



How much climate change can we bear?

The stated goal of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) is to avoid 'dangerous climate change'. We are at present already committed to a warming of 1.2-1.3°C of global average temperature above pre-industrial levels from the greenhouse gases (GHGs) that have been emitted into the atmosphere through human activities. Considering this inevitable degree of warming, the goal of climate change policy should be keeping the global average temperature rise that can still be expected to **below** 2°C.¹ However, this is certainly dangerous to the millions of people who will be affected, and recent science indicates that our target should perhaps be set even lower.

Two degrees Centigrade global average warming – what will that mean for the planet?

Threatens many tens of millions of people with increased risk of hunger, hundreds of millions with increased malaria risk, millions with increased flooding and billions with increased risk of water shortage.²

³ Damages fall largely on the poorest and developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of SE Asia and Latin America.

Risks melting of major ice sheets with commitments to many metres of sea level rise over several centuries, particularly the Greenland ice sheet (seven metres), and the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) (5-7 metres). Greenland melting is accelerating and rapid melting acceleration of the glaciers from a large sector of the WAIS is now observed to be occurring and may presage the dynamic collapse of this component of the ice sheet. Ensuing sea level rise threatens large populations everywhere and particularly low lying areas in developing countries such as Bangladesh, South China, and low-lying island states everywhere, not to mention 'the low countries' (Belgium, the Netherlands, NW Germany), and Southeast UK.

Threatens damage to major ecosystems from the Arctic and Antarctic to the tropics. Loss of forests and species will affect the lives of all with economic costs falling disproportionately on the poor and developing countries.

Scientific knowledge is increasing constantly and improving our understanding of the likely changes that will come from rising global temperatures and the assessment keeps getting worse. Some of the most important recent reports and findings include:

The landmark 'Stern Report' commissioned by the UK Government confirms beyond any reasonable doubt that the costs of *inaction* outweigh the costs of avoiding dangerous climate change by more than an order of magnitude. Throwing the global economy into a permanent worldwide recession would be 'dangerous' by anyone's definition.⁴

A landmark paper published in October of this year by veteran climate scientist James Hansen of NASA clearly identifies a level of global warming that should not be breached. For the first time in the scientific literature, scientists have set a limit on "dangerous climate change" of less than 1.8°C global warming above preindustrial (19th century) levels. Hansen and colleagues argue that exceeding the warming known to have occurred over the past million years, which would occur for another 1°C warming above year 2000 levels (warming in 2000 was 0.8°C above 19th century), risks major consequences, including multimetre sea level rise from the disintegration of the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets and the widespread extinction of plant and animal species.⁵

1 <http://www.climatenetwork.org/docs/CAN-adequacy30102002.pdf>

2 Hare, B (2003) "Assessment of Knowledge on Impacts of Climate Change – Contribution to the Specification of Art. 2 of the UNFCCC: Impacts on Ecosystems, Food Production, Water and Socioeconomic System", http://www.wbgu.de/wbgu_sn2003_ex01.pdf

3 See M Parry, N Arnell, T McMichael, R Nicholls, P Martens, S Kovats, M Livermore, C Rosenzweig, A Iglesias and G Fischer, Millions at Risk: Defining Critical Climate Change Threats and Targets, *Global Environmental Change* 11.3 (2001): 1-3.

⁴ See "Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change", available at: http://hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_review_economics_climate_change/stern_review_report.cfm

⁵ James Hansen, Makiko Sato, Reto Ruedy, Ken Lo, David W. Lea, and Martin Medina-Elizade, "Global temperature change", *PNAS*, **September 26, 2006** vol. 103 no. 39, see <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/103/39/14288>

A multi-year international study published in *Nature*⁶ predicts that mid-range climate change scenarios will doom a million species to extinction by mid-century;

A study of the European heat wave in the summer of 2003, published in December 2004⁷ concluded that there was a clear global warming fingerprint on the killer heat wave, and that by mid-century, such a summer would be cooler than average;

Finally, scientists at the US National Center for Atmospheric Research concluded that the amount of the earth's surface suffering from drought has doubled in the last thirty years, and that at least half of this is as a result of increased temperatures rather than changes in precipitation⁸

Keep warming below 2°C – What CAN be avoided?

- Limit damages to coral reefs
- Limit risk of major ecological damages globally
- Limiting both rate and extent of sea level rise over many centuries
- Limit risk of Greenland ice sheet collapse
- Limit West Antarctic Ice Sheet instability risk
- Limit risk to millions affected by hunger, water scarcity and disease, which seems to accelerate with higher temperature, taking into account future economic growth and increased wealth

How to Get There?

It is still technologically, economically and scientifically possible to limit global temperature rise to less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels, but time is not on our side. We are within a decade or two of closing off those options with known technological means.

Estimates of the 'sensitivity' of the climate to increases in GHGs are expressed in terms of the temperature response of the climate system to a doubling of pre-industrial levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, expressed in carbon dioxide equivalence in parts-per-million (ppm). Pre-industrial levels of carbon dioxide were about 270 million ppm. Today we are at about 379 ppm. Until relatively recently the "best" estimate of the response to the climate of a doubling of CO₂ concentrations has been a 2.5°C increase.

However, recent studies have revealed that the climate sensitivity is more likely to be in fact closer to 3°C, with a significant risk of it being much higher. **This means that the response from the climate to the anticipated rise in GHGs could be even more dramatic than previously thought. We have to act even faster and take more dramatic action if we are to avoid the damage associated with a 2°C global average temperature rise.** This means that for now we have to aim for stabilizing GHGs in the atmosphere at a level below 400 ppm and then seek to bring them down as rapidly as possible if we are to have a reasonable chance of keeping global temperature rise below 2°C.

To meet these goals dramatic reductions in greenhouse gas emissions are needed, and they are needed soon. From a moral, legal and practical perspective, the initial burden of emissions reductions has to fall on industrialized countries. Domestic reductions of at least 30% on 1990 levels (the 'baseline' year for the Kyoto Protocol) by 2020 from industrialized countries are required, with a target of at least 75% reductions by mid-century.

Globally, we need to ensure that emissions peak as soon as possible, and no later than 2015-2020, and then reduce them by 50% by mid-century. This means not only that industrialised countries must make dramatic reductions in the next decade but that a fair means must be found for engaging rapidly industrialising countries in reduction efforts in the near future.

The consequences of delay in the process of reducing emissions means that we will face a dire global emergency in the 2020s which will require rates of emissions reductions which in the past have only been associated with massive economic collapse, i.e., with the collapse of the Soviet Union. We must not be forced to choose between economic catastrophe and climate catastrophe...the most likely outcome in that case would be both, and we have a good chance of avoiding this if we ACT NOW.

For further information please contact Greenpeace in Nairobi:

Mhairi Dunlop, Greenpeace International Communications, +44 (0)7801 212 960

<http://www.greenpeace.org/climate/nairobi>

⁶ Thomas, et. al, "Extinction risk from climate change", NATURE [VOL 427 | 8 JANUARY 2004 pp. 146 - 148

⁷ Stott, et. al., "Human contribution to the European heatwave of 2003", NATURE [VOL 432 | 2 DECEMBER 2004 pp. 610-614

⁸ Dai et. al, "A Global Dataset of Palmer Drought Severity Index for 1870–2002: Relationship with Soil Moisture and Effects of Surface Warming", American Meteorological Society, Vol 5, December 2004, pp. 1117- 1130