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), Bonn, Germany, 74 pp.
Ürge-Vorsatz, D., S.T. Herrero, N.K. Dubash, and F. Lecocq, 2014: Measuring the co-benefits of climate change mitigation. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **39**, 549–582, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-031312-125456.
Ürge-Vorsatz, D. et al., 2016: Measuring multiple impacts of low-carbon energy options in a green economy context. *Applied Energy*, **179**, 1409–1426, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.07.027.
Ustadi, I., T. Mezher, and M.R.M. Abu-Zahra, 2017: The effect of the carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology deployment on the natural gas market in the United Arab Emirates. *Energy Procedia*, **114**, 6366–6376, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1773.
Vale, L.J., 2014: The politics of resilient cities: whose resilience and whose city? *Building Research and Information*, **42(2)**, 191–201, doi:10.1080/09613218.2014.850602.
Van Aelst, K. and N. Holvoet, 2016: Intersections of gender and marital status in accessing climate change adaptation: evidence from rural Tanzania. *World Development*, **79**, 40–50, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.003.
Van de Graaf, T. and A. Verbruggen, 2015: The oil endgame: strategies of oil exporters in a carbon-constrained world. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **54**, 456–462, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.004.
van der Geest, K. and K. Warner, 2015: Editorial: Loss and damage from climate change: emerging perspectives. *International Journal of Global Warming*, **8(2)**, 133–140, doi:10.1504/ijgw.2015.071964.
Van der Heijden, J., 2018: The limits of voluntary programs for low-carbon buildings for staying under 1.5°C. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **30**, 59–66, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.03.006.
van der Voorn, T., J. Quist, C. Pahl-Wostl, and M. Haasnoot, 2017: Envisioning robust climate change adaptation futures for coastal regions: a comparative evaluation of cases in three continents. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **22(3)**, 519–546, doi:10.1007/s11027-015-9686-4.
van Noorloos, F. and M. Kloosterboer, 2017: Africa's new cities: The contested future of urbanisation. *Urban Studies*, 1–19, doi:10.1177/0042098017700574.
van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2017a: The Shared Socio-economic Pathways: Trajectories for human development and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 148–152, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.009.
van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2017b: Energy, land-use and greenhouse gas emissions trajectories under a green growth paradigm. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 237–250, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.008.
van Vuuren, D.P. et al., 2018: Alternative pathways to the 1.5°C target reduce the need for negative emission technologies. *Nature Climate Change*, **8**, 1–7, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0119-8.
Vanhala, L. and C. Hestbaek, 2016: Framing climate change Loss and Damage in UNFCCC negotiations. *Global Environmental Politics*, **16(4)**, 111–129, doi:10.1162/glep_a_00379.
Vardakoulias, O. and N. Nicholles, 2014: *Managing uncertainty: An economic evaluation of community-based adaptation in Dakoro, Niger*. nef consulting, London, UK, 53 pp.
Veland, S. et al., 2018: Narrative matters for sustainability: the transformative role of storytelling in realizing 1.5°C futures. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 41–47, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.005.
Vermeulen, S. et al., 2016: *The Economic Advantage: Assessing the value of climate change actions in agriculture*. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Rome, Italy, 77 pp.
Vierros, M., 2017: Communities and blue carbon: the role of traditional management systems in providing benefits for carbon storage, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 89–100, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0920-3.
Vinyeta, K., K.P. Whyte, and K. Lynn, 2015: *Climate Change Through an Intersectional Lens: Gendered Vulnerability and Resilience in Indigenous Communities in the United States*. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-923, US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Corvallis, Oregon, USA, 72 pp.
Vogt-Schilb, A. and S. Hallegatte, 2017: Climate Policies and Nationally Determined Contributions: Reconciling the Needed Ambition with the Political Economy. IDB Working Paper Series No. IDB-WP-818, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC, USA, 35 pp., doi:10.18235/0000714.
Volz, U. et al., 2015: *Financing the Green Transformation: How to Make Green Finance Work in Indonesia*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK, 174 pp., doi:10.1057/9781137486127.
von Stechow, C. et al., 2015: Integrating Global Climate Change Mitigation Goals with Other Sustainability Objectives: A Synthesis. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **40(1)**, 363–394, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-021113-095626.
von Stechow, C. et al., 2016: 2°C and SDGs: United they stand, divided they fall? *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(3)**, 034022, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034022.
Wachsmuth, D., D. Cohen, and H. Angelo, 2016: Expand the frontiers of urban sustainability. *Nature*, **536**, 391–393, doi:10.1038/536391a.
Waisman, H.-D., C. Guivarch, and F. Lecocq, 2013: The transportation sector and low-carbon growth pathways: modelling urban, infrastructure, and spatial determinants of mobility. *Climate Policy*, **13(sup01)**, 106–129, doi:10.1080/14693062.2012.735916.
Wallimann-Helmer, I., 2015: Justice for climate loss and damage. *Climatic Change*, **133(3)**, 469–480, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1483-2.
Walsh-Dilley, M. and W. Wolford, 2015: (Un)Defining resilience: subjective understandings of 'resilience' from the field. *Resilience*, **3(3)**, 173–182, doi:10.1080/21693293.2015.1072310.
Wamsler, C., C. Luederitz, E. Brink, C. Wamsler, and C. Luederitz, 2014: Local levers for change: mainstreaming ecosystem-based adaptation into municipal planning to foster sustainability transitions. *Global Environmental Change*, **29**, 189–201, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.008.
Wang, X., 2017: The role of attitudinal motivations and collective efficacy on Chinese consumers' intentions to engage in personal behaviors to mitigate climate change. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1–13, doi:10.1080/00224545.2017.1302401.
Wang, Y., Q. Song, J. He, and Y. Qi, 2015: Developing low-carbon cities through pilots. *Climate Policy*, **15**, 81–103, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1050347.
Wanner, T., 2014: The new 'Passive Revolution' of the green economy and growth discourse: Maintaining the 'Sustainable Development' of Neoliberal capitalism. *New Political Economy*, **20(1)**, 1–21, doi:10.1080/13563467.2013.866081.
Warner, B.P. and C.P. Kuzdas, 2017: The role of political economy in framing and producing transformative adaptation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **29**, 69–74, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.012.
Warner, B.P., C. Kuzdas, M.G. Yglesias, and D.L. Childers, 2015: Limits to adaptation to interacting global change risks among smallholder rice farmers in Northwest Costa Rica. *Global Environmental Change*, **30**, 101–112, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.11.002.
Warner, K. and K. Geest, 2013: Loss and damage from climate change: local-level evidence from nine vulnerable countries. *International Journal of Global Warming*, **5(4)**, 367–386, doi:10.1504/ijgw.2013.057289.
Watts, N. et al., 2015: Health and climate change: policy responses to protect public health. *The Lancet*, **386(10006)**, 1861–1914, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60854-6.
Wegner, G.I., 2016: Payments for ecosystem services (PES): a flexible, participatory, and integrated approach for improved conservation and equity outcomes. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **18(3)**, 617–644, doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9673-7.
Weisser, F., M. Bollig, M. Doevenspeck, and D. Müller-Mahn, 2014: Translating the 'adaptation to climate change' paradigm: the politics of a travelling idea in Africa. *The Geographical Journal*, **180(2)**, 111–119, doi:10.1111/geoj.12037.
Wells, E.M. et al., 2015: Indoor air quality and occupant comfort in homes with deep versus conventional energy efficiency renovations. *Building and Environment*, **93(Part 2)**, 331–338, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.06.021.
Welsch, M. et al., 2014: Adding value with CLEWS – Modelling the energy system and its interdependencies for Mauritius. *Applied Energy*, **113**, 1434–1445, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.08.083.
Weng, X., Z. Dong, Q. Wu, and Y. Qin, 2015: *China's path to a green economy: decoding China's green economy concepts and policies*. IIED Country Report, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, UK, 40 pp.

Werfel, S.H., 2017: Household behaviour crowds out support for climate change policy when sufficient progress is perceived. *Nature Climate Change*, **7(7)**, 512–515, doi:10.1038/nclimate3316.

Wesseling, J.H. et al., 2017: The transition of energy intensive processing industries towards deep decarbonization: Characteristics and implications for future research. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79**, 1303–1313, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.156.

Weston, P., R. Hong, C. Kaboré, and C.A. Kull, 2015: Farmer-managed natural regeneration enhances rural livelihoods in dryland West Africa. *Environmental Management*, **55(6)**, 1402–1417, doi:10.1007/s00267-015-0469-1.

Wewerinke-Singh, M., 2018a: Climate migrants' right to enjoy their culture. In: *Climate Refugees: Beyond the Legal Impasse?* [Behrman, S. and A. Kent (eds.)]. Earthscan/Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 194–213.

Wewerinke-Singh, M., 2018b: State Responsibility for Human Rights Violations Associated with Climate Change. In: *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights and Climate Governance* [Duyck, S., S. Jodoin, and A. Johl (eds.)]. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 75–89.

WHO, 2014: Quantitative risk assessment of the effects of climate change on selected causes of death, 2030s and 2050s. [Hales, S., S. Kovats, S. Lloyd, and D. Campbell-Lendrum (eds.)]. World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, Switzerland, 128 pp.

Wiebe, K. et al., 2015: Climate change impacts on agriculture in 2050 under a range of plausible socioeconomic and emissions scenarios. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(8)**, 085010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/8/085010.

Wiktorowicz, J., T. Babaeff, J. Eggleston, and P. Newman, 2018: WGV: an Australian urban precinct case study to demonstrate the 1.5C agenda including multiple SDGs. *Urban Planning*, **3(2)**, 64–81, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1245.

Wilkinson, E., A. Kirbyshire, L. Mayhew, P. Batra, and A. Milan, 2016: *Climate-induced migration and displacement: closing the policy gap*. Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, UK, 12 pp.

Willand, N., I. Ridley, and C. Maller, 2015: Towards explaining the health impacts of residential energy efficiency interventions – A realist review. Part 1: Pathways. *Social Science and Medicine*, **133**, 191–201, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.005.

Winkler, H. and N.K. Dubash, 2016: Who determines transformational change in development and climate finance? *Climate Policy*, **16(6)**, 783–791, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1033674.

Winkler, H. et al., 2018: Countries start to explain how their climate contributions are fair: more rigour needed. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **18(1)**, 99–115, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9381-x.

Winsemius, H.C. et al., 2018: Disaster risk, climate change, and poverty: assessing the global exposure of poor people to floods and droughts. *Environment and Development Economics*, **17**, 1–21, doi:10.1017/s1355770X17000444.

Wise, R.M. et al., 2014: Reconceptualising adaptation to climate change as part of pathways of change and response. *Global Environmental Change*, **28**, 325–336, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.002.

Wood, B.T., 2017: Socially just triple-wins? An evaluation of projects that pursue climate compatible development goals in Malawi. PhD Thesis, School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK, 278 pp.

Wood, B.T., S.M. Sallu, and J. Paavola, 2016a: Can CDM finance energy access in Least Developed Countries? Evidence from Tanzania. *Climate Policy*, **16(4)**, 456–473, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1027166.

Wood, B.T., A.J. Dougill, C.H. Quinn, and L.C. Stringer, 2016b: Exploring Power and Procedural Justice Within Climate Compatible Development Project Design: Whose Priorities Are Being Considered? *The Journal of Environment & Development*, **25(4)**, 363–395, doi:10.1177/1070496516664179.

Work, C., 2015: Intersections of Climate Change Mitigation Policies, Land Grabbing and Conflict in a Fragile State: Insights from Cambodia. MOSAIC Working Paper Series No. 2, MOSAIC Research project, International Institute of Social Studies (IISS), RCSD Chiang Mai University, 34 pp.

Wright, H., S. Huq, and J. Reeves, 2015: Impact of climate change on least developed countries: are the SDGs possible? IIED Briefing May 2015, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, UK, 4 pp.

WWF, 2017: *Responsible sourcing of forest products: The business case for retailers*. World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Gland, Switzerland, 47 pp.

Wyborn, C., L. Yung, D. Murphy, and D.R. Williams, 2015: Situating adaptation: how governance challenges and perceptions of uncertainty influence adaptation in the Rocky Mountains. *Regional Environmental Change*, **15(4)**, 669–682, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0663-3.

Yang, S., B. Chen, and S. Ulgiati, 2016: Co-benefits of CO_2 and PM2.5 Emission Reduction. *Energy Procedia*, **104**, 92–97, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2016.12.017.

Yaro, J.A., J. Teye, and S. Bawakyillenuo, 2015: Local institutions and adaptive capacity to climate change/variability in the northern savannah of Ghana. *Climate and Development*, **7(3)**, 235–245, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.951018.

Zeng, H., X. Chen, X. Xiao, and Z. Zhou, 2017: Institutional pressures, sustainable supply chain management, and circular economy capability: Empirical evidence from Chinese eco-industrial park firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **155**, 54–65, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.093.

Zhang, H. and W. Chen, 2015: The role of biofuels in China's transport sector in carbon mitigation scenarios. *Energy Procedia*, **75**, 2700–2705, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2015.07.682.

Zhang, S., E. Worrell, and W. Crijns-Graus, 2015: Cutting air pollution by improving energy efficiency of China's cement industry. *Energy Procedia*, **83**, 10–20, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2015.12.191.

Zhang, Y. et al., 2017: Processes of coastal ecosystem carbon sequestration and approaches for increasing carbon sink. *Science China Earth Sciences*, **60(5)**, 809–820, doi:10.1007/s11430-016-9010-9.

Zhao, D., A.P. McCoy, J. Du, P. Agee, and Y. Lu, 2017: Interaction effects of building technology and resident behavior on energy consumption in residential buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, **134**, 223–233, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.10.049.

Ziervogel, G., A. Cowen, and J. Ziniades, 2016: Moving from adaptive to transformative capacity: Building foundations for inclusive, thriving, and regenerative urban settlements. *Sustainability*, **8(9)**, 955, doi:10.3390/su8090955.

Ziervogel, G. et al., 2017: Inserting rights and justice into urban resilience: a focus on everyday risk. *Environment and Urbanization*, **29(1)**, 123–138, doi:10.1177/0956247816686905.

Zimm, C., F. Sperling, and S. Busch, 2018: Identifying sustainability and knowledge gaps in socio-economic pathways vis-à-vis the Sustainable Development Goals. *Economies*, **6(2)**, 20, doi:10.3390/economies6020020.

REF

Reference list for Table 5.2.

Aamaas, B. and G.P. Peters, 2017: The climate impact of Norwegians' travel behavior. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, **6**, 10–18, doi:10.1016/j.tbs.2016.04.001.

Abanda, F.H., M.B. Manjia, K.E. Enongene, J.H.M. Tah, and C. Pettang, 2016: A feasibility study of a residential photovoltaic system in Cameroon. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, **17**, 38–49, doi:10.1016/j.seta.2016.08.002.

Abdelouas, A., 2006: Uranium mill tailings: geochemistry, mineralogy, and environmental impact. *Elements*, **2(6)**, 335–341, doi:10.2113/gselements.2.6.335.

Abdul Quader, M., S. Ahmed, S.Z. Dawal, and Y. Nukman, 2016: Present needs, recent progress and future trends of energy-efficient Ultra-Low Carbon Dioxide (CO_2) Steelmaking (ULCOS) program. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **55**, 537–549, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.101.

Acemoglu, D., 2009: *Introduction to modern economic growth*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 1008 pp.

Acemoglu, D., F.A. Gallego, and J.A. Robinson, 2014: Institutions, human Capital, and development. *Annual Review of Economics*, **6(1)**, 875–912, doi:10.1146/annurev-economics-080213-041119.

Acheampong, M., F.C. Ertem, B. Kappler, and P. Neubauer, 2017: In pursuit of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) number 7: Will biofuels be reliable? *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **75(7)**, 927–937, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.074.

Adamantiades, A. and I. Kessides, 2009: Nuclear power for sustainable development: Current status and future prospects. *Energy Policy*, **37(12)**, 5149–5166, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.052.

Aggarwal, P., 2017: 2°C target, India's climate action plan and urban transport sector. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, **6**, 110–116, doi:10.1016/j.tbs.2016.11.001.

Ahearne, J.F., 2011: Prospects for nuclear energy. *Energy Economics*, **33(4)**, 572–580, doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2010.11.014.

Ahmad, S. and J.A. Puppim de Oliveira, 2016: Determinants of urban mobility in India: lessons for promoting sustainable and inclusive urban transportation in developing countries. *Transport Policy*, **50**, 106–114, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2016.04.014.

Åhman, M., L.J. Nilsson, and B. Johansson, 2017: Global climate policy and deep decarbonization of energy-intensive industries. *Climate Policy*, **17(5)**, 634–649, doi:10.1080/14693062.2016.1167009.

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**, 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.

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.

Alahakoon, S., 2017: Significance of energy storages in future power networks. *Energy Procedia*, **110**, 14–19, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.098.

Alho, C.J.R., 2011: Environmental Effects of Hydropower Reservoirs on Wild Mammals and Freshwater Turtles in Amazonia: A Review. *Oecologia Australis*, **15(3)**, 593–604, doi:10.4257/oeco.2011.1503.11.

Ali, S.M.H., M.J.S. Zuberi, M.A. Tariq, D. Baker, and A. Mohiuddin, 2015: A study to incorporate renewable energy technologies into the power portfolio of Karachi, Pakistan. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **47**, 14–22, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.03.009.

Allen, S., T. Dietz, and A.M. McCright, 2015: Measuring household energy efficiency behaviors with attention to behavioral plasticity in the United States. *Energy Research & Social Science*, **10**, 133–140, doi:10.1016/j.erss.2015.07.014.

Alongi, D.M., 2012: Carbon sequestration in mangrove forests. *Carbon Management*, **3(3)**, 313–322, doi:10.4155/cmt.12.20.

AlSabbagh, M., Y.L. Siu, A. Guehnemann, and J. Barrett, 2017: Integrated approach to the assessment of CO_2e-mitigation measures for the road passenger transport sector in Bahrain. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **71**, 203–215, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.12.052.

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.

Al-Zoughool, M. and D. Krewski, 2009: Health effects of radon: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Radiation Biology*, **85(1)**, 57–69, doi:10.1080/09553000802635054.

Anda, M. and J. Temmen, 2014: Smart metering for residential energy efficiency: the use of community based social marketing for behavioural change and smart grid introduction. *Renewable Energy*, **67**, 119–127, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2013.11.020.

Anderson, A. et al., 2017: Empowering smart communities: electrification, education, and sustainable entrepreneurship in IEEE Smart Village Initiatives. *IEEE Electrification Magazine*, **5(2)**, 6–16, doi:10.1109/mele.2017.2685738.

Andrew, D., 2017: *Trade and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 15: Promoting "Life on Land" through Mandatory and Voluntary Approaches*. ADBI Working Paper Series, No. 700, Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI), Tokyo, Japan, 33 pp.

Anenberg, S.C. et al., 2013: Cleaner cooking solutions to achieve health, climate, and economic cobenefits. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **47(9)**, 3944–3952, doi:10.1021/es304942e.

Apeaning, R.W. and P. Thollander, 2013: Barriers to and driving forces for industrial energy efficiency improvements in African industries: a case study of Ghana's largest industrial area. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **53**, 204–213, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.04.003.

Apps, J.A., L. Zheng, Y. Zhang, T. Xu, and J.T. Birkholzer, 2010: Evaluation of Potential Changes in Groundwater Quality in Response to CO_2 Leakage from Deep Geologic Storage. *Transport in Porous Media*, **82(1)**, 215–246, doi:10.1007/s11242-009-9509-8.

Aranda, C., A.C. Kuesel, and E.R. Fletcher, 2014: *A systematic review of linkages between access to electricity in healthcare facilities, health services delivery, and health outcomes: findings for emergency referrals, maternal and child services*. UBS Optimus Foundation & Liberian Institute for Biomedical Research, Zurich, Switzerland.

Asaduzzaman, M., D.F. Barnes, and S.R. Khandker, 2010: *Restoring Balance: Bangladesh's Rural Energy Realities*. World Bank Working Paper: No. 181, World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 170 pp., doi:10.1596/978-0-8213-7897-7.

Asfaw, A., C. Mark, and R. Pana-Cryan, 2013: Profitability and occupational injuries in US underground coal mines. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, **50**, 778–786, doi:10.1016/j.aap.2012.07.002.

Ashworth, P. et al., 2012: What's in store: Lessons from implementing CCS. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **9**, 402–409, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.04.012.

Atchley, A.L., R.M. Maxwell, and A.K. Navarre-Sitchler, 2013: Human health risk assessment of CO_2 leakage into overlying aquifers using a stochastic, geochemical reactive transport approach. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **47(11)**, 5954–5962.

Azevedo, I. and V.M.S. Leal, 2017: Methodologies for the evaluation of local climate change mitigation actions: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79**, 681–690, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.100.

Babiker, M.H. and R.S. Eckaus, 2007: Unemployment effects of climate policy. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **10(7–8)**, 600–609, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2007.05.002.

Bailis, R., R. Drigo, A. Ghilardi, and O. Masera, 2015: The carbon footprint of traditional woodfuels. *Nature Climate Change*, **5(3)**, 266–272, doi:10.1038/nclimate2491.

Bajželj, B. et al., 2014: Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(10)**, 924–929, doi:10.1038/nclimate2353.

Balishter, G.V.K. and R. Singh, 1991: Impact of mechanization on employment and farm productivity. *Productivity*, **32(3)**, 484–489.

Banerjee, R. et al., 2012: Energy End-Use: Industry. In: *Global Energy Assessment – Toward a Sustainable Future* [Johansson, T.B., N. Nakicenovic, A. Patwardhan, and L. Gomez-Echeverri (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, pp. 513–574.

Bartley, T., 2010: Transnational Private Regulation in Practice: The Limits of Forest and Labor Standards Certification in Indonesia. *Business and Politics*, **12(03)**, 1–34, doi:10.2202/1469-3569.1321.

Bartos, M.D. and M. Chester, 2014: The Conservation Nexus: Valuing Interdependent Water and Energy Savings in Arizona. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **48(4)**, 2139–2149, doi:10.1021/es4033343.

Bastos Lima, M.G., W. Ashely-Cantello, I. Visseren-Hamakers, A. Gupta, and J. Braña-Varela, 2015: *Forests Post-2015: Maximizing Synergies between the Sustainable Development Goals and REDD+*. WWF-WUR Policy Brief No. 3, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Wageningen University & Research (WUR), 5 pp.
Bastos Lima, M.G., G. Kissinger, I.J. Visseren-Hamakers, J. Braña-Varela, and A. Gupta, 2017: The Sustainable Development Goals and REDD+: assessing institutional interactions and the pursuit of synergies. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **17(4)**, 589–606, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9366-9.
Bazilian, M. et al., 2011: Considering the energy, water and food nexus: towards an integrated modelling approach. *Energy Policy*, **39(12)**, 7896–7906, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.09.039.
Beddington, J. et al., 2012: *Achieving food security in the face of climate change: Final report from the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change*. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), Copenhagen, Denmark, 59 pp.
Behnassi, M., M. Boussaid, and R. Gopichandran, 2014: Achieving Food Security in a Changing Climate: The Potential of Climate-Smart Agriculture. In: *Environmental Cost and Face of Agriculture in the Gulf Cooperation Council Countries* [Shahid, S.A. and M. Ahmed (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 27–42, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-05768-2_2.
Bellarby, J. et al., 2013: Livestock greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation potential in Europe. *Global Change Biology*, **19(1)**, 3–18, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02786.x.
Belton Chevallier, L., B. Motte-Baumvol, S. Fol, and Y. Jouffe, 2018: Coping with the costs of car dependency: A system of expedients used by low-income households on the outskirts of Dijon and Paris. *Transport Policy*, **65**, 79–88, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2017.06.006.
Benson, S.M. and D.R. Cole, 2008: CO_2 Sequestration in Deep Sedimentary Formations. *Elements*, **4(5)**, 325–331, doi:10.2113/gselements.4.5.325.
Bernard, T. and M. Torero, 2015: Social interaction effects and connection to electricity: experimental evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, **63(3)**, 459–484, doi:10.1086/679746.
Bernier, Q. et al., 2013: *Addressing Gender in Climate-Smart Smallholder Agriculture*. ICRAF Policy Brief 14, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Nairobi, Kenya, 4 pp.
Berrueta, V.M., M. Serrano-Medrano, C. Garcia-Bustamante, M. Astier, and O.R. Masera, 2017: Promoting sustainable local development of rural communities and mitigating climate change: the case of Mexico's Patsari improved cookstove project. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 63–77, doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1523-y.
Bertram, C. et al., 2015: Carbon lock-in through capital stock inertia associated with weak near-term climate policies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90(PA)**, 62–72, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.10.001.
Bhattacharyya, A., J.P. Meltzer, J. Oppenheim, Z. Qureshi, and N. Stern, 2016: *Delivering on better infrastructure for better development and better climate*. The Brookings Institution, The New Climate Economy, and Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, 160 pp.
Bhojvaid, V. et al., 2014: How do People in Rural India Perceive Improved Stoves and Clean Fuel? Evidence from Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, **11(2)**, 1341–1358, doi:10.3390/ijerph110201341.
Bickerstaff, K., P. Simmons, and N. Pidgeon, 2008: Constructing Responsibilities for Risk: Negotiating Citizen – State Relationships. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, **40(6)**, 1312–1330, doi:10.1068/a39150.
Bilton, A.M., R. Wiesman, A.F.M. Arif, S.M. Zubair, and S. Dubowsky, 2011: On the feasibility of community-scale photovoltaic-powered reverse osmosis desalination systems for remote locations. *Renewable Energy*, **36(12)**, 3246–3256, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2011.03.040.
Blyth, W. et al., 2014: *Low carbon jobs: the evidence for net job creation from policy support for energy efficiency and renewable energy*. Technical Report, UK Energy Research Centre, London, UK, 66 pp.
Bogdanski, A., 2012: Integrated food-energy systems for climate-smart agriculture. *Agriculture & Food Security*, **1(1)**, 9, doi:10.1186/2048-7010-1-9.
Bonan, J., S. Pareglio, and M. Tavoni, 2014: *Access to Modern Energy: A Review of Impact Evaluations*. Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy, 30 pp.
Bongardt, D. et al., 2013: *Low-Carbon Land Transport: Policy Handbook*. Routledge, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 264 pp.
Bonsch, M. et al., 2016: Trade-offs between land and water requirements for large-scale bioenergy production. *GCB Bioenergy*, **8(1)**, 11–24, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12226.
Borenstein, S., 2012: The private and public economics of renewable electricity generation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **26**, 67–92, doi:10.1257/jep.26.1.67.
Branca, G., N. McCarthy, L. Lipper, and M.C. Jolejole, 2011: *Climate-smart agriculture: a synthesis of empirical evidence of food security and mitigation benefits from improved cropland management*. Mitigation of Climate Change in Agriculture Series 3, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy, 35 pp.
Brandl, P., S.M. Soltani, P.S. Fennell, and N. Mac Dowell, 2017: Evaluation of cooling requirements of post-combustion CO_2 capture applied to coal-fired power plants. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design*, **122**, 1–10, doi:10.1016/j.cherd.2017.04.001.
Brown, H.C.P., 2011: Gender, climate change and REDD+ in the Congo Basin forests of Central Africa. *International Forestry Review*, **13(2)**, 163–176, doi:10.1505/146554811797406651.
Brugge, D. and V. Buchner, 2011: Health effects of uranium: new research findings. *Reviews on Environmental Health*, **26(4)**, 231–249, doi:10.1515/reveh.2011.032.
Buck, B.H. and G. Krause, 2012: Integration of Aquaculture and Renewable Energy Systems. In: *Encyclopedia of Sustainability Science and Technology Vol. 1*. Springer Science+ Business Media, New York, NY, USA, pp. 511–533, doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-0851-3_180.
Burgherr, P., P. Eckle, and S. Hirschberg, 2012: Comparative assessment of severe accident risks in the coal, oil and natural gas chains. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, **105**, 97–103, doi:10.1016/j.ress.2012.03.020.
Burlig, F. and L. Preonas, 2016: *Out of the darkness and into the light? Development effects of rural electrification*. EI @ Haas WP 268, Energy Institute at Haas, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA, 52 pp.
Burney, J., H. Alaofè, R. Naylor, and D. Taren, 2017: Impact of a rural solar electrification project on the level and structure of women's empowerment. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(9)**, 095007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa7f38.
Burton, C.H., 2007: The potential contribution of separation technologies to the management of livestock manure. *Livestock Science*, **112(3)**, 208–216, doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2007.09.004.
Bustamante, M. et al., 2014: Co-benefits, trade-offs, barriers and policies for greenhouse gas mitigation in the agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) sector. *Global Change Biology*, **20(10)**, 3270–3290, doi:10.1111/gcb.12591.
Byers, E.A., J.W. Hall, J.M. Amezaga, G.M. O'Donnell, and A. Leathard, 2016: Water and climate risks to power generation with carbon capture and storage. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(2)**, 024011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/2/024011.
Byravan, S. et al., 2017: Quality of life for all: A sustainable development framework for India's climate policy reduces greenhouse gas emissions. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, **39**, 48–58, doi:10.1016/j.esd.2017.04.003.
Cabraal, A.R., D.F. Barnes, and S.G. Agarwal, 2005: Productive uses of energy for rural development. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **30(1)**, 117–144, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144228.
CAF, 2017: *Crecimiento urbano y accesso a Oportunidades: un desafío para América Latina (in Spanish)*. Corporacion Andina de Fomento (CAF), Bogotá, Colombia, 287 pp.
Cameron, C. et al., 2016: Policy trade-offs between climate mitigation and clean cook-stove access in South Asia. *Nature Energy*, **1**, 1–5, doi:10.1038/nenergy.2015.10.
Cameron, R.W.F., J. Taylor, and M. Emmett, 2015: A Hedera green facade – energy performance and saving under different maritime-temperate, winter weather conditions. *Building and Environment*, **92**, 111–121, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.04.011.
Campbell, B.M., P. Thornton, R. Zougmoré, P. van Asten, and L. Lipper, 2014: Sustainable intensification: What is its role in climate smart agriculture? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **8**, 39–43, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2014.07.002.
Cardis, E. et al., 2006: Estimates of the cancer burden in Europe from radioactive fallout from the Chernobyl accident. *International Journal of Cancer*, **119(6)**, 1224–1235, doi:10.1002/ijc.22037.
Carrara, S. and T. Longden, 2017: Freight futures: The potential impact of road freight on climate policy. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, **55**, 359–372, doi:10.1016/j.trd.2016.10.007.

Cascajo, R., A. Garcia-Martinez, and A. Monzon, 2017: Stated preference survey for estimating passenger transfer penalties: design and application to Madrid. *European Transport Research Review*, **9(3)**, 42, doi:10.1007/s12544-017-0260-x.
Casillas, C.E. and D.M. Kammen, 2010: The Energy-Poverty-Climate Nexus. *Science*, **330(6008)**, 1181–1182, doi:10.1126/science.1197412.
Casillas, C.E. and D.M. Kammen, 2012: Quantifying the social equity of carbon mitigation strategies. *Climate Policy*, **12(6)**, 690–703, doi:10.1080/14693062.2012.669097.
Cass, N., G. Walker, and P. Devine-Wright, 2010: Good neighbours, public relations and bribes: the politics and perceptions of community benefit provision in renewable energy development in the UK. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, **12(3)**, 255–275, doi:10.1080/1523908x.2010.509558.
Cayla, J.-M. and D. Osso, 2013: Does energy efficiency reduce inequalities? Impact of policies in Residential sector on household budget. In: *ECEEE Summer Study Proceedings*. European Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ECEEE), Toulon/Hyeres, France, pp. 1247–1257.
CDP, 2015: *CDP Global Climate Change Report 2015 – At the tipping point?* Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) Worldwide, 91 pp.
Chakrabarti, S. and E.J. Shin, 2017: Automobile dependence and physical inactivity: insights from the California Household Travel Survey. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6**, 262–271, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.002.
Chakravarty, D., S. Dasgupta, and J. Roy, 2013: Rebound effect: how much to worry? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 216–228, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.03.001.
Chakravorty, U., M. Pelli, and B. Ural Marchand, 2014: Does the quality of electricity matter? Evidence from rural India. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, **107**, 228–247, doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2014.04.011.
Chan, E.Y.Y. and S.M. Griffiths, 2010: The epidemiology of mine accidents in China. *The Lancet*, **376(9741)**, 575–577, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(10)60660-5.
Chaturvedi, V. and P.R. Shukla, 2014: Role of energy efficiency in climate change mitigation policy for India: assessment of co-benefits and opportunities within an integrated assessment modeling framework. *Climatic Change*, **123(3)**, 597–609, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0898-x.
Chen, B. and X. Qi, 2018: Protest response and contingent valuation of an urban forest park in Fuzhou City, China. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 68–76, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.11.005.
Chen, H., H. Qi, R. Long, and M. Zhang, 2012: Research on 10-year tendency of China coal mine accidents and the characteristics of human factors. *Safety science*, **50(4)**, 745–750, doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2011.08.040.
Cherian, A., 2015: *Energy and Global Climate Change: Bridging the Sustainable Development Divide*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Chichester, UK, 304 pp., doi:10.1002/9781118846070.
Chowdhury, S.K., 2010: Impact of infrastructures on paid work opportunities and unpaid work burdens on rural women in Bangladesh. *Journal of International Development*, **22(7)**, 997–1017, doi:10.1002/jid.1607.
Cibin, R., E. Trybula, I. Chaubey, S.M. Brouder, and J.J. Volenec, 2016: Watershed-scale impacts of bioenergy crops on hydrology and water quality using improved SWAT model. *GCB Bioenergy*, **8(4)**, 837–848, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12307.
Clancy, J.S., T. Winther, M. Matinga, and S. Oparaocha, 2012: *Gender equity in access to and benefits from modern energy and improved energy technologies: world development report background paper*. Gender and Energy WDR Background Paper 44, ETC/ENERGIA in association Nord/Sør-konsulentene, 44 pp.
Clarke, L.E. et al., 2009: International climate policy architectures: Overview of the EMF 22 International Scenarios. *Energy Economics*, **31**, S64–S81, doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2009.10.013.
Clarke, L.E. et al., 2014: Assessing transformation pathways. In: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 413–510.
Clifton, K.J., 2004: Mobility Strategies and Food Shopping for Low-Income Families: A Case Study. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **23(4)**, 402–413, doi:10.1177/0739456x04264919.
Colenbrander, S. et al., 2016: Can low-carbon urban development be pro-poor? The case of Kolkata, India. *Environment and Urbanization*, **29(1)**, 139–158, doi:10.1177/0956247816677775.
Connolly, D. et al., 2014: Heat Roadmap Europe: Combining district heating with heat savings to decarbonise the EU energy system. *Energy Policy*, **65**, 475–489, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.035.
Cook, P., 2011: Infrastructure, rural electrification and development. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, **15(3)**, 304–313, doi:10.1016/j.esd.2011.07.008.
Cooke, S.J. et al., 2016: On the sustainability of inland fisheries: finding a future for the forgotten. *Ambio*, **45(7)**, 753–764, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0787-4.
Corbera, E. and U. Pascual, 2012: Ecosystem Services: Heed Social Goals. *Science*, **335(6069)**, 655–656, doi:10.1126/science.335.6069.655-c.
Corner, A. et al., 2011: Nuclear power, climate change and energy security: Exploring British public attitudes. *Energy Policy*, **39(9)**, 4823–4833, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.06.037.
Corsten, M., A. Ramirez, L. Shen, J. Koornneef, and A. Faaij, 2013: Environmental impact assessment of CCS chains – lessons learned and limitations from LCA literature. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **13**, 59–71.
Crane, R., 2007: Is There a Quiet Revolution in Women's Travel? Revisiting the Gender Gap in Commuting. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **73(3)**, 298–316, doi:10.1080/01944360708977979.
Creutzig, F., R. Mühlhoff, and J. Römer, 2012: Decarbonizing urban transport in European cities: four cases show possibly high co-benefits. *Environmental Research Letters*, **7(4)**, 044042, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044042.
Creutzig, F., C. Esteve, B. Simon, and H. Carol, 2013: Integrating place-specific livelihood and equity outcomes into global assessments of bioenergy deployment. *Environmental Research Letters*, **8(3)**, 035047, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/035047.
Creutzig, F. et al., 2014: Catching two European birds with one renewable stone: mitigating climate change and Eurozone crisis by an energy transition. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **38**, 1015–1028, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.028.
Creutzig, F. et al., 2015: Transport: A roadblock to climate change mitigation? *Science*, **350(6263)**, 911–912, doi:10.1126/science.aac8033.
Creutzig, F. et al., 2016: Beyond technology: demand-side solutions for climate change mitigation. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **41(1)**, 173–198, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085428.
Cumbers, A., 2012: *Reclaiming Public Ownership: Making Space for Economic Democracy*. Zed Books Ltd, London, UK and New York, NY, USA, 192 pp.
Dagevos, H. and J. Voordouw, 2013: Sustainability and meat consumption: is reduction realistic? *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy*, **9(2)**, 1–10, doi:10.1080/15487733.2013.11908115.
Dahl, E.L., K. Bevanger, T. Nygård, E. Røskaft, and B.G. Stokke, 2012: Reduced breeding success in white-tailed eagles at Smøla windfarm, western Norway, is caused by mortality and displacement. *Biological Conservation*, **145(1)**, 79–85, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.10.012.
Daut, I., M. Adzrie, M. Irwanto, P. Ibrahim, and M. Fitra, 2013: Solar Powered Air Conditioning System. *Energy Procedia*, **36**, 444–453, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2013.07.050.
Davis, S.C. et al., 2013: Management swing potential for bioenergy crops. *GCB Bioenergy*, **5(6)**, 623–638, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12042.
de Best-Waldhober, M., D. Daamen, and A. Faaij, 2009: Informed and uninformed public opinions on CO_2 capture and storage technologies in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **3(3)**, 322–332, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.09.001.
de Koning, J.I.J.C., T.H. Ta, M.R.M. Crul, R. Wever, and J.C. Brezet, 2016: GetGreen Vietnam: towards more sustainable behaviour among the urban middle class. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134(Part A)**, 178–190, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.01.063.
de Lucas, M., M. Ferrer, M.J. Bechard, and A.R. Muñoz, 2012: Griffon vulture mortality at wind farms in southern Spain: distribution of fatalities and active mitigation measures. *Biological Conservation*, **147(1)**, 184–189, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.12.029.
de Moraes, M.A.F.D., C.C. Costa, J.J.M. Guilhoto, L.G.A. Souza, and F.C.R. Oliveira, 2010: Social Externalities of Fuels. In: *Ethanol and Bioelectricity: Sugarcane in the Future of the Energy Matrix* [Leão de Sousa, E.L. and I. de Carvalho Macedo (eds.)]. UNICA Brazilian Sugarcane Industry Association, São Paulo, Brazil, pp. 44–75.
De Stefano, L., J.D. Petersen-Perlman, E.A. Sproles, J. Eynard, and A.T. Wolf, 2017: Assessment of transboundary river basins for potential hydro-political tensions. *Global Environmental Change*, **45**, 35–46, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.04.008.

Dechezleprêtre, A. and M. Sato, 2014: *The impacts of environmental regulations on competitiveness*. London School of Economics (LSE) and Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), 28 pp.
Demetriades, J. and E. Esplen, 2009: The Gender Dimensions of Poverty and Climate Change Adaptation. *IDS Bulletin*, **39(4)**, 24–31, doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.2008.tb00473.x.
Denis-Ryan, A., C. Bataille, and F. Jotzo, 2016: Managing carbon-intensive materials in a decarbonizing world without a global price on carbon. *Climate Policy*, **16(sup1)**, S110–S128, doi:10.1080/14693062.2016.1176008.
Denman, K.L., 2008: Climate change, ocean processes and ocean iron fertilization. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **364**, 219–225, doi:10.3354/meps07542.
Denton, F., 2002: Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts, and Adaptation: Why Does Gender Matter? *Gender and Development*, **10(2)**, 10–20, www.jstor.org/stable/4030569.
Derbez, M. et al., 2014: Indoor air quality and comfort in seven newly built, energy-efficient houses in France. *Building and Environment*, **72**, 173–187, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.10.017.
Dinkelman, T., 2011: The Effects of Rural Electrification on Employment: New Evidence from South Africa. *The American Economic Review*, **101(7)**, 3078–3108, doi:10.1257/aer.101.7.3078.
Djamila, H., C.-M. Chu, and S. Kumaresan, 2013: Field study of thermal comfort in residential buildings in the equatorial hot-humid climate of Malaysia. *Building and Environment*, **62**, 133–142, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.01.017.
Dodson, J. and N. Sipe, 2008: Shocking the Suburbs: Urban Location, Homeownership and Oil Vulnerability in the Australian City. *Housing Studies*, **23(3)**, 377–401, doi:10.1080/02673030802015619.
Dodson, J., B. Gleeson, and N. Sipe, 2004: *Transport Disadvantage and Social Status: A review of literature and methods*. Urban Policy Program Research Monograph 5, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, 55 pp.
Dooley, K. and S. Kartha, 2018: Land-based negative emissions: risks for climate mitigation and impacts on sustainable development. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, **18(1)**, 79–98, doi:10.1007/s10784-017-9382-9.
Duarte, C.M., J. Wu, X. Xiao, A. Bruhn, and D. Krause-Jensen, 2017: Can Seaweed Farming Play a Role in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation? *Frontiers in Marine Science*, **4**, 100, doi:10.3389/fmars.2017.00100.
Dulac, J., 2013: *Global land transport infrastructure requirements: Estimating road and railway infrastructure capacity and costs to 2050*. 50 pp.
ECF, 2014: *Europe's low-carbon transition: Understanding the challenges and opportunities for the chemical sector*. European Climate Foundation (ECF), 60 pp.
Echegaray, F., 2016: Consumers' reactions to product obsolescence in emerging markets: the case of Brazil. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134**, 191–203, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.119.
Einsiedel, E.F., A.D. Boyd, J. Medlock, and P. Ashworth, 2013: Assessing socio-technical mindsets: Public deliberations on carbon capture and storage in the context of energy sources and climate change. *Energy Policy*, **53**, 149–158, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2012.10.042.
Eis, J., R. Bishop, and P. Gradwell, 2016: *Galvanising Low-Carbon Innovation. A New Climate Economy working paper for Seizing the Global Opportunity: Partnerships for Better Growth and a Better Climate*. New Climate Economy (NCE), Washington DC, USA and London, UK, 28 pp.
Epstein, A.H. and S.L.H. Theuer, 2017: Sustainable development and climate action: thoughts on an integrated approach to SDG and climate policy implementation. In: *Papers from Interconnections 2017*. Interconnections 2017.
Epstein, P.R. et al., 2011: Full cost accounting for the life cycle of coal. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1219(1)**, 73–98, doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05890.x.
Ertem, F.C., P. Neubauer, and S. Junne, 2017: Environmental life cycle assessment of biogas production from marine macroalgal feedstock for the substitution of energy crops. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **140**, 977–985, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.08.041.
Evenson, R.E., 1999: Global and local implications of biotechnology and climate change for future food supplies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **96(11)**, 5921–8, doi:10.1073/pnas.96.11.5921.
Fan, Y., Q. Qiao, L. Fang, and Y. Yao, 2017: Energy analysis on industrial symbiosis of an industrial park: a case study of Hefei economic and technological development area. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **141**, 791–798, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.159.
Fankhaeser, S., F. Sehlleier, and N. Stern, 2008: Climate change, innovation and jobs. *Climate Policy*, **8(4)**, 421–429, doi:10.3763/cpol.2008.0513.
Fankhauser, S. and S. Tepic, 2007: Can poor consumers pay for energy and water? An affordability analysis for transition countries. *Energy Policy*, **35(2)**, 1038–1049, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2006.02.003.
Fay, M. et al., 2015: *Decarbonizing Development: Three Steps to a Zero-Carbon Future*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 185 pp., doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0479-3.
Fernando, L. and S. Evans, 2015: Case Studies in Transformation towards Industrial Sustainability. *International Journal of Knowledge and Systems Science*, **6(3)**, 1–17, doi:10.4018/ijkss.2015070101.
Figueroa, M.J. and S.K. Ribeiro, 2013: Energy for road passenger transport and sustainable development: assessing policies and goals interactions. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 152–162, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.04.004.
Figueroa, M.J., L. Fulton, and G. Tiwari, 2013: Avoiding, transforming, transitioning: Pathways to sustainable low carbon passenger transport in developing countries. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 184–190, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.02.006.
Figueroa, M.J., O. Lah, L.M. Fulton, A. McKinnon, and G. Tiwari, 2014: Energy for transport. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, **39**, 295–325, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-031913-100450.
Finco, M.V.A. and W. Doppler, 2010: Bioenergy and sustainable development: The dilemma of food security and climate change in the Brazilian savannah. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, **14**, 194–199, doi:10.1016/j.esd.2010.04.006.
Fricko, O. et al., 2016: Energy sector water use implications of a 2°C degree climate policy. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(3)**, 034011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034011.
Frondel, M., N. Ritter, C.M. Schmidt, and C. Vance, 2010: Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energy technologies: The German experience. *Energy Policy*, **38(8)**, 4048–4056, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2010.03.029.
Fu, W., Y. Lü, P. Harris, A. Comber, and L. Wu, 2018: Peri-urbanization may vary with vegetation restoration: A large scale regional analysis. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 77–87, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.11.006.
Gallego, F., J.P. Montero, and C. Salas, 2013: The effect of transport policies on car use: A bundling model with applications. *Energy Economics*, **40**, S85–S97, doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2013.09.018.
Gao, L. and B.A. Bryan, 2017: Finding pathways to national-scale land-sector sustainability. *Nature*, **544(7649)**, 217–222, doi:10.1038/nature21694.
Garnett, T., 2011: Where are the best opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the food system (including the food chain)? *Food Policy*, **36**, S23–S32, doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.10.010.
Garvin, J.C., C.S. Jennelle, D. Drake, and S.M. Grodsky, 2011: Response of raptors to a windfarm. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **48(1)**, 199–209, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01912.x.
Ghosh-Dastidar, B. et al., 2014: Distance to Store, Food Prices, and Obesity in Urban Food Deserts. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, **47(5)**, 587–595, doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2014.07.005.
Gnanadesikan, A., J.L. Sarmiento, and R.D. Slater, 2003: Effects of patchy ocean fertilization on atmospheric carbon dioxide and biological production. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, **17(2)**, 1050, doi:10.1029/2002gb001940.
Godfray, H.C.J. and T. Garnett, 2014: Food security and sustainable intensification. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **369(1639)**, doi:10.1098/rstb.2012.0273.
Gohin, A., 2008: Impacts of the European Biofuel Policy on the Farm Sector: A General Equilibrium Assessment. *Review of Agricultural Economics*, **30(4)**, 623–641, www.jstor.org/stable/30225908.
Goldthau, A., 2014: Rethinking the governance of energy infrastructure: Scale, decentralization and polycentrism. *Energy Research & Social Science*, **1**, 134–140, doi:10.1016/j.erss.2014.02.009.
Gössling, S. and D. Metzler, 2017: Germany's climate policy: Facing an automobile dilemma. *Energy Policy*, **105**, 418–428, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.019.
Gouldson, A. et al., 2015: Exploring the economic case for climate action in cities. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 93–105, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.07.009.
Greenberg, H.R., J.A. Blink, and T.A. Buscheck, 2013: *Repository Layout and Required Ventilation Trade Studies in Clay/Shale using the DSEF Thermal Analytical Model*. LLNL-TR-638880, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Livermore, CA, USA, 33 pp.
Griffin, P.W., G.P. Hammond, and J.B. Norman, 2018: Industrial energy use and carbon emissions reduction in the chemicals sector: A UK perspective. *Applied Energy*, **227**, 587–602, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.08.010.

Griffiths, N.A. et al., 2017: Water quality effects of short-rotation pine management for bioenergy feedstocks in the southeastern United States. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **400**, 181–198, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2017.06.011.
Grill, G. et al., 2015: An index-based framework for assessing patterns and trends in river fragmentation and flow regulation by global dams at multiple scales. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(1)**, 015001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/1/015001.
Grodsky, S.M. et al., 2011: Investigating the causes of death for wind turbine-associated bat fatalities. *Journal of Mammalogy*, **92(5)**, 917–925, doi:10.1644/10-mamm-a-404.1.
Grogan, L. and A. Sadanand, 2013: Rural Electrification and Employment in Poor Countries: Evidence from Nicaragua. *World Development*, **43**, 252–265, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.09.002.
Grubert, E.A., 2016: Water consumption from hydroelectricity in the United States. *Advances in Water Resources*, **96**, 88–94, doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.07.004.
Grubler, A. and D. Fisk (eds.), 2013: *Energizing Sustainable Cities: Assessing Urban Energy*. Routledge Earthscan, Abingdon, UK and New York, NY, USA, 222 pp.
Guivarch, C., R. Crassous, O. Sassi, and S. Hallegatte, 2011: The costs of climate policies in a second-best world with labour market imperfections. *Climate Policy*, **11(1)**, 768–788, doi:10.3763/cpol.2009.0012.
Güssow, K., A. Proelss, A. Oschlies, K. Rehdanz, and W. Rickels, 2010: Ocean iron fertilization: why further research is needed. *Marine Policy*, **34(5)**, 911–918, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2010.01.015.
Gyamfi, S., S. Krumdieck, and T. Urmee, 2013: Residential peak electricity demand response – Highlights of some behavioural issues. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **25**, 71–77, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.04.006.
Ha, M. and M. Wu, 2017: Land management strategies for improving water quality in biomass production under changing climate. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(3)**, 034015, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa5f32.
Haileselassie, M., H. Taddele, K. Adhana, and S. Kalayou, 2013: Food safety knowledge and practices of abattoir and butchery shops and the microbial profile of meat in Mekelle City, Ethiopia. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, **3(5)**, 407–412, doi:10.1016/s2221-1691(13)60085-4.
Haines, A. and C. Dora, 2012: How the low carbon economy can improve health. *BMJ*, **344**, 1–6, doi:10.1136/bmj.e1018.
Haines, A. et al., 2007: Policies for accelerating access to clean energy, improving health, advancing development, and mitigating climate change. *The Lancet*, **370(9594)**, 1264–1281, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(07)61257-4.
Hallegatte, S. et al., 2016a: *Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*. The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 227 pp., doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0673-5.
Hallegatte, S. et al., 2016b: Mapping the climate change challenge. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(7)**, 663–668, doi:10.1038/nclimate3057.
Hammond, J. et al., 2017: The Rural Household Multi-Indicator Survey (RHoMIS) for rapid characterisation of households to inform climate smart agriculture interventions: Description and applications in East Africa and Central America. *Agricultural Systems*, **151**, 225–233, doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2016.05.003.
Hartmann, J. et al., 2013: Enhanced chemical weathering as a geoengineering strategy to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide, supply nutrients, and mitigate ocean acidification. *Reviews of Geophysics*, **51(2)**, 113–149, doi:10.1002/rog.20004.
Harvey, C.A. et al., 2014: Climate-Smart Landscapes: Opportunities and Challenges for Integrating Adaptation and Mitigation in Tropical Agriculture. *Conservation Letters*, **7(2)**, 77–90, doi:10.1111/conl.12066.
Hasegawa, T. et al., 2015: Consequence of climate mitigation on the risk of hunger. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **49(12)**, 7245–7253, doi:10.1021/es5051748.
Haves, E., 2012: *Does energy access help women? Beyond anecdotes: a review of the evidence*. Ashden, London, UK, 9 pp.
Havlík, P. et al., 2014: Climate change mitigation through livestock system transitions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **111(10)**, 3709–14, doi:10.1073/pnas.1308044111.
He, R., Y. Xiong, and Z. Lin, 2016: Carbon emissions in a dual channel closed loop supply chain: the impact of consumer free riding behavior. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134(Part A)**, 384–394, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.142.
Hedenus, F., S. Wirsenius, and D.J.A. Johansson, 2014: The importance of reduced meat and dairy consumption for meeting stringent climate change targets. *Climatic Change*, **124(1–2)**, 79–91, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1104-5.
Heinävaara, S. et al., 2010: Cancer incidence in the vicinity of Finnish nuclear power plants: an emphasis on childhood leukemia. *Cancer Causes & Control*, **21(4)**, 587–595, doi:10.1007/s10552-009-9488-7.
Heinonen, J., M. Jalas, J.K. Juntunen, S. Ala-Mantila, and S. Junnila, 2013: Situated lifestyles: II. The impacts of urban density, housing type and motorization on the greenhouse gas emissions of the middle-income consumers in Finland. *Environmental Research Letters*, **8(3)**, 035050, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/035050.
Hejazi, M.I. et al., 2015: 21st century United States emissions mitigation could increase water stress more than the climate change it is mitigating. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112(34)**, 10635–40, doi:10.1073/pnas.1421675112.
Hendrickson, T.P. and A. Horvath, 2014: A perspective on cost-effectiveness of greenhouse gas reduction solutions in water distribution systems. *Environmental Research Letters*, **9(2)**, 024017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/2/024017.
Herrero, M. and P.K. Thornton, 2013: Livestock and global change: Emerging issues for sustainable food systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110(52)**, 20878–20881, doi:10.1073/pnas.1321844111.
Herrero, M. et al., 2013: Biomass use, production, feed efficiencies, and greenhouse gas emissions from global livestock systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110(52)**, 20888–20893, doi:10.1073/pnas.1308149110.
Hertwich, E.G., M. Aaberg, B. Singh, and A.H. Strømman, 2008: Life-cycle Assessment of Carbon Dioxide Capture for Enhanced Oil Recovery. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering*, **16(3)**, 343–353, doi:10.1016/s1004-9541(08)60085-3.
Hiç, C., P. Pradhan, D. Rybski, and J.P. Kropp, 2016: Food Surplus and Its Climate Burdens. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(8)**, 4269–4277, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05088.
Hillier, J., 2011: Strategic navigation across multiple planes: Towards a Deleuzean-inspired methodology for strategic spatial planning. *Town Planning Review*, **82(5)**, 503–527, doi:10.3828/tpr.2011.30.
Hirth, L. and F. Ueckerdt, 2013: Redistribution effects of energy and climate policy: The electricity market. *Energy Policy*, **62**, 934–947, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.07.055.
Hiyama, A. et al., 2013: The Fukushima nuclear accident and the pale grass blue butterfly: evaluating biological effects of long-term low-dose exposures. *BMC evolutionary biology*, **13(1)**, 168, doi:10.1186/1471-2148-13-168.
Holland, R.A. et al., 2015: Global impacts of energy demand on the freshwater resources of nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112(48)**, E6707–E6716, doi:10.1073/pnas.1507701112.
Holopainen, R. et al., 2014: Comfort assessment in the context of sustainable buildings: Comparison of simplified and detailed human thermal sensation methods. *Building and Environment*, **71**, 60–70, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.09.009.
Hontelez, J., 2016: Advancing SDG Implementation through Forest Certification. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Winnipeg, MN, Canada. Retrieved from: http://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/guest-articles/advancing-sdg-implementation-through-forest-certification.
Hori, S., K. Kondo, D. Nogata, and H. Ben, 2013: The determinants of household energy-saving behavior: Survey and comparison in five major Asian cities. *Energy Policy*, **52**, 354–362, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2012.09.043.
Huang, W., A. Wilkes, X. Sun, and A. Terheggen, 2013: Who is importing forest products from Africa to China? An analysis of implications for initiatives to enhance legality and sustainability. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **15(2)**, 339–354, doi:10.1007/s10668-012-9413-1.
Huebner, G.M., J. Cooper, and K. Jones, 2013: Domestic energy consumption – What role do comfort, habit, and knowledge about the heating system play? *Energy and Buildings*, **66**, 626–636, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.07.043.
Hult, A. and J. Larsson, 2016: Possibilities and problems with applying a consumption perspective in local climate strategies – the case of Gothenburg, Sweden. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134**, 434–442, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.033.
Hwang, J., K. Joh, and A. Woo, 2017: Social inequalities in child pedestrian traffic injuries: Differences in neighborhood built environments near schools in Austin, TX, USA. *Journal of Transport and Health*, **6**, 40–49, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.003.
ICSU and ISSC, 2015: *Review of targets for the Sustainable Development Goals: The Science Perspective*. International Council for Science (ICSU), Paris, France, 92 pp., doi:978-0-930357-97-9.

IEA, 2016: *Energy and Air Pollution: World Energy Outlook Special Report*. International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris, France, 266 pp.
Inger, R. et al., 2009: Marine renewable energy: potential benefits to biodiversity? An urgent call for research. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **46(6)**, 1145–1153, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01697.x.
Ingram, J., 2011: A food systems approach to researching food security and its interactions with global environmental change. *Food Security*, **3(4)**, 417–431, doi:10.1007/s12571-011-0149-9.
IPCC, 2005: IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. [Metz, B., O. Davidson, H.C. de Coninck, M. Loos, and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 442 pp.
IPCC, 2014: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel, and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1454 pp.
IRENA, 2016: *Renewable Energy and Jobs – Annual Review 2016*. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Abu Dhabi, UAE, 19 pp.
Isenhour, C. and K. Feng, 2016: Decoupling and displaced emissions: on Swedish consumers, Chinese producers and policy to address the climate impact of consumption. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **134(Part A)**, 320–329, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.037.
Islar, M., S. Brogaard, and M. Lemberg-Pedersen, 2017: Feasibility of energy justice: Exploring national and local efforts for energy development in Nepal. *Energy Policy*, **105**, 668–676, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.004.
Jackson, T. and P. Senker, 2011: Prosperity without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet. *Energy & Environment*, **22(7)**, 1013–1016, doi:10.1260/0958-305x.22.7.1013.
Jain, A.A., R.R. Koford, A.W. Handcock, and G.G. Zenner, 2011: Bat mortality and activity at a northern Iowa wind resource area. *The American Midland Naturalist*, **165(1)**, 185–200, doi:10.1674/0003-0031-165.1.185.
Jain, R.K., R. Gulbinas, J.E. Taylor, and P.J. Culligan, 2013: Can social influence drive energy savings? Detecting the impact of social influence on the energy consumption behavior of networked users exposed to normative eco-feedback. *Energy and Buildings*, **66**, 119–127, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.06.029.
Jain, S. and M.P. Sharma, 2010: Prospects of biodiesel from Jatropha in India: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **14(2)**, 763–771, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2009.10.005.
Jakob, M. and J.C. Steckel, 2014: How climate change mitigation could harm development in poor countries. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **5(2)**, 161–168, doi:10.1002/wcc.260.
Jin, X. and N. Gruber, 2003: Offsetting the radiative benefit of ocean iron fertilization by enhancing N_2O emissions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **30(24)**, 1–4, doi:10.1029/2003gl018458.
Jingura, R. and R. Kamusoko, 2016: The energy-development nexus in Sub-Saharan Africa. In: *Handbook on Africa: Challenges and Issues for the 21st Century* [Sherman, W. (ed.)]. Nova Science Publishers, Hauppauge, NY, USA, pp. 25–46.
Johansson, M.T. and P. Thollander, 2018: A review of barriers to and driving forces for improved energy efficiency in Swedish industry – Recommendations for successful in-house energy management. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **82**, 618–628, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.09.052.
Johnson, J.M.-F., A.J. Franzluebbers, S.L. Weyers, and D.C. Reicosky, 2007: Agricultural opportunities to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. *Environmental Pollution*, **150(1)**, 107–124, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2007.06.030.
Johnson, N. et al., 2015: Stranded on a low-carbon planet: implications of climate policy for the phase-out of coal-based power plants. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90(Part A)**, 89–102, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.02.028.
Jones, B.A. and S.M. McDermott, 2018: The economics of urban afforestation: Insights from an integrated bioeconomic-health model. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, **89**, 116–135, doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2018.03.007.
Jost, C. et al., 2016: Understanding gender dimensions of agriculture and climate change in smallholder farming communities. *Climate and Development*, **8(2)**, 133–144, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1050978.
Kaatsch, P., C. Spix, R. Schulze-Rath, S. Schmiedel, and M. Blettner, 2008: Leukaemia in young children living in the vicinity of German nuclear power plants. *International Journal of Cancer*, **122(4)**, 721–726, doi:10.1002/ijc.23330.
Kagawa, S. et al., 2015: CO_2 emission clusters within global supply chain networks: Implications for climate change mitigation. *Global Environmental Change*, **35**, 486–496, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.04.003.
Kahn Ribeiro, S. et al., 2012: Energy End-Use: Transport. In: *Global Energy Assessment – Toward a Sustainable Future* [Johansson, T.B., N. Nakicenovic, A. Patwardhan, and L. Gomez-Echeverri (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria, pp. 575–648.
Karekezi, S., S. McDade, B. Boardman, and J. Kimani, 2012: Energy, Poverty and Development. In: *Global Energy Assessment – Toward a Sustainable Future* [Johansson, T.B., N. Nakicenovic, A. Patwardhan, and L. Gomez-Echeverri (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria, pp. 151–190.
Karner, K., M. Theissing, and T. Kienberger, 2015: Energy efficiency for industries through synergies with urban areas. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **2020**, 1–11, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.010.
Katila, P., W. de Jong, G. Galloway, B. Pokorny, and P. Pacheco, 2017: *Building on synergies: Harnessing community and smallholder forestry for Sustainable Development Goals*. International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), 23 pp.
Kaygusuz, K., 2011: Energy services and energy poverty for sustainable rural development. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **15**, 936–947, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2010.11.003.
Kern, J.D., D. Patino-Echeverri, and G.W. Characklis, 2014: The Impacts of Wind Power Integration on Sub-Daily Variation in River Flows Downstream of Hydroelectric Dams. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **48(16)**, 9844–9851, doi:10.1021/es405437h.
Khan, M., G. Srafeim, and A. Yoon, 2015: *Corporate Sustainability: First Evidence on Materiality*. HBS Working Paper Number: 15-073, Harvard Business School, Cambridge, MA, USA, 55 pp.
Khan, S., M.A. Hanjra, and J. Mu, 2009: Water management and crop production for food security in China: A review. *Agricultural Water Management*, **96(3)**, 349–360, doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2008.09.022.
Kibria, G., 2015: *Climate Resilient Development (CRD), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) & Climate Finance (CF) – A Case Study*. ResearchGate, 4 pp., doi:10.13140/rg.2.1.4393.2240.
Kim, Y. and C. Sun, 2017: The Energy-Efficient Adaptation Scheme for Residential Buildings in Kazakhstan. *Energy Procedia*, **118**, 28–34, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2017.07.005.
Kim, Y. et al., 2017: A perspective on climate-resilient development and national adaptation planning based on USAID's experience. *Climate and Development*, **9(2)**, 141–151, doi:10.1080/17565529.2015.1124037.
Kirubi, C., A. Jacobson, D.M. Kammen, and A. Mills, 2009: Community-Based Electric Micro-Grids Can Contribute to Rural Development: Evidence from Kenya. *World Development*, **37(7)**, 1208–1221, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2008.11.005.
Klausbruckner, C., H. Annegarn, L.R.F. Henneman, and P. Rafaj, 2016: A policy review of synergies and trade-offs in South African climate change mitigation and air pollution control strategies. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **57**, 70–78, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.12.001.
Köhler, P., J. Hartmann, and D.A. Wolf-Gladrow, 2010: Geoengineering potential of artificially enhanced silicate weathering of olivine. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **107(47)**, 20228–20233, doi:10.1073/pnas.1000545107.
Köhler, P., J.F. Abrams, C. Völker, J. Hauck, and D.A. Wolf-Gladrow, 2013: Geoengineering impact of open ocean dissolution of olivine on atmospheric CO_2, surface ocean pH and marine biology. *Environmental Research Letters*, **8(1)**, 014009, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014009.
Köhlin, G., E.O. Sills, S.K. Pattanayak, and C. Wilfong, 2011: *Energy, Gender and Development: What are the Linkages? Where is the Evidence?* A background paper for the World Development Report 2012 on Gender Equality and Development. Paper No. 125, World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 75 pp.
Kong, X. et al., 2016: Groundwater Depletion by Agricultural Intensification in China's HHH Plains, Since 1980s. *Advances in Agronomy*, **135**, 59–106, doi:10.1016/bs.agron.2015.09.003.
Koornneef, J., A. Ramírez, W. Turkenburg, and A. Faaij, 2011: The environmental impact and risk assessment of CO_2 capture, transport and storage-an evaluation of the knowledge base using the DPSIR framework. *Energy Procedia*, **4**, 2293–2300, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2011.02.119.
Kowarik, I., 2018: Urban wilderness: Supply, demand, and access. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 336–347, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.05.017.

Krukowski, R.A., C. Sparks, M. Dicarlo, J. McSweeney, and D.S. West, 2013: There's more to food store choice than proximity: A questionnaire development study. *BMC Public Health*, **13(1)**, 586, doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-586.

Kumar, A. et al., 2011: Hydropower. In: *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schlömer, and C. von Stechow (eds.)]. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 437–496.

Kumar, N., P. Besuner, S. Lefton, D. Agan, and D. Hilleman, 2012: *Power Plant Cycling Costs*. NREL/SR-5500-55433, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden, CO, USA, 80 pp.

Kummu, M. et al., 2012: Lost food, wasted resources: Global food supply chain losses and their impacts on freshwater, cropland, and fertiliser use. *Science of The Total Environment*, **438**, 477–489, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.08.092.

Kunz, M.J., A. Wüest, B. Wehrli, J. Landert, and D.B. Senn, 2011: Impact of a large tropical reservoir on riverine transport of sediment, carbon, and nutrients to downstream wetlands. *Water Resources Research*, **47(12)**, doi:10.1029/2011wr010996.

Kunze, C. and S. Becker, 2015: Collective ownership in renewable energy and opportunities for sustainable degrowth. *Sustainability Science*, **10**, 425–437, doi:10.1007/s11625-015-0301-0.

Kwong, Q.J., N.M. Adam, and B.B. Sahari, 2014: Thermal comfort assessment and potential for energy efficiency enhancement in modern tropical buildings: A review. *Energy and Buildings*, **68(Part A)**, 547–557, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.09.034.

Lakshmi, K., C. Anuradha, K. Boomiraj, and A. Kalaivani, 2015: Applications of Biotechnological Tools to Overcome Climate Change and its Effects on Agriculture. *Research News For U (RNFU)*, **20**, 218–222.

Lall, S.V. et al., 2017: *Africa's Cities: Opening Doors to the World*. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 162 pp., doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-1044-2.

Lam, N.L., K.R. Smith, A. Gauthier, and M.N. Bates, 2012: Kerosene: A Review of Household Uses and their Hazards in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part B*, **15(6)**, 396–432, doi:10.1080/10937404.2012.710134.

Lamb, A. et al., 2016: The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Nature Climate Change*, **6**, 488–492, doi:10.1038/nclimate2910.

Lampitt, R.S. et al., 2008: Ocean fertilization: a potential means of geoengineering? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **366(1882)**, 3919–3945, doi:10.1098/rsta.2008.0139.

Larson, A.M., T. Dokken, and A.E. Duchelle, 2014: The role of women in early REDD+ implementation. *REDD+ on the ground: A case book of subnational initiatives across the globe*, **17(1)**, 440–441, doi:10.1505/146554815814725031.

Launiainen, S. et al., 2014: Is the Water Footprint an Appropriate Tool for Forestry and Forest Products: The Fennoscandian Case. *Ambio*, **43(2)**, 244–256, doi:10.1007/s13280-013-0380-z.

Lawrence, A., M. Karlsson, and P. Thollander, 2018: Effects of firm characteristics and energy management for improving energy efficiency in the pulp and paper industry. *Energy*, **153**, 825–835, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.04.092.

LeDoux, T.F. and I. Vojnovic, 2013: Going outside the neighborhood: The shopping patterns and adaptations of disadvantaged consumers living in the lower eastside neighborhoods of Detroit, Michigan. *Health & Place*, **19**, 1–14, doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.09.010.

Li, T. et al., 2016: Aging will amplify the heat-related mortality risk under a changing climate: projection for the elderly in Beijing, China. *Scientific Reports*, **6(1)**, 28161, doi:10.1038/srep28161.

Liddell, C. and C. Guiney, 2015: Living in a cold and damp home: Frameworks for understanding impacts on mental well-being. *Public Health*, **129(3)**, 191–199, doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2014.11.007.

Lieder, M. and A. Rashid, 2016: Towards circular economy implementation: A comprehensive review in context of manufacturing industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **115**, 36–51, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.12.042.

Lim, S.S. et al., 2012: A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*, **380(9859)**, 2224–2260, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(12)61766-8.

Lin, J., Y. Hu, S. Cui, J. Kang, and A. Ramaswami, 2015: Tracking urban carbon footprints from production and consumption perspectives. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10(5)**, 054001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/5/054001.

Lipper, L. et al., 2014: Climate-smart agriculture for food security. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(12)**, 1068–1072, doi:10.1038/nclimate2437.

Lipscomb, M., A.M. Mobarak, and T. Barham, 2013: Development Effects of Electrification: Evidence from the Topographic Placement of Hydropower Plants in Brazil. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, **5(2)**, 200–231, doi:10.1257/app.5.2.200.

Liu, Y. and Y. Bai, 2014: An exploration of firms' awareness and behavior of developing circular economy: An empirical research in China. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, **87**, 145–152, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2014.04.002.

Long, T.B., V. Blok, and I. Coninx, 2016: Barriers to the adoption and diffusion of technological innovations for climate-smart agriculture in Europe: evidence from the Netherlands, France, Switzerland and Italy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **112**, 9–21, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.06.044.

Lotze-Campen, H. et al., 2014: Impacts of increased bioenergy demand on global food markets: an AgMIP economic model intercomparison. *Agricultural Economics*, **45(1)**, 103–116, doi:10.1111/agec.12092.

Lovich, J.E. and J.R. Ennen, 2013: Assessing the state of knowledge of utility-scale wind energy development and operation on non-volant terrestrial and marine wildlife. *Applied Energy*, **103**, 52–60, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2012.10.001.

Lowery, B., D. Sloane, D. Payán, J. Illum, and L. Lewis, 2016: Do Farmers' Markets Increase Access to Healthy Foods for All Communities? Comparing Markets in 24 Neighborhoods in Los Angeles. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **82(3)**, 252–266, doi:10.1080/01944363.2016.1181000.

Lucas, K. and K. Pangbourne, 2014: Assessing the equity of carbon mitigation policies for transport in Scotland. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, **2(2)**, 70–80, doi:10.1016/j.cstp.2014.05.003.

Lybbert, T. and D. Sumner, 2010: *Agricultural Technologies for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Developing Countries: Policy Options for Innovation and Technology Diffusion*. ICTSD–IPC Platform on Climate Change, Agriculture and Trade, Issue Brief No.6, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland and International Food & Agricultural Trade Policy Council, Washington DC, USA, 32 pp.

Brander, L.M. et al., 2012: Ecosystem service values for mangroves in Southeast Asia: a meta-analysis and value transfer application. *Ecosystem Services*, **1(1)**, 62–69, doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.06.003.

Maidment, C.D., C.R. Jones, T.L. Webb, E.A. Hathway, and J.M. Gilbertson, 2014: The impact of household energy efficiency measures on health: A meta-analysis. *Energy Policy*, **65**, 583–593, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.054.

Månsson, A., 2016: Energy security in a decarbonised transport sector: A scenario based analysis of Sweden's transport strategies. *Energy Strategy Reviews*, **13–14**, 236–247, doi:10.1016/j.esr.2016.06.004.

Manville, M., 2017: Travel and the Built Environment: Time for Change. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **83(1)**, 29–32, doi:10.1080/01944363.2016.1249508.

Markusson, N. et al., 2012: A socio-technical framework for assessing the viability of carbon capture and storage technology. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **79(5)**, 903–918, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2011.12.001.

Marra, J.E. and R.A. Palmer, 2011: Radioactive Waste Management. In: *Waste* [Letcher, T.M. and D.A. Vallero (eds.)]. Academic Press, Boston, MA, USA, pp. 101–108, doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-381475-3.10007-5.

Martínez-Jaramillo, J.E., S. Arango-Aramburo, K.C. Álvarez-Uribe, and P. Jaramillo-Álvarez, 2017: Assessing the impacts of transport policies through energy system simulation: The case of the Medellin Metropolitan Area, Colombia. *Energy Policy*, **101**, 101–108, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.11.026.

Matinga, M.N., 2012: *A socio-cultural perspective on transformation of gender roles and relations, and non-change in energy-health perceptions following electrification in rural South Africa (Case Study for World Development Report 2012)*. ETC/ENERGIA in association Nord/Sør-konsulentene, 17 pp.

Matthews, N. and M. McCartney, 2018: Opportunities for building resilience and lessons for navigating risks: Dams and the water energy food nexus. *Environmental Progress & Sustainable Energy*, **37(1)**, 56–61, doi:10.1002/ep.12568.

Mbow, C. et al., 2014: Agroforestry solutions to address food security and climate change challenges in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **6**, 61–67, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.014.

McCarthy, N., L. Lipper, and G. Branca, 2011: *Climate-Smart Agriculture: Smallholder Adoption and Implications for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation*. Mitigation of Climate Change Series 4, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 25 pp.

McCollum, D.L. et al., 2018: Connecting the sustainable development goals by their energy inter-linkages. *Environmental Research Letters*, **13(3)**, 033006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaafe3.
McKinney, M.L. and K. Ingo, 2018: The contribution of wild urban ecosystems to liveable cities. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 334–335, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.09.004.
McLeod, R.S., C.J. Hopfe, and A. Kwan, 2013: An investigation into future performance and overheating risks in Passivhaus dwellings. *Building and Environment*, **70**, 189–209, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.08.024.
McPherson, E.G., A.M. Berry, and N.S. van Doorn, 2018: Performance testing to identify climate-ready trees. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 28–39, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.09.003.
Meldrum, J., S. Nettles-Anderson, G. Heath, and J. Macknick, 2013: Life cycle water use for electricity generation: a review and harmonization of literature estimates. *Environmental Research Letters*, **8(1)**, 015031.
Meltzer, J.P., 2016: *Financing Low Carbon, Climate Resilient Sustainable Infrastructure: The Role of Climate Finance and Green Financial Systems*. Global Economy & Development Working Paper 96, Brookings Institution, Washington DC, USA, 52 pp.
Michler-Cieluch, T., G. Krause, and B.H. Buck, 2009: Reflections on integrating operation and maintenance activities of offshore wind farms and mariculture. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **52(1)**, 57–68, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.09.008.
Miles, L. and V. Kapos, 2008: Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation: Global Land-Use Implications. *Science*, **320(5882)**, 1454–1455, doi:10.1126/science.1155358.
Miller, E., L.M. Bell, and L. Buys, 2007: Public understanding of carbon sequestration in Australia: socio-demographic predictors of knowledge, engagement and trust. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society*, **5(1)**, 15–33.
Mittlefehldt, S., 2016: Seeing forests as fuel: How conflicting narratives have shaped woody biomass energy development in the United States since the 1970s. *Energy Research & Social Science*, **14**, 13–21, doi:10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.023.
Møller, A.P. and T.A. Mousseau, 2011: Conservation consequences of Chernobyl and other nuclear accidents. *Biological Conservation*, **144(12)**, 2787–2798, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2011.08.009.
Møller, A.P., F. Barnier, and T.A. Mousseau, 2012: Ecosystems effects 25 years after Chernobyl: pollinators, fruit set and recruitment. *Oecologia*, **170(4)**, 1155–1165, doi:10.1007/s00442-012-2374-0.
Møller, A.P., A. Bonisoli-Alquati, G. Rudolfsen, and T.A. Mousseau, 2011: Chernobyl Birds Have Smaller Brains. *PLOS ONE*, **6(2)**, e16862, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016862.
Montanarella, L. and I.L. Alva, 2015: Putting soils on the agenda: the three Rio Conventions and the post-2015 development agenda. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **15**, 41–48, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.07.008.
Moomaw, W. et al., 2011: Annex II: Methodology. In: *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schlömer, and C. von Stechow (eds.)]. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 973–1000.
Morton, J.F., 2007: The impact of climate change on smallholder and subsistence agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **104(50)**, 19680–19685, doi:10.1073/pnas.0701855104.
Mousseau, T.A. and A.P. Møller, 2013: Elevated Frequency of Cataracts in Birds from Chernobyl. *PLOS ONE*, **8(7)**, e66939, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066939.
Msangi, S., M. Ewing, M.W. Rosegrant, and T. Zhu, 2010: Biofuels, Food Security, and the Environment: A 2020/2050 Perspective. In: *Global Change: Impacts on Water and food Security* [Ringler, C., A.K. Biswas, and S. Cline (eds.)]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin and Heidelberg, Germany, pp. 65–94, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-04615-5_4.
Mtui, G.Y.S., 2011: Involvement of biotechnology in climate change adaptation and mitigation: Improving agricultural yield and food security. *International Journal for Biotechnology and Molecular Biology Research*, **2(13)**, 222–231, www.academicjournals.org/ijbmbr/abstracts/abstracts/abstracts2011/30dec/mtui.htm.
Muratori, M., K. Calvin, M. Wise, P. Kyle, and J. Edmonds, 2016: Global economic consequences of deploying bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS). *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(9)**, 1–9, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095004.
Muys, B. et al., 2014: Integrating mitigation and adaptation into development: the case of *Jatropha curcas* in sub-Saharan Africa. *GCB Bioenergy*, **6**, 169–171, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12070.
NCE, 2014: *Better Growth, Better Climate: Global Report*. New Climate Economy (NCE), Washington DC, USA, 308 pp.
NCE, 2015: *Seizing the Global Opportunity: Partnerships for Better Growth and a Better Climate*. New Climate Economy (NCE), Washington DC, USA and London, UK, 76 pp.
Nelson, V., K. Meadows, T. Cannon, J. Morton, and A. Martin, 2002: Uncertain Predictions, Invisible Impacts, and the Need to Mainstream Gender in Climate Change Adaptations. *Gender and Development*, **10(2)**, 51–59, www.jstor.org/stable/4030574.
Nemet, G.F., T. Holloway, and P. Meier, 2010: Implications of incorporating air-quality co-benefits into climate change policymaking. *Environmental Research Letters*, **5(1)**, 014007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/5/1/014007.
Nguyen, M.T., S. Vink, M. Ziemski, and D.J. Barrett, 2014: Water and energy synergy and trade-off potentials in mine water management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **84(1)**, 629–638, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.063.
Noonan, D.S., L.-H.C. Hsieh, and D. Matisoff, 2015: Economic, sociological, and neighbor dimensions of energy efficiency adoption behaviors: Evidence from the U.S residential heating and air conditioning market. *Energy Research & Social Science*, **10**, 102–113, doi:10.1016/j.erss.2015.07.009.
Noris, F. et al., 2013: Indoor environmental quality benefits of apartment energy retrofits. *Building and Environment*, **68**, 170–178, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.07.003.
O'Mahony, T. and J. Dufour, 2015: Tracking development paths: Monitoring driving forces and the impact of carbon-free energy sources in Spain. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **50(2007)**, 62–73, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.02.005.
O'Neill, B.C. et al., 2017: The roads ahead: narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways describing world futures in the 21st century. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 169–180, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.01.004.
OECD, 2017: *Economic Outlook for Southeast Asia, China and India 2017: Addressing Energy Challenges*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Publishing, Paris, France, 261 pp.
Oschlies, A., W. Koeve, W. Rickels, and K. Rehdanz, 2010: Side effects and accounting aspects of hypothetical large-scale Southern Ocean iron fertilization. *Biogeosciences*, **7(12)**, 4014–4035, doi:10.5194/bg-7-4017-2010.
Ozturk, M. et al., 2017: Biomass and bioenergy: An overview of the development potential in Turkey and Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79**, 1285–1302, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.111.
Pachauri, S. and N.D. Rao, 2013: Gender impacts and determinants of energy poverty: are we asking the right questions? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **5(2)**, 205–215, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.04.006.
Pachauri, S. et al., 2012: Energy Access for Development. In: *Global Energy Assessment – Toward a Sustainable Future* [Johansson, T.B., N. Nakicenovic, A. Patwardhan, and L. Gomez-Echeverri (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria, pp. 1401–1458.
Paquay, F.S. and R.E. Zeebe, 2013: Assessing possible consequences of ocean liming on ocean pH, atmospheric CO_2 concentration and associated costs. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **17**, 183–188, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2013.05.005.
Patel, S.J., J.H. Patel, A. Patel, and R.N. Gelani, 2016: Role of women gender in livestock sector: A review. *Journal of Livestock Science*, **7**, 92–96.
Pei, N. et al., 2018: Long-term afforestation efforts increase bird species diversity in Beijing, China. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, **29**, 88–95, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.11.007.
Peng, J. and L. Lu, 2013: Investigation on the development potential of rooftop PV system in Hong Kong and its environmental benefits. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **27**, 149–162, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.06.030.
Peng, W., J. Yang, F. Wagner, and D.L. Mauzerall, 2017: Substantial air quality and climate co-benefits achievable now with sectoral mitigation strategies in China. *Science of The Total Environment*, **598**, 1076–1084, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.03.287.
Pettit, L.R., C.W. Smart, M.B. Hart, M. Milazzo, and J.M. Hall-Spencer, 2015: Seaweed fails to prevent ocean acidification impact on foraminifera along a shallow-water CO_2 gradient. *Ecology and Evolution*, **5(9)**, 1784–1793, doi:10.1002/ece3.1475.

Pietzcker, R.C. et al., 2014: Long-term transport energy demand and climate policy: Alternative visions on transport decarbonization in energy-economy models. *Energy*, **64**, 95–108, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2013.08.059.
Pode, R., 2013: Financing LED solar home systems in developing countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **25**, 596–629, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.04.004.
Potouroglou, M. et al., 2017: Measuring the role of seagrasses in regulating sediment surface elevation. *Scientific Reports*, **7(1)**, 1–11, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-12354-y.
Pueyo, A., F. Gonzalez, C. Dent, and S. DeMartino, 2013: *The Evidence of Benefits for Poor People of Increased Renewable Electricity Capacity: Literature Review*. Brief supporting Evidence Report 31, Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Brighton, UK, 8 pp.
Rafaj, P., W. Schöpp, P. Russ, C. Heyes, and M. Amann, 2013: Co-benefits of post-2012 global climate mitigation policies. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **18(6)**, 801–824, doi:10.1007/s11027-012-9390-6.
Raji, B., M.J. Tenpierik, and A. van den Dobbelsteen, 2015: The impact of greening systems on building energy performance: A literature review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **45**, 610–623, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.02.011.
Ramaker, J., J. Mackby, P.D. Marshall, and R. Geil, 2003: *The final test: a history of the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty negotiations*. Provisional Technical Secretariat, Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, 291 pp.
Ran, Y., M. Lannerstad, M. Herrero, C.E. Van Middelaar, and I.J.M. De Boer, 2016: Assessing water resource use in livestock production: A review of methods. *Livestock Science*, **187**, 68–79, doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2016.02.012.
Rao, N.D. and S. Pachauri, 2017: Energy access and living standards: some observations on recent trends. *Environmental Research Letters*, **12(2)**, 025011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa5b0d.
Rao, N.D., K. Riahi, and A. Grubler, 2014: Climate impacts of poverty eradication. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(9)**, 749–751, doi:10.1038/nclimate2340.
Rao, S. et al., 2013: Better air for better health: forging synergies in policies for energy access, climate change and air pollution. *Global Environmental Change*, **23**, 1122–1130, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.003.
Rao, S. et al., 2016: A multi-model assessment of the co-benefits of climate mitigation for global air quality. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(12)**, 124013, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/12/124013.
Raptis, C.E., M.T.H. van Vliet, and S. Pfister, 2016: Global thermal pollution of rivers from thermoelectric power plants. *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(10)**, 104011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/10/104011.
Ravindranath, N.H., R.K. Chaturvedi, and I.K. Murthy, 2008: Forest conservation, afforestation and reforestation in India: Implications for forest carbon stocks. *Current Science*, **95(2)**, 216–222.
Reiner, D.M. and W.J. Nuttall, 2011: Public Acceptance of Geological Disposal of Carbon Dioxide and Radioactive Waste: Similarities and Differences. In: *Geological Disposal of Carbon Dioxide and Radioactive Waste: A Comparative Assessment* [Toth, F.L. (ed.)]. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 295–315, doi:10.1007/978-90-481-8712-6_10.
Riahi, K. et al., 2012: Energy Pathways for Sustainable Development. In: *Global Energy Assessment – Toward a Sustainable Future* [Johansson, T.B., N. Nakicenovic, A. Patwardhan, and L. Gomez-Echeverri (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria, pp. 1203–1306.
Riahi, K. et al., 2015: Locked into Copenhagen pledges – Implications of short-term emission targets for the cost and feasibility of long-term climate goals. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **90**, 8–23, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.09.016.
Riahi, K. et al., 2017: The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: an overview. *Global Environmental Change*, **42**, 153–168, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009.
Rogalsky, J., 2010: The working poor and what GIS reveals about the possibilities of public transit. *Journal of Transport Geography*, **18(2)**, 226–237, doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.06.008.
Rogelj, J., D.L. McCollum, and K. Riahi, 2013: The UN's 'Sustainable Energy for All' initiative is compatible with a warming limit of 2°C. *Nature Climate Change*, **3(6)**, 545–551, doi:10.1038/nclimate1806.
Rogner, H.-H., 2010: Nuclear Power and Sustainable Development. *Journal of International Affairs*, **64(1)**, 137–163, www.jstor.org/stable/24385190.
Rose, S.K. et al., 2014: Bioenergy in energy transformation and climate management. *Climatic Change*, **123(3–4)**, 477–493, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0965-3.
Roy, J. et al., 2018: Where is the hope? Blending modern urban lifestyle with cultural practices in India. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **31**, 96–103, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.01.010.
Rud, J.P., 2012: Electricity provision and industrial development: Evidence from India. *Journal of Development Economics*, **97(2)**, 352–367, doi:10.1016/j.jdeveco.2011.06.010.
Sagan, S.D., 2011: The Causes of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, **14(1)**, 225–244, doi:10.1146/annurev-polisci-052209-131042.
Salvalai, G., M.M. Sesana, and G. Iannaccone, 2017: Deep renovation of multi-storey multi-owner existing residential buildings: a pilot case study in Italy. *Energy and Buildings*, **148**, 23–36, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.05.011.
Sansoucy, R., 1995: Livestock – a driving force for food security and sustainable development. *World Animal Review*, **84/85(2)**.
Santarius, T., H.J. Walnum, and C. Aall (eds.), 2016: *Rethinking Climate and Energy Policies: New Perspectives on the Rebound Phenomenon*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 294 pp., doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38807-6.
Sarin, R., M. Sharma, S. Sinharay, and R.K. Malhotra, 2007: Jatropha-Palm biodiesel blends: An optimum mix for Asia. *Fuel*, **86(10–11)**, 1365–1371, doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2006.11.040.
Satolo, L. and M. Bacchi, 2013: Impacts of the Recent Expansion of the Sugarcane Sector on Municipal per Capita Income in São Paulo State. *ISRN Economics*, **2013**, 828169, doi:10.1155/2013/828169.
Saunders, L.E., J.M. Green, M.P. Petticrew, R. Steinbach, and H. Roberts, 2013: What Are the Health Benefits of Active Travel? A Systematic Review of Trials and Cohort Studies. *PLOS ONE*, **8**, e69912, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0069912.
Schader, C. et al., 2015: Impacts of feeding less food-competing feedstuffs to livestock on global food system sustainability. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, **12(113)**, doi:10.1098/rsif.2015.0891.
Scherr, S.J., S. Shames, and R. Friedman, 2012: From climate-smart agriculture to climate-smart landscapes. *Agriculture & Food Security*, **1(1)**, 12, doi:10.1186/2048-7010-1-12.
Schirmer, J. and L. Bull, 2014: Assessing the likelihood of widespread landholder adoption of afforestation and reforestation projects. *Global Environmental Change*, **24**, 306–320, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.009.
Schnelzer, M., G.P. Hammer, M. Kreuzer, A. Tschense, and B. Grosche, 2010: Accounting for smoking in the radon-related lung cancer risk among German uranium miners: results of a nested case-control study. *Health Physics*, **98(1)**, 20–28, doi:10.1097/hp.0b013e3181b8ce81.
Schucht, S. et al., 2015: Moving towards ambitious climate policies: Monetised health benefits from improved air quality could offset mitigation costs in Europe. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **50**, 252–269, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.03.001.
Schwanitz, V.J., F. Piontek, C. Bertram, and G. Luderer, 2014: Long-term climate policy implications of phasing out fossil fuel subsidies. *Energy Policy*, **67**, 882–894, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.12.015.
Schwenk-Ferrero, A., 2013: German Spent Nuclear Fuel Legacy: Characteristics and High-Level Waste Management Issues. *Science and Technology of Nuclear Installations*, 293792, doi:10.1155/2013/293792.
Schwerhoff, G. and M. Sy, 2017: Financing renewable energy in Africa – Key challenge of the sustainable development goals. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **75**, 393–401, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.004.
Scott, C.A., 2011: The water-energy-climate nexus: Resources and policy outlook for aquifers in Mexico. *Water Resources Research*, **47(6)**, doi:10.1029/2011wr010805.
Scott, C.A. et al., 2011: Policy and institutional dimensions of the water–energy nexus. *Energy Policy*, **39(10)**, 6622–6630, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.08.013.
Scott, F.L., C.R. Jones, and T.L. Webb, 2014: What do people living in deprived communities in the UK think about household energy efficiency interventions? *Energy Policy*, **66**, 335–349, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.084.
Sermage-Faure, C. et al., 2012: Childhood leukemia around French nuclear power plants – The geocap study, 2002-2007. *International Journal of Cancer*, **131(5)**, E769–E780, doi:10.1002/ijc.27425.
Shackley, S. and M. Thompson, 2012: Lost in the mix: will the technologies of carbon dioxide capture and storage provide us with a breathing space as we strive to make the transition from fossil fuels to renewables? *Climatic Change*, **110(1)**, 101–121, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0071-3.

Shackley, S. et al., 2009: The acceptability of CO_2 capture and storage (CCS) in Europe: An assessment of the key determining factors: Part 2. The social acceptability of CCS and the wider impacts and repercussions of its implementation. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **3(3)**, 344–356, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.09.004.

Shah, N., M. Wei, V. Letschert, and A. Phadke, 2015: *Benefits of leapfrogging to superefficiency and low global warming potential refrigerants in room air conditioning*. LBNL-1003671, Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Berkeley, CA, USA, 58 pp.

Shahbaz, M., G. Rasool, K. Ahmed, and M.K. Mahalik, 2016: Considering the effect of biomass energy consumption on economic growth: fresh evidence from BRICS region. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **60**, 1442–1450, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.03.037.

Sharpe, R.A., C.R. Thornton, V. Nikolaou, and N.J. Osborne, 2015: Higher energy efficient homes are associated with increased risk of doctor diagnosed asthma in a UK subpopulation. *Environment International*, **75**, 234–244, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.11.017.

Shaw, C., S. Hales, P. Howden-Chapman, and R. Edwards, 2014: Health co-benefits of climate change mitigation policies in the transport sector. *Nature Climate Change*, **4(6)**, 427–433, doi:10.1038/nclimate2247.

Shaw, C., S. Hales, R. Edwards, and P. Howden-Chapman, 2017: Health Co-Benefits of Policies to Mitigate Climate Change in the Transport Sector: Systematic Review. *Journal of Transport & Health*, **5**, S107–S108, doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.05.268.

Shi, Y., J. Liu, H. Shi, H. Li, and Q. Li, 2017: The ecosystem service value as a new eco-efficiency indicator for industrial parks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **164**, 597–605, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.187.

Siirila, E.R., A.K. Navarre-Sitchler, R.M. Maxwell, and J.E. McCray, 2012: A quantitative methodology to assess the risks to human health from CO_2 leakage into groundwater. *Advances in Water Resources*, **36**, 146–164, doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2010.11.005.

Sikkema, R. et al., 2014: Legal Harvesting, Sustainable Sourcing and Cascaded Use of Wood for Bioenergy: Their Coverage through Existing Certification Frameworks for Sustainable Forest Management. *Forests*, **5(9)**, 2163–2211, doi:10.3390/f5092163.

Singh, B., A.H. Strømman, and E.G. Hertwich, 2011: Comparative life cycle environmental assessment of CCS technologies. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **5(4)**, 911–921, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.03.012.

Sippo, J.Z., D.T. Maher, D.R. Tait, C. Holloway, and I.R. Santos, 2016: Are mangroves drivers or buffers of coastal acidification? Insights from alkalinity and dissolved inorganic carbon export estimates across a latitudinal transect. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, **30(5)**, 753–766, doi:10.1002/2015gb005324.

Sjoberg, L. and B.M.D. Sjoberg, 2009: Public risk perception of nuclear waste. *International Journal of Risk Assessment and Management*, **11(3/4)**, doi:10.1504/ijram.2009.023156.

Skipperud, L. et al., 2013: Environmental impact assessment of radionuclide and metal contamination at the former U sites Taboshar and Digmai, Tajikistan. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, **123**, 50–62, doi:10.1016/j.jenvrad.2012.05.007.

SLoCaT, 2017: *Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action (MPGCA) Transport Initiatives: Stock-take on action toward implementation of the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development. Second Progress Report*. Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport (SLoCaT), Bonn, Germany, 72 pp.

Smetacek, V. and S.W.A. Naqvi, 2008: The next generation of iron fertilization experiments in the Southern Ocean. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **366(1882)**, 3947–3967, doi:10.1098/rsta.2008.0144.

Smith, A., A. Pridmore, K. Hampshire, C. Ahlgren, and J. Goodwin, 2016: *Scoping study on the co-benefits and possible adverse side effects of climate change mitigation: Final report*. Report to the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). Aether Ltd, Oxford, UK, 91 pp.

Smith, J. et al., 2014: What is the potential for biogas digesters to improve soil fertility and crop production in Sub-Saharan Africa? *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **70**, 58–72, doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2014.02.030.

Smith, K.R. and A. Sagar, 2014: Making the clean available: escaping India's Chulha Trap. *Energy Policy*, **75**, 410–414, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.024.

Smith, P., 2013: Delivering food security without increasing pressure on land. *Global Food Security*, **2(1)**, 18–23, doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2012.11.008.

Smith, P. et al., 2010: Competition for land. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **365**, 2941–2957, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0127.

Smith, P. et al., 2013: How much land-based greenhouse gas mitigation can be achieved without compromising food security and environmental goals? *Global Change Biology*, **19(8)**, 2285–2302, doi:10.1111/gcb.12160.

Smith, P. et al., 2016a: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO_2 emissions. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(1)**, 42–50, doi:10.1038/nclimate2870.

Smith, P. et al., 2016b: Global change pressures on soils from land use and management. *Global Change Biology*, **22(3)**, 1008–1028, doi:10.1111/gcb.13068.

Sola, P., C. Ochieng, J. Yila, and M. Iiyama, 2016: Links between energy access and food security in sub Saharan Africa: an exploratory review. *Food Security*, **8(3)**, 635–642, doi:10.1007/s12571-016-0570-1.

Sommerfeld, J., L. Buys, and D. Vine, 2017: Residential consumers' experiences in the adoption and use of solar PV. *Energy Policy*, **105**, 10–16, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.02.021.

Sondak, C.F.A. et al., 2017: Carbon dioxide mitigation potential of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs). *Journal of Applied Phycology*, **29(5)**, 2363–2373, doi:10.1007/s10811-016-1022-1.

Song, Y. et al., 2016: The Interplay Between Bioenergy Grass Production and Water Resources in the United States of America. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(6)**, 3010–3019, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05239.

Stahel, W.R., 2013: Policy for material efficiency – sustainable taxation as a departure from the throwaway society. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **371(1986)**, doi:10.1098/rsta.2011.0567.

Stahel, W.R., 2016: The circular economy. *Nature*, **531(7595)**, 435–438, doi:10.1038/531435a.

Stanley, J.K., D.A. Hensher, and C. Loader, 2011: Road transport and climate change: Stepping off the greenhouse gas. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, **45(10)**, 1020–1030, doi:10.1016/j.tra.2009.04.005.

Steenwerth, K.L. et al., 2014: Climate-smart agriculture global research agenda: scientific basis for action. *Agriculture & Food Security*, **3(1)**, 11, doi:10.1186/2048-7010-3-11.

Stefan, A. and L. Paul, 2008: Does It Pay to Be Green? A Systematic Overview. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **22(4)**, 45–62, doi:10.5465/amp.2008.35590353.

Stehfest, E. et al., 2009: Climate benefits of changing diet. *Climatic Change*, **95(1–2)**, 83–102, doi:10.1007/s10584-008-9534-6.

Steinfeld, H. and P. Gerber, 2010: Livestock production and the global environment: Consume less or produce better? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **107(43)**, 18237–18238, doi:10.1073/pnas.1012541107.

Suckall, N., E. Tompkins, and L. Stringer, 2014: Identifying trade-offs between adaptation, mitigation and development in community responses to climate and socio-economic stresses: Evidence from Zanzibar, Tanzania. *Applied Geography*, **46**, 111–121, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2013.11.005.

Supino, S., O. Malandrino, M. Testa, and D. Sica, 2016: Sustainability in the EU cement industry: The Italian and German experiences. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **112**, 430–442, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.022.

Sweeney, J.C., J. Kresling, D. Webb, G.N. Soutar, and T. Mazzarol, 2013: Energy saving behaviours: Development of a practice-based model. *Energy Policy*, **61**, 371–381, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.06.121.

Tabellini, G., 2010: Culture and Institutions: Economic Development in the Regions of Europe. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **8(4)**, 677–716, doi:10.1111/j.1542-4774.2010.tb00537.x.

Taniwaki, R.H. et al., 2017: Impacts of converting low-intensity pastureland to high-intensity bioenergy cropland on the water quality of tropical streams in Brazil. *Science of The Total Environment*, **584**, 339–347, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.150.

Taylor, L.L. et al., 2016: Enhanced weathering strategies for stabilizing climate and averting ocean acidification. *Nature Climate Change*, **6(4)**, 402–406, doi:10.1038/nclimate2882.

Ten Hoeve, J.E. and M.Z. Jacobson, 2012: Worldwide health effects of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident. *Energy & Environmental Science*, **5(9)**, 8743–8757, doi:10.1039/c2ee22019a.

Terry, G., 2009: No climate justice without gender justice: an overview of the issues. *Gender and Development*, **17(1)**, 5–18, www.jstor.org/stable/27809203.

Thornton, P.K., 2010: Livestock production: recent trends, future prospects. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **365(1554)**, 2853–2867, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0134.

Tiedeman, K., S. Yeh, B.R. Scanlon, J. Teter, and G.S. Mishra, 2016: Recent Trends in Water Use and Production for California Oil Production. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **50(14)**, 7904–7912, doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b01240.

Tilman, D. and M. Clark, 2014: Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*, **515(7528)**, 518–522, doi:10.1038/nature13959.
Tilman, D. et al., 2009: Beneficial Biofuels – The Food, Energy, and Environment Trilemma. *Science*, **325(5938)**, 270–271, doi:10.1126/science.1177970.
Tirmarche, M. et al., 2012: Risk of lung cancer from radon exposure: contribution of recently published studies of uranium miners. *Annals of the ICRP*, **41(3)**, 368–377, doi:10.1016/j.icrp.2012.06.033.
Treasury, H.M., 2009: *Green biotechnology and climate change*. Euro Bio, 12 pp.
Trick, C.G. et al., 2010: Iron enrichment stimulates toxic diatom production in high-nitrate, low-chlorophyll areas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **107(13)**, 5887–5892, doi:10.1073/pnas.0910579107.
Tully, S., 2006: The Human Right to Access Electricity. *The Electricity Journal*, **19**, 30–39, doi:10.1016/j.tej.2006.02.003.
Turpie, J., B. Warr, and J.C. Ingram, 2015: *Benefits of Forest Ecosystems in Zambia and the Role of REDD+ in a Green Economy Transformation*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 98 pp.
Tyler, A.N. et al., 2013: The radium legacy: Contaminated land and the committed effective dose from the ingestion of radium contaminated materials. *Environment International*, **59**, 449–455, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2013.06.016.
UN, 1989: The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. In: *United Nations – Treaty Series No. 26369*. United Nations (UN), pp. 29–111.
UNSCEAR, 2011: Health effects due to radiation from the Chernobyl accident (Annex D). In: *UNSCEAR 2008 Report Vol. II: Effects. Scientific Annexes C, D and E*. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), New York, NY, USA, pp. 45–220.
UN-Women, UNDESA, and UNFCCCC, 2015: *Implementation of gender-responsive climate action in the context of sustainable development*. EGM/GR-CR/Report, UN-Women, UNDESA and UNFCCCC, 47 pp.
van de Walle, D., M. Ravallion, V. Mendiratta, and G. Koolwal, 2013: *Long-Term Impacts of Household Electrification in Rural India*. Policy Research working paper no. WPS 6527, World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 54 pp.
van der Horst, D. and S. Vermeylen, 2011: Spatial scale and social impacts of biofuel production. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **35(6)**, 2435–2443, doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.11.029.
van Oel, P.R. and A.Y. Hoekstra, 2012: Towards Quantification of the Water Footprint of Paper: A First Estimate of its Consumptive Component. *Water Resources Management*, **26(3)**, 733–749, doi:10.1007/s11269-011-9942-7.
van Sluisveld, M.A.E., S.H. Martínez, V. Daioglou, and D.P. van Vuuren, 2016: Exploring the implications of lifestyle change in 2°C mitigation scenarios using the IMAGE integrated assessment model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **102**, 309–319, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2015.08.013.
van Vliet, O. et al., 2012: Synergies in the Asian energy system: Climate change, energy security, energy access and air pollution. *Energy Economics*, **34, Supple**, S470–S480, doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2012.02.001.
van Vuuren, D.P., J. van Vliet, and E. Stehfest, 2009: Future bio-energy potential under various natural constraints. *Energy Policy*, **37(11)**, 4220–4230, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.05.029.
Vasconcellos, E.A. and A. Mendonça, 2016: *Observatorio de Movilidad Urbana: Informe final 2015-2016 (in Spanish)*. Corporacion Andina de Fomento (CAF) Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina, 25 pp.
Vassolo, S. and P. Döll, 2005: Global-scale gridded estimates of thermoelectric power and manufacturing water use. *Water Resources Research*, **41(4)**, W04010, doi:10.1029/2004wr003360.
Veltman, K., B. Singh, and E.G. Hertwich, 2010: Human and Environmental Impact Assessment of Postcombustion CO_2 Capture Focusing on Emissions from Amine-Based Scrubbing Solvents to Air. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **44(4)**, 1496–1502, doi:10.1021/es902116r.
Vergragt, P.J., N. Markusson, and H. Karlsson, 2011: Carbon capture and storage, bio-energy with carbon capture and storage, and the escape from the fossil-fuel lock-in. *Global Environmental Change*, **21(2)**, 282–292, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.01.020.
Vermeulen, S. et al., 2012: Climate change, agriculture and food security: a global partnership to link research and action for low-income agricultural producers and consumers. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **4(1)**, 128–133, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2011.12.004.
Vidic, R.D., S.L. Brantley, J.M. Vandenbossche, D. Yoxtheimer, and J.D. Abad, 2013: Impact of Shale Gas Development on Regional Water Quality. *Science*, **340(6134)**, 1235009, doi:10.1126/science.1235009.
Vierros, M., 2017: Communities and blue carbon: the role of traditional management systems in providing benefits for carbon storage, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods. *Climatic Change*, **140(1)**, 89–100, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0920-3.
Vierros, M., C. Salpin, C. Chiarolla, and S. Aricò, 2015: Emerging and unresolved issues: the example of marine genetic resources of areas beyond national jurisdiction. In: *Ocean Sustainability in the 21st Century* [Aricò, S. (ed.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 198–231, doi:10.1017/cbo9781316164624.012.
Visschers, V.H.M. and M. Siegrist, 2012: Fair play in energy policy decisions: Procedural fairness, outcome fairness and acceptance of the decision to rebuild nuclear power plants. *Energy Policy*, **46**, 292–300, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2012.03.062.
von Hippel, D., T. Suzuki, J.H. Williams, T. Savage, and P. Hayes, 2011: Energy security and sustainability in Northeast Asia. *Energy Policy*, **39(11)**, 6719–6730, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.001.
von Hippel, F., R. Ewing, R. Garwin, and A. Macfarlane, 2012: Time to bury plutonium. *Nature*, **485**, 167–168, doi:10.1038/485167a.
von Stechow, C. et al., 2016: 2°C and SDGs: United they stand, divided they fall? *Environmental Research Letters*, **11(3)**, 034022, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034022.
Walker, G. and P. Devine-Wright, 2008: Community renewable energy: What should it mean? *Energy Policy*, **36**, 497–500, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2007.10.019.
Walker, R.V., M.B. Beck, J.W. Hall, R.J. Dawson, and O. Heidrich, 2014: The energy-water-food nexus: Strategic analysis of technologies for transforming the urban metabolism. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **141**, 104–115, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.01.054.
Walks, A., 2015: *The Urban Political Economy and Ecology of Automobility: Driving Cities, Driving Inequality, Driving Politics*. Routledge, London, UK, 348 pp.
Wallquist, L., V.H.M. Visschers, and M. Siegrist, 2009: Lay concepts on CCS deployment in Switzerland based on qualitative interviews. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, **3(5)**, 652–657, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.03.005.
Wallquist, L., V.H.M. Visschers, and M. Siegrist, 2010: Impact of Knowledge and Misconceptions on Benefit and Risk Perception of CCS. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **44(17)**, 6557–6562, doi:10.1021/es1005412.
Wang, S. and P.R. Jaffe, 2004: Dissolution of a mineral phase in potable aquifers due to CO_2 releases from deep formations; effect of dissolution kinetics. *Energy Conversion and Management*, **45(18–19)**, 2833–2848, doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2004.01.002.
WBGU, 2013: *World in Transition: Governing the Marine Heritage*. German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU), Berlin, Germany, 390 pp.
Webb, D., G.N. Soutar, T. Mazzarol, and P. Saldaris, 2013: Self-determination theory and consumer behavioural change: Evidence fromahousehold energy-saving behaviour study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, **35**, 59–66, doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.04.003.
Webster, M., P. Donohoo, and B. Palmintier, 2013: Water-CO_2 trade-offs in electricity generation planning. *Nature Climate Change*, **3(12)**, 1029–1032, doi:10.1038/nclimate2032.
Wells, E.M. et al., 2015: Indoor air quality and occupant comfort in homes with deep versus conventional energy efficiency renovations. *Building and Environment*, **93(Part 2)**, 331–338, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.06.021.
Wesseling, J.H. et al., 2017: The transition of energy intensive processing industries towards deep decarbonization: Characteristics and implications for future research. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79**, 1303–1313, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.156.
West, J.J. et al., 2013: Co-benefits of Global Greenhouse Gas Mitigation for Future Air Quality and Human Health. *Nature Climate Change*, **3(10)**, 885–889, doi:10.1038/nclimate2009.
West, P.C. et al., 2014: Leverage points for improving global food security and the environment. *Science*, **345(6194)**, 325–328, doi:10.1126/science.1246067.
West, T.O. and W.M. Post, 2002: Soil Organic Carbon Sequestration Rates by Tillage and Crop Rotation. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, **66**, 1930–1946, doi:10.2136/sssaj2002.1930.
WHO, 2013: *Health risk assessment from the nuclear accident after the 2011 Great East Japan earthquake and tsunami, based on a preliminary dose estimation*. World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, Switzerland, 172 pp.
Willand, N., I. Ridley, and C. Maller, 2015: Towards explaining the health impacts of residential energy efficiency interventions – A realist review. Part 1: Pathways. *Social Science and Medicine*, **133**, 191–201, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.005.

Williamson, P. et al., 2012: Ocean fertilization for geoengineering: A review of effectiveness, environmental impacts and emerging governance. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, **90(6)**, 475–488, doi:10.1016/j.psep.2012.10.007.
Winter, E., A. Faße, and K. Frohberg, 2015: Food security, energy equity, and the global commons: a computable village model applied to sub-Saharan Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, **15(7)**, 1215–1227, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0674-0.
Wiser, R. et al., 2011: Wind Energy. In: *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schlömer, and C. von Stechow (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 535–608.
Wolosin, M., 2014: *Quantifying Benefits of the New York Declaration on Forests*. Climate Advisers, 17 pp.
Wong-Parodi, G. and I. Ray, 2009: Community perceptions of carbon sequestration: insights from California. *Environmental Research Letters*, **4(3)**, 034002, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/4/3/034002.
Woodbury, P.B., A.R. Kemanian, M. Jacobson, and M. Langholtz, 2018: Improving water quality in the Chesapeake Bay using payments for ecosystem services for perennial biomass for bioenergy and biofuel production. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **114**, 132–142, doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.01.024.
Woodcock, J. et al., 2009: Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: urban land transport. *The Lancet*, **374(9705)**, 1930–1943, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61714-1.
Xi, Y., T. Fei, and W. Gehua, 2013: Quantifying co-benefit potentials in the Chinese cement sector during 12th Five Year Plan: An analysis based on marginal abatement cost with monetized environmental effect. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **58**, 102–111, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.020.
Xylia, M. and S. Silveira, 2017: On the road to fossil-free public transport: the case of Swedish bus fleets. *Energy Policy*, **100**, 397–412, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.02.024.
Yang, L., H. Yan, and J.C. Lam, 2014: Thermal comfort and building energy consumption implications – A review. *Applied Energy*, **115**, 164–173, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.10.062.
Yanine, F.F. and E.E. Sauma, 2013: Review of grid-tie micro-generation systems without energy storage: Towards a new approach to sustainable hybrid energy systems linked to energy efficiency. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **26**, 60–95, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.05.002.
Yim, M.-S. and J. Li, 2013: Examining relationship between nuclear proliferation and civilian nuclear power development. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, **66**, 108–114, doi:10.1016/j.pnucene.2013.03.005.
York, R. and J.A. McGee, 2017: Does Renewable Energy Development Decouple Economic Growth from CO_2 Emissions? *Socius*, **3**, doi:10.1177/2378023116689098.
Yu, C.-Y., 2015: How Differences in Roadways Affect School Travel Safety. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **81(3)**, 203–220, doi:10.1080/01944363.2015.1080599.
Yue, T., R. Long, and H. Chen, 2013: Factors influencing energy-saving behavior of urban households in Jiangsu Province. *Energy Policy*, **62**, 665–675, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.07.051.
Zeng, H., X. Chen, X. Xiao, and Z. Zhou, 2017: Institutional pressures, sustainable supply chain management, and circular economy capability: Empirical evidence from Chinese eco-industrial park firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **155**, 54–65, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.093.
Zenk, S.N. et al., 2015: Prepared Food Availability in U.S. Food Stores. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, **49(4)**, 553–562, doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.02.025.
Zhang, S., E. Worrell, and W. Crijns-Graus, 2015: Cutting air pollution by improving energy efficiency of China's cement industry. *Energy Procedia*, **83**, 10–20, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2015.12.191.
Zhang, Y. et al., 2017: Processes of coastal ecosystem carbon sequestration and approaches for increasing carbon sink. *Science China Earth Sciences*, **60(5)**, 809–820, doi:10.1007/s11430-016-9010-9.
Zhao, D., A.P. McCoy, J. Du, P. Agee, and Y. Lu, 2017: Interaction effects of building technology and resident behavior on energy consumption in residential buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, **134**, 223–233, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.10.049.
Ziv, G., E. Baran, S. Nam, I. Rodríguez-Iturbe, and S.A. Levin, 2012: Trading-off fish biodiversity, food security, and hydropower in the Mekong River Basin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109(15)**, 5609–5614, doi:10.1073/pnas.1201423109.
Zomer, R.J., A. Trabucco, D.A. Bossio, and L. Verchot, 2008: Climate change mitigation: A spatial analysis of global land suitability for clean development mechanism afforestation and reforestation. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **126(1–2)**, 67–80, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2008.01.014.
Zulu, L.C. and R.B. Richardson, 2013: Charcoal, livelihoods, and poverty reduction: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, **17(2)**, 127–137, doi:10.1016/j.esd.2012.07.007.