

# Climate Treaties and Approaching Catastrophes

Scott Barrett  
Columbia University


# Politics of “dangerous” climate change

- **Framework Convention** says that atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases should be stabilized “at a level that would prevent *dangerous* [my emphasis] anthropogenic interference with the climate system.”
- **Copenhagen Accord** recognizes “*the scientific view* that the increase in global temperature should be below 2 degrees Celsius.”

# Science of “dangerous” climate change

- **IPCC TAR** identified “reasons for concern,” and constructed the “burning embers diagram,” which **Smith et al. (2009)** updated.
- **Lenton *et al.* (2008)** identify a number of tipping points, mainly clustering around 0.5-2 °C and 3-5 °C.
- **Rockstrom *et al.* (2009)** recognize the political primacy of the 2 °C target, but propose a “climate boundary” of 350 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> by volume and an increase in radiative forcing not to exceed 1 W/m<sup>2</sup> above pre-industrial levels.

# “Burning embers diagram”



Smith et al. (2009). “Assessing Dangerous Climate Change through an Update of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) “Reasons for Concern” PNAS 106: 4133-4137.

# Science of “dangerous” climate change

- IPCC TAR identified “reasons for concern,” and constructed the “burning embers diagram,” which Smith et al. (2009) updated.
- Lenton *et al.* (2008) identify a number of tipping points, mainly clustering around 0.5-2 °C and 3-5 °C.
- Rockstrom *et al.* (2009) recognize the political primacy of the 2 °C target, but propose a “climate boundary” of 350 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> by volume and an increase in radiative forcing not to exceed 1 W/m<sup>2</sup> above pre-industrial levels.

# Possible thresholds due to “global warming”

Change	Threshold
Disappearance of Arctic summer ice	0.5-2°C
Loss of Greenland Ice Sheet	1-2°C
Disintegration of West Antarctic Ice Sheet	3-5°C
Shutoff of Atlantic Thermohaline Circulation	3-5°C
Shift in El Nino-Southern Oscillation	3-6°C
Shift in Sahara/Sahel and West African monsoon	3-5°C
Amazon rainforest dieback	3-4°C
Boreal forest dieback	3-5°C


Source: Lenton *et al.* (2008).

Note: thresholds are uncertain; impacts are uncertain; the table is not exhaustive.

# Science of “dangerous” climate change

- IPCC TAR identified “reasons for concern,” and constructed the “burning embers diagram,” which Smith et al. (2009) updated.
- Lenton *et al.* (2008) identify a number of tipping points, mainly clustering around 0.5-2 °C and 3-5 °C.
- Rockstrom *et al.* (2009) recognize the political primacy of the 2 °C target, but propose a “climate boundary” of 350 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> by volume and an increase in radiative forcing not to exceed 1 W/m<sup>2</sup> above pre-industrial levels.

# Planetary boundary



350 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>



# Planetary boundary

- One reason for picking this threshold is stability of the large polar ice sheets.
- “...the planet was largely ice-free until CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations fell below 450 ppmv ( $\pm 100$  ppmv), suggesting that there is a critical threshold between 350 and 550 ppmv.
- “Our boundary of 350 ppmv aims *to ensure* the continued existence of the large polar ice sheets.”

# Meanwhile....

- **Durban Decisions** note “*with grave concern* the significant gap between the aggregate effect of Parties’ mitigation pledges in terms of global annual emissions of greenhouse gases by 2020 and aggregate emission pathways consistent with having a likely chance of holding the increase in global average temperature below 2 °C... above pre-industrial levels.”

# What will happen at 2°C?



If the consequences were *truly* catastrophic, would cooperation be any easier?

Would the US even contribute



under these circumstances?

Would treaties be more effective



if their purpose were to avert  
catastrophe?

# A game!

- There are 10 players.
- Everyone starts with two operating funds.

# Everyone has two operating funds

£1 in Account A



Up to 10  
windmills at  
10p each.

£10 in Account B



Up to 10 AC  
machines  
at £1 each.



# Everyone also has an endowment fund

- Worth £20.
- This cannot be spent.



# Payoffs

- Everyone gets to keep the money they don't spend from these accounts.
- Plus everyone gets 5p for every machine deployed by anyone.
- So, if you give 6 windmills and nothing from Account B, and everyone else contributes 50 machines, you get
- $56 \times £.05 + 4 \times £.1 + 10 \times £1 + £20 = £33.20.$

# Analysis

- Collective best—everyone contributes all of Account A, none of Account B.
- Every player gets  $100 \times £.05 + £10 + £20 = £35$ .
- Self-interest makes everyone want to keep their money, yielding everyone £31.

What kind of game is this?

A Prisoners' Dilemma!

# Catastrophic climate change

- Suppose there will be a catastrophe if fewer than 150 machines are deployed.
- If there is a catastrophe, everyone loses £15.
- So, if you give 6 windmills and nothing from Account B, and everyone else contributes 50 machines, you get
- $56 \times £.05 + 4 \times £.1 + 10 \times £1 + £20 - £15 = £18.20.$

# Analysis

- Collective best—everyone contributes all of Account A and 5 units from Account B.
- Every player gets  $150 \times £.05 + £5 + £20 = £32.50$ .
- Self-interest makes everyone want to hold onto their money, yielding everyone £16.

## But wait

- Self-interest also makes everyone want to contribute some machines, provided everyone else contributes *enough* machines.
- For example, suppose everyone else contributes 138 machines.
  - If you contribute 0, you get  $138 \times £.05 + £1 + £10 + £20 - £15 = £22.90$ .
  - If you contribute 12 machines, you get  $150 \times £.05 + £8 + £20 = £35.50$ .

# Two compelling outcomes

- One is where no one contributes.
- The other is where the total contribution averts catastrophe.
  - Everyone can be better off in this second situation.
  - For example, if everyone contributes 15 machines, everyone gets £32.50.
  - If everyone contributes 0 machines, everyone gets £16.


What kind of game is this?

A Coordination Game



# The difference

- In the Prisoners' Dilemma, the central challenge is enforcement.
- In the Coordination game, enforcement is provided by Mother Nature!



# Uncertainty

- **Threshold Uncertainty.** From Rockström *et al.* (2009), the last time the Earth was ice-free, CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were at 450 ppmv  $\pm$  100. To be sure to preserve the large ice sheets, they recommend 350 ppmv.
- **Impact Uncertainty.** From Lenton *et al.* (2008), Loss of Greenland Ice Sheet might add 2-7 meters to sea level and take 300 to more than 1,000 years.

# What does theory say?

- Impact uncertainty should make no difference.
  - Suppose the loss wasn't £15 but somewhere between £10 and £20.
  - Then countries will act as if the loss were £15.
  - This is especially true for our example because even if the impact is “low,” this remains a coordination game.

# What does theory say?

- Threshold uncertainty should be transformative.
  - Suppose threshold somewhere between 100 and 200.
  - Then, if you cut your contribution a tiny bit, starting from 150 units, you increase the probability of catastrophe by a tiny bit.
  - For our example,
    - if everyone else contributes 15 and you contribute 15 you get an expected payoff of  $150 \times £.05 + £5 + £20 - (200 - 150)/(200 - 100) \times £15 = £25$ .
    - If you contribute 14 you get an expected payoff of  $149 \times £.05 + £6 + £20 - (200 - 149)/(200 - 100) \times £15 = £25.80$ .

# Full cooperation

- If countries cooperate, they can't do better than to *eliminate* the probability of catastrophe.
  - Each would then get  $200 \times £.05 + £20 = £30$  or £300 in total.
- Suppose you cut back by one unit.
  - The others would then get  $199 \times £.05 + £20 - (200 - 199)/(200 - 100) \times £15 = £29.80$  or £268.20 in total.
  - You would get  $199 \times £.05 + £1 + £20 - (200 - 199)/(200 - 100) \times £15 = £30.80$
  - or £299 in total.

# Planetary boundary

- So Rockström *et al.* are applying the right collective logic.
- Application of the “precautionary principle” without risk aversion!
- But self-interest impels countries to cut back on their contributions.


# Not convinced?

- An experiment with Astrid Dannenberg, University of Gothenburg.
- The same game I described here.
- Four treatments: Certainty, Impact Uncertainty, Threshold Uncertainty, Impact and Threshold Uncertainty.
- Each game played by 10 people.
- 10 different groups play for each treatment.



# Results

## Catastrophe occurrence




Graphs by treatment

# Results


## Catastrophe occurrence

Certainty




Here, one group reduces probability to just 93%


I-Uncertainty




T-Uncertainty



IT-Uncertainty




Here, three groups reduce probability to 91, 86, and 80%



Graphs by treatment

# When will we succeed?



# What can we do?

Devise other means for enforcement.

By taking a different approach to treaty design.

Starting with a new protocol for limiting HFCs.

What will we do if/when catastrophe strikes?

# Geoengineering




# Geoengineering the climate

Science, governance and uncertainty  
September 2009



THE ROYAL SOCIETY








# Giant pipe and balloon to pump water into the sky in climate experiment

Field test by British academics marks first step towards recreating an artificial volcano that would inject particles into the stratosphere and cool the planet

John Vidal, environment editor  
guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 31 August 2011 11:00 EDT

[A larger | smaller](#)  
[Article history](#)



It sounds barmy, audacious or sci-fi: a tethered balloon the size of Wembley stadium suspended 20km above Earth, linked to the ground by a giant garden hose pumping hundreds of tonnes of minute chemical particles a day into the thin stratospheric air to reflect sunlight and cool the planet.

But a team of British academics will next month formally announce the first step towards creating an artificial volcano by going ahead with the world's first major "geo-engineering" field-test in the next few months. The ultimate aim is to mimic the cooling effect that volcanoes have when they inject particles into the stratosphere that bounce some of the Sun's energy back into space, so preventing it from warming the Earth and mitigating the effects of man-made [climate change](#).

theguardian

## Public supports geoengineering research, survey finds

First international survey on the perception of geoengineering finds 72% of respondents approve of research

Hanna Gersmann  
guardian.co.uk, Monday 24 October 2011 06:43 EDT  
[Article history](#)



The British, American and Canadian public is largely in favour of research into engineering the planet's climate to combat global warming, according to the study. Photograph: Gallo Images/Getty Images

The British, American and Canadian public is largely in favour of research into engineering the planet's climate to combat global warming, according to a study published on Monday. But critics said the paper was "not exactly disinterested science" because one of the authors is the founder and president of a [geoengineering](#) company.

The first international survey on the perception of geoengineering, [published in the Environmental Research Letters of the Institute](#), comes at a critical stage as a [major UK test project was recently postponed](#).

# But

- While geoengineering works fast, it probably can't avert every catastrophe.
- It may not work well.
- It will impose other risks.
- It does not address the root cause of climate change.


So we may wish to try something else

# Air capture on a huge scale



# Brief economics of air capture

- Currently, the SCC might be around £50/tCO<sub>2</sub>.
- Estimates of the cost of air capture vary; a recent high estimate about £375/tCO<sub>2</sub>.
  - Currently, air capture is not economic.
- But air capture is the only true “backstop technology.”
  - In a crisis, we may want to use it.



Thank you!