

Is CO₂ MITIGATION COST-EFFECTIVE?

by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley



SPPI ORIGINAL PAPER



May 2, 2013

IS CO₂ MITIGATION COST-EFFECTIVE?

by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley | May 2, 2013

This summary updates Monckton of Brenchley (2013), read at the World Federation of Scientists' 2012 Seminars on Planetary Emergencies. The paper applied inter-temporal investment appraisal to mainstream IPCC climatology by comparing the cost of Australia's 10-year CO₂ tax (Parliament of Australia, 2011) with the benefit in the cost of warming-related damage the tax might avoid.

Fraction of world CO₂ emissions abated:	Over ten years, the tax, which its inventor, Professor Garnaut, said in 2013 had failed, cannot now abate more than 5% of predicted CO ₂ emissions. Australia emits 1.2% of world emissions (derived from Boden <i>et al.</i> , 2010ab). The tax will thus abate 5% x 1.2% = 0.06% of world emissions.
CO₂ concentration abated:	Without the tax, CO ₂ concentration after ten years would be 410 µatm (IPCC, 2007), up by 20 µatm on the 390 µatm (Conway & Tans, 2011) at the outset. With the tax, after ten years CO ₂ concentration would be 410 µatm less 0.06% of the 20 µatm growth: i.e. 409.988 µatm .
CO₂ forcing abated	(IPCC, 2007; Myhre, 1998), would be 5.35 ln(410/409.988) = 0.00016 W m⁻² .
Ten-year climate sensitivity parameter:	IPCC (2007, p. 803, Table 10.26) says CO ₂ will be 713 µatm in 2100 against 368 µatm in 2000. It predicts 2.8 C° 21 st -century warming, of which 0.6 C° is pre-committed, leaving 2.2 C° , of which 70%, or 1.54 C° , is CO ₂ -driven. IPCC's implicit 100-year climate sensitivity parameter is then 1.54 C° / [5.35 ln(713/368) W m⁻²] , or 0.44 C° W⁻¹ m² , up by 0.13 C° W⁻¹ m² on the instantaneous (Planck) parameter 0.31 C° W⁻¹ m² (derived from IPCC, 2007, p. 631 fn). Since the temperature feedbacks that lift the sensitivity parameter grow with time, a fair ten-year parameter is 0.31 + 10% of 0.13, or 0.32 C° W⁻¹ m² .
Global warming abated	by the tax – the ten-year parameter multiplied by the forcing abated – would be 0.33(0.00016) = 0.00005 C° , or 1/20,000 C° .
No performance indicator:	Even if the tax succeeded, we could not detect that it had. 1/20,000 C° , as a fraction of the 0.05 C° measurement uncertainty in temperature datasets, is just 1/1000 of that uncertainty.
The cost of the tax:	The tax, as enacted in Australia's Clean Energy Act 2011, is costing \$10.1 bn/year , plus \$1.6 bn/year for administration (Wong, 2010, p. 5), plus \$1.3 bn/year for renewables and other costs, a total of \$13 bn/year , escalated under the Act at 2%/year , and by a further 2%/year to allow for economic growth. Conservatively, the total cost over the ten-year term will thus be \$162.3 bn .
The mitigation cost-effectiveness	of the tax, which is the cost of abating 1 C° warming by global measures as cost-effective as the tax, is \$162.3 bn / 0.00005 C° = \$3.2 quadrillion per C° abated .

Projected anthropogenic warming	over the ten-year term will be 0.17 C° (IPCC 2007, p. 803, Table 10.26).
Discount rate:	The minimum market discount rate is 5% (Murphy <i>et al.</i> , 2008). The US Treasury's standard rate is 7%. However, in line with Stern (2006), the discount rate assumed in the present appraisal is 0% .
The undiscounted cost	of abating 0.17 C° warming by global measures as cost-effective as the tax is 0.17 x \$3.2 quadrillion , or \$540 trillion in cash, which, divided by 7 bn global population, is \$77,000 per head . Divided by 10 years' global GDP of \$670 trillion (World Bank, 2011), it equates to 80% of global GDP .
The undiscounted avoided-cost benefit	of abating the 3 C° 21 st -century global warming the IPCC predicts is estimated by Stern (2006, p. vi) at 0-3% of 21 st -century global GDP: central undiscounted estimate 1.5% of GDP .
Cost-benefit ratio:	The cost of immediate mitigation divided by that of later adaptation is 80% / 1.5% , or 53 . Therefore, it is at least 50 times more expensive and less cost-effective to mitigate CO ₂ emissions by typical measures such as Australia's carbon tax than to take no action at all today and, instead, to meet the later and far lesser cost of climate-related damage that 3 C° unabated 21 st -century warming might cause.

METHOD

From the fraction of global CO₂ emissions a mitigation scheme will abate over its term, establish the fall in CO₂ concentration and hence in CO₂ forcing the scheme will achieve at the end of the term. Multiply the abated CO₂ forcing by a climate-sensitivity parameter suitable to the term to obtain the global warming the scheme will abate by the end of the term. Establish the cost of the scheme and divide it by the abated warming to obtain the scheme's mitigation cost-effectiveness per degree of warming abated. Multiply the mitigation cost-effectiveness by projected global warming over the term to obtain the cost of abating that warming by worldwide measures whose cost-effectiveness is equivalent to that of the scheme. Compare this global abatement cost with the benefit in the cost of avoiding predicted global warming over the term.

REFERENCES

Boden and Marland, 2010a. Global CO₂ Emissions from Fossil-Fuel Burning, Cement Manufacture, and Gas Flaring, 1751-2007. Carbon Dioxide Information and Analysis Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA.

Boden *et al.*, 2010b. Ranking of the world's countries by 2007 total CO₂ emissions from fossil-fuel burning, cement production, and gas flaring. Carbon Dioxide Information and Analysis Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA.

Conway, T., & P. Tans, 2011. Recent trends in globally-averaged CO₂ concentration, NOAA/ESRL, <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/global.html#global>.

Garnaut, R., 2008. The Garnaut Climate Change Review: Final Report. Cambridge University Press, Port Melbourne, Australia, 680 pp, ISBN 9780521744447.

HadCRUt3gl, 2011. Monthly global mean surface temperature anomalies, 1850-2011. <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/temperature/hadcrut3gl.txt>.

IPCC, 2001. Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis: Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Houghton, J.T., Y. Ding, D.J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P.J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell and C.A. Johnson (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.

IPCC, 2007. Climate Change 2007: the Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007 [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Avery, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.

Monckton of Brenchley, C.W., 2013. Is CO₂ mitigation cost-effective? Proceedings of the 45th (2012) Seminars on Planetary Emergencies, World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, Switzerland, and Erice, Sicily.

Murphy, 2008. Some Simple Economics of Climate Changes. Paper presented to the MPS General Meeting, Tokyo, September 8.

Myhre et al., 1998. New estimates of radiative forcing due to well mixed greenhouse gases. Geophysical Research Letters 25:14, 2715–2718, doi:10.1029/98GL01908.

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 2011, Exposure Draft of the Clean Energy Bill. <http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/submissions/clean-energy-legislative-package/~media/publications/clean-energy-legislation/exposure-draft-clean-energy-bill-2011-pdf.pdf>.

Stern, N., 2006, The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.

Wong, P., 2010. Portfolio Budget Statements 2010-11: Budget-Related Paper No. 1.4. Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Portfolio, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, Australia.

World Bank, 2011. Gross Domestic Product 2009, in *World Development Indicators 2009*. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf>.



*Cover photo of the Great Barrier Reef in Australia
and Australian dollar clipart provided by Microsoft.*



Science & Public Policy Institute

"Science-based policy for a better world."

Robert Ferguson

SPPI President

bferguson@sppinstitute.org

202-288-5699

P.O. Box 209

5501 Merchants View Square

Haymarket, VA 20169

www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org

