1. What are the session key findings? What are the new Lesson(s) learned / Scientific progress (since AR5 release, if relevant)?

- Climate policies can yield substantial cobenefits for health, including indirectly through air quality impacts (Kinney, Colette, Ghude). Such approaches were presented for the US, India and Europe, but the number of such assessments remains limited (Menne).
- Cobenefits can also be found in the field of food security (through the reduced adverse impact of ozone on crop yields), as illustrated in a study focusing on India (Ghude).
- A study on Europe also pointed out the impact of climate on pollen (ambrosia) allergy risk in Europe (Hamaoui-Laguel).
- The revised schematic on pathways of climate impacts on health of the Lancet 2015 commission provides a welcome comprehensive update of current understanding (Kinney).

2. What are the major knowledge Gaps and Research Needs identified in the session?

- We now have a good understanding of ozone response to climate change, whereas it is less clear for particulate matter and even less so for pollen, wildfires and dusts (Kinney).
- The WHO Global Burden of Disease has produced updated exposure-response function for a wider range of particulate matter concentrations (Kinney) but we are still lacking quantitative response functions for individual PM components (Menne). The recent REVIHAP, HRAPIE and APHEKOM projects provided relevant framework to perform health impact assessment.
- We lack scenarios projections that would be consistent for population growth, climate and air quality policies (Pascal).
- Integrated modelling is a key tool to assess climate & air quality impacts on health. But it remains cumbersome to implement and associated with substantial uncertainties as long as ensemble approach are not implemented (Kinney, Colette, Pascal). There is also a need to downscale spatially such assessment to improve their quality (Pascal).
- The WHO European region questionnaire emphasizes the lack of investments towards a climate resilient health system (Menne).
3. Did the session discuss/identify promising approaches in the fields of Adaptation and Mitigation, or both?

There are very significant health co-benefits of climate policies through the indirect impact of air pollution (studies for US, European and India). This feature should be better emphasized and systematically included in the cost of carbon as it could help developing leverage for climate policies.

4. Are there take-home messages from the session?

(When relevant, please specify targeted group of stakeholders. For example, policy-makers / COP21 negotiators, practitioners (experts, etc.), NGOs, private sector, citizens, media, etc.)

Climate change will have detrimental impacts on health. At the same time there, are very substantial co-benefits of climate mitigation for health (both direct and indirectly due to air pollution). We should therefore emphasize that climate mitigation constitute a unique public health opportunity.

5. Are there Important Quotes from the session?

6. Please include any other remark that you might have.