

Mitigation choices impact carbon budget size compatible with low temperature goals

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

2015 Environ. Res. Lett. 10 075003

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/10/7/075003>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 193.174.18.5

This content was downloaded on 10/02/2016 at 14:11

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Environmental Research Letters



LETTER

Mitigation choices impact carbon budget size compatible with low temperature goals

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED

20 February 2015

REVISED

15 June 2015

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

16 June 2015

PUBLISHED

10 July 2015

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence](#).

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.



Joeri Rogelj^{1,2}, Andy Reisinger³, David L McCollum¹, Reto Knutti², Keywan Riahi^{1,4} and Malte Meinshausen^{5,6}

¹ Energy Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

² Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zurich, Universitätsstrasse 16, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland

³ New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre, Private Bag 11008, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

⁴ Graz University of Technology, Inffeldgasse, A-8010 Graz, Austria

⁵ Australian-German College of Climate and Energy Transitions, School of Earth Sciences, The University of Melbourne, 3010 Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁶ PRIMAP Group, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), PO Box 60 12 03, D-14412 Potsdam, Germany

E-mail: rogelj@iiasa.ac.at

Keywords: climate change, carbon budgets, emission budgets, mitigation, greenhouse gases, non-CO₂, methane

Supplementary material for this article is available [online](#)

Abstract

Global-mean temperature increase is roughly proportional to cumulative emissions of carbon-dioxide (CO₂). Limiting global warming to any level thus implies a finite CO₂ budget. Due to geophysical uncertainties, the size of such budgets can only be expressed in probabilistic terms and is further influenced by non-CO₂ emissions. We here explore how societal choices related to energy demand and specific mitigation options influence the size of carbon budgets for meeting a given temperature objective. We find that choices that exclude specific CO₂ mitigation technologies (like Carbon Capture and Storage) result in greater costs, smaller compatible CO₂ budgets until 2050, but larger CO₂ budgets until 2100. Vice versa, choices that lead to a larger CO₂ mitigation potential result in CO₂ budgets until 2100 that are smaller but can be met at lower costs. In most cases, these budget variations can be explained by the amount of non-CO₂ mitigation that is carried out in conjunction with CO₂, and associated global carbon prices that also drive mitigation of non-CO₂ gases. Budget variations are of the order of 10% around their central value. In all cases, limiting warming to below 2 °C thus still implies that CO₂ emissions need to be reduced rapidly in the coming decades.

1. Introduction

Cumulative carbon emissions over the industrial era largely determine peak global-mean temperature increase (Allen *et al* 2009, Matthews *et al* 2009, Meinshausen *et al* 2009, Collins *et al* 2013, Gillett *et al* 2013, Knutti and Rogelj 2015). This characteristic has led to the suggestion that cumulative carbon emissions could be used as benchmarks for climate policy aiming at limiting global-mean warming (Meinshausen *et al* 2009, Zickfeld *et al* 2009, Bowerman *et al* 2011, Matthews *et al* 2012, Knutti and Rogelj 2015). However, emissions from greenhouse gases (GHG) other than carbon-dioxide (CO₂) also contribute to peak warming. For forcing agents with short atmospheric lifetimes (for example, methane, CH₄), the annual rate

of emissions leading up to the time of peak warming is more important for maximum warming than their cumulative emissions (Smith *et al* 2012, Bowerman *et al* 2013, Lauder *et al* 2013, Rogelj *et al* 2014c).

Currently, international climate talks are focussed on limiting global-mean temperature increase to below 2 °C relative to preindustrial levels, and lower long-term global goals like a warming of 1.5 °C are also considered. Recently, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in its Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), reported that limiting total human-induced warming to less than 2 °C relative to the period 1861–1880 with a probability of >66% would leave a carbon budget of about 1000 GtCO₂ from 2011 onward (Collins *et al* 2013, IPCC 2013, Stocker *et al* 2013, Clarke *et al* 2014, IPCC, 2014a,

IPCC, 2014b). The IPCC AR5 (IPCC, 2014b) also indicates that an uncertainty exists in the allowable carbon budget, not only due to geophysical uncertainties, but also due to uncertainties linked to the possible variations of accompanying non-CO₂ emissions. Finally, IPCC (2014b) also indicated that end-of-century CO₂ budgets continue to be a good indicator for end-of-century warming, even if at some point net negative CO₂ emissions are achieved.

Given the uncertainties, several questions arise related to the practical implementation of the concept of cumulative carbon emissions in climate policy. This is because—besides inevitable geophysical uncertainties—the amount of carbon emissions consistent with a given temperature limit depends on the concurrent mitigation of non-CO₂ gases, which in turn depends to some extent on carbon prices that are influenced by socio-economic developments (energy demand and technology availability—like nuclear power and bio-energy). So, how can policy choices influence the appropriate size of the carbon budget for limiting warming to below 2 °C? Furthermore, how do costs implied by a particular cumulative global carbon budget vary depending on these choices? Here we look at these questions from an integrated assessment modelling (IAM) perspective and attempt to identify synergistic policies and key trade-offs.

2. Methods

2.1. Emission scenarios

Assessing the policy and technology dependence of cumulative carbon emissions ideally makes use of emission scenarios with an internally consistent evolution of all radiatively active species over time. We use the IAM framework MESSAGE (Model for Energy Supply Strategy Alternatives and their General Environmental impact) (Riahi *et al* 2007) developed at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). At the core of MESSAGE lies a systems-engineering optimization model of the global energy economy, which includes a large portfolio of energy technologies for the assessment of technological transitions over the 21st century (see for example: Riahi *et al* 2012, McCollum *et al* 2013). The modelling framework contains a detailed representation of the most important GHG-emitting sectors, a representation of land-use emissions, a link to the macro-economic model MACRO (Messner and Schrattenholzer 2000), and a link to IIASA's GAINS (GHG and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies) air-quality model (Amann *et al* 2009), which allows the consistent tracking of (non-GHG) air pollutants over time.

In brief, putting a limit on the cumulative amount of GHG emissions over the 21st century results in a transformation of the energy, industry and land-use sector, modelled by MESSAGE. The carbon price implied by this transformation is used by MACRO to

iteratively determine possible price-driven reductions of energy demand. Finally, the transformation of the energy, industry and land-use system also impact possible sources of air pollutants. The presence and activity of these sources (like coal-fired power plants or diesel engines) is translated into actual emissions by the MESSAGE-GAINS linkage, which assumes that current legislation is successfully implemented throughout the 21st century (Rogelj *et al* 2014b). A detailed description of the model setup used in this study is provided in Rogelj *et al* (2013b).

We use a set of more than 500 scenarios that were originally developed in a study focusing on the relative importance of uncertainties (technological, societal, political and geophysical) for the cost of limiting warming below particular temperature levels with a given probability (Rogelj *et al* 2013b). The scenarios differ from each other in their underlying assumptions: (i) the stringency of mitigation action (reflected in the equivalent carbon price applied to GHG emissions over time), (ii) variations in the availability of key mitigation technologies, and (iii) future energy demand.

GHG emissions follow cost-minimizing trajectories that stay within varying global cumulative emission limits, with emissions of non-CO₂ gases weighted using 100-year Global Warming Potentials (GWPs: IPCC, 2007). Delayed mitigation cases are not considered here, in other words all scenarios started optimizing concerted, global efforts to mitigate climate change from 2010 onward. Delaying action can significantly constrain the achievability of low temperature stabilization targets and would imply higher overall costs (Luderer *et al* 2013, Rogelj *et al* 2013b, Clarke *et al* 2014). However, carbon budgets to 2100 would remain similar even in delayed-action scenarios (see, Collins *et al* 2013).

Our scenario set contains five technology variations which span a wide range of mitigation options and which are categorized in two groups: three technology-restricting cases and two cases that assume breakthroughs in mitigation technologies (Rogelj *et al* 2013a, Rogelj *et al* 2013b). Mitigation technologies are defined here as technologies or practices that significantly reduce GHG emissions by replacing technologies or practices that would generate more GHG emissions otherwise. The technology restricting cases are (1) no new nuclear (assuming a phase-out over the 21st century), (2) limited land-based mitigation measures (limiting the global bio-energy potential and not considering forest management as a mitigation option), and (3) no Carbon Capture and Storage (no CCS—assuming that CCS will never become available at large scale during the 21st century). The technological breakthrough cases are (1) advanced transport (allowing more than 50% of the transport sector's final energy consumption being electrified by the end of the century), and (2) advanced non-CO₂ mitigation (assuming that mitigation technologies for non-CO₂

GHGs, like CH₄, improve significantly throughout the 21st century beyond current levels). The latter two cases are considered breakthroughs because, on the one hand, the transport sector is particularly difficult to decarbonize given its high reliance on liquid fossil fuels and because, on the other hand, currently only limited mitigation potentials for some parts of the agricultural sector have been identified (Smith *et al* 2014).

Other drivers that can influence future GHG emission pathways are population (O'Neill *et al* 2012) or economic projections (of world gross domestic product (GDP)). These are not explicitly varied in our scenarios but are taken directly from the Global Energy Assessment (Riahi *et al* 2012). Such socio-economic and demographic developments can lead to different levels of future energy demand, depending, however, on how efficiently energy is transformed into services going forward. In order to cover a broad scenario space in terms of energy-demand, we assume a range of projections that roughly spans the entire range of outcomes that would otherwise be obtained when widely varying population and GDP projections in consistent ways (Nakicenovic and Swart 2000, Rogelj *et al* 2013b).

2.2. Temperature assessment and consistency with IPCC AR5

Here we use the reduced-complexity carbon-cycle and climate model MAGICC (Meinshausen *et al* 2011a, Meinshausen *et al* 2011b) in a probabilistic setup (Meinshausen *et al* 2009) to translate emissions to atmospheric concentrations and then to temperature change. The model setup is updated such that the marginal climate sensitivity distribution is consistent with the findings of the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the IPCC (Rogelj *et al* 2012; IPCC, 2007). This model setup also remains consistent with the more recent AR5 assessment (Rogelj *et al* 2014a). For each of the 500+ socio-economic scenarios created with the MESSAGE model, MAGICC is used to compute the temperature increase relative to pre-industrial (1850–1875) for a set of 600 geophysical ensemble members (Meinshausen *et al* 2011b). The ‘implied probabilities’ (Smith and Stern, 2011) used in this study are defined by the proportion of geophysical ensemble members exceeding a particular temperature limit at a given point in time.

2.3. Base performance of model setup

Cumulative CO₂ emissions from 1870 to 2011 are estimated at about 1810 billion metric tonnes of carbon-dioxide (GtCO₂) in our simulations. This is just slightly lower than the median (1890 GtCO₂; ~4% lower) but well within the *likely* range (1630–2150 GtCO₂) of historical cumulative carbon emissions reported by the IPCC AR5 (IPCC 2014b). Uncertainties in cumulative CO₂ emissions over this

Table 1. Cumulative CO₂ budgets consistent with limiting warming below 1.5 and 2 °C. Note that ranges are given for the feasible scenarios available in our set. With increasing stringency less feasible scenarios become available and, as a result, ranges could be narrower for more stringent targets. Values are rounded to the nearest 10 GtCO₂.


| Likelihood | | CO ₂ budget (GtCO ₂) | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | 2011–2050 | 2011–2100 ^a |
| <2 °C during 21st century | | | |
| 50% | Central case (intermediate demand) | 1150 | 1280 |
| | Technology range | 1050–1270 | 1200–1430 |
| | Low–high energy demand range | 1080–1250 | 1050–1270 |
| | Range of full scenario set | 1050–1310 | 990–1450 |
| 66% | Central case | 940 | 940 |
| | Technology range | 890–1060 | 840–1050 |
| | Low–high energy demand range | 920–1050 | 720–880 |
| | Range of full scenario set | 890–1130 | 670–1050 |
| 75% | Central case | <i>NF</i> | <i>NF</i> |
| | Technology range | 870–910 | 610–830 |
| | Low–high energy demand range | 910– <i>NF</i> | 640– <i>NF</i> |
| | Range of full scenario set | 860–1010 | 610–830 |
| <1.5 °C in 2100 | | | |
| 50% | Low demand case | 740 | 400 |
| | Technology range | 700–900 | 400–570 |
| | Range of full scenario set | 700–900 | 400–570 |

^a Note that cases with larger emission budgets from 2011 to 2050 have corresponding smaller budgets from 2011 to 2100.

Note: *NF*, infeasible to achieve probability.

time period are about ±12% (90% range derived from Le Quéré *et al* 2013).

We find that to limit warming to below 2 °C with 66% chance (or alternatively, 75 or 50%) cumulative CO₂ emissions from 2011 to 2100 need to be limited to 670–1050 GtCO₂ (rounded to the nearest 10 GtCO₂, range of upper and lower bound estimates over our entire scenario set; see table 1). For two other probability levels (75 and 50%), the cumulative amounts are 610–830 and 990–1450, respectively. The range of cumulative emissions is markedly smaller for the 75% probability level because such climate protection levels can only be reached under a subset of our full set of scenario variations. The spread of cumulative CO₂ emissions in each of the ranges reported above (for example, the 670–1050 GtCO₂ range for a 66% chance) stems from non-CO₂ forcing variations, which are driven by differences in technology and energy-demand assumptions in the range of scenarios. Geophysical uncertainties are reflected by the fact that any given carbon budget can limit warming only at a



given probability level (with levels of 50, 66 and 75% reported in this study).

This means that if the world implements a 1000 GtCO₂ carbon budget over the 2011–2100 period, the probability of global temperature increase in fact remaining below 2 °C could be about 50% or more than 75%, depending on the technology choices and the pathway that the world follows in meeting this budget (figure 1). In the next section we further

explore what drives these differences in carbon budgets and the probability with which they constrain warming below given limits.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Influence of technology availability

All our technology limiting cases result in a smaller potential for CO₂ emission reductions by 2100. At the

same time, our technological breakthrough cases increase the CO₂ mitigation potential (advanced transport) or leave it unchanged (advanced non-CO₂ mitigation).

However, changes in the CO₂ and non-CO₂ mitigation potential do not translate into a proportional actual change in corresponding CO₂ and non-CO₂ emissions. We find a significant and complex interaction between non-CO₂ abatement and CO₂ emissions budgets, even though many non-CO₂ GHGs are emitted by sources which are relatively independent of sources of CO₂. This is because in MESSAGE, as in most IAM frameworks that assume a multi-gas approach to climate change mitigation, both reductions in CO₂ and in other Kyoto-GHGs are driven by the same carbon price, which is translated between gases via 100-year GWPs.

When mitigation of CO₂ is made relatively harder (by limiting CO₂ mitigation technologies), carbon prices will be higher to achieve a similar level of CO₂ emission reductions. These higher prices will result in relatively larger concurrent emissions reductions of CH₄ and other non-CO₂ gases; the lower radiative forcing from those gases hence allows slightly greater cumulative emissions of CO₂. Conversely, larger CH₄ reductions can also be the result of a higher non-CO₂ mitigation potential (for example, this is the case in our advanced non-CO₂ mitigation case for agriculture). Peak warming is largely determined by the cumulative emissions of CO₂, but is also influenced by the annual emissions of shorter-lived GHGs like CH₄ leading up to the peak (Smith *et al* 2012). Consequently, stronger abatement of non-CO₂ gases will also result in a slightly smaller amount of CO₂ reductions needed to meet the same peak temperature goal and hence allow greater cumulative CO₂ emissions, resulting in slightly lower carbon prices.

This indicates that cumulative CO₂ emissions consistent with a specific temperature limit are contingent on the future abatement potential (and actual abatement) of non-CO₂ gases. In our set of scenarios, the non-CO₂ mitigation potential is varied by the assumed availability and future improvements of technologies to reduce emissions from agriculture and some energy technologies.

Our scenario results indicate that the effect of limiting key mitigation technologies on cumulative CO₂ emissions compatible with limiting warming to below 2 °C is about ±10%, although this estimate varies in sign and magnitude over time (figure 1).

If the availability of CO₂ mitigation technologies is restricted in the long term, then 2 °C-consistent cumulative CO₂ emission budgets over the 2011–2100 period are generally up to 10% higher than when assuming a full mitigation portfolio, because the required higher carbon prices will stimulate more mitigation of non-CO₂ species. Another consequence of the higher carbon prices is that more CO₂ mitigation is carried out in the near-term and hence cost-

effective cumulative carbon emissions until 2050 are up to 10% lower.

Assuming that the full portfolio of mitigation technologies is available, the cumulative 2011–2100 CO₂ budget in our scenarios in line with 2 °C is 940 GtCO₂ (66% chance) and 1280 GtCO₂ (50% chance), respectively (table 1, figure 1). Limiting the construction of new nuclear plants has virtually no effect on the 2011–2100 CO₂ budgets, which are changed by less than 1%. However, limiting land-based mitigation options increases carbon prices to achieve this budget by about 30% and increases the compatible CO₂ budget by about 5% (see also section 3.3). In the absence of CCS, our model is unable to limit warming to below 2 °C with at least a 66% chance under our default (intermediate) levels of future energy demand. Only if demand is lower are these higher-probability options still possible without CCS (see, Rogelj *et al* 2013b, and further below). For budgets that give a 50% chance of staying below 2 °C, not relying on the future availability of CCS technologies increases carbon prices to achieve these budgets by about 90% and in turn increases 2011–2100 CO₂ budgets by about 12%.

In the nearer term (2011–2050), 2 °C-consistent CO₂ budgets are slightly lower instead of higher when assuming technology limitations (table 1) for the reasons given above. Limiting nuclear availability reduces the 2011–2050 CO₂ budget by about 3%, limiting land-based mitigation options does so by 5–6%, and assuming no large-scale CCS does so by about 9%. This is because higher carbon prices associated with limited technology scenarios mean that more costly mitigation options are taken up earlier (before 2050) rather than later.

Qualitatively similar effects are found under our technological breakthrough cases. However, depending on the sector affected, breakthroughs can result in an increase or a decrease of the carbon budget for a given temperature limit. Assuming breakthroughs in the transportation sector yields 2011–2050 and 2011–2100 CO₂ budgets that are about 7% higher and 10% lower, respectively, for having a 66% chance of staying below 2 °C. This is because lower carbon prices stimulate less near-term CO₂ abatement but allow more CO₂ mitigation in the long term in this sensitivity case. Assuming breakthroughs in the mitigation of non-CO₂ GHGs implies CO₂ budgets which are consistently higher by 12%, both in the 2011–2050 and the 2011–2100 period, because the contribution of non-CO₂ gases to peak warming is reduced, and hence slightly more CO₂-induced warming is permissible.

In theory, similar shifts in emission budgets are expected for a 1.5 °C limit (table 1). However, the number of scenarios reaching such a stringent level of climate protection in our set is too limited to extract robust quantitative results on these shifts.

3.2. Influence of energy-demand projections

The level of energy-demand growth over the 21st century, is another factor that is varied in our scenario ensemble. We consider three levels of future energy demand in our scenarios: low, intermediate, and high, consistent with the 'Efficiency', 'Mix', and 'Supply' scenario families, respectively, of the framework of the Global Energy Assessment (Riahi *et al* 2012). Also here, relationships that are qualitatively similar to the ones discussed above are found.

In scenarios assuming a high future energy demand, the single most important influencing factor in our scenarios is that CH₄ emissions from the waste sector are about 50% higher in the second half of the century. Therefore, CO₂ emission budgets consistent with a given temperature limit become smaller. If CO₂ mitigation is assumed to be easier because of a lower future energy demand, emissions can be reduced at relatively lower cost (i.e., lower carbon price, consumption loss, etc). However, the lower associated carbon price in the energy sector also results—for similar reductions in CO₂—in less concurrent CH₄ mitigation in low energy-demand scenarios, at least in cases where mitigation of CO₂ and CH₄ is linked. On aggregate, this results in a greater relative need to reduce carbon emissions in order to achieve the same climate outcome with a given budget.

Due to the carbon-price linkage described above, 2 °C-consistent budgets of CO₂ emissions from 2011 until 2100 are smaller by about 17% under high energy-demand assumptions relative to our intermediate future energy-demand case and for a 50% chance. They remain virtually the same, however, (<1% smaller) under low energy-demand assumptions (figure 1). For a 66% chance, a low energy-demand future would imply a CO₂ budget that is about 6% smaller.

3.3. The cost of cumulative emissions: carbon prices and total mitigation costs

Having explored how the efficiency of 2 °C-compatible CO₂ budgets can change with technology variations, which themselves are influenced by mitigation choices, we now focus on the question of how mitigation choices influence the costs of keeping emissions within a given budget (figure S3).

The carbon price associated with keeping temperature rise to below 2 °C with 66% chance assuming a full mitigation technology portfolio and intermediate future energy demand is about 37 USD in 2020. (Note that we here report year-2020 carbon prices discounted back with a discount rate of 5% to 2011, the first year the model assumes the carbon price to be effective, and report these in year-2005 USD.) The corresponding discounted total mitigation costs are about 23.5 trillion USD (table 2). Discounted total mitigation costs are computed over the entire

century and relative to a scenario in absence of any mitigation.

Costs vary strongly with technology availability and future energy demand (table 2). Carbon prices to limit emissions to within the same 2 °C-consistent CO₂ budget over the entire 21st century (940–1280 GtCO₂, table 1, figure S3) decrease by about 30–40% or increase more than an order of magnitude, when varying the availability of mitigation technologies. Technology limitation cases consistently increase mitigation costs while technology breakthroughs decrease costs. When varying future energy-demand projections, consistent carbon prices can decrease by about 70% (low energy demand) or up by 450% (high energy demand).

Total mitigation costs see qualitatively similar shifts (table 2). Underlying drivers that can be actively influenced by policies (for example, energy efficiency improvements) therefore appear robust means to limit mitigation costs in both the short and long term.

3.4. Integrating technology and cost information

In a final step of our assessment of the impact of policy choices on the efficiency of cumulative CO₂ emissions for limiting warming below a given temperature level in a multi-gas context, we integrate all findings and explore robust features in the relationship between costs, technology dependencies and emission budgets. We find important difference between the medium term (until 2050) and the long term (until 2100).


We find that for limiting warming to below 2 °C with a given probability, lower carbon prices or mitigation costs lead to higher compatible carbon emissions budget until 2050 (figure 2). This relationship holds over all our mitigation technology variations and for each energy-demand sensitivity case. This is because high availability of technologies or low energy-demand scenarios are generally associated with lower carbon prices, which means that relatively less costly mitigation is carried out in the near term resulting in higher cumulative CO₂ emissions until 2050. This also implies that emissions targets can be achieved at lower overall cost.

However, looking further until the end of the century this relationship changes. Within each energy-demand category, scenarios that assume limited availability of technology have, as noted above, larger consistent cumulative CO₂ emission budgets until the end of the century, as much higher carbon prices drive more abatement of non-CO₂ gases. However, these higher prices nonetheless result in higher overall mitigation costs despite the slightly greater carbon budgets. Vice versa, scenarios with breakthroughs in the electrification of the transport sector give smaller CO₂ budgets because they are able to remove more

Table 2. Costs to limit cumulative CO₂ emissions to within specific budgets. Costs in terms of carbon prices (year-2020 carbon price discounted back to 2011 [2005USD]) and total discounted mitigation costs are provided [trillion 2005USD]. CO₂ budgets are drawn from table 1.

| | Carbon price | Mitigation costs |
|---|--------------|------------------|
| <i>Cost from 2011 to 2050 for CO₂ budget from 2011 to 2050 of 940 GtCO₂ (rounded)</i> | | |
| Central case (intermediate demand) | 37 | 23.5 |
| Technology range (intermediate demand) | 34–669 | 22.2–33.8 |
| Low–high energy demand range (full technology portfolio) | 16–112 | 10.5–45.5 |
| <i>Cost from 2011 to 2100 for CO₂ budget from 2011 to 2100 of 940 GtCO₂ (rounded)</i> | | |
| Central case (intermediate demand) | 37 | 23.5 |
| Technology range (intermediate demand) | 22–NF | 16.5–NF |
| Low–high energy demand range (full technology portfolio) | 11–45 | 7.4–33.0 |

NF: infeasible to stay within budget.



CO₂ from the atmosphere by 2100, but they are able to achieve these smaller budgets at lower costs. A different relationship arises where the technology breakthrough is for advanced mitigation of non-CO₂ gases. This case results in both higher cumulative CO₂ emission budgets over the 21st

century and lower overall costs, as more low-cost abatement is provided from non-CO₂ sectors. This further confirms the important influence of long-term non-CO₂ abatement potentials for allowable cumulative CO₂ emissions and overall abatement costs.




Figure 3. Overview of general influence of policy choices on costs and size of CO₂ emissions budget during the 21st consistent with limiting warming to below a particular temperature level. Starting from the black dot in the centre, policy choices push the consistent carbon budget in different directions. Note that for CO₂ budgets until 2050, the CO₂ mitigation arrow would be rotated by 90° clockwise (see figure 2—panel a).

4. Discussion and conclusions

Our integrated assessment of CO₂ budgets consistent with limiting warming to below 2 °C provides a few key insights. Importantly, our study reinforces the general understanding that cumulative CO₂ emissions largely determine peak warming, and that a limit on cumulative carbon emissions is required to stabilize global-mean temperature rise. Furthermore, we have shown that some of the uncertainties surrounding the anticipated ability of a given cumulative CO₂ budget to limit warming to below 2 °C are influenced by non-CO₂ abatement and hence specific policy choices, as are the costs for achieving those budgets.

Within the cost-minimizing framework of the IAM scenarios that we assess here, some general conclusions can be drawn for 21st-century budgets compatible with limiting warming to below 2 °C (figure 3). These conclusions are driven by interactions between CO₂ and non-CO₂ mitigation. Cost-effective allocation of emission budgets over the entire 21st century in addition results in variations between the near and the long term. The linkage between CO₂ and non-CO₂ mitigation in MESSAGE is very comparable the behaviour of other IAMs (figure S7). Therefore, it is anticipated that also other IAMs will find qualitatively similar results.

Policy choices that limit the long-term mitigation potential of CO₂ (but do not significantly affect non-CO₂ mitigation) imply slightly greater budgets to 2100 as higher carbon prices drive stronger mitigation of non-CO₂ GHGs. Reducing CO₂ mitigation

technology availability results in larger costs, even though the allowable CO₂ budget over 2011–2100 is slightly greater. By contrast, policy choices that expand the CO₂ mitigation potential would—everything else remaining equal—result in compatible CO₂ budgets that are smaller over the 21st century but can be met at lower costs. These variations make the budget vary with about 10% around its default value. Costs vary much more than the consistent emission budgets.

Even if 21st-century carbon budgets are higher, CO₂ emissions are reduced more rapidly in the near term in scenarios which assume fewer CO₂ mitigation options. This is because less CO₂ mitigation options result in lower maximum attainable emission reduction rates over the century. Our cost-effectiveness framework thus allocates more abatement until 2050, to leave more space for higher emissions in the long term.

In our modelling framework, policy choices that increase or decrease energy demand relative to an intermediate baseline both result in slightly smaller consistent CO₂ budgets to 2100, but for different reasons. Under high future energy demand, baseline non-CO₂ emissions also increase, resulting in lower consistent CO₂ emissions budgets. Under low future baseline energy demand, baseline non-CO₂ emissions are lower and this would suggest larger compatible CO₂ budgets. However, mitigating CO₂ becomes much cheaper in a low energy-demand world. When applying a fixed exchange rate between non-CO₂ GHGs and CO₂, relatively less non-CO₂ mitigation therefore occurs in our modelling framework. This relationship

might be more complex in the real world as countries do not necessarily apply the same carbon prices and relative costs to CO₂ and non-CO₂ emitting sectors (Johansson and Persson, 2005).

The interaction between cumulative CO₂ emissions and emissions of non-CO₂ gases, particularly CH₄ can be condensed into a fairly simple conclusion: the greater the abatement of CH₄ during the time of peak warming, the larger the CO₂ budget compatible with a given temperature limit. However, the interaction between CH₄ and CO₂ abatement via a common price of carbon is strongly dependent on how CO₂ and CH₄ are assumed to be linked. While most IAMs use 100 year GWPs, other metrics like dynamic Global Temperature-change Potentials (Shine et al 2007) give a time-varying weight to CH₄ abatement, which would result in less CH₄ abatement initially, but more abatement later on, and thus could allow for a greater carbon emissions budget (Reisinger et al 2012). A recent study indicated that alternative metrics have only a limited effect on the 2010–2100 CO₂ budget (Strefler et al 2014), but more research would be required to quantify this effect more precisely. Emissions reductions of CH₄ clearly can complement (but not substitute) a limit on cumulative CO₂ emissions to enhance the probability of limiting warming to below 2 °C (Rogelj et al 2014c). This underlines the importance of research striving to expand the mitigation potential of currently hard-to-mitigate sources, such as CH₄ from enteric fermentation, and to manage demand for CH₄-intensive products (see Smith et al 2014).

In summary, our study quantifies the extent to which the carbon budget consistent with the 2 °C limit depends—in parts counterintuitively—on policy choices that influence future CO₂ and non-CO₂ mitigation technology availability, and future energy demand. We conclude that such policy choices will either constrain or relax the size of the remaining carbon budget for the 21st century. These variations are of the order of about 10%. For temperature stabilization, it is indispensable that annual carbon emissions reach zero levels globally. The carbon budget variations we identified here thus only gain importance once a break-away from current emission trends (Friedlingstein et al 2014) has been achieved. However, an early appreciation of how carbon budgets depend on technology options can help shape today's mitigation policies in a multi-gas context so that the available carbon budget is influenced and used in the most desired way.

References

- Allen M R, Frame D J, Huntingford C, Jones C D, Lowe J A, Meinshausen M and Meinshausen N 2009 Warming caused by cumulative carbon emissions towards the trillionth tonne *Nature* **458** 1163–6
- Amann M et al 2009 Potentials and costs for greenhouse gas mitigation in annex I countries: methodology *IIASA Interim Report* IR-09-043 (Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA))
- Bowman N H A, Frame D J, Huntingford C, Lowe J A and Allen M R 2011 Cumulative carbon emissions, emissions floors and short-term rates of warming: implications for policy *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **369** 45–66
- Bowman N H A, Frame D J, Huntingford C, Lowe J A, Smith S M and Allen M R 2013 The role of short-lived climate pollutants in meeting temperature goals *Nat. Clim. Change* **3** 1021–4
- Clarke L et al 2014 *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change, Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed O Edenhofer et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 413–510
- Collins M et al 2013 *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed T F Stocker et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 1029–136
- Friedlingstein P et al 2014 Persistent growth of CO₂ emissions and implications for reaching climate targets *Nat. Geosci.* **7** 709–15
- Gillett N P, Arora V K, Matthews D and Allen M R 2013 Constraining the ratio of global warming to cumulative CO₂ emissions using CMIP5 simulations *J. Clim.* **26** 6844–58
- IPCC 2007 *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis Working Group I Contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p 994
- IPCC 2013 *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed T F Stocker et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 1–29
- IPCC 2014a *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change, Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed O Edenhofer et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 1–33
- IPCC 2014b *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report of the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 1–32
- Johansson D and Persson U 2005 Non-CO₂ greenhouse gases in national climate policies: a reassessment of the comprehensive approach *4th Conf. Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases (NCGG-4)* (Rotterdam) pp 463–70
- Knutti R and Rogelj J 2015 The legacy of our CO₂ emissions: a clash of scientific facts, politics and ethics *Clim. Change* **1–13**
- Lauder A R, Enting I G, Carter J O, Clisby N, Cowie A L, Henry B K and Raupach M R 2013 Offsetting methane emissions—an alternative to emission equivalence metrics *Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control* **12** 419–29
- Le Quéré C et al 2013 The global carbon budget 1959–2011 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **5** 165–85
- Luderer G, Pietzcker R C, Bertram C, Kriegler E, Meinshausen M and Edenhofer O 2013 Economic mitigation challenges: how further delay closes the door for achieving climate targets *Environ. Res. Lett.* **8** 034033
- Matthews H D, Gillett N P, Stott P A and Zickfeld K 2009 The proportionality of global warming to cumulative carbon emissions *Nature* **459** 829–32
- Matthews H D, Solomon S and Pierrehumbert R 2012 Cumulative carbon as a policy framework for achieving climate stabilization *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **370** 4365–79
- McCollum D, Krey V, Riahi K, Kolp P, Grubler A, Makowski M and Nakicenovic N 2013 Climate policies can help resolve energy security and air pollution challenges *Clim. Change* **119** 479–94
- Meinshausen M, Meinshausen N, Hare W, Raper S C B, Frieler K, Knutti R, Frame D J and Allen M R 2009 Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2 °C *Nature* **458** 1158–62

- Meinshausen M, Raper S C B and Wigley T M L 2011a Emulating coupled atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler model, MAGICC6: I. Model description and calibration *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **11** 1417–56
- Meinshausen M, Wigley T M L and Raper S C B 2011b Emulating atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler model, MAGICC6: II. Applications *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **11** 1457–71
- Messner S and Schrattenholzer L 2000 MESSAGE–MACRO: linking an energy supply model with a macroeconomic module and solving it iteratively *Energy* **25** 267–82
- Nakicenovic N and Swart R 2000 *IPCC Special Report on Emissions Scenarios* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- O'Neill B C, Liddle B, Jiang L, Smith K R, Pachauri S, Dalton M and Fuchs R 2012 Demographic change and carbon dioxide emissions *Lancet* **380** 157–64
- Reisinger A, Havlik P, Riahi K, Vliet O, Obersteiner M and Herrero M 2012 Implications of alternative metrics for global mitigation costs and greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture *Clim. Change* **117** 677–90
- Riahi K et al 2012 *Global Energy Assessment—Toward a Sustainable Future* (Cambridge/Laxenburg, Austria: Cambridge University Press/International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis) pp 1203–1306
- Riahi K, Gruebler A and Nakicenovic N 2007 Scenarios of long-term socio-economic and environmental development under climate stabilization *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change (Special Issue: Greenhouse Gases—Integrated Assessment)* **74** 887–935
- Rogelj J, McCollum D L, O'Neill B C and Riahi K 2013a 2020 emissions levels required to limit warming to below 2 °C *Nat. Clim. Change* **3** 405–12
- Rogelj J, McCollum D L, Reisinger A, Meinshausen M and Riahi K 2013b Probabilistic cost estimates for climate change mitigation *Nature* **493** 79–83
- Rogelj J, Meinshausen M and Knutti R 2012 Global warming under old and new scenarios using IPCC climate sensitivity range estimates *Nat. Clim. Change* **2** 248–53
- Rogelj J, Meinshausen M, Sedláček J and Knutti R 2014a Implications of potentially lower climate sensitivity on climate projections and policy *Environ. Res. Lett.* **9** 031003
- Rogelj J, Rao S, McCollum D L, Pachauri S, Klimont Z, Krey V and Riahi K 2014b Air-pollution emission ranges consistent with the representative concentration pathways *Nat. Clim. Change* **4** 446–50
- Rogelj J, Schaeffer M, Meinshausen M, Shindell D T, Hare W, Klimont Z, Velders G J, Amann M and Schellnhuber H J 2014c Disentangling the effects of CO₂ and short-lived climate forcer mitigation *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111** 16325–30
- Shine K, Berntsen T, Fuglestvedt J, Skeie R B and Stuber N 2007 Comparing the climate effect of emissions of short- and long-lived climate agents *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **365** 1903–14
- Smith L A and Stern N 2011 Uncertainty in science and its role in climate policy *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **369** 4818–41
- Smith P et al 2014 *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed O Edenhofer et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 811–922
- Smith S M, Lowe J A, Bowerman N H A, Gohar L K, Huntingford C and Allen M R 2012 Equivalence of greenhouse-gas emissions for peak temperature limits *Nat. Clim. Change* **2** 535–8
- Stocker T F et al 2013 *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed T F Stocker et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 33–115
- Streifer J, Luderer G, Aboumahboub T and Kriegler E 2014 Economic impacts of alternative greenhouse gas emission metrics: a model-based assessment *Clim. Change* **125** 319–31
- Zickfeld K, Eby M, Matthews H D and Weaver A J 2009 Setting cumulative emissions targets to reduce the risk of dangerous climate change *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106** 16129–34