

RESPONSIBLE GROWTH REPORT COMMITTEE

WITH THE COMMUNITIES WE SERVE

RESPONSIBLE GROWTH REPORT /FALL 2022

/CONTENTS

Introduction 2
Testimonials. 3
Afterword 13

The RGRC consists of Elsevier and RELX employees concerned about the climate impacts of the company. The purpose of this group is to highlight where the science reveals misalignment of our business with our policies and with a healthy future. Operating in the spirit of a culture of integrity that insists we incorporate ethics into all our actions, speak out for what is right, and hold ourselves accountable, we also advocate for the removal of any constraints placed upon employees that restrict their ability to follow Elsevier's Operating Principles, RELX's 'Do the Right Thing' principles, and other ethical standards by which we've been challenged to abide. For more information and to get involved with our work, please contact Kip Lyall at klyall@cell.com.

At left and next page: Health and science professionals risk arrest while protesting the expansion of fossil fuel development.





Introduction

Elsevier/RELX policies and statements contend that, taking into consideration the impacts of "customer use of products and services," our company is responding to the climate crisis "in line with the scale deemed necessary by science"[1] in order to achieve net zero and Paris Agreement-based warming goals.[2] These are goals that the scientific community—including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and International Energy Agency (IEA)—has concluded require immediately halting new fossil fuel projects. Our company continues, however, to offer products and services (see RGR Fall 2021) that facilitate fossil fuel expansion, and has indicated we are not prepared to draw a line between the transition away from fossil fuels and the expansion of oil and gas extraction.[3] Despite an April 2021 ethics complaint and further appeals made by employees, company leaders continue to assert that policies[4] are being accurately followed in accordance with the findings of the scientific community.

With one of Elsevier's top priorities of 2022 being to build trust by partnering **WITH THE COMMUNITIES WE SERVE** to help them meet their objectives, the RGRC presents here the voices of health and science experts who are attempting to meet the urgency of this crisis. In providing an opportunity for our colleagues to hear from the scientific community about the conclusions and decisions being made at Elsevier and RELX, we will become better equipped to put ourselves in our customers' shoes, to better serve them, and—in being accountable to make the right decisions and deliver the right outcomes—to achieve our collective goals.

All those quoted are speaking on their own behalf.

[1] https://www.relx.com/~/media/Files/R/RELX-Group/documents/responsibility/policies/environmental-policy-2021.pdf
[2] https://www.relx.com/~/media/Files/R/RELX-Group/documents/responsibility/policies/climate-change-statement-new.pdf
[3] https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/feb/24/elsevier-publishing-climate-science-fossil-fuels
[4] These also include memberships in the UN's Race to Zero campaign, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the We Are Still In Declaration, the Responsible Media Forum's Climate Pact, the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data, the UNGC ("No function is conflicting with company sustainability commitments and objectives" with action required when considering "where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage" and "acceptability to the public."), and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Discontinue "activities with potentially adverse climate change-related human rights impacts.")

With the company facilitating the expansion of fossil fuel extraction through fossil fuel industry-oriented data services, R&D, books, journals, and U.S.-based lobbying, contributors were invited to answer questions such as these, or simply choose to offer a statement. Other testimonials are public statements related to these issues.

1. Pledges
Based on Elsevier/RELX's business activity, does the current climate research indicate that company pledges and statements are being correctly followed? Is the company acting consistently with what the science says is required for there to be a realistic pathway to the net zero and warming targets?

2. Health
Is the company being true to its purpose to improve health outcomes and to benefit society? To what degree will the new fossil fuel development that the company is serving promote any negative health outcomes for individuals or society?

3. Expansion
The company says they are not prepared to draw a line between the transition away from fossil fuels and expansion of oil and gas extraction. What are your thoughts on this?

4. Publications
For the company to be consistent with its pledges, would it need to alter the scope of its publications? Is there a difference between knowledge produced about fossil fuels, production, and the industry vs. knowledge whose justification is to help the industry develop new production and stimulate old reserves?

5. Measurements
The company has told investors it isn't focusing on the impacts of customer use of products and services because it's "difficult to measure how the customers behaved, how they used things and what they did." Is it difficult to know how the fossil fuel industry is behaving and using these products and services, and is it always necessary to have precise measurements for the company to act in adherence with its pledges?



Testimonials

The science is clear. Based on scenarios created by the IPCC or IEA, upon which the Race to Zero campaign is based, there can be no new oil and gas fields or coal projects for the world to reach even the goal of global net zero by mid-century, which is not ambitious enough. Yet Elsevier/RELX continues to support the goals of the fossil fuel industry, which are antithetical to a livable planet. For Elsevier to claim that it's being guided by science, therefore, undermines the hard work of the actual scientists as we struggle to communicate the dire nature of the climate emergency and compel action. If Elsevier's pledge is real, then it will have to go well beyond simply rebranding Elsevier's "R&D solutions for oil and gas"[1] as "R&D solutions for a sustainable world,"[2] and sever all ties with the fossil fuel industry.

Dr. Peter Kalmus
NASA climate scientist

Winner of the NASA Early Career Achievement Medal and three Jet Propulsion Laboratory Voyager Awards

---

Elsevier and its parent company RELX are not, in fact, aligned with global efforts to achieve net zero emissions before 2050. Their aid of the fossil fuel industry in discovering and recovering oil and gas reserves is explicitly opposed to these goals.

Dr. Ethan E. Butler
Research Scientist, University of Minnesota

Academic publishers who run journals that publish climate research while supporting the expansion of fossil fuel extraction. Do they read what they publish?

Dr. Katherine Hayhoe
Atmospheric Scientist, Texas Tech University

Winner of the American Geophysical Union's Climate Communication Prize, the Sierra Club's Distinguished Service Award, and the National Center for Science Education's Friend of the Planet awardand named one of Foreign Policy's 100 Leading Global Thinkers.

[1] https://web.archive.org/web/20210923062544/https://www.elsevier.com/rd-solutions/oil-and-gas
[2] https://www.elsevier.com/rd-solutions/sustainability-and-climate-change

Elsevier is the publisher of some of the most important journals in the environmental space. They cannot claim ignorance of the facts of climate change and the urgent necessity to move away from fossil fuels…Their business model seems to be to profit from publishing climate and energy science, while disregarding the most basic fact of climate action: the urgent need to move away from fossil fuels.

On policies: Elsevier is not acting consistently with the science which is published in its own journals.

On publications: There is a clear difference between publications which aim to study the industry, and publications with the aim of supporting the industry. The kind of ethical guidance which Elsevier should adopt is routine in medical domains, for example.

On not focusing on impacts of products and services: This is disingenuous because Elsevier is directly marketing to the industry. It is thus selecting them as customers and hoping they use the products Elsevier is promoting to them. The medical principle of "first do no harm" comes to mind: "First don't create and promote products to a destructive industry."

Dr. Julia Steinberger
Social ecologist and ecological economist
Université de Lausanne

Co-author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 6th Assessment Report, contributing to the report's discussion of climate change mitigation pathways

---

If the same publisher putting out the papers that show definitively we can't burn any more fossil fuels and stay within this carbon budget is also helping the fossil fuel industry do just that, what does that do to the whole premise of validity around the climate research? That is what's deeply concerning about these conflicts.

Dr. Kimberly Nicholas
Senior Lecturer in Sustainability Science
Lund University

Guest at Elsevier's 2021 SUSTAIN Festival, where she informed employees: "We have to stop the carbon and climate pollution at its source… turning off the tap is really, really critical. The International Energy Agency, IPCC, and every other alphabet soup of analysts is saying that, nope there's no more room for fossil fuel expansion."

I agree that publishing hydrocarbon exploration studies exacerbates the danger of a fossil fuel focused future and all that comes with that. However I would not call out any scientific work for being contractictory. Contradictions can lead to debate and new discoveries. Expanding knowledge of geology is not in itself dangerous. It is exciting and delicious if you like that sort of thing (as I do). It is the application that forms the problem, as well as the funding of the research. Good applications may be that such geological studies can also find places to bury CO_2 underground. Such twists are already going on.

Meanwhile we all know the planetary and human injustice and damage caused by extraction. So what are possible conclusions in terms of publishers' ethics? I would encourage publishers: to clearly mark out articles that could be used to promote climate damage and pollution; to state next to them which IPCC recommendations they contravene if used for extraction—akin to cigarette warnings; to not publish any that directly undermine widely accepted climate goals.

Putting limits and blocks on oil company access to science that may aid future extraction would be a realistic first policy to help towards meeting climate goals. Alternative revenue streams for publishers, and limits on climatically dirty revenue streams for all publishers, could help enormously.

Sophie Paul
Geoscientist and strategy adviser

Elsevier: serving healthcare by compounding public health issues.

Aaron Berdofe
Clinical Informatics Director at Zus Health

[Elsevier] is hastening global warming by providing consultancy services to fossil fuel companies to help them develop new drilling sites.

Dr. Kris McNeill
Professor of Environmental Chemistry, ETH Zurich
Editor-in-Chief, Environmental Science: Processes and Impacts

Elsevier/RELX's business activities are in direct conflict with the most conservative estimates of what it would take to avert the worst impacts of climate change. The stance of curtailing paper use and employee travel while benefiting from a business model that supports new fossil fuel developments amounts to greenwashing: it is entirely hypocritical and disrespects the community of climate scientists, particularly those who publish in, or donate their peer-review time for, Elsevier publications.

Scientific knowledge is never neutral. Despite the claims of nuclear physicists that they were not responsible for how the military uses their research, we now know that not all information should be widely shared, not when the risks of its application are so dire. Carbon-emitting technologies have reached a degree of destructiveness that makes them commensurate to atomic technology, and one should apply the same principle: Elsevier cannot feign ignorance of the uses to which the research it publishes (and more consequentially, promotes) is being put. It has the moral duty to track the contributions of its leading business associates to fossil fuel emissions, else abstain from doing business with them.

Dr. Julien Emile-Geay
Associate Professor, Department of Earth Sciences
University of Southern California

It's hard to believe that a company that publishes research about the dangers of the climate and ecological crises is the very same company that actively works with oil and gas companies to extract more fossil fuels, which drags us towards disaster.

James Dyke
Assistant Director of the Global Systems Institute
University of Exeter

This all happens without the broader public knowing, and it operates to entrench the industry. To effect a rapid replacement of fossil fuels, I believe these entanglements will need to be exposed and reformed.

Ben Franta
Researcher at Stanford University

As presented here, it seems the Company is not 'ensuring the content, products, and data insights it generates are serving an energy transition' as claimed. Providing insights and knowledge on new fossil fuel extraction undermines their claim to be behaving consistently with a 1.5 degree pathway. The science is pretty clear that to meet such a target we must rapidly decarbonise and no new fossil fuel extraction can take place (indeed many existing claimed resources would be stranded). See https://www.nature.com/articles/nature14016 and more recently: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03821-8.

It seems perverse to publish material that improves extraction while admitting the need to rapidly cease extraction: it's akin to gun companies taking no liability for what is done with the guns. Legally it might be fine, but morally it seems they should at least put a 'health warning' on all such publications along the lines of, "Elsevier recognises the need to rapidly cease all new exploration and reduce production of fossil fuels in order to keep global temperature changes well below 2 degrees, in line with international commitments." I feel like this is the least they could do. It reduces their liability and allows them to show willingness, while also making the case very clearly to any climate-denying fossil fuel bodies.

Dr. Duncan Watson-Parris
Atmospheric Physicist
University of Oxford

This is troubling.

Dr. Jonathan Foley
Executive Director of Project Drawdown
Former Executive Director of the California Academy of Sciences

Winner of the Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, the J.S. McDonnell Foundation's 21st Century Science Award, an Aldo Leopold Leadership Fellowship, the Sustainability Science Award from the Ecological Society of America, and the National Science Foundation's Faculty Early Career Development Award, and the Heinz Award for the Environment. Named by Thomson Reuters a Highly Cited Researcher in ecology and environmental science, placing him among the top 1 percent most cited global scientists.

The recent IPCC Working Group II Assessment Report (2022) concludes: "Any further delay in concerted anticipatory global action on adaptation and mitigation will miss a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all (very high confidence)"

Each one of us has a duty to effect urgent transformational change for the benefit of people and the planet. Major corporations like Elsevier have an especially important responsibility given their impact and their role in the curation and dissemination of the science that underpins our understanding of intersecting global crises from climate change to biodiversity loss and practices that drive inequity and injustice.

Dr. Bruce C. Glavovic
School of People, Environment and Planning
Massey University, New Zealand

Coordinating Lead Author of the sea-level rise chapter in the IPCC's Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (2019) and a Cross-Chapter Paper Lead and Lead Author in the IPCC's Sixth Assessment.

Halting continued temperature increase requires net-zero emissions of carbon dioxide as a first step and then negative emissions. This means that the use of fossil fuels need to be phased out. This also means that exploration of new fossil fuel resources need to stop. Any company and business model that builds on exploring more fossil fuels cannot claim to be sustainable and in line with international commitments on climate change. The reports that Elsevier works with the fossil fuel industry to help increase oil and gas drilling is therefore very disturbing. Many of us publish in Elsevier journals, help in reviewing papers, and serve on editorial boards. We would like to work with publishers that support a sustainable future and commitments on climate change.

Dr. Göran Finnveden
Professor, KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

Editorial board member: The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, The International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Journal of Cleaner Production, and Sustainability
Member of the Board of the Stockholm Environment Institute (2020-present)
Member of the Swedish Government's Scientific Council on Sustainable Development (2015-2018)
Member of the Scientific Advisory Council to the Minister of Environment (2012-2014)

As a major publisher of climate science, Elsevier knows that we have 'a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all.' Investing in fossil fuels, and helping to close that window, should be unthinkable for Elsevier. Supporting fossil fuel expansion is simply not compatible with responding to the climate crisis on the scale deemed necessary by the science.

Prof. John Marsham
Professor of Atmospheric Science
University of Leeds

It appears Elsevier is failing to account for their responsibility in measuring the impact of their business activity. Elsevier's communications in the context of the climate emergency is a good example of greenwashing for they have demonstrated complicity with the destructive extractivist system over time (see Guardian's article).

Dr. Elia Valentini
Senior Lecturer, University of Essex

Might be time for academics to boycott publishing in any of the Elsevier stable of journals.

Prof. Lynley Wallis
Griffith University

We are witnessing the sixth mass-extinciton, with unprecedented bio-diversity loss and rapid climate change. Elsevier play a prominent position in the distribution of scientific knowledge to the world, yet continue to facilitate new fossil fuel extraction. As eco-systems collapse, sea-levels rise, and wet-bulb temperatures reach new highs, will future generations look back and agree that Elsevier was acting "in line with the scale deemed necessary by science"?

James Fallon
PhD candidate, University of Reading

I knew there were some reservations about Elsevier, but not about their oil and gas conflict of interest. I'll definitely be thinking about my next MS submissions.

Dr. Shelby C. McClelland
Agroecosystem ecologist, Cornell University

Elsevier provides a platform for extensive scientific reporting on climate and biodiversity that guides the IPCC and the decisions of all governments around the world, which requires responsibility, ethics, and consistency to be maintained. These are blurred by also providing a platform for research on methods to continue extracting and refining oil, gas and coal, putting the prized legitimacy of Elsevier at extreme risk. To provide early-stage researchers, like me, a future where research is possible, instead of all efforts going instead to simply survive, Elsevier cannot provide a platform for fossil fuel extraction to continue.

Pete Knapp,
Research Scientist, Imperial College London

It's not surprising that Elsevier/RELX publishes books and journals and data that support increased (or more effective) exploration for and discovery of new oil and gas. Having a fully integrated top to bottom climate policy would be the surprise. I agree with you and your colleagues to keep up the pressure on the company to align itself more fully with its climate commitment.

Dr. Richard Heede
Climate Accountability Institute

Co-author of "White Knights, or Horsemen of the Apocalypse? Prospects for Big Oil to align emissions with a 1.5°C pathway," published in Energy Research & Social Science, Elsevier (2021)

Elsevier journals have done so much to alert the world to the severity of the planetary crisis, so to find out that the company continues to facilitate fossil fuel expansion - even in 2022! - is deeply troubling. But beyond any ethical dimension, I find it odd because it undermines the whole scientific enterprise. Elsevier journals trade on the authority of the science they publish but ignoring the warnings of that science serves to diminish and delegitimize it. It is as if Elsevier is publicly rubbishing the findings of its own journals as unimportant.

Dr. Charlie Gardner
Associate Senior Lecturer
Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology

The science should now be clear: avoiding catastrophic climate change requires ending the exploration and extraction of new fossil fuel resources. How can Elsevier claim to be responding to climate change, whilst at the same time promoting work which actively undermines this cause? By doing this, they are also undermining the thousands of researchers who dedicate their lives to addressing the climate crisis, and who rely on publishers such as Elsevier to publish the science which can help us to do this. This is a blatant violation of trust. More than that – it risks undermining the crucial and fragile public trust in science itself.

Dr. Emily Cox
Research Associate,
Universities of Oxford and Cardiff

No person or business is acting in a way "consistent with a 1.5-degree pathway" because such a pathway is not logistically possible—our government and business have already failed. Our only options now involve reaching 1.5°C of warming and then drawing carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere in addition to reaching net-zero emissions, eventually reducing the warming level. To be consistent with any climate pledges, Elsevier would need to divest financially from fossil fuel and other extractive industries.

All companies need to define their values. If Elsevier values climate mitigation, then it needs to stop supporting the fossil fuel industry by providing logistical and technical support. Some would argue that science is and should be policy neutral, but it is naively ignorant of history to consider that the funding and institutional support of science is not motivated by our values as a society (e.g., development of atomic weapons, space flight, artificial intelligence). I imagine that Elsevier would not want to provide a publishing platform to eugenicists, weapons manufacturers, or producers of illegal narcotics. Why then provide that platform to the industry that is currently jeopardizing the habitability of our planet?

I think RELX should promote open data use in general, but can withhold support to the fossil fuel industry when it does not affect other legitimate researchers.

Dr. Rose Z. Abramoff
Associate Scientist, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Question from an advocacy panel at Elsevier's 2021 SUSTAIN Festival:

Studies indicate MNE's [multi-national enterprises], being aware that necessary "systemic change" is a threat to their profits and global influence, are adopting the language of advocacy while failing to "walk the talk." What's the best way to advocate for change at organizations whose business activity is hindering the systemic change for which they claim to support? How can the profit motive of MNE's realistically be overcome in the absence of effective legal restrictions on business activity?

Raki Ap, Ministry of the Interior, Netherlands

We have to reflect on and expose these activities. We have to be honest. That is the only way we can change the system, by making people realize what these industries are doing.

Jonathan Leggett, Environmental Campaigner

Greenwashing is a really big issue. I don't know if either of you went to the Green zone at the COP [UN Conference of the Parties]. It's the zone with all these big companies. They were talking about how great they were at climate action, and they're really just not walking the talk. There was one stall that I went to that was for SSE which is a big energy company in Scotland. They were talking about all the wind power that they were planning in the North Sea. And so I went up to them and I was like, 'This sounds great. It's fantastic that you're doing these big investments in wind power. Does this mean you're going to be reducing your fossil fuel extraction in the North Sea as well?' And they were like 'Oh, God no.' That was their reaction. They just don't even think about the fact that they can be talking about these great things but...the profit they receive from these really destructive forces still comes first.

One way or another, [we need to] ensure that these companies are changing their activities. I think activists need to be pressuring both governments and corporations directly to ensure that they do so.

Paul Behrens, Associate Professor of Energy and Environmental Change, Leiden University

I totally agree with the direct action. What you're trying to do with systemic change is raise the costs of that business. And you're raising the cost of that business and removing the license to operate, and so societies are raising more exposure of risk to these businesses.

It's the smaller businesses that are easier to decarbonize, and the ones that are harder don't do the structural efforts. What you don't see from these businesses is actually the announcement of asking for change in the systems that they operate in...[Y]ou don't see the fundamental changes. This is ultimately a power issue. You can put it in all the accounting standards that you like, but if they're not transparent because there's a power issue, they're not going to happen.

If you're someone working in an organization and you want to see change, there's direct action, but also the real pushing internally for transparent accounting standards for setting yourself goals, and not taking no as an answer, in terms of the power dynamics within companies. I know that's always really hard because power dynamics are there for a reason. That's why they've been so powerful. It's ultimately [about] overturning that...[and] pushing for change within companies like that and showing where the power lies.

• • •

Paul Behrens, 2022 (email): I was very surprised and disappointed by the details in the Guardian article. It didn't surprise me there were journals on fossil fuels but to see the level of integration with the industry was disturbing. To my knowledge, the broader energy journals and renewable energy journals don't have renewable energy industry representatives on editorial boards but academics. I was even more disturbed by the business offerings for fossil fuel exploration and extraction. That is a clear decision to profit from an industry that has a well documented history of willingly misleading the public and capturing regulators to extend their profitability. It is an industry that has already contributed to the suffering of many millions of people across the planet. It is an industry that has repeatedly stood in the way of technical progress towards a cleaner, better world. This is the industry Elsevier decided to work with while talking about the importance of sustainability.

Had I known these details before speaking at the festival I would have certainly zeroed in on this. Time and time again I find that companies are not making the decisions that would have a real, consequential impact on environmental sustainability. Instead the focus is on inconsequential nice-to-haves, greenwashing their hands of any real impact or responsibility.

This was all unknown to me when I did the sustainability festival event so...you feel tricked.



Afterword

Scientists—including experts at our own journals—have concluded that our company's involvement in helping the fossil fuel industry expand production renders various pledges and statements inaccurate, misrepresents climate science, and accelerates climate change. Oil firm customers are broadly engaged in increasing production while only reducing emissions per barrel, plans antithetical to a livable planet; helping them do business more efficiently while they supplement this production with renewables still delivers an unlivable planet.[1] With one coal company describing our services as "vital,"[2] Elsevier/RELX is in a position to use its leverage by withholding products and services from companies whose current business plans will deny us a safe and stable future. Despite this opportunity, our company has continued claiming that the industry is credibly "transitioning," while simultaneously altering and removing content from our websites[3] that indicates complicity in what are being called crimes against humanity.[4]

Elsevier/RELX's latest commitment is membership[5] in the UN's Race to Zero campaign,[6] requiring an actionable plan demonstrating that, after June 2023, we will no longer be involved in facilitating new fossil fuel production.[7] Plans for Race to Zero are being reviewed by the UN Secretary General Expert Group on Net Zero Pledges, a panel that's concerned with science over corporate narratives. As one member of the assessment group, Bill Hare, pointed out in 2021, "all new fossil fuel investments and infrastructure—oil, coal and gas—need to stop. Not next year, not in 2030, but today."[8] The Lancet—as a founding member of the UK Health Alliance on Climate Change (UKHACC)—has also called for ending the expansion of any new fossil fuel infrastructure and production.[9] With calls growing from scientists for scientist activism and civil disobedience,[10] it should be in management's interest to pivot, to be true to our mission, and to stand **WITH THE COMMUNITIES WE SERVE**.

—RGRC
September 2022
Global average atmospheric carbon dioxide: ~416 ppm

[1] https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2022/may/11/fossil-fuel-carbon-bombs-climate-breakdown-oil-gas
https://productiongap.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PGR2021_web_rev.pdf
[2] Adani/Bravus, involved in major coal expansion projects, with ties to the Myanmar military dictatorship committing genocide: https://www.queenslandminingexpo.com.au/en-gb/exhibitors.html
[3] > Late 2021, "Solutions for Oil and Gas:" https://web.archive.org/web/20210923062544/https://www.elsevier.com/rd-solutions/oil-and-gas
2022: "Solutions for a Sustainable World": https://www.elsevier.com/rd-solutions/oil-and-gas
> Late 2021, Oil and gas testimonials: https://web.archive.org/web/20211213061419/https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/geofacets
2022, For sustainable growth in energy and mining: https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/geofacets
> 2020: https://web.archive.org/web/20200815142051/https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/geofacets/geofacets-uncovering-diverse-insights: 2022: Removed
[4] https://theintercept.com/2019/09/24/climate-justice-ecocide-humanity-crime/
[5] https://unfccc.int/climate-action/race-to-zero/who-s-in-race-to-zero#eq-23
[6] https://climatechampions.unfccc.int/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/EPRG-interpretation-guide-2.pdf
[7] https://climatechampions.unfccc.int/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Race-to-Zero-Criteria-3.0-4.pdf
[8] https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/may/20/the-world-is-moving-away-from-fossil-fuels-while-in-australia-its-all-systems-go-for-coal-and-gas
[9] https://fossilfueltreaty.org/health-letter
[10] https://zenodo.org/record/7047049#.YxYjWuzMJdB; https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-022-01461-y.epdf?