

**QUNO Interventions during
the 54th Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and 14th Session of the
Working Group 1**

26 July – 6 August 2021

QUNO: Thank you co-chair. As an observer working to communicate IPCC summaries to wider audiences, we consider the B.1.2. paragraph as a whole, and including the last lines and hyphenated text, to be policy relevant, clear, concise and valuable to readers to better understand the chart presented. Thank you.

QUNO: We thank CAN International's intervention and underscore risk of net zero when the full effort should be on reducing GHG emissions (not CDR) also appreciate Germany's point on risk of temperature overshoot – we cannot bring back species made extinct due to higher temperature rise or eco-system collapse, as outlined in the SR1.5 Report. Finally, in our efforts to communicate IPCC summaries, while we appreciate there is a footnote, neither the footnote nor the word 'affect' in the last sentence reflect the significant negative side effects of large scale CDR as outlined in other IPCC SPMs on this issue.

QUNO: In addition to our colleagues' many important points, including on communicating the fraction of rises. Do the authors believe this section – B.2.2 or an upcoming paragraph, communicate clearly for policy makers the extreme of what we could face for SSP5 - 8.5 – many regions from where we now speak under a +4C would be uninhabitable. Do the authors believe the extremes we could face without sufficient transformative climate action is clear in this section?

QUNO: While we appreciate all the efforts to find a way forward, the wider world needs to be confident that the science is not compromised and that the authors' findings are upheld.

QUNO: While we appreciate all the efforts to find a way forward, the word 'determine' is clear and truthful. What we do now defines how or if we can live healthily on this planet. The world needs to be confident that the science is not compromised and that the author's findings are upheld.

QUNO: Concerning – C2 – even on the difference between 1.5C and 2C – does 'widespread' honor the findings of the SR1.5C on Global Warming where the difference between 1.5C and 2C alone would be significant and reflect loss of lives and livelihoods?

Evening contact group:

QUNO: Colleagues, on B.1.3 ad B.1.4 (concerning language on exceeding 1.5C) we wish to stress the sensitive nature of this paragraph in engaging hope with the wider public communication, to be clear that the 1.5C is not lost.

QUNO: As an organization communicating the science, the scientific findings reflected in this sentence are policy relevant and critical for the wider world to hear. We are aware that for nearly all countries here, the sentence in yellow reflects the temperature range of survival for our countries. Removing the sentence would be of great concern, if our efforts here are to protect our citizens by avoiding catastrophic global temperature rise, thank you.

QUNO: Thank you co-chair, we wish to reflect what has been said, in our experience the influence of CDR on water, food security and biodiversity can profoundly negative and not neutral, and we would ask the authors to clarify this, thank you.

QUNO: FWCC – Quakers – deeply thank the IPCC co-chairs, technical support unit and authors – many of whom do this voluntarily – for their dedicated hard work. We thank States for supporting this intergovernmental process. We thank civil society efforts to support, engage in and communicate this science widely. And we thank those who supported observer engagement in these weeks. The process of collating scientific findings worldwide, by authors worldwide, is a profound, inspiring and essential contribution to humanity as we, the human family, still have a chance to sustainably and justly transform the human activities driving anthropogenic climate change, to protect nature on which our, and all other species', lives depend. Thank you