



Quaker United Nations Office

13 Avenue du Mervelet
CH-1209 Geneva, Switzerland

Tel +41 (22) 748-4800

Fax +41 (22) 748-4819

Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC)

Interventions made during the 56th meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by Lindsey Fielder Cook, QUNO Representative for the Human Impacts of Climate Change, on behalf of FWCC.

21 March – 4 April 2022

This meeting oversaw the approval for the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) of the Working Group III contribution to the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), **Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change**.

The IPCC collates peer-reviewed climate science worldwide, and approximately every 7 years produces an Assessment Report of over 1000 pages. Hundreds of scientists are involved, nearly all (except the Secretariat and Technical Support Unit, TSU) voluntarily, and the content of these chapters cannot be changed. However, the SPM summarizes findings and must be approved by Governments. It is therefore exposed to negotiation of language, and while the IPCC has the right to refuse Country delegate suggestions that compromise ‘the integrity of the science’, there are political pressures. This last report focuses on mitigation of often lucrative activities driving climate change (fossil fuels, intensive agriculture, unsustainable consumption). As observers, we worked to support IPCC authors to protect the integrity of the science, pressed for language on transformative, sustainable, and just (rights) approaches, and challenged attempts to weaken language communicating the urgency and gravity of findings.

The Representative on Climate Change played a number of roles, including: expert reviewer of earlier SPM drafts, coordination with UN Human Rights (OHCHR) staff to engage on rights language, preparation for interventions based on past and new SPM drafts, and attendance during the virtual negotiations, (spread over 13 hours a day, for 15 days).

FWCC is the only active accredited faith-based organization at the IPCC. We are one of three observers which normally speak, being the European Union (special status), Climate Action Network (representing 100s of CSO groups), and FWCC. In this third IPCC approval session, Observer access was reduced from the past two IPCC sessions, only allowing oral interventions in the Plenary, and only written submissions following observation of Contact Group discussions.

During the approval session, IPCC co-chairs simply called us ‘**Friends**’. We made **35 Oral** interventions (with ‘outcomes’ included) and **11 written** submissions on behalf of FWCC.

1. Monday, 21 March - Opening Plenary

FWCC Oral Intervention *Thank you co-chair. The Friends World Committee for Consultation (QUAKERS), express our gratitude to the scientists and IPCC Secretariat for this body of work, and to the British and Indian governments for supporting this meeting.*

We express our commitment to help strengthen policy relevant language on urgent and healthy mitigation policies which benefit people and nature. We see need for greater engagement on urgent and healthy pathways for a 1.5C temperature rise limit, in energy transformations through demand side options, renewable energies and reduction of fossil fuels. We are also concerned by absence in this SPM of language highlighting research on human rights, Indigenous Peoples rights, protection of nature, and rights-based approaches which, as included in the WG2 SPM, make for more effective and fair climate action. However, our ability as observers has been curtailed in this WG3 approval process; unlike Working Group (WG) 1 and WG2 approval sessions, we now cannot speak in Contact Groups, which are used heavily in virtual meetings. We understand observer expertise to be constructive and valuable and we express regret at this change in the IPCC AR6 approval guidelines. We have a question – will observers be allowed to provide written contributions to contact groups as well as to the plenaries?

Outcome: this leads to a number of countries and the OHCHR emphasizing the valuable role of observers. The IPCC offers a compromise – Observers can only speak in Plenary sessions, however, as long as no Party objects, they can attend (but not speak) a Contact Group (where most language evolution happens) and can make a written submissions at the end of a session for authors to consider.

2. Monday, 21 March SECTION E

FWCC Oral intervention *Thank you Co-Chair. These E sections are critical in communicating how to do mitigation well, rather than badly. We welcome calls tonight to include equity and climate justice. Yet we are concerned that this section, in fact the whole SPM, fails to reflect research on how rights-based approaches lead to more effective, fair and therefore successful mitigation climate action. Rights-based approaches, participation and inclusion can reduce structural vulnerabilities to climate change and advance climate resilient development.*

This, alongside inclusive climate governance, were clearly outlined in the recent Working Group 2 Summary. Just as rights-based approaches will contribute to more sustainable outcomes for adaptation action, rights-based approaches which will also help form more effective, fair and therefore successful mitigation action. We ask IPCC Authors to explore where, in section E, they can include rights-based approaches, which are grounded in human rights, Indigenous People's Rights, public participation, gender, just transition, biodiversity protection and intergenerational justice.

Finally, as also shared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights this morning, we are concerned that this SPM fails to include language on human rights, Indigenous Peoples rights and the right to participation. Meaningful and informed participation in decision-making is a human right, as recognized by core human rights treaties and reaffirmed in environmental matters by Rio Principle 10 and other instruments. Meaningful participation and inclusion also lead to better, more effective

and more sustainable outcomes. We hope IPCC Authors and States can ensure this critical research is shared with policy makers, to help ensure effective and fair mitigation policies.

Outcome: see further on - has some modest rights language agreed in the last days.

3. Tuesday, 22 March – Section E

FWCC written submission - *For E.6.5, as this emphasizes benefits to good mitigation policy, and noting that air pollution leads to some 7-8 million premature deaths a year, would Authors consider adding in sentence two that 'are leading to further reductions in the emissions of specific GHGs, while in turn significantly reducing deaths saving related to pollution and toxin exposure'. For E.6.6, it is important to add that an international agreement exists which bans climate related geo-engineering that affects biodiversity, which SRM would. For additional language, we suggest 'a number of agreements contain relevant provisions'...while one, the Convention for Biological Diversity contains a moratorium on geo-engineering that affects biodiversity.*

4. Tuesday, 22 March – Section B.3

FWCC written submission - *We thank authors for this B3 section, highlighting findings on emissions as they reflect wealth, income and consumption. We hope very much that this information remains in the final SPM, and welcome more detailed findings on consumption overall, noting that, as concluded in the AR5, economic growth is a main driver of CO2 emissions. For example, consumption-based CO2 emissions related unsustainable economic systems is essential to highlight. Emissions from consumption through unsustainable (unhealthy, intensive meat based) diets are significant, and are outlined in the underlying chapters in the IPCC SR1.5C and in the IPCC SR CC and Land SPM. Consumption emissions information is policy relevant and communicates welcome information to the many communities which want to help in transformations to a healthier world. Communicating these findings on wealth/income/consumption is empowering for positive change. We hope IPCC authors will uphold and deepen these findings in the SPM.*

5. Tuesday, 22 March - Section E

FWCC written submission – *As Canada shared, we would add - this chart, and actually any chart in the SPM, fails to visually communicate consequences of the different temperature rises in efforts to sustain a liveable environment. We need to help policy makers ask, 'what do we want to sustain?', and 'what will it take to get there?' As an IPCC policy communicator, I have no idea how to translate this chart into real action. A good example was the IPCC SR1.5C which had clear pathways with % on actions to transform drivers, as well as clarity on sacrifice of overshoot (deaths, species extinction, food insecurity, eco-system collapse, etc). For example, connecting category temp rises with a visual like the ARG SYN chapter 3 p12 fig 3.2. I fear SPM.1 is written for emission mathematicians but not policy makers trying to make responsible choices to protect their society and all future generations.*

6. Tuesday, 22 March Section C.1 and C1.2

FWCC written submission - *please ensure that pathways for 1.5C come first, and 'below 2C' second, so that priority is in line with the Paris Agreement 'efforts to pursue'. 1.5C must remain priority while there is still some chance, noting the SR1.5C clarity on what is at stake between 1.5C and 2C (let*

alone 3C or +4C), and witness to the responsibility we have to act urgently and healthily. In C overall, please could we have more information on model limitations related to methane, and how this translates to actual, physical limitations. Finally, it is essential that we have clarity on 'end of century' warming expected from 'current policies', as was offered in the AR5 and was so helpful to communicating what is at stake to policy makers.

7. Tuesday, 22 March - Section E.3

FWCC written submission – *The E section, particularly E3, relates policy relevant information on more effective mitigation policy. Yet to date, the SPM draft does not mention human rights, Indigenous People's rights, protection of biodiversity, or 'rights-based approaches' which lead to (to quote the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment) 'more sustainable, coherent and legitimate climate policy'. The absence of these approaches is a great loss. Rights-based approaches, inclusiveness and participatory processes, can reduce structural vulnerabilities and strengthen public acceptance/sense of fairness in climate mitigation policies. These approaches, as outlined yesterday in the Plenary by the Office of the High Commission for Human Rights, are critical to all forms of climate policy, both adaptation and mitigation. They are rooted in the WG2 SPM yet absent in the WG3 SPM, and we are concerned by the lack of consistency. We ask WG3 authors to highlight findings in the E (or D?) section, on strengthening mitigation policies through the inclusion of human rights, Indigenous Peoples rights, and the right to participation. Meaningful and informed participation in decision making of climate mitigation actions affecting communities will increase public support and reduce potential 'backlash'. Finally, we would like to ask authors if research on 'polluter pays' approaches, including full liability for polluters, is highlighted in the SPM.*

8. Tuesday, 22 March – C.12

FWCC Written Submission - *We appreciate tonight's call from numerous States to include information on costs of higher levels of warming beyond 2C. This information is important for policy makers to recognize that delaying based on short term costs is not only expensive in the long term, it is also dangerous to society.*

We appreciate the calls from numerous States for deeper engagement in avoided costs in limiting temperature rise. For example, we are unsure if the costs presented include costs of rebuilding after ever-intensive storms and their damage, of displacement of people and loss of whole communities if not also Island States. We suggest a footnote on cost to explain that C portrays economic costs, that there are non-economic costs, or 'losses' (NEL) are not included here, and that higher temperatures include NEL of increased human suffering, loss of life, food insecurity/starvation, displacement/loss of livable land. Authors could pose the question to SPM readers, that we need to ask ourselves, 'what do we want to sustain? What are we willing to do, to get there'?*

On Fig 7 - We thank authors for this figure, which is highly policy relevant. We would ask, as many States tonight have, if this chart had one, or different assessment methodologies. It appears to have different assessment methodologies. Finally, we appreciate the request from Luxembourg that the cost of nuclear energy include the cost of nuclear waste treatment and storage, which does not appear included, or cost would be much higher than what is portrayed.

Thank you!

9. Tuesday, 22 March – Section C.5

FWCC Oral Intervention *Thank you co-chair, we are surprised by the extensive emphasis on Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) in the SPM – there are 33 references compared to 6 references for ‘renewable energies’. This is surprising as in the 2018 SR1.5C the IPCC wrote - The political, economic, social and technical feasibility of solar energy, wind energy and electricity storage technologies has improved dramatically over the past few years, while that of nuclear energy and carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) in the electricity sector have not shown similar improvements.” We do not think the technology has changed dramatically in these three years. Finally, what is the physical global limit to CCS storage on earth, is this mentioned in the SPM? Otherwise, this section sounds like a pitch for maintaining fossil fuels.*

Outcome: concerns over CCS increase over the approval process, with Germany taking the lead requesting language throughout reflect that CCS is currently not available to scale due to development status/price. The final SPM has some improved language; however, CCS remains prominent in the SPM - fossil fuel extraction dependent economies see CCS as the answer to continued (‘abated’) FF use.

10. Wednesday, 23 March – C.8.2

FWCC Oral Intervention *Thank you co-chairs and thank you authors for this really important section. My question is for the authors. In C.8.2 you reference ‘active transport infrastructure’ to help with reduced emissions from transport. Does this phrase include ‘bicycle and walking paths’, and if so, could you include that as examples? If ‘active transport’ does not include bicycle/walking paths, could you see if the underlying research supports the importance of these additions, and bring this into the summary, as bicycle and walking paths are very important for car alternatives.*

Outcome: Co-chair confirms this is what active transport implies, and notes suggestion - the final SPM now includes – ‘and active transport infrastructure (e.g., bike and pedestrian pathways)’

11. Wednesday, 23 March - C.10

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chair, we really appreciate Figure 6, which we find as highly policy relevant. On the discussion of the phrase, balanced diets featuring plant-based diets’. WG2 does actually use this – it says ‘balanced diet features plant-based diets’. But it was put into a footnote. That was adaptation, and this is mitigation. Plant based diets have a significant mitigation potential, and this is outlined in the underlying research as well as extensively in the SRCCL Land Report. We appreciate the concern raised over pastoral lifestyle, but these are sustainable diets. The real problem is not pastoral lifestyle, it is increased income is pressing increased meat consumption at ever more intense quantities and this has a profound connection to deforestation, biodiversity loss, all in turn linked to mitigation. We hope very much that this highly policy relevant detail can stay in the main text.*

Outcome: This issue carries on through the negotiation, eventually using footnotes to give different definitions. In no area of the SPM is meat or dairy mentioned, as this remains

politically difficult despite strong emissions-related research in underlying and other IPCC reports.

12. Thursday 24 March- B.1.4

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chair, briefly, if the authors are being asked to return to the underlying chapters for additional information on the covid period, could they include information on the significant reduction of air pollution and its positive effects on health in urban areas. As we know, some 8 million people die prematurely every year from air pollution. Thank you.*

Outcome: ignored, though health benefits through reduced air pollution are highlighted in other areas of the SPM.

13. Friday 25 March - Section E

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chairs, the Technical Summary on page 111, sentence 23, gives a high confidence statement on the following – “Explicit attention to equity and justice is salient to both social acceptance and fair and effective policymaking for mitigation (high confidence). Distributional implications of alternative climate policy choices can be usefully evaluated at city, local and national scales as an input to policymaking. It is anticipated that institutions and governance frameworks that enable consideration of justice and just transitions can build broader support for climate policymaking. We ask if ‘meaningful participation could be brought to begin this sentence, “meaningful participation of all stakeholders including civil society’.*

Outcome: As the sentence was already accepted in a Contact Group (where we could not speak), the IPCC author said she would not reopen the sentence. However, we later influence adoption of similar language into Section D.

14. Friday, 25 March - Section E

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you chair, we again bring up the high confidence statement in the Technical Summary relating to governance and broader support for climate policymaking. We thank Germany and others for suggesting gender be included. We add that in no place in this SPM is human rights, Indigenous Peoples Rights or rights-based approaches are mentioned, which were grounded in the WG2 and which are critical to effective and fair climate policy. All of these are part of ‘rights-based approaches’. We ask the authors if ‘Structural factors, including meaningful, rights-based approaches ... could be included, to ensure that policy makers understand how these approaches build for better mitigation policies.*

Outcome: USA supports our intervention with ‘meaningful participation of most marginalized groups’, but language is not updated.

15. Friday, 25 March - Section E

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chairs, for this next statement on ideas, values and beliefs, I again ask the authors to consider including their high confidence statement in the Technical Statement that quotes ‘equity and justice’ as critical for climate policy being ‘more easily adopted’.*

Outcome: The SPM inclusion of 'equity' increases from 10 to 16 places in the final SPM, mostly due to India's insistence. 'Equity and justice' are together only once, as in the earlier draft. Yet 'climate justice' is added, see below.

16. Saturday, 26 March - C.5.1

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chair, we wanted to thank authors for this extremely important paragraph. As we learn from the AR5, economic growth is the main driver of CO2. As researchers in this field, the concept of circular solutions is not familiar, but 'circular economy' is well known, but I also wanted to appreciate the suggestion of 'sustainable produce and consumption'. In brief, that you offer a range, such as 'circular economy and other sustainable production and consumption economic models.*

Outcome: – 'sustainable' is added to the sentence – *"There are many sustainable options for demand management"*. 'Circular economy' is not accepted, but 'circular material flows' is to avoid being omitted. One Party make a point of order about my intervention; the IPCC Co-chair said it would be 'noted' but that observers have the right to speak in the plenary.

17. Saturday, 26 March - C.5.2

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you co-chair, as this paragraph is about the reduction of cement emissions, I wanted to ask the authors if it would be policy relevant to also include reduced use of cement as well as transferring to more sustainable building materials. Thank you.*

Outcome: Author expresses appreciation for this intervention as relevant, yet sees this as covered in the earlier paragraph (see above).

18. Monday, 28 March- Section A

FWCC Oral Intervention: *Thank you co-chair for giving me the floor. We also thank you for the inclusion of just transition in the text. Reflecting on many calls to better integrate equity and justice in the whole SPM, and calls to better integrate equity and justice WG2 language into this SPM, we have some comments for this Framing Section. We wish to share with delegates that just transition is a rights-based approach. Rights-based approaches are included twice in the WG2, and they include not only just transition but also intergenerational equity, gender, human rights including Indigenous Peoples rights, meaningful public participation and protection of biodiversity.*

Outcome: while the final SPM has some improved 'rights' language, the concept of 'rights-based approaches' is not included anywhere.

19. Monday, 28 March D1 and D2

FWCC Written Submission -*We are thankful for Party calls for more consistent integration of equity and justice in this SPM, and for better grounding of these in D for more successful and fair mitigation policy. While these issues have more focus in D3, they are critical to successful, effective and fair mitigation policy in D1 and D2. The High Confidence findings in the Technical summary states that 'explicit attention to equity and justice is salient to both social acceptance and fair and effective policymaking for mitigation (p.111 line 23/24). For D1 and D2, attention to equity, rights-based*

approaches, and protection of biodiversity are essential to help policy makers avoid past mistakes that have led to community backlash to policies experienced as unfair, inequitable or dangerous to biodiversity.

20. Monday, 28 March- Section D3 - E1 and E2

FWCC Written Submission: *We thank the authors very much for their focus on equity and justice in D3, and the focus on the role of just transition for effective, fair and successful mitigation transitions. Reflecting on Canada's submission just now, we wish to also emphasize that just transition is one of a number of rights-based approaches. **Rights-based approaches** are included twice in the WG2 SPM and reflect significant research findings on successful social acceptance of climate policy, including reports from the UN Special Rapporteurs and Human Rights Council over the last decade. Rights-based approaches reflect the calls from Parties at this WG3 session for policy relevant wording on integrating women and marginalized groups, meaningful public participation, human rights including Indigenous Peoples rights, just transition, and protection of biodiversity/environmental integrity. The overall D3 sentence could be strengthened with, for example, 'Attention to equity, **rights-based and broad, informed and meaningful** stakeholder participation in decision making can build social trust and deepen and widen support for transformative changes.'. For D.3.2, we ask authors if language of 'gender concerns' would be improved with 'gender equality, as 'gender equality' is in UNFCCC decision 3/CP.25 and UNEA Resolution 4/17. For E1 (my hand was raised but I was not given a chance to speak), for the overall E paragraph, 'strengthening climate governance through **meaningful and informed participation** of civil society, local groups, Indigenous Peoples, professional bodies, business and the financial section.' We offer these as important policy relevant findings for more effective and fair (and therefore successful) mitigation policy. Thank you so much.*

Outcome: The author rewrite changes 'gender concerns' to 'gender equality' and no Party objects – it is in the final SPM draft

21. Tuesday, 29 March – Section D3

FWCC Written submission: *We thank the authors for today's engagement on D3 strengthening, including their efforts to bring in underlying and positive findings on climate justice to the SPM. As observers we cannot speak in the CGs but we refer to inputs to D3 already given below, and calls from States and observers for more consistent language with WG2 on positive influences of rights-based approaches to climate policy, and stronger language (as the US and UK also asked today) on 'meaningful' participation and adding 'marginalized communities' to ensure their voices are heard. We encourage authors to consider delegates calls today for language to be stronger, where 'gender concerns' could be 'gender equality', for example. Finally, we hope that the overall D3 statement could then be strengthened to include rights-based approaches and meaningful stakeholder participation, practices which are already resulting in improved success in mitigation policies. The absence of this language in this SPM would be a loss to the potential of more successful (experienced as fair and thus gaining society's support) mitigation policy in the future.*

22. Tuesday, 29 March – Section E1

FWCC Written Submission - E1 - *We encourage authors to consider States requests to better integrate in the SPM, the underlying research on barriers of CCS and costs to nuclear energy. Costs to nuclear energy must include cost of building (and cement emissions), costs of storing radioactive waste, costs to local health due to increased cancer rates, and costs to international security through potential nuclear proliferation.*

23. Tuesday, 29 March – Section E

FWCC Written Submission - E2 - *We thank authors for this section highlighting the positive mitigation roles of human behaviour and lifestyles. The section could be stronger for successful mitigation policy in recognizing the 'two way effort'; many communities are already actively promoting sustainable behaviour and lifestyle transformation. Therefore, policies are not only 'top down' but can help support existing/growing local and regional efforts to live more healthily. Another two-way concerning more sustainable diets, for example, would link to supporting existing farming attempts for more sustainable, more plant-based and agroecological agriculture practices but the market structures make that financial suicide.*

24. Tuesday, 29 March – Section E1

FWCC Oral Intervention C.5.4 - *Thank you co-chair. On a communications comment, we share concern over the phrase 'CCS infrastructure' to better clarify the actual availability status of this technology, and misleading as a policy option rather than the actual reduction of fossil fuel use. Also, the phrase 'lead markets', this has two meanings in English and since we are talking about industry materials, I first read this as the metal 'lead'. While we here understand it is 'lead', I wonder if there is another word to avoid any confusion.*

Outcome: The co-chair notes the linguistic challenge to 'lead' – language is changed in the final SPM to *'economic and regulatory instruments to drive market uptake'*, while voices of concern over CCS portrayal language is increasing.

25. Tuesday 29 March – Section C9

FWCC Oral intervention: C.9.1 – *thank you co-chair, on the phrase of 'sustainable healthy diets', we ask this not be reduced to 'healthy', because 'healthy' is a subjective word, you and I can argue what is healthy, but the word 'sustainable' grounds it in an objective way, so we hope the phrase 'sustainable healthy diets' remains.*

Outcome: 'sustainable' remains, despite some Party challenges, and being an WHO/FAO recognized term, it later receives a footnote explanation. However, reference to meat/dairy are non-existent in early/final SPM drafts, only 'mostly plant-based' in other diet related sections.

26. Tuesday, 29 March – Section C.9

FWCC Oral Intervention – Section C.9.1 – *thank you co-chair, we wish to support India's concern for small scale farmers, and the need for agroecological agriculture, and in reading this I thought the authors were asking for 'intensification of sustainable agriculture to protect eco-systems, but you are saying here 'sustainable intensification of agriculture' and this doesn't quite make sense.*

Outcome – authors concern that in their chapter they have a ‘whole box’ on sustainable intensification of agriculture’. However, the second paragraph, C.9.2, eventually gets improved needed language for vulnerable communities – ‘*AFOLU carbon sequestration and GHG emission reduction options have both co-benefits and risks in terms of biodiversity and ecosystem conservation, food and water security, wood supply, livelihoods and land tenure and land-use rights of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and small landowners.*’

27. Wednesday, 30 March – Section B

FWCC Oral Intervention – *thank you co-chair, as we are on the footnotes, raising my question again for advice from the authors, would this be a place to inform policy makers of any emissions that are not included in the NDCs, so they can be made aware. Thank you.*

Outcome: co-chair – ‘we will pick that up when we discuss the footnotes’, however, the substance of our point gets nowhere.

28. Wednesday, 30 March – Section E.3.3

FWCC Oral Interventions - (concerning a deadlock over climate litigation) – *A suggestion to held with the deadlock, would it help to cut reference to countries and simply have, ‘is growing, and in some cases....’*

Outcome – considered by authors as useful but the US and Saudi Arabia wanted countries mentioned. Remains in pink.

29. Wednesday, 30 March – Section E.3.

FWCC Oral Intervention – *Thank you, co-chair, a number of Parties have over the days suggested ‘meaningful’ before ‘engagement’. Would Parties wish to bring this in here, to help strengthen engagement, a form of ‘rights-based approach’ that can lead to more fair and accepted climate policy?’*

Outcome – USA supports the inclusion of this word too, but authors do not include it and the sentence is gavelled without it added.

30. Thursday, 30 March– Section D.3

FWCC Oral Intervention: *Thank you co-chair. This sentence is about building social trust, and with social trust, deepen and widen support, in turn to avoid society backlash and result in more successful climate policy. We appreciate calls over the last weeks to add ‘inclusive and meaningful’ with ‘participation’. These words help guide policy makers create more successful climate policy.*

Outcome – see below

31. Thursday, 30 March– Section D.3

FWCC Oral Intervention – *Thank you co-chair, to encompass concerns expressed by Parties over ignored voices, is to specify the language ‘including marginalized groups’. We ask authors if that would help strengthen what is being said here.*

32. Thursday, 30 March– Section D.3

FWCC Oral Intervention – *Thank you co-chair and thank you to the US for also encouraging the words ‘inclusive and meaningful’ for participation. This reflects extensive research on how climate policy can build social trust, society acceptance and therefore successful mitigation policies.*

Outcome: *The US delegate returns several times, pushing for language that ‘our Quaker colleague suggested’. Finally, the D3 overarching sentence now reads – ‘Attention to equity and broad and meaningful participation of all relevant actors in decision-making at all scales can build social trust, and deepen and widen support for transformative changes. (high confidence)’*

33. Thursday, 30 March– Section E.2.4

FWCC Oral Intervention – *Thank you co-chair, responding to Parties comment about what kind of ‘behaviour’, we would appreciate authors’ suggestions for words to clarify ‘behaviour’, for example, ‘high emission’, ‘unsustainable’, etc, to help guide policy maker.*

Outcome: authors offer ‘some changes in behaviour toward low-emission’ (‘some’ as there are behaviour changes can happen immediately, and ‘low emission’ to sound more positive/encouraging. India states, for the record, that this is still weak and should be ‘high consumption’.

34. Thursday, 30 March– Section C.7.3

FWCC Oral Intervention – (in efforts by some countries to remove a statistic) *Thank you co-chair, we have waited seven years for this report and if the authors calculate this figure as reflecting the most accurate figures, this information must remain to protect the integrity of the science.*

Outcome: list of % remain.

35. Friday, 1 April- Figure 7

FWCC Oral intervention – *Thank you co-chair, we appreciate this very policy relevant figure. My comment is on communication of the figure. SPM Figures are often used in presentations outside the SPM context, to help to visually communicate information. Many parties over the last days have noted the lack of mention of fossil fuels on the list, and we understand the authors’ explanations as to why. However, for communications of the figure, could the title bring clarity, for example, ‘Alongside reduction of fossil fuel combustion, other mitigation options available now include Also, on the issue of dates, maybe the language could be, ‘from 2030 and beyond’. Thank you*

Outcome: comments not considered.

36. Saturday, 2 April – Section B.3.3

FWCC Oral intervention (following India’s challenge and attempt to remove language of ‘decent’ living standards and Finland’s suggestion of basic human rights and rights-based approaches). *Thank you co-chair, in this discussion on decent living standards, we heard a Party suggest rights language as a solution. We welcome this, and wish to share that the Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of*

Human Rights speaks exactly to what is being referred to in this, specifically: Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself, and continues on. The Party which has concerns on 'decent' is a signatory of this UN Declaration on Human Rights. Thank you.

Outcome: 'Decent living standards' is kept, with a footnote below, while India's request to link with sustainable development framing is accepted. A footnote is added to explain 'decent living standards' which interestingly reflects UNDR language – *'In this report, decent living standards are defined as a set of minimum material requirements essential for achieving basic human well-being, including nutrition, shelter, basic living conditions, clothing, health care, education, and mobility.'*

37. Saturday, 2 April - Section C.8

FWCC Oral intervention (some Parties attempt to remove last headline statement) *Thank you co-chair, we want to support the authors in this last sentence, which outlines important information for policy makers how the above can benefit their citizens' health. On questions over equitable transportation, maybe the emphasis on supporting public transport would help connect with 'equitable', but this is a very important sentence on citizen health that should remain.*

Outcome: sentence remains

38. Saturday, 2 April – Footnote 23

FWCC Oral Interventions — *Thank you co-chair, the IPCC Special Report of 1.5C was very specific on the extensive species extinctions related to temperature overshoot and I want to ask authors if they believe the sentence here clearly highlights the human and nature biodiversity loss related too overshoot, thank you.*

Outcome: co-chairs does not ask for author input and says this is covered in D. Thus ignored to a point, sentence approved.

39. Saturday, 2 April – Section C.9.1

FWCC Oral Intervention *Thank you co-chair, again, for communication the phrase "sustainable intensification of agriculture' it is unclear what kind of agriculture – intensive, unsustainable or sustainable agriculture? Could the authors help specify?*

Outcome – co-chair says we need to get approval, does not ask the authors to come back in.

40. Saturday, 2 April – C.9.2

FWCC Oral Intervention *Thank you co-chair, we see this last sentence as extremely important and we hope it is not dropped, because it reflects exactly how to avoid the risks noted above, how to do the mitigation well by engaging with stakeholders appropriately, so the mitigation policy does not fail.*

Outcome - discussion continues – a Party asks for ‘all relevant voices’ instead of stakeholders as this language has already been accepted and better reflect Indigenous People’s voices and other communities. Another to include Indigenous Groups and small-scale landholders.
Sentence returned to purple for authors to reflect.

41. Saturday, 2 April – Section C.9.4

FWCC Oral Intervention – *Thank you co-chair, we welcome the suggestion to include Indigenous Peoples alongside NGOs, and would also ask if local communities could be added in this list. Thank you.*

Outcome: language included - ‘A wide range of actors, including private businesses, NGOs, Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

- **Saturday, 2 April – Section D.1.4**

FWCC Oral Intervention - *Thank you, co-chair, I have a question for the authors, would it be clearer and more appropriate to add ‘sustainable’ before ‘agricultural activity’?*

Outcome: Italy also supports, and they gavel ‘sustainable agricultural activity’.

42. Sunday, 3 April Section D.1

FWCC Oral Intervention – *(Headline statement, following a FF extraction-rich country’s successful intervention to weaken the opening sentence, with a damage control attempt by a European country) – Thank you co-chair, we reflect what has just been said (by a European country). On a communications level, the opening sentence has gone from an encouraging and inspiring message, and has been weakened, which is of concern. We hope that the suggestions by () for the second sentence can be considered.*

Outcome: second sentence adopted by the European Party’s suggestion and made the following sentences more proactive - ‘some trade-offs, then followed by policy actions to reduce trade-offs’.

43. Sunday, 3 April Section D.1

FWCC Oral Intervention (Headline statement) – *Thank you co-chair, the IPCC Reports are critical for informing us of the latest science. The reports need to reflect the authors’ conclusions, or trust in the IPCC process is affected. The author has stated clearly why we must keep the phrase, ‘in the context of the sustainable development’. The suggested change just now would take this out, which is of concern as sustainable development is how we live now and, in the future, it is not time limited.*

Outcome: ‘in the context of sustainable development’ remains.

44. Sunday 3 April Section D.1

FWCC Oral Intervention – **Section C.4.1** *Thank you co-chair, just to ask on communications level, as we have examples of ‘sustainable biofuels’ for energy transformation systems, yet no mention of renewable energy systems, is that what the authors want, or should renewable energies also be mentioned?*

Outcome – author confirmed this is not a mistake (renewables come into greater detail in the next paragraphs).

45. Sunday, 3 April Section E.4.2

FWCC Oral Intervention – (on fossil fuel subsidies) *Thank you co-chair, we wish to back what our civil society colleagues CAN International have just said concerning the importance and expansion of information on fossil fuel subsidies in this paragraph.*

Outcome – information is kept, alongside concern for those affected by loss of subsidies, packed into an incredibly long sentence.

46. Monday 4 April - Closing Plenary

FWCC Oral Intervention – *we did not expect to speak – but hearing Svitlana from Ukraine, I wish to repeat what she said highlighting the role of fossil fuels in the war. And that more money is spent on fossil fuels than on climate change mitigation and adaptation. The acquisition and protection of fossil fuels have effectively defined our geo-politics for the last 100 years, affecting human rights and destroying the environment. My own country spends some 800 billion a year on military and we must ask, what is ‘true security’? I wish to thank those countries which supported language during this session in human rights, rights-based approaches and climate justice, because how we implement climate action will define its success – when people participate and benefit from climate action, they will more likely support the action. We thank Belgium for its support to observers, and hope that the WG3 restricted access is not repeated. We thank EU for its clear call that IPCC authors have the last say, and finally, we thank the IPCC – the Authors, the co-chairs, the TSU, the Secretariat, for all their work to help us understand what is happening, why, and what we can do to help stabilize a safer climate. We have trust in you to be the voice for science and for nature, thank you.*

IPCC Chair – ‘thank you FWCC for your views’

Lindsey Fielder Cook, QUNO Geneva

April 2022