Multi-gas emission profiles for stabilising greenhouse gas concentrations
Emission implications of limiting global temperature increase to 2°C

B. Eickhout, M.G.J. den Elzen and D.P. van Vuuren

This research was conducted for the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment as part of the International Climate Change Policy Support Project (M/728001 Ondersteuning Klimaatbeleid).
National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
Global Sustainability and Climate (KMD)
Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency
P.O. Box 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands
Telephone : +31 30 2742924
Fax : +31 30 2744464
E-mail : Bas.Eickhout@rivm.nl
Website : http://www.rivm.nl/ieweb
Abstract

In this report we present two CO₂-equivalent emission profiles leading to two different stabilised greenhouse gas concentration levels. The contribution of the various greenhouse gas emissions is expressed in CO₂-equivalent emissions. These equivalent emissions are determined by using the concept of Global Warming Potential (GWP). Moreover the radiative forcing of the emission profiles are summed resulting in CO₂ equivalent concentration levels. The profile leading to 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalents can result in a maximum global mean temperature increase of less than 2°C above pre-industrial level (i.e. 1765), with a low to medium value for climate sensitivity. The profile leading to 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalents only remains below the 2°C level if the value for climate sensitivity is at the low end of the range, which means that this profile is unlikely to meet the 2°C target. With a high climate sensitivity of 4.5°C, the target will not be met under either profile. A robust conclusion is that the 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent stabilisation level can only be reached if global emissions peak around 2015 or if an overshoot of 550 ppmv is allowed. Other conclusions also depend on the level of sulphur emission reductions and the share of non-CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions in the reductions. Sulphur emissions are not taken into account in the GWP concept, but only have a small effect on the temperature increase in the short term. In the default analyses it is assumed that non-CO₂ greenhouse gases contribute 100 ppmv CO₂-equivalents in both profiles. From a sensitivity analysis we concluded that the variation in the contribution of non-CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions leads to a variation of ± 50 ppmv in CO₂-equivalents and ± 0.2°C temperature change in the short term (i.e. until 2100). This effect occurs since the GWP concept tends to underestimate the effect of efforts to reduce the emissions of short-lived gases such as CH₄. The effects of CO₂ mitigation measures are underestimated in the long-term (over 100 years). This shows that the validity of the GWP concept beyond short-term emission goals is limited.
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Samenvatting

In dit rapport presenteren we twee broeikasgas emissieprofielen die leiden tot twee verschillende stabilisatieniveaus van concentraties. De multi-gas emissieprofielen zijn gebaseerd op het ‘Global Warming Potential’ (GWP) concept. De concentratieniveaus zijn berekend aan de hand van de som van de stralingsforcering van de Kyoto gassen (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O en de F-gassen). Het profiel dat stabiliseert op 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalenten resulteert in een temperatuurtoename tot onder de 2°C wanneer de klimaatgevoeligheid wordt gevarieerd tussen de 1.5°C en 2.5°C. Bij hogere waardes van de klimaatgevoeligheid zal het profiel leiden tot hogere temperatuurtoenames, daarmee het EU-doel overschrijdend. De onzekerheidsband van de klimaatgevoeligheid is gesteld op 1.5°C tot 4.5°C. Verder blijkt dat het 2°C doel bij het 650 ppmv stabilisatieprofiel alleen binnen bereik is als de klimaatgevoeligheid aan de lage kant zit van die onzekerheidsband. Om het temperatuurdoel van de 2°C met grotere waarschijnlijkheid te kunnen halen, zou stabilisatie dus gericht moeten worden op 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalenten. Zonder het toestaan van een overshoot betekent dit stringente restricties voor de mondiale emissies, die niet later mogen pieken dan 2015 – 2020. Deze conclusies zijn ook afhankelijk van de aannames in de zwavelemmissies, die niet worden meegenomen in het GWP-concept. In deze studie blijkt de onzekerheid door zwavelemmissies niet groter dan 0.3°C te zijn, wat verwaarloosbaar is ten opzichte van de onzekerheid in de klimaatgevoeligheid. Voor onze conclusies hebben we aangenomen dat de niet-CO₂ broeikasgassen 100 ppmv CO₂-equivalenten bijdragen aan de stabilisatieniveaus. Uit een gevoeligheidsanalyse blijkt dat variatie in de bijdrage van niet-CO₂ broeikasgassen resulteert in een ander stabilisatieniveau (± 50 ppmv) en ook een andere temperatuurtoename (± 0.2°C) in de komende 100 jaar. Dit wordt verklaard door het feit dat het gebruik van GWP’s, met een 100-jarig tijds horizont, ervoor zorgt dat de bijdrage van kortlevende gassen zoals methaan wordt onderschat. Dit effect is minder zichtbaar op de langere termijn (meer dan 100 jaar), maar zorgt ervoor dat het GWP-concept minder goed bruikbaar is om temperatuurdoelen te vertalen naar equivalent broeikasgas emissiedoelen.
1. Introduction

1.1 Need for multi-gas stabilisation scenarios
Article 2 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) states that the ultimate objective of the Convention is ‘to achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.’ There is much debate on the question of which concentrations of greenhouse gases can be regarded as safe and the conditions required for achieving these. Much of this debate has been covered in the Third Assessment Report (TAR) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2001c) by assessing scientific literature that researched the impacts of climate change. In fact, determining ‘safe’ levels is not only a scientific question but is also related to perceptions, values and political negotiations (Rayner and Malone, 1998). Most studies seem to agree that baseline emissions, without climate policy, will result in climate change and associated adverse impacts. Consequently, mitigation scenarios need to be developed to explore the required ‘safe’ level for stabilising greenhouse gas concentrations (Van Vuuren and De Vries, 2001).

Many previous studies into the ‘safe emission’ levels required to remain within a certain temperature change have only looked at CO2 profiles (Enting et al., 1994; Wigley et al., 1996; Morita et al., 2000). However, we know that to study temperature increase we need to look at other greenhouse gases and radiative active gases (such as sulphur aerosols) as well. The IPCC has paid some attention to this issue in its TAR, but could only combine existing CO2 profiles with baseline assumptions for non-CO2 greenhouse gases (IPCC, 2001d). In view of the recent interest in non-CO2 greenhouse gases (Hansen et al., 2000; Reilly et al., 1999) profiles need to be formulated not only for CO2 but also for total greenhouse gases. Such profiles may serve a similar role in mitigation studies as CO2 curves have in earlier studies. Some studies into constructing multi-gas emission profiles are now under way. As far as we know, Sygna et al. (2002) were the first to investigate how to link multi-gas profiles to long-term temperature targets. In this study we explore multi-gas profiles in a more systematic way than has been done so far.

1.2 Purpose of this study
In this study we present CO2-equivalent emission profiles, calculated using Global Warming Potentials (GWP) on a time horizon of 100 years, that lead to CO2-equivalent concentrations calculated using the radiative forcing for the Kyoto gases (CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6). The GWP concept was introduced to the scientific community in the first IPCC Assessment Report (IPCC, 1990) and was implemented in the Kyoto Protocol by the UNFCCC in 1997. The GWP is described as the comparison of the integrated radiative forcing of a pulse emission of a radiatively active species for a specific time horizon with the integrated radiative forcing of a CO2 pulse emission. Although there is much debate on the concept of the GWP (Smith and Wigley, 2000a, Smith and Wigley, 2000b; Manne and Richels, 2001; Fuglestvedt et al., 2003), we used GWPs to calculate CO2-equivalent emission profiles because simple economic models need this kind of information. Ideally, the share of CO2 and non-CO2 gases in CO2-equivalent emission profiles does not matter. In this study we assess whether the use of CO2-equivalent emission profiles leads to substantial differences in the global mean surface temperature increase in 2100, and whether this problem also occurs when CO2-equivalent concentrations based on radiative forcing are used.
Box 1.1: Emission profiles versus stabilisation scenarios

In this report we describe the construction of emission profiles that are in line with the temperature target of 2 degrees Celsius. To construct these emission profiles we use a methodology that is mainly based on inverse calculations of the CO₂ emissions, as described in Enting et al. (1994). Since we focus on multi-gas emission profiles, we also determined the non-CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions. For this study we have made arbitrary assumptions to be able to compare our constructed multi-gas emission profiles with other CO₂-only emission profiles. Consequently, we assumed that non-CO₂ greenhouse gases will contribute 100 ppmv CO₂-equivalents (based on the sum of their radiative forcing effect). The resulting CO₂-equivalent emission profiles (based on the GWP concept) are evaluated in this study and are presented as multi-gas emission profiles that can serve as a basis for stabilisation studies, where the contribution of non-CO₂ greenhouse gases will be determined by cost optimisation calculations. An example of such a study is performed and described in Van Vuuren et al. (2003). This report forms the basis of that study.

Within the scope of this study we have only developed greenhouse gas emission profiles that stay within a ‘safe’ temperature range. Several studies have tried to help in determining the temperature increase corresponding to a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system (IPCC, 2001b; Berk et al. 2001; O’Neill and Oppenheimer, 2002). This involves a considerable level of uncertainty. In addition, whether this level is regarded as ‘safe’ also involves political decisions. In this study we avoid this problem by evaluating the greenhouse gas stabilisation profiles that remain within a limit for the global mean surface temperature increase set at 2°C above the pre-industrial level. This level is in line with the goals of the climate policies of the European Commission (EC, 1996) and the Dutch government.

Which CO₂-equivalent concentration level leads to a rise in temperature of no more than 2°C above the pre-industrial level? To answer this we need to know the climate sensitivity that gives the equilibrium global mean surface temperature increase resulting from a doubling of CO₂-equivalent concentrations. Given the many uncertainties surrounding climate sensitivity, the IPCC has defined a range from 1.5°C to 4.5°C with 2.5°C as the medium value (IPCC, 2001a). Assuming a medium climate sensitivity, stabilisation of the CO₂-equivalent concentration level at around 560 ppmv leads to a temperature increase of 2.5°C (the pre-industrial CO₂-equivalent concentration is taken to be 280 ppmv). Based on this rough estimate, we decided to take the CO₂-equivalent concentration of 550 ppmv as our central case. Although stabilisation at 450 ppmv CO₂-equivalent may also lead to a 2°C increase we did not construct this emission profile because the current (2000) CO₂-equivalent concentration level is about 420 ppmv. Given the current annual increase in concentrations this means that stabilisation at 450 ppmv is only possible in profiles that first exceed this concentration level and later decline to 450 ppmv. As we have excluded ‘overshoot’ profiles from our analysis, we considered the 450 ppmv CO₂-equivalents out of range. We decided to analyse two stabilisation levels: 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalents. To compare our results with other emission profiles we broke down our 550/650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profiles into 450/550 ppmv CO₂ and 100 ppmv non-CO₂ profiles. The calculated CO₂ emission profiles (leading to 450 and 550 ppmv CO₂) described in this report are compared with emission profiles determined using the Wigley, Richels & Edmonds profiles (WRE profiles) (Wigley et al., 1996).

We used the IMAGE 2.2 model (Alcamo et al., 1998; IMAGE team, 2001) to construct the emission profiles from pre-defined CO₂-equivalent concentration profiles. The IMAGE model (Integrated Model to Assess the Global Environment) is a system-dynamics oriented...
integrated assessment model. It provides a reasonably elaborate description of the sources of greenhouse gas emissions, greenhouse gas concentrations, changes in radiative forcing and the resulting temperatures. The climate model is based on the MAGICC model (Hulme et al., 2000), which allows the climate sensitivity to be adjusted to investigate the consequences of uncertainties in the climate system.

1.3 Outline of the report
In Section 2 we review the theoretical background on CO$_2$-equivalent emissions and concentrations and briefly describe the IMAGE model. In Section 3 we describe how we constructed the emission profiles from pre-described concentration stabilisation levels and analysed the baseline used for the period from 2000 and 2100. Section 4 contains an analysis of the CO$_2$-equivalent emission profiles and their influence on the temperature increase. Section 5 explores the consequences of the range in climate sensitivities, different sulphur emission profiles and differences in the breakdown rates of CO$_2$ and non-CO$_2$ in the CO$_2$-equivalent emission profiles. In Section 5 we present our conclusions.
2. Theoretical background

2.1 CO\textsubscript{2} emission profiles
In 1994, Enting, Wigley and Heimann published the first coordinated attempt to determine CO\textsubscript{2} emission profiles that lead to several CO\textsubscript{2} stabilisation levels (Enting et al., 1994). The CO\textsubscript{2} concentration profiles, published in IPCC (1994), were called S350–S750 (which refers to the CO\textsubscript{2} stabilisation levels) and had smooth transitions from the 1990 level (±355 ppmv) to the stabilisation level. In the second half of the 1990s discussions focused mostly on whether early action was more effective than delayed response. Wigley et al. (1996; WRE profiles) argued that postponing abatement action is always a more cost-effective strategy, mainly because reduction options will become cheaper in the future. On the other hand, others (e.g. Azar, 1998; Van Vuuren and De Vries, 2001) argued that early abatement can significantly accelerate technology development.

Discussion of mitigation actions has focused on CO\textsubscript{2} – the most important greenhouse gas (GHG) – until the late 1990s, when scientists claimed that mitigation analyses should include full consideration of all major greenhouse gases (CH\textsubscript{4}, N\textsubscript{2}O, HFCs, PFCs and SF\textsubscript{6}) as stated in the Kyoto Protocol (Reilly et al., 1999). A full ‘multi-gas’ analysis was found to result in significant cost reductions. In addition, Hansen et al. (2000) argued that a multi-gas analysis may open up opportunities to have less global warming in the shorter term than analyses on CO\textsubscript{2} alone because some gases have shorter atmospheric lifetimes. Despite these claims the IPCC, in its TAR in 2001, used CO\textsubscript{2} stabilisation profiles from IPCC (1994) and Wigley et al. (1996). To be able to calculate climate impacts, crude assumptions were made for the non-CO\textsubscript{2} greenhouse gases: they follow the A1b path until 2100 and thereafter remain constant (IPCC, 2001c). Morita et al. (2002) studied different post-SRES mitigation scenarios, but only with policies for reducing CO\textsubscript{2} emissions. In all these studies the Kyoto Protocol reductions were not included either.

Given this history, there is a need to update the emission profiles. Most importantly, we need emission profiles resulting in a stabilisation of the radiative forcing while taking into account all the Kyoto gases. Moreover, besides an updated base year (from 1990 to 2000), GHG profiles may need to take the Kyoto Protocol into account (i.e. a reduction for some countries, baseline for others).

2.2 CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emission profiles
To compile stabilisation profiles that take all the Kyoto gases into account we need to resolve how to add up the emissions from different gases. In this report we use two terms: CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emissions and CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent concentrations. For CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emissions we make use of the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of each Kyoto gas. GWP is defined as the integrated radiative forcing of a pulse emission of a radiatively active species for a specific time horizon compared with the integrated radiative forcing of a CO\textsubscript{2} pulse emission (i.e. the GWP of CO\textsubscript{2} is by definition 1.0). We used the GWPs with a time horizon of 100 years given in the TAR (IPCC, 2001a). Appendix A contains more details on the mathematics.

The introduction of the GWPs prompted a scientific debate on whether they are a good measure for combining the various effects of different greenhouse gases on the climate system. Smith and Wigley (2000a) provide a good review of the scientific problems of GWPs. They argue that the limitations of GWPs can be divided into definitional problems, quantification uncertainties and mathematical problems. Definitional problems arise from the
fact that the use of global GWPs ignores explicit geographical differences in the impacts of, for example, SO\textsubscript{2} emissions. Smith and Wigley also argue that the derivation of GWP involves many quantitative uncertainties, mainly in the gas-cycle modelling (e.g. lifetime uncertainties). Finally, they argue that the use of GWPs leads to substantial errors in the longer term (especially for short-lived gases such as CH\textsubscript{4}). The main reason is that the GWPs account for the cumulative effect of greenhouse gases on the radiative forcing. This cumulative effect can never decrease over an infinite time horizon (it will reach a constant value); once it is emitted, the contribution of a GHG is fully accounted for and no further decrease can occur. This is not the case in the atmosphere: on an infinite time scale, every emission pulse will be removed from the atmosphere and, after reaching an equilibrium state again, the influence of the greenhouse gas pulse on the global mean temperature change will be zero. The discussion on the use of GWPs is still very lively, as shown by Fuglestvedt et al. (2003), Smith (2003) and O’Neill (2003), who give a good overview of the different problems arising from the use of GWPs.

Despite these difficulties, the use of GWPs has some important advantages, the main one being the easy method for calculating and interpreting CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emissions. Most studies that have assessed possible alternatives conclude that at the moment no good alternatives exist that take the different effects of GHGs on the climate system into account and are as easy for modellers and policy makers as using GWPs.

In this report we also use CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent concentrations, which express the radiative forcing of all greenhouse gases as an equivalent CO\textsubscript{2} concentration that would result in a similar forcing (see Appendix A for the equations). This approach allows us to include all compounds influencing the radiative forcing (i.e. aerosols and ozone precursors), but we do not consider the consequences of this possibility in this study. After emitting the Kyoto gases, the concentration and the radiative forcing of each Kyoto gas are calculated. Because of different rates of removal from the atmosphere of each greenhouse gas the CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent concentration can decrease whereas CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emissions can never decrease (see above). Therefore, the effect of different contributions of Kyoto gases (with an equal total amount of CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent emissions) can lead to different levels of CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalent concentrations. In this study this effect is assessed in Chapter 5 by using the more complex IMAGE model (see Box 2.1), which also models atmospheric gas-cycles (see Eickhout et al., 2003).
Box 2.1: The IMAGE 2.2 model

The purpose of the IMAGE 2.2 model (Integrated Model to Assess the Global Environment, IMAGE team, 2001) is to explore the long-term dynamics of global environmental change. The model contains several disciplinary models (Figure 2.1) and delivers results for 17 socio-economic regions (plus Antarctica and Greenland). The IMAGE model consists of four main components:

- The Energy-Industry models calculate regional energy consumption, energy efficiency improvements, fuel substitution, and the supply of and trade in fossil fuels and renewable energy technologies. Data on energy use and industrial production are used to calculate emissions of GHGs, ozone precursors and sulphur (De Vries et al., 2001).

- The ecosystem, crop and land use models dynamically compute land use from data on regional consumption, production and trade of food, animal feed, fodder, grass and timber, and local climatic and terrain properties. Emissions from land use change, natural ecosystems and agricultural production systems, and the exchange of CO₂ between terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere are computed (Alcamo et al., 1998).

- The atmospheric and ocean models calculate changes in atmospheric composition using emissions data and take oceanic CO₂ uptake and atmospheric chemistry into consideration. Changes in climatic properties are then computed by resolving the changes in radiative forcing caused by GHGs, aerosols and oceanic heat transport. The climate model implemented in IMAGE 2.2 is based on the MAGICC model (Hulme et al., 2000). For further details on the implementation in IMAGE see Eickhout et al. (2003).

- The impact models involve specific models for sea level rise and land degradation and make use of specific features of the ecosystem and crop models to depict impacts on vegetation. The ecosystem models include an algorithm that estimates the carbon cycle consequences of different assumptions on the speed of climate change induced vegetation migration (Van Minnen et al., 2000).

Figure 2.1: The structure of the IMAGE 2.2 framework (IMAGE team, 2001).
3. Methodology: Constructing the emission profiles

Emission profiles for two concentration levels (550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO$_2$-equivalents) have been developed using the IMAGE 2.2 model. The basis of our calculations is the Common POLES-IMAGE (CPI) baseline (without climate policies; see Section 3.1). In Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 we describe how we constructed the CO$_2$-equivalent emission profiles that lead to stabilisation of CO$_2$-equivalent concentrations.

3.1 General methodology

For several reasons we need to specify the baseline from which the stabilisation regimes have been derived. First, baseline assumptions on population growth and technology changes determine future land use through agricultural activities. Land use is important since it affects the carbon cycle, notably the uptake of carbon from the atmosphere by the biosphere (terrestrial carbon uptake), and it affects non-CO$_2$ GHG emissions (e.g. methane from animals and rice paddies and N$_2$O from agricultural fertilisers). Second, the baseline influences the emissions of non-participating countries during the Kyoto period (i.e. the non-Annex I countries and the US between 2000 and 2010).

For this study we used the CPI baseline (Van Vuuren et al., 2003) developed by RIVM and the French Institute de l’Economie et de Politique de l’Energie (IEPE). This baseline describes trends in the main driving forces (population and economic growth), environmental pressures (energy, industrial and land use emissions) and their resulting effects, such as temperature increase, for the 1995–2100 period. It is derived from the existing POLES reference scenario to 2030 (see Criqui and Kouvaritakis, 2000) and the IMAGE B2 scenario from 2000 to 2100 (IMAGE team, 2001; Nakicenovic et al., 2000). This baseline does not include any climate policies and runs from 1970 to 2100, with calibration to data from 1970 to 2000. Table 3.1 summarises the main characteristics of the CPI baseline. The population scenario assumes that the global population stabilises at a level of 9.5 billion by 2100. On the economic side, the CPI baseline scenario describes a world in which globalisation and technological development continue to be important factors underlying economic growth, although not as strong as assumed in the IPCC A1b scenario (IMAGE-team, 2001; Nakicenovic et al., 2000). As a consequence, the economic growth rate in the Annex I regions varies between 1.5 and 2.0% in the 1995–2025 period and slows down somewhat after 2025 to around 1.0 to 1.2%. Growth rates for Asia, South America and North Africa and the Middle East are significantly higher and vary between 2.0 and 4.0% (see Table 3.1).
Table 3.1: Main driving forces by CPI baseline region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population (x 10^6)</th>
<th>Per Capita Income (in PPP 1995 $/year)</th>
<th>Per Capita Income (growth rates annually)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former SU</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>5706</td>
<td>7891</td>
<td>8984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections describe the methodology for constructing emission profiles. Figure 3.1 shows the four phases identified in the methodology. In phase I (from 1970 to 2000) historical emissions data are used to set the scene. These emissions include the recent slowdown in GHG emission growth towards the end of the last century, in particular resulting from the strong reductions in emissions in the Former Soviet Union (FSU) and Eastern Europe following their economic decline and the reductions in CO₂ emissions in China during the second half of the 1990s. Given the projected increase in population and income, this decrease in emissions is considered to be a temporary phenomenon, with future emission projected to increase substantially again.

In phase II, from 2000 to 2010, climate policies are implemented for those countries that have agreed to them. The countries that do not implement any climate policy follow the CPI baseline. Table 3.2 contains a summary of the CPI baseline emissions. More details on the period from 2000 to 2010 are given in section 3.2.
I : Historical emissions
II : CPI baseline and Kyoto implementation
III : From annual increase to annual decrease
IV : Inverse calculations

Figure 3.1: Schematic sketch of the general methodology used for the construction of the emission profiles, distinguishing four different phases from 1970 to 2100.

In phase III it is assumed that post-Kyoto policies bring about more ambitious emission reductions. These reductions are achieved by assuming a shift from an annual emission increase to a certain annual emission decrease. The year in which emissions peak and the size of the annual emission decrease depend on the stabilisation level (see Section 3.3). Finally, in phase IV, global emissions are calculated by using inverse calculations of the IMAGE model. A pre-defined concentration path (with a certain stabilisation level) forms the basis for calculating back the global emissions (see Section 3.4).

Table 3.2: Main model results by CPI baseline region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions (in GtCO₂/year)</th>
<th>GHG emissions (in GtCO₂-eq/year) *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former SU</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: The GHGs included here are the 6 Kyoto gases: CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, SF₆, PFCs, HFCs. However, the F-gases are excluded from the regional figures because only global estimates are made. This means that the regional subtotals do not add up to the world total.
Until 2100 the CO₂ land use emissions follow the CPI baseline. Therefore, the assumptions relating to land use determine the amount of carbon that is emitted and sequestered during the 21st century. In general, population growth and a shift towards more luxurious diets increases the area of agricultural land needed during the first half of century, despite improvements in agricultural production. Later, further productivity gains result in a more excess agricultural land than can be converted into forest, particularly in high-income regions. As a result, CO₂ emissions from land use increase slightly between 1995 and 2040, but decrease thereafter. The CPI baseline emissions are depicted in Figure 3.2.

3.2 Implementation of current climate policies until 2010

In contrast to the baseline, for the stabilisation profiles we assumed that recent climate policies – the Kyoto Protocol and the Bush Climate Initiative – will be fully implemented from 2000 to 2010: all Annex I countries except the US meet their Kyoto targets and the United States reduces ‘greenhouse gas intensity’ by 18% in the 10-year period. For the exact implications of the Kyoto Protocol we used the quantified emission limitations or reductions as a percentage of the base year or 1990 emissions. This takes into account the corrections that follow from specific articles of the Kyoto Protocol on country-specific base years other than 1990 and the sink credits under the Marrakesh Accords (Den Elzen and De Moor, 2002). The Kyoto Protocol allows countries to bank ‘hot air’. In our analysis we assumed that Eastern Europe and the FSU will bank hot air optimally to maximise revenues (exercise market power by limiting the supply of hot air and so raise the prices of emission permits), leading to 80% banking of hot air. Using the results of the FAIR model (Den Elzen and Lucas, 2003) we determined the new emission reduction goals for Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. In Table 3.3 the emission reduction targets are compared with the 1990 emission levels of the Annex I countries. It is assumed that these new emission reduction goals are met in 2010 (the middle of the first Commitment Period).

---

1 Because of the economic downturn in the early 1990s, the Annex I countries of the former Soviet Union (FSU), that is Russia, Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, are emitting substantially less CO₂ and their emissions in 2010 are expected to be well below their Kyoto targets. Although this is sometimes referred to as surplus allowances, the term ‘hot air’ is mostly commonly used.
Table 3.3: Emission reduction targets compared with 1990 levels for the Annex I countries, taking into account the US withdrawal (see Den Elzen and De Moor, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex I Region</th>
<th>Original Kyoto target</th>
<th>Targets compared to 1990 with optimal hot air banking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD’90 Europe</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>+6.8%</td>
<td>+22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that Eastern Europe and the FSU only bank fossil CO₂ emissions and so emissions from CH₄ and N₂O follow the baseline as described in Section 3.1. Furthermore, it is assumed that all other Annex I countries meet their targets for fossil CO₂, anthropogenic CH₄ and anthropogenic N₂O separately. Given this assumption, all Annex I countries mentioned in Table 3.3 (except for Eastern Europe and FSU) will have to take action to reach their targets for fossil CO₂ emissions. For CH₄ and N₂O this is not always the case, since some of the industrial and/or land use emissions for these gases are below the targets for the baseline. Please note that no emission reductions in HFCs, PFCs and SF₆ are assumed because IMAGE 2.2 only uses global emissions data for these gases.

3.3 CO₂ emissions after 2010: when will they peak?

After 2010 we assume emission reductions are introduced to reach the pre-defined concentration levels. The time taken for GHG concentrations to stabilise were adopted from IPCC for CO₂ to allow for comparison between the stabilisation profile for CO₂ only and for all GHGs. The 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent concentration level (450 ppmv CO₂ and 100 ppmv CO₂-equivalents for CH₄, N₂O and F-gases) is reached in 2100 and the 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent concentration level (550 ppmv CO₂ and 100 ppmv non-CO₂) is reached in 2150.²

After 2010 we distinguish two phases in the constructed emission profiles:
1) The growth of CO₂ emissions shifts from an annual increase in 2010 to a maximum annual decrease of 2%.
2) After this first phase, CO₂ emissions are derived using an inverse calculation by the IMAGE 2.2 model, determining the allowable emission levels resulting from a pre-described CO₂ concentration profile.

We assumed that an optimal reduction pathway over the century should not exceed an annual reduction in global emissions of 2% per year (at least not over longer time periods). The reason is that a faster reduction is difficult to achieve given the inertia in the energy system: electric power plants, for instance, have a technical lifetime of 30 years or more. Fast reduction rates would require early replacement of existing plants, which is expensive. In order to get an impression of the maximum reduction rates in long-term emission scenarios we plotted the annual emission reduction rates (30 year averages) for a set of 18 emissions reduction scenarios (Morita et al., 2000). These scenarios were constructed using a large number of different models and aim for stabilisation of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration at 450–750 ppmv CO₂. To remain consistent with the stabilisation levels chosen for in this

² Note that 650 ppmv stabilisation in 2150 leads to a much smoother profile than stabilisation in 2100. The latter would require relative high emissions during the initial decades (to reach a high enough concentration level) followed by steep emission reductions in the second half of the century to stabilise concentrations.
report, we only looked at the scenarios that aim for stabilisation at 450 ppmv and 550 ppmv CO₂ (13 scenarios; see Figure 3.3).

Figure 3.3: Global energy-related CO₂ emissions scenarios that aim to stabilise the greenhouse gas concentration at 450 ppmv and 550 ppmv CO₂, in terms of their emissions (left) and 20-year average annual reduction rates (right; Morita et al., 2000).

Figure 3.3 shows that the 2% rate of decrease is hardly exceeded across the total set. Some exceptions occur for 450 ppmv stabilisation scenarios that have a relatively fast reduction period around 2050 (the A1T-450 MESSAGE scenario and the A2-450 PETRO scenario) and one 550 ppmv stabilisation scenario that postpones mitigation action to the very last decades (A1T-550 MESSAGE). In all cases this rate is only kept for a limited period of time. This is illustrated by converting the data in Figure 3.3 into a histogram showing reduction rates (Figure 3.4; data from 2025 to 2100).

Figure 3.4: Histogram of the rate of reduction in the 2025-2100 period across the reduction scenarios of the post-SRES set leading to stabilising at 450 and 550 ppmv stabilisation of the CO₂ concentration (data from Figure 3.3).
Stabilising concentrations of CO₂-equivalents at 550 ppmv in 2100 requires steep reductions after implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Bush Climate Change Initiative. In 2010 the CO₂ concentration is already above 390 ppmv, which means fast emission reductions thereafter. For the 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalents level in 2150 we had more scope for adjustment. To prevent stringent emission reductions we assumed that the CO₂ emissions have to reach a 1.5% annual decrease in 2040. Consequently, the global emissions peak in different years: around 2015 in the case of 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalents and around 2025 in the case of 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalents.

### 3.4 Calculating CO₂ emissions from CO₂ concentration pathways

Phase IV of the emission profiles is determined using the method described by Enting et al. (1994). The CO₂ concentration profile is determined using a Padé approximant (Eq. 3.1).

\[
[\text{CO}_2](t) = \frac{a + bx + cx^2}{1 + dx + ex^2}
\]

with:

\[
x = \frac{t-t_0}{t_{stab}-t_0}
\]

\[
[\text{CO}_2] = \text{calculated CO}_2 \text{ concentration (ppmv)}
\]

\[
t = \text{calculated year (yr)}
\]

\[
t_0 = \text{start year of stabilisation profile (yr)}
\]

\[
t_{stab} = \text{year of stabilisation (yr)}
\]

The values of \(a\), \(b\), \(c\), \(d\) and \(e\) can be calculated because five points of the concentration profile are pre-described:

1. the CO₂ concentration in the starting year (2010; ppmv);
2. the gradient of the CO₂ concentration profile in the starting year (2010; ppmv per year);
3. the CO₂ concentration in the year of stabilisation (ppmv);
4. the gradient in the year of stabilisation (0.0 ppmv per year);
5. the CO₂ concentration in a year in between (ppmv).

The reader is referred to Appendix B for more details on the calculation of the values in Equation 3.1 using the 5 constraints. Table 3.4 summarises the assumptions we used to reach stabilisation levels in 2100 and 2150 for the 550 and 650 cases respectively. Using inverse calculations of the IMAGE 2.2 model we calculated the resulting fossil CO₂ emissions using the CO₂ concentration profile as input. The terrestrial and oceanic carbon cycle models (see Figure 2.1) of IMAGE 2.2 calculate the corresponding terrestrial and oceanic carbon fluxes.

### Table 3.4: Defined values in Padé approximants to calculate CO₂ concentration stabilisation profiles, based on Enting et al. (1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter in Padé approximant</th>
<th>CO₂ 450 ppmv stabilisation profile</th>
<th>CO₂ 550 ppmv stabilisation profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(t_0)</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<a href="t_0">\text{CO}_2</a>)</td>
<td>427.0 ppmv</td>
<td>486.9 ppmv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta<a href="t_0">\text{CO}_2</a>)</td>
<td>1.5 ppmv/yr</td>
<td>1.6 ppmv/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t_{stab})</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<a href="t_%7Bstab%7D">\text{CO}_2</a>)</td>
<td>450.0 ppmv</td>
<td>550.0 ppmv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta<a href="t_%7Bstab%7D">\text{CO}_2</a>)</td>
<td>0.0 ppmv/yr</td>
<td>0.0 ppmv/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Reductions in non-CO$_2$ greenhouse gases after 2010

We assumed that non-CO$_2$ greenhouse gases are responsible for a further 100 ppmv CO$_2$-equivalent in each stabilisation profile. As the lifetimes of the GHGs differ greatly the distribution among the gases is important for our final outcomes. As we did not apply a full costs optimisation over time, we assumed reduction rates based on expert judgement. Until 2010, the non-CO$_2$ greenhouse gases for the non-Annex-I countries are determined by the baseline (Section 3.1) and for the Annex-I countries by the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol (Section 3.2).\(^3\)

After 2010 mitigation options are applied to non-CO$_2$ emission categories that are assumed to be easy to reduce. These emission reductions are applied to get to a contribution of 100 ppmv CO$_2$-equivalent concentration by the non-CO$_2$ greenhouse gas emissions. For methane these are all emissions from energy and industry and emissions from landfills and sewage. For nitrous oxide these are all emissions from energy and industry, emissions from sewage and emissions from fertiliser use. It is assumed that emission reductions in the developing countries will be slower than in the developed countries. Table 3.5 compares the assumed emission reductions for CH$_4$ and N$_2$O with the baseline.

### Table 3.5: Assumed emission reductions compared with the CH$_4$ and N$_2$O baseline profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission category</th>
<th>Annex-I</th>
<th>Non-Annex-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ energy and industry</td>
<td>-50% in 2025</td>
<td>-50% in 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ landfills</td>
<td>-100% in 2025</td>
<td>-100% in 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ sewage</td>
<td>-50% in 2025</td>
<td>-50% in 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$O energy and industry</td>
<td>-50% in 2025</td>
<td>-50% in 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$O sewage</td>
<td>-100% in 2025</td>
<td>-100% in 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$O fertiliser use</td>
<td>-20% in 2025</td>
<td>-20% in 2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emission reductions in HFCs, PFCs and SF$_6$ are determined in a similar way to the emission reductions for methane and nitrous oxide. However, in these emission profiles of the F-gases a distinction has been made between the two stabilisation profiles. This distinction is needed because the natural N$_2$O emissions in the highest profile are higher than in the 550 CO$_2$-equivalent profile as a result of the higher temperature in the 650 CO$_2$-equivalent profile. The higher temperature in this profile causes more soil respiration of N$_2$O. To compensate for these higher N$_2$O emissions, it is assumed that the reductions in HFC and PFC emissions reach a level of 100% in 2100. In the lower profile of 550 CO$_2$-equivalents only a 50% reduction is reached in 2100.

3.6 Summary of the emission profiles

Table 3.6 summarises the main characteristics of the constructed GHG stabilisation profiles. In Figures 3.5 and 3.6 the resulting CO$_2$-equivalent concentration levels and the coinciding CO$_2$-equivalent emissions are plotted alongside the results for the CPI baseline for comparison. The consequences for the global-mean temperature change are discussed in Chapter 4. For this analysis we also have to look at the sulphur emissions because SO$_2$ aerosols have a negative impact on radiative forcing. The negative health effects and environmental impacts of SO$_2$ emissions make it hard to believe that no SO$_2$ emission reductions will take place in the coming 100 years. When carbon intensive energy sources like coal are phased out to achieve CO$_2$ emission reductions in the stabilisation profiles, SO$_2$

\(^3\) Since only global estimates are available for the HFCs, PFCs and SF$_6$ in the baseline, these gases follow the baseline completely until 2010.
emissions will also be reduced. In the stabilisation profiles we assumed the ratio between energy and industry related SO₂ reductions will be the same as for energy and industry related CO₂ reductions, compared with the baseline. The assumption of an equal CO₂ : SO₂ ratio in emission reductions by the energy and industry sectors was checked against other IMAGE mitigation scenarios defined by the IMAGE energy demand model TIMER (De Vries et al., 2001). In these scenarios the energy related SO₂ reductions were even slightly bigger than the energy CO₂ reductions. This supports the assumption that the same ratio for emission reductions from the energy and industry sectors is reasonable.

Table 3.6: Main characteristics of the two constructed emission profiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>IMAGE S550e</th>
<th>IMAGE S650e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ emissions in 2010 (GtCO₂ per year)</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>37.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual increase in 2010 (in %)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target year of pre-described annual decrease CO₂</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of annual CO₂ decrease in that target year (in %)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of stabilisation</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of CO₂ concentration</td>
<td>450 ppmv</td>
<td>550 ppmv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed levels of CH₄ reductions (compared to baseline)¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy: 50%</td>
<td>Energy: 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industry: 50%</td>
<td>Industry: 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landfills: 100%</td>
<td>Landfills: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewage: 50%</td>
<td>Sewage: 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed levels of N₂O reductions (compared to baseline)¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy: 50%</td>
<td>Energy: 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industry: 50%</td>
<td>Industry: 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewage: 100%</td>
<td>Sewage: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fertiliser: 20%</td>
<td>Fertiliser: 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of reduction for HFCs and PFCs in 2100 (reduction percentage compared to baseline)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur emission levels</td>
<td>Constant CO₂/SO₂ ratio</td>
<td>Constant CO₂/SO₂ ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹) Reached in 2025 for Annex I and in 2040 for non-Annex I.

²) Reductions in F-gases are higher in IMAGE S650e to compensate for higher natural N₂O emissions resulting from a larger temperature increase.

Figure 3.5: Global CO₂-equivalent concentration stabilisation profiles for S550e and S650e ppmv compared with the CPI baseline scenario.
Figure 3.6: Global emission profiles for stabilising GHG concentrations at 550 ppmv (IMAGE S550e) and 650 ppmv (IMAGE S650e) compared with baseline emissions.
4. Analysis of the greenhouse gas emission profiles

In this Chapter, we analyse the emission profiles reported in Chapter 3. We compare our results with the IPCC profiles (IPCC, 1994) and the WRE profiles (Wigley et al., 1996) in Section 4.1. This is followed by a discussion of the consequences for the increase in global mean temperature (Section 4.2) and the emission reduction burden (Section 4.3).

4.1 The CO₂-equivalent emission profiles

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 compare the two CO₂-only emission profiles with the corresponding ‘early action’ profile of the IPCC (1994) and the ‘delayed response’ profile of Wigley, Richels and Edmonds (WRE), of which the latter is commonly used in the IPCC-TAR. Interestingly, the CO₂ emissions in the IMAGE 450 ppmv profile peak somewhat later and at a higher level than in the WRE ‘Delayed Response’ profile, followed by steeper emissions reductions. The main reason for this is that in this analysis the developing countries follow their baseline until 2010. This implies that reductions are already somewhat delayed compared with the WRE ‘Delayed Response’ profile. Compared to the IPCC S450 profile the IMAGE profile can be really characterised as ‘delayed response’.

![Figure 4.1: The comparison of the constructed IMAGE profile and the WRE Delayed Response emission profile, leading to 450 ppmv CO₂ in 2100.](image)

The 550 ppmv CO₂ IMAGE profile (from the IMAGE S650e profile) is very similar to the 550 ppmv CO₂ WRE profile, this in contrast to the IPCC 550 ppmv CO₂ profile (Figure 4.2). In Table 4.1 the characteristics of the IMAGE profiles and the WRE profiles are compared using indicators mentioned in the IPCC Synthesis Report (IPCC, 2001d).
Table 4.1: Characteristics of the IMAGE 2.2 stabilisation profiles compared with the characteristics of the WRE profiles, as calculated by two IPCC models in the Synthesis Report (IPCC, 2001d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stabilisation profile (in ppmv CO₂ equivalent)</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions (GtC/yr)</th>
<th>Accumulated CO₂ emissions (Gt C)</th>
<th>Year in which emissions Peak</th>
<th>Fall below 1990 levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550-IMAGE</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>≈2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-WRE</td>
<td>3.0–6.9</td>
<td>1.0–3.7</td>
<td>365–735</td>
<td>2005–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-IMAGE</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>≈2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-WRE</td>
<td>6.4–2.6</td>
<td>2.7–7.7</td>
<td>590–1135</td>
<td>2020–2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Comparison of the constructed IMAGE emission profile and the WRE Delayed Response emission profile, leading to 550 ppmv CO₂ in 2150.

The results for the 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent pathway imply that there is hardly any scope for flexibility in timing if stabilisation in 2100 is to be achieved without an overshoot, while the 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalents leaves more options open. The profile we constructed in Chapter 3 results in emissions that peak around 2025, but stabilisation can also be reached by earlier or later emission reductions (see Figure 4.3, where the range of emission peaks varies from 2015 to 2035). In other words, stabilising at 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent without overshoot requires stringent action after 2010 (Kyoto), while stabilisation at 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent demands less strict mitigation actions after 2010.
4.2 Consequences for the temperature increase

To study whether these constructed profiles stay within the 2°C range (as discussed in the Introduction) we also included assumptions on the sulphur emissions because SO\(_2\) aerosols have a negative impact on radiative forcing. The assumed SO\(_2\) profiles, as discussed in Section 3.6, are shown in Figure 4.4. Logically, the 550 ppmv CO\(_2\)-equivalent profile coincides with larger reductions in the SO\(_2\) profile as well.

The resulting global mean surface temperature increases in the baseline and the two constructed stabilisation profiles are plotted in Figure 4.5. For these default cases it is interesting to see that the 550 ppmv CO\(_2\)-equivalent profile reaches the 2°C Celsius temperature increase above the pre-industrial level in 2100. However, the temperature increase in 2100 is not the equilibrium temperature value because of the inertia in the climate system. In the 650 ppmv CO\(_2\) equivalent stabilisation profile (see Figure 4.5), the
concentration levels have not yet stabilised by 2100 and there will be significant residual warming. The additional warming after 2100 is estimated at 0.4°C (leading to 2.4°C) and 0.6°C (leading to 2.9°C) for the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO2-equivalents profiles if GHG emissions continue to be reduced after 2100. These estimates are based on the elaboration of the climate sensitivity, but nevertheless, remain highly uncertain because of other factors that influence the final equilibrium temperature increase:

- the behaviour of the biosphere (temperature increase may cause vegetation to become a source instead of a sink; Cox et al., 2000);
- the behaviour of the ocean (temperature increase may cause changes in ocean currents and consequently changes in carbon uptake);
- emissions of aerosols of which some have a warming effect (soot) and others have a cooling effect;
- ozone formation that is dependent of the emissions of ozone precursors like NOx, CO and non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC).

![Figure 4.5: Global mean surface temperature increase compared with the pre-industrial level for the baseline and the two constructed stabilisation profiles.](image)

Interestingly, the 550 ppmv CO2-equivalent profile shows a somewhat higher temperature increase in the period from 2020 to 2050 because of the higher SO2 emission reductions. This effect is more visible on a graph showing the rate of temperature change (Figure 4.6).

---

4 IPCC (2001) tends to overestimate the residual temperature increase after stabilisation of CO2 concentrations because non-CO2 greenhouse gas emissions follow the A1b path until 2100 and remain constant at the A1b 2100 level thereafter. This assumption is highly debatable given the gap between CO2 emissions in a 450 ppmv CO2 stabilisation case and non-CO2 emissions in the A1b scenario.

5 Here, we base our estimates on the fact that a doubling of the CO2 equivalent concentration (from 280 to 560 ppmv) will finally lead to 2.5°C temperature increase. Consequently, an increase to 550 ppmv CO2-equivalents will lead to 2.4°C (550/560*2.5°C) and an increase to 650 ppmv CO2-equivalents will lead to 2.9°C (650/560*2.5°C).
Figure 4.6: Rate of temperature increase for the baseline and the two constructed stabilisation profiles.

Figure 4.6 shows that both stabilisation profiles have a slightly higher rate of temperature increase than the baseline until 2015/2020. The 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profile does not fall below the baseline until 2035 and only falls below the 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profile around 2045. This shows the dominant effect of SO₂ emissions on the temperature effect in the beginning of the stabilisation profile. Given this reduction in SO₂ emissions, any decrease in temperature resulting from mitigation actions cannot be expected immediately. However, on a local scale regions with presently low levels of SO₂ emissions may already gain from the abatement of GHG emissions on the shorter term.

One final remark can be made on the geographical impact of a global mean temperature effect. Figure 4.7 shows that a 2°C global mean surface temperature increase involves much higher temperature increases above land because of the low temperature effects above oceans. The uncertainty in the climate pattern is high, but Figure 4.7 gives a good indication of the diversity in local temperature effects.

Figure 4.7: Regional distribution of the global mean surface temperature increase of ± 2°C, reached in 2100 by the 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profile as shown in Figure 4.9. The regional distribution of the global mean temperature is calculated by using the climate pattern of the HADCM-2 model (Mitchell et al., 1995).
4.3 Emission reduction burden

Figure 4.8 presents the percentage change in energy- and industry-related GHG emission levels required under the IMAGE S550e and S650e profiles, compared with the CPI baseline and 1990 levels, for the years 2025, 2050 and 2100. Note that these levels are different from the reductions indicated in Figure 3.4 because of the exclusion of emissions related to land use change. In fact, the reduction in emissions related to land use change in the baseline allow for relatively smaller future reductions in energy- and industry-related greenhouse gases.

From Figure 4.8 we can conclude that:

- Stabilisation at both the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO2-equivalent concentrations requires substantial emission reductions from the CPI baseline, particularly in the long term.
- For the S550e profile, global energy- and industry-related GHG emission levels in 2025 can still increase to about 20% above 1990 levels, but this already implies a substantial emission reduction of 30% compared with baseline levels. For S650e the reduction compared with the baseline is smaller, but still significant at around 15%.
- For stabilisation at 550 ppmv in 2050, emissions have to be reduced strongly, not only compared with the baseline level (approximately 65%) but also compared with 1990 levels (approximately 15%). In contrast, for stabilisation at 650 ppmv the GHG emissions levels may still be 50% above 1990 levels by 2050. However, compared with the baseline, global emissions need to be reduced by about 35%.
- By the end of the century, the stabilisation profiles for both the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO2-equivalent concentrations imply that global emissions are substantially reduced compared with CPI: by about 70% and 55% respectively. However, when compared with 1990, this implies a reduction of 30% for stabilisation at 550 ppmv CO2-equivalent and stabilisation at 1990 levels for the 650 ppmv case.

Figure 4.8: Global energy- and industry-related GHG emissions reduction efforts for stabilisation at 550 ppmv (left panel) and 650 ppmv (right panel) CO2-equivalent levels.
5. Factors important for the temperature increase

The results shown in Chapters 3 and 4 are based on the default settings of the IMAGE 2.2 model and standardised assumptions on the sulphur emissions and share of CO₂ in the CO₂-equivalent profile. In this Chapter we analyse the consequences of changing some sensitive parameters that determine the temperature outcome: the climate sensitivity and SO₂ emissions. The results for changes in these parameters are discussed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 respectively. In Section 5.3 we analyse whether changes in the share of CO₂ emissions in the equivalent profiles have an impact on the determined CO₂-equivalent concentration and temperature increase. This issue is important when CO₂-equivalent profiles are used for emission reduction strategies based on cost optimisation. This also relates to the discussion on the use of GWPs touched upon in Chapter 2.

5.1 Climate sensitivity

Figure 5.1 shows the results for different climate sensitivity values in the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profiles.

![Figure 5.1: Global mean temperature increase since pre-industrial levels resulting from the IMAGE S550e (left panel) and IMAGE S650e (right panel) profiles for different climate sensitivity assumptions (1.5, 2.5 and 4.5). The upper lines indicate the temperature increase resulting from CS=4.5, the middle lines CS=2.5 and the bottom lines CS=1.5; the (horizontal) dotted line is the 2°C Celsius target, a climate policy target used by the EU and the Dutch government.](image)

From Figure 5.1 it can be concluded that in principle the IMAGE-550 profile can remain below the maximum global temperature increase of 2°C by 2100 with both medium and low climate sensitivities. The IMAGE-650 profile can only do so with low climate sensitivity, but this profile is likely to overshoot the target by a considerable margin. Neither profile meets the EU target with high climate sensitivity.

This analysis shows the importance of the climate sensitivity when temperature increases are used as targets. IPCC (2001a) has already stated the importance of the climate sensitivity when the temperature increase of the WRE profiles (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2) is calculated with the MAGICC model (Hulme et al., 2000). For this analysis they calibrated the MAGICC model to reproduce the temperature increase of the different General Circulation Models (GCMs). The resulting climate sensitivity ranged from 1.7 to 4.2°C, comparable with the
values used in this study. The calculated temperature increase for the WRE450 profile ranges from 1.2 to 2.3°C and for the WRE550 profile from 1.6 to 2.9°C in the period from 1990 to 2100 (see also Raper et al., 2001). These ranges, mentioned in IPCC (2001a), are also dependent of assumptions on other GHG emissions and sulphur emissions, which the IPCC (2001a) assumed to follow the A1b scenario (Nakicenovic et al., 2000).

5.2 SO2 emissions

Assumptions about the SO2 emission profile are also important for the temperature increase because of the cooling effect of sulphate aerosols. The temperature increase for the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO2-equivalent profiles are shown in Figures 5.2 and 5.3, assuming two different situations regarding the impacts of climate policy on SO2 emissions: no reductions of SO2 (baseline) and a reduction in SO2 emissions proportionate to CO2 in the same ratio that has been applied so far. The figures show that climate policy, through its effects on SO2 emissions, not only has an impact on the profile of the temperature effect in the beginning of the mitigation profile, but also has an absolute effect on the level of temperature increase by the end of the century.

![Figure 5.2: Global mean surface temperature increase in the 550 ppmv CO2-equivalent profile, with SO2 emissions according to the baseline (green) and SO2 emission reductions in a fixed ratio to CO2 emission reductions (red). For SO2 profiles, see Figure 4.4.](image)

However, since it is reasonable to assume that SO2 emissions will be further reduced in the longer term, it is fair to say that after 2100 the difference between the temperature profiles will diminish, which can already be seen in Figure 5.2. We can conclude that the uncertainty in climate sensitivity discussed in the previous section has a more important effect on absolute temperature increases after stabilisation than the uncertainty in the sulphur emission profile. This is less true when the rate of temperature increase is used as a climate target (Swart et al., 1998).
5.3 Share of CO₂ and non-CO₂ emissions: use of GWPs

We have developed our GHG stabilisation profiles for use in climate policy and energy models to find the cheapest combination of emission reductions to achieve the CO₂-equivalent emission reductions needed to reproduce the CO₂-equivalent profiles in Figure 3.4. The question is whether researchers can use these CO₂-equivalent profiles (based on GWPs) and substitute freely among different GHGs within the overall emissions given by the profile. This question is important because it is likely that each analysis will result in a different composition of reductions of GHGs than we assumed in the default construction of the IMAGE S550 and IMAGE S650 profiles. To investigate whether changes in the share of CO₂ versus non-CO₂ gases in the overall reduction affect the CO₂-equivalent concentration and temperature increases given in Section 4.2, we varied the ratio CO₂: non-CO₂ in the CO₂-equivalent profiles. Figure 5.4 shows a plot of the share of CO₂ and non-CO₂ over time. The upper panel is the default case. The lower left panel show the situation when non-CO₂ GHGs are assumed to be reduced much more. In this case we assumed 100% reductions in the CH₄ emissions stemming from energy and industry, the sewage system and landfills, and we assumed a 20% reduction in CH₄ emissions from rice fields. For N₂O we assumed 100% emission reductions in the energy system and a 100% reduction in the emissions stemming from industrial activities and the sewage system. Other important land use sources for N₂O, such as fertilisers and animal waste, were assumed to contribute 50% compared with the baseline. All these reduction percentages are reached in 2040. These are clearly ambitious assumptions, but they are meant to give an extreme situation for GHG reductions other than CO₂.

Figure 5.3: Global mean surface temperature increase in the 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent profile, with SO₂ emissions according the baseline (green) and SO₂ emission reductions in a fixed ratio to CO₂ emission reductions (red). For SO₂ profiles, see Figure 4.4.
In Figure 5.5 we show that equal CO₂-equivalent emission profiles based on GWPs but with different shares of CO₂ and non-CO₂ gases lead to different levels of CO₂-equivalent concentrations (i.e. radiative forcings). When the reductions are only achieved through CO₂ reductions, the CO₂-equivalent concentration reaches a level of 565 ppmv instead of 550 ppmv in the default case. In contrast, the CO₂-equivalent concentration is lower (520 ppmv) when most of the reductions are gained with non-CO₂ gases such as CH₄ and N₂O. An explanation of this result is that the use of a 100 year time horizon for GWPs tends to underestimate the influence of short-lived gases such as CH₄ in the short term (100 years). This means that early steep reductions in non-CO₂ GHGs, as in the case of maximum non-CO₂, lead to more reductions in the radiative forcing than expected from the GWP approach in the period until 2100. The reason for this is that the influence of short-lived gases is spread over 100 years in the GWP approach, while in reality most of the effects occur straight away (in the first 20 years for CH₄). In Figure 5.5 it can be seen that in the case of extreme non-CO₂ reductions the difference from the default case is largest from 2030 to 2060 (when the difference in share of reductions with the default case is most marked, as shown in Figure 5.4). Sygna et al. (2002) have already drawn attention to this problem with the use of GWP,
but also showed that the effect is reversed over the longer term (hundreds of years). Thus, in the extreme case of CO₂-only reductions, the CO₂-equivalent concentration is higher than in the default case for the first 100 years, but lower hundreds of years later. The explanation is that the reduction effect of short-lived gases diminishes and has disappeared entirely after 200 years, while CO₂ reductions continue to have an effect. In Figure 5.5 the difference with the default case is already narrowing in 2100.

These results show that freely substituting reductions of different greenhouse gases on the basis of GWPs leads to substantially different CO₂-equivalent concentration levels in 2100.

\[ \text{Figure 5.5: Different levels of CO₂-equivalent concentration, resulting from different shares of CO₂ and non-CO₂ emissions, leading to equal CO₂-equivalent emissions (blue = extreme CO₂ reductions; red = default case; green = extreme non-CO₂ reductions).} \]

The resulting temperature effects are shown in Figure 5.6, where the reductions in CO₂-only result in a higher temperature effect than the default case. Although the GWP approach leads to a different temperature effect, the range in temperature increase (~0.5°C) is less than the range in temperature increase due to the uncertainty in the climate sensitivity (~1.6°C).

\[ \text{Figure 5.6: Temperature increase in the different cases shown in Figure 5.4, with the same CO₂-equivalent emission profiles (blue = extreme CO₂ reductions; red = default case; green = extreme non-CO₂ reductions).} \]
Figure 5.7 shows the results for the global mean temperature increase (compared with the pre-industrial age) when the analysis is repeated for the IMAGE S650 profile. The effects on temperature change in Figure 5.7 are similar to the results in Figure 5.6: the range of temperature change is fairly large because of scientific drawbacks of using GWPs. However, the temperature effect has a smaller deviation than the range caused by the different climate sensitivities (Section 5.1).

Figure 5.7: Temperature increase with different reduction efforts: the red line represents the default case, leading to 650 ppmv CO\textsubscript{2}-equivalents in 2150; the blue line represents the temperature effects when reduction efforts are achieved through CO\textsubscript{2}-only; the green line shows the temperature effects in an extreme case of non-CO\textsubscript{2} reductions.
6. Conclusions

In this report we have presented two profiles for total greenhouse gas emissions that lead to stabilisation of GHG concentrations at 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent by 2100 and 2150 respectively. The total greenhouse gas emissions are summed to CO₂ equivalent emissions using the concept of Global Warming Potentials (GWP) and the greenhouse gas concentrations are summed using the total radiative forcing of the Kyoto gases. Until 2010 we implemented the current climate policies as agreed in the Kyoto Protocol and the Bush Climate Initiative. From 2010 to 2100 we used constraints on the maximum reduction rate to account for inertia in the energy system and applied an inverse calculation to determine allowable global emissions to meet the stabilisation levels (without overshoot). From our analyse we conclude that the 550 ppmv profile can result in a maximum global mean temperature increase of less than 2°C, with a low to medium value for the climate sensitivity. The 650 ppmv profile only remains below 2°C if the value for the climate sensitivity is at the low end of the range (from 1.5°C to 4.5°C), which means that this profile is unlikely to meet the target. With a high climate sensitivity of 4.5°C, neither profile meets the 2°C target. It should be noted that in terms of temperature change, the two profiles only start to diverge from 2050 onwards because of delays within the system and differences in sulphur emission levels.

Stabilising CO₂-equivalent concentrations at 550 ppmv requires substantially larger and earlier global emission reductions than stabilising CO₂-equivalent concentrations at 650 ppmv. The emission profiles leading to a stabilisation of the CO₂-equivalent concentration at 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv peak by 2015 and 2030 respectively. Other possible pathways for reaching the 650 ppmv allow emissions to peak later. For the 550 ppmv CO₂-equivalent a further delay would result in rapid reductions after 2025 (over an emission reduction of 2% per year) and/or a (temporary) overshoot of the 550 ppmv level. The 550 ppmv CO₂ equivalent profile requires a 30% reduction of global GHG emissions in 2050 compared with 1990 levels, which corresponds to a 60% reduction from the baseline we used. In the 650 ppmv CO₂ equivalent profile, 2050 global emissions can be 25% higher than 1990 levels, but this still represents a 35% reduction compared with the baseline.

Our analysis assumed that gases are allocated in such a way that the 550 ppmv and 650 ppmv CO₂-equivalent stabilisation profiles correspond to CO₂ stabilisation at 450 ppmv in 2100 and at 550 ppmv by 2150. These derived CO₂ emission profiles compare well against the WRE profiles used in many IPCC studies.

Moreover, we performed a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of our findings when we vary our assumptions on sulphur emissions and on the share of CO₂ and non-CO₂ emissions within the CO₂-equivalent profile. Ideally, it would be possible to develop profiles that can be used independently of the baseline from which they are derived and which allow free substitution among the contributors of different forcing agents within the profile, but still result in a similar temperature impact. Unfortunately, our analysis shows that these ideal conditions cannot be met completely. The baseline we used in our analysis has some influence on our results through the emissions from the non-mitigating regions until 2010, through land use emissions and uptake and through the sulphur emissions. From our sensitivity analysis we conclude that the effect on the temperature outcome of different sulphur mitigation efforts is small compared with the effect of different values for the climate sensitivity.
Our analysis also shows that different compositions of GHGs within the CO$_2$-equivalent emission profiles lead to other CO$_2$-equivalent concentrations (i.e. radiative forcing) and temperature impacts. This result shows the limitations inherent in the use of GWPs for temperature targets. With the common 100 year time horizon the effect of reduction efforts for short-lived gases such as CH$_4$ is underestimated in the first 40 years. On the other hand, the temperature effects of measures to reduce CO$_2$ are underestimated over the long term (over 100 years). Taking other disadvantages of the GWP concept into account, such as not being able to include all climate-forcing agents (e.g. aerosols) in the analysis, we suggest that more research should to be conducted to find appropriate alternatives to the GWP concept in multi-gas analyses.
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Appendix A: Calculating GWPs and radiative forcings

Equivalent emissions
The CO₂-equivalent emissions (in Tg CO₂ per year) are computed according to the following simple equation:

\[ E_{CO₂eq} = E_{GHG} \cdot GWP \]  

(A.1)

with GWP being the Global Warming Potential (in Tg CO₂ per Tg GHG) and \( E_{GHG} \) the annual emission of the greenhouse gas (in Tg GHG per year) taken into account (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, the HFCs, PFCs and SF₆). The direct GWP is relative to carbon dioxide for a 100-year time horizon. We used the estimates from IPCC (2001a). For example, the GWP for CH₄ is 23, which means that 1 kg of CH₄ has the same impact as 23 kg of CO₂ for a time horizon of 100 years. The GWP for N₂O is 296. GWPs for the other substances cover a wide range of values up to 22,200 for SF₆ (IPCC, 2001).

Equivalent concentrations
For the calculation of the equivalent concentrations we used the direct relation of each gas to its radiative forcing. From the sum of all radiative forcings we can calculate the CO₂-equivalent concentration. We mainly used the Special Report on Simple Climate Models (Harvey et al., 1997) and the Contribution of Working Group I to the TAR (IPCC, 2001a) to calculate the radiative forcing of each Kyoto gas from its atmospheric concentration (see also Eickhout et al., 2003).

The radiative forcing of carbon dioxide is calculated as follows:

\[ \Delta Q_{CO₂,t} = 5.325 \cdot \ln \left( \frac{[CO₂]_t}{[CO₂]_{t0}} \right) \]  

(A.2)

where \( t_0 \) is the pre-industrial age (1765, the year of initialisation in IMAGE 2.2). The pre-industrial concentration of CO₂ is assumed to be 278 ppmv. The value 5.325 stems from the fact that a doubling of the CO₂ concentration since pre-industrial times will lead to an increased forcing of 3.7 Wm⁻². This is in line with the assumed value of IPCC (2001).

For CH₄ and N₂O we have to consider that as the concentration of these greenhouse gases increases, the dependence of each forcing on both concentrations will gradually ‘saturate’, since both gases absorb in each other’s frequency domains. To take this mechanism into account, IMAGE 2.2 uses the following equations (IPCC, 2001):

\[ \Delta Q_{CH₄,t} = 0.036 \cdot \ln \left( \sqrt{[CH₄]_t} - \sqrt{[CH₄]_{t0}} \right) - \left( 0.47 \cdot \ln \left( 1 + a \cdot [CH₄]_t \cdot [N₂O]_t \right)^{0.75} + b \cdot [CH₄]_t \cdot [CH₄]_t \cdot [N₂O]_t^{0.52} \right) \]  

(A.3)

for the change in radiative forcing of methane, and:
\[
\Delta Q_{\text{N}_2\text{O},t} = 0.12 \cdot \left( \sqrt{[\text{N}_2\text{O}]_t} - \sqrt{[\text{N}_2\text{O}]_{t_0}} \right) - \\
\left( 0.47 \cdot \ln \left[ 1 + a \cdot \left( [\text{CH}_4]_t \cdot [\text{N}_2\text{O}]_t \right) \right]^{0.75} + \left( b \cdot [\text{CH}_4]_t \cdot [\text{N}_2\text{O}]_t \right)^{0.52} \right) \\
\left( 0.47 \cdot \ln \left[ 1 + a \cdot \left( [\text{CH}_4]_t \cdot [\text{N}_2\text{O}]_t \right) \right]^{0.75} + \left( b \cdot [\text{CH}_4]_t \cdot [\text{N}_2\text{O}]_t \right)^{0.52} \right)
\]

(A.4)

for the change in radiative forcing of nitrous oxide. The pre-industrial concentrations \([\text{CH}_4]_{t_0}\) and \([\text{N}_2\text{O}]_{t_0}\) are assumed to be 700 ppbv and 270 ppbv respectively (IPCC, 2001). The values \(a\) and \(b\) are \(2.01 \times 10^{-5}\) and \(5.31 \times 10^{-15}\).

For the HFCs, PFCs and SF6 the radiative forcing is calculated by multiplying the tropospheric concentrations by the ‘radiative efficiency coefficients’ taken from IPCC (2001). Table A.1 contains the radiative efficiency coefficients used in IMAGE 2.2.

Table A.1: Radiative efficiency coefficients of the HFCs, PFCs and SF6 taken into account by IMAGE 2.2, based on IPCC (2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical compound</th>
<th>Radiative efficiency coefficient (in (Wm^{-2}ppbv^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFC-23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-32</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-43-10-mee</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-125</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-143a</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-152a</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-227ea</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-236fa</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-245ca</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF4(^{1)})</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2F6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1)}\) The pre-industrial concentration of naturally occurring GHGs is subtracted before multiplying by the radiative efficiency coefficient to obtain the radiative forcing compared with pre-industrial times. Of these gases only CF4 occurs naturally, at an assumed level of 40 ppbv.

After summing these different radiative forcings, the \(\text{CO}_2\)-equivalent concentration is calculated by an inverse equation of Equation A.2 (see Equation A.5),

\[
[\text{CO}_2 - \text{equivalent}] = [\text{CO}_2]_{t_0} \cdot e^{-\frac{\sum_{\text{conc.}}}{0.525}}
\]

(A.5)

where the pre-industrial concentration is again assumed to be 278 ppmv.
Appendix B: Elaboration on Padé approximant

The visualisation of the Padé approximant described in Section 3.4 (see here Equation B.1) leads to a curve that resembles a stabilisation profile of atmospheric CO₂ concentration. For this reason this mathematical approximant was introduced as a stabilisation profile by Enting et al. (1994). Any desired stabilisation profile can be determined by defining 5 constraints to the approximant. This Appendix contains the algebra for calculating the values \(a\), \(b\), \(c\), \(d\) and \(e\) in Equation B.1 by defining the 5 constraints, subsequently leading to a stabilisation profile.

\[
\begin{align*}
f(x) &= \frac{a + bx + cx^2}{1 + dx + ex^2} \\
&\text{with: } 0 \leq x \leq 1
\end{align*}
\]  

(B.1)

The five constraints explained in Section 3.4 are the following:

1. \(h(0) = r\)
2. \(h'(0) = q\)
3. \(h(1) = p\)  
(B.2)
4. \(h'(1) = 0\)
5. \(h(x_i) = s\)

First, we assume function \(h(x)\) without value \(a\). The derivative of function \(h\) is:

\[
h'(x) = \frac{(b + 2cx)(1 + dx + ex^2) - (d + 2ex)(bx + cx^2)}{(1 + dx + ex^2)^2}  
\]  

(B.3)

The first two constraints from Equation B.2 lead to the following definitions:

1. \(r = 0\)  
2. \(q = b\)  
(B.4)

The other three constraints are elaborated as follows:

3. \(p = \frac{b + c}{1 + d + e}\)
4. \(b(1 - e) + c(d + 2) = 0\)  
(B.5)
5. \(s = \frac{bx_i + cx_i^2}{1 + dx_i + ex_i^2}\)

Combination of 3 and 4 in B.5 leads to the following cascade of equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
b(1 - e) &+ c(d + 2) &= 0 \\
b &+ c &= p(1 + d + e) \\
b(1 - e) &+ c(1 - e) &= p(1 + d + e)(1 - e) &\leftrightarrow& 3.* (1 - e) \\
0 &+ c(1 + d + e) &= p(e - 1)(1 + d + e) &\leftrightarrow& 4.-3.* (1 - e)
\end{align*}
\]

In other words:

\[
c = p(e - 1) \land (1 + d + e) \neq 0  
\]  

(B.6)

The combination of the fourth constraint and the Equations B.4 and B.6 leads to:

\[
d = \frac{q}{p} - 2  
\]  

(B.7)
So far, the elaboration has given more insight into the values $a$, $b$ and $d$. The values $c$ and $e$ still have unknown variables in the definitions. The fifth constraint is needed to resolve this issue. Elaboration on the fifth constraint in Equation B.5, by substituting the variables $b$, $c$ and $d$ with Equations B.4, B.6 and B.7, returns the following equation for $e$:

$$e = \frac{1}{(s-p)x_i^2} \left[ qx_i - px_i^2 - s \left( 1 + \frac{q}{p} x_i^2 - 2x_i \right) \right]$$ \hspace{1cm} (B.8)

Now, value $c$ can be written as a defined value as well:

$$c = \frac{p}{(s-p)x_i^2} \left[ qx_i - s \left( x_i^2 + 1 + \frac{q}{p} x_i^2 - 2x_i \right) \right]$$ \hspace{1cm} (B.9)

The previous elaboration has returned known values for the 5 unknown values in the Padé approximant, using the 5 constraints given a priori. However, so far the function $h$ has been elaborated with value $a$ equals 0. Function $f$ is the Padé approximant needed for the stabilisation profile. Hence, the value $a$ is added to the previous elaboration, returning the following 5 definitions of the 5 unknown variables in the Padé approximant from equation B.1:

\[
a = r \\
d = \frac{q}{p-a} - 2 \\
b = a \cdot d + q \\
e = \frac{1}{(s-p)x_i^2} \left[ qx_i - (p-a)x_i^2 - (s-a)(1+dx_i) \right] \\
c = \frac{p-a}{(s-p)x_i^2} \left[ qx_i - (s-a)(x_i^2 + 1 + dx_i) \right] + ae
\] \hspace{1cm} (B.10)

Thus, by defining 5 constraints as summed in Equation B.2, the values $a$, $b$, $c$, $d$ and $e$ can be calculated according Equation B.10, leading to any desired stabilisation profile.