



# Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone

## Summary for Decision Makers



A complete elaboration of the topics covered in this summary can be found in the Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone report and in the fully referenced underlying research, analyses and reports.

For details of UNEP's regional and sub-regional areas referred to throughout this document see <http://geodata.grid.unep.ch/extras/geosubregions.php>.

© Copyright: UNEP and WMO 2011 – Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone: Summary for Decision Makers.

**This is a pre-publication version of the Summary for Decision Makers. Please do not cite page numbers from this version or quote from it. These materials are produced for informational purposes only and may not be duplicated.**

UNEP/GC/26/INF/20

#### Disclaimers

The views expressed in this document are not necessarily those of the agencies cooperating in this project. The designations employed and the presentation do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP and WMO concerning the legal status of any country, territory or city or its authority, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Mention of a commercial company or product in this document does not imply endorsement by UNEP and WMO. The use of information from this document for publicity or advertising is not permitted. Trademark names and symbols are used in an editorial fashion with no intention on infringement on trademark or copyright laws.

We regret any errors or omissions that may have been unwittingly made.

© Maps, photos and illustrations as specified.

Writing team: Coordinators – Drew Shindell (National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Institute for Space Studies, USA) and Johan C. I. Kuylenstierna (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK); Writers – Kevin Hicks (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Frank Raes (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Veerabhadran Ramanathan (Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA), Erika Rosenthal (Earth Justice, USA), Sara Terry (US Environmental Protection Agency), Martin Williams (King's College London, UK).

With inputs from: Markus Amann (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Susan Anenberg (US Environmental Protection Agency), Volodymyr Demkine (UNEP, Kenya), Lisa Emberson (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), David Fowler (The Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), Liisa Jalkanen (WMO, Switzerland), Zbigniew Klimont (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), N.T. Kim Oahn, (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand), Joel Schwartz (Harvard University, USA), David Streets (Argonne National Laboratory, USA), Rita van Dingenen (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Harry Vallack (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Elisabetta Vignati (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy).

With advice from the High-level Consultative Group especially: Ivar Baste (UNEP, Switzerland), Adrián Fernández Bremauntz (National Institute of Ecology, Mexico), Harald Dovland (Ministry of Environment, Norway), Dale Evarts (US Environmental Protection Agency), Rob Maas (The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Netherlands), Pam Pearson (International Cryosphere Climate Initiative, Sweden/USA), Sophie Punte (Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities, Philippines), Andreas Schild (International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal), Surya Sethi (Former Principal Adviser Energy and Core Climate Negotiator, Government of India), George Varughese (Development Alternatives Group, India), Robert Watson (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK).





Editor: Bart Ullstein (Banson, UK).

Design and layout: Audrey Ringler (UNEP, Kenya).

Printing: UNON/Publishing Services Section/Nairobi, ISO 14001:2004-certified.

1	2	Cover photographs: credits	
3	1. Kevin Hicks		
4	5	2. Caramel/flickr	
7	8	3. Veerabhadran Ramanathan	
	9	4. Christian Lagerek/Shutterstock Images	
		5. John Ogren, NOAA	
		6. Raphaël V/flickr	
		7. Robert Marquez	
		8. Jerome Whittingham/Shutterstock Images	
		9. Brian Tan/Shutterstock Images	

UNEP promotes environmentally sound practices globally and in its own activities. This publication is printed on 100% recycled paper using vegetable based inks and other eco-friendly practices. Our distribution policy aims to reduce UNEP's carbon footprint.



# **Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone**

Summary for Decision Makers

# Table of Contents

<b>Main Messages</b> .....	<b>1</b>
The challenge .....	1
Reducing emissions .....	2
Benefits of emission reductions .....	3
Responses .....	3
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Limiting Near-Term Climate Changes and Improving Air Quality</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Identifying effective response measures .....	8
Achieving large emission reductions .....	8
Reducing near-term global warming .....	10
Staying within critical temperature thresholds .....	12
Benefits of early implementation .....	13
Regional climate benefits .....	13
Tropical rainfall patterns and the Asian monsoon .....	13
Decreased warming in polar and other glaciated regions .....	15
Benefits of the measures for human health .....	16
Benefits of the measures for crop yields .....	16
Relative importance and scientific confidence in the measures .....	18
Mechanisms for rapid implementation .....	19
Potential international regulatory responses .....	22
Opportunities for international financing and cooperation .....	23
<b>Concluding Remarks</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Glossary</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>28</b>

# Main Messages

**Scientific evidence and new analyses demonstrate that control of black carbon particles and tropospheric ozone through rapid implementation of proven emission reduction measures would have immediate and multiple benefits for human well-being.**

Black carbon exists as particles in the atmosphere and is a major component of soot, it has significant human health and climate impacts. At ground level, ozone is an air pollutant harmful to human health and ecosystems, and throughout the troposphere, or lower atmosphere, is also a significant greenhouse gas. Ozone is not directly emitted, but is produced from emissions of precursors of which methane and carbon monoxide are of particular interest here.


## THE CHALLENGE

1. **The climate is changing now, warming at the highest rate in polar and high-altitude regions.** Climate change, even in the near term, has the potential to trigger abrupt transitions such as the release of carbon from thawing permafrost and biodiversity loss. The world has warmed by about 0.8°C from pre-industrial levels, as reported by the



Credit: Kevin Hicks

*Traditional brick kilns in South Asia are a major source of black carbon. Improved kiln design in this region is significantly reducing emissions.*



Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have agreed that warming should not exceed 2°C above pre-industrial levels.

2. **Black carbon and ozone in the lower atmosphere are harmful air pollutants that have substantial regional and global climate impacts.** They disturb tropical rainfall and regional circulation patterns such as the Asian monsoon, affecting the livelihoods of millions of people.
3. **Black carbon's darkening of snow and ice surfaces increases their absorption of sunlight, which, along with atmospheric heating, exacerbates melting of snow and ice around the world, including in the Arctic, the Himalayas and other glaciated and snow-covered regions.** This affects the water cycle and increases risks of flooding.
4. **Black carbon, a component of particulate matter, and ozone both lead to adverse impacts on human health leading to premature deaths worldwide. Ozone is also the most important air pollutant responsible for reducing crop yields, and thus affects food security.**

## REDUCING EMISSIONS


5. **Reducing black carbon and tropospheric ozone now will slow the rate of climate change within the first half of this century. Climate benefits from reduced ozone are achieved by reducing emissions of some of its precursors, especially methane which is also a powerful greenhouse gas.** These short-lived climate forcers – methane, black carbon and ozone – are fundamentally different from longer-lived greenhouse gases, remaining in the atmosphere for only a relatively short time. Deep and immediate carbon dioxide reductions are required to protect long-term climate, as this cannot be achieved by addressing short-lived climate forcers.
6. **A small number of emission reduction measures targeting black carbon and ozone precursors could immediately begin to protect climate, public health, water and food security, and ecosystems.** Measures include the recovery of methane from coal, oil and gas extraction and transport, methane capture in waste management, use of clean-burning stoves for residential cooking, diesel particulate filters for vehicles and the banning of field burning of agricultural waste. Widespread implementation is achievable with existing technology but would require significant strategic investment and institutional arrangements.
7. **The identified measures complement but do not replace anticipated carbon dioxide reduction measures.** Major carbon dioxide reduction strategies mainly target the energy and large industrial sectors and therefore would not necessarily result in significant reductions in emissions of black carbon or the ozone precursors methane and carbon monoxide. Significant reduction of the short-lived climate forcers requires a specific strategy, as many are emitted from a large number of small sources.

## BENEFITS OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS

8. **Full implementation of the identified measures would reduce future global warming by 0.5°C (within a range of 0.2–0.7°C, Figure 1).** If the measures were to be implemented by 2030, they could halve the potential increase in global temperature projected for 2050 compared to the Assessment's reference scenario based on current policies and energy and fuel projections. The rate of regional temperature increase would also be reduced.
9. **Both near-term and long-term strategies are essential to protect climate.** Reductions in near-term warming can be achieved by control of the short-lived climate forcers whereas carbon dioxide emission reductions, beginning now, are required to limit long-term climate change. Implementing both reduction strategies is needed to improve the chances of keeping the Earth's global mean temperature increase to within the UNFCCC 2°C target.
10. **Full implementation of the identified measures would have substantial benefits in the Arctic, the Himalayas and other glaciated and snow-covered regions.** This could reduce warming in the Arctic in the next 30 years by about two-thirds compared to the projections of the Assessment's reference scenario. This substantially decreases the risk of changes in weather patterns and amplification of global warming resulting from changes in the Arctic. Regional benefits of the black carbon measures, such as their effects on snow- and ice-covered regions or regional rainfall patterns, are largely independent of their impact on global mean warming.
11. **Full implementation of the identified measures could avoid 2.4 million premature deaths (within a range of 0.7–4.6 million) and the loss of 52 million tonnes (within a range of 30–140 million tonnes), 1–4 per cent, of the global production of maize, rice, soybean and wheat each year (Figure 1).** The most substantial benefits will be felt immediately in or close to the regions where action is taken to reduce emissions, with the greatest health and crop benefits expected in Asia.

## RESPONSES

12. The identified measures are all currently in use in different regions around the world to achieve a variety of environment and development objectives. **Much wider and more rapid implementation is required to achieve the full benefits identified in this Assessment.**
13. **Achieving widespread implementation of the identified measures would be most effective if it were country- and region-specific, and could be supported by the considerable existing body of knowledge and experience.** Accounting for near-term climate co-benefits could leverage additional action and funding on a wider international scale which would facilitate more rapid implementation of the measures. Many measures achieve cost savings over time. However, initial capital investment could be problematic in some countries, necessitating additional support and investment.



**Figure 1.** Global benefits from full implementation of the identified measures in 2030 compared to the reference scenario. The climate change benefit is estimated for a given year (2050) and human health and crop benefits are for 2030 and beyond.

14. **At national and sub-national scales many of the identified measures could be implemented under existing policies designed to address air quality and development concerns. Improved cooperation within and between regions would enhance widespread implementation and address transboundary climate and air quality issues.** International policy and financing instruments to address the co-benefits of reducing emissions of short-lived climate forcers need development and strengthening. Supporting and extending existing relevant regional arrangements may provide an opportunity for more effective cooperation, implementation and assessment as well as additional monitoring and research.
15. **The Assessment concludes that there is confidence that immediate and multiple benefits will be realized upon implementation of the identified measures.** The degree of confidence varies according to pollutant, impact and region. For example, there is higher confidence in the effect of methane measures on global temperatures than in the effect of black carbon measures, especially where these relate to the burning of biomass. There is also high confidence that benefits will be realized for human health from reducing particles, including black carbon, and to crop yields from reducing tropospheric ozone concentrations. Given the scientific complexity of the issues, further research is required to optimize near-term strategies in different regions and to evaluate the cost-benefit ratio for individual measures.



# Introduction

Black carbon (BC, Box 1) and tropospheric ozone (O<sub>3</sub>, Box 2) are harmful air pollutants that also contribute to climate change. In recent years, scientific understanding of how BC and O<sub>3</sub> affect climate and public health has significantly improved. This has catalysed a demand for information and action from governments, civil society and other stakeholders. The United Nations (UN) has been requested to urgently provide science-based advice on action to reduce the impacts of these pollutants<sup>1</sup>.

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in consultation with partners, initiated an assessment designed to provide an interface between knowledge and action, science and policy, and to provide a scientifically credible basis for informed decision-making. The result is a comprehensive analysis of drivers of emissions, trends in concentrations, and impacts on climate, human health and ecosystems of BC, tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> and its precursors. BC, tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) are often referred to as short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs) as they have a short lifetime in the atmosphere (days to about a decade) relative to carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>).

The Assessment is an integrated analysis of multiple co-emitted pollutants reflecting the fact that these pollutants are not emitted in isolation (Boxes 1 and 2). The Assessment determined that under current policies, emissions of BC and O<sub>3</sub> precursors are expected globally either to increase or to remain roughly constant unless further mitigation action is taken.

*The Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone* convened more than 50

authors to assess the state of science and existing policy options for addressing these pollutants. The Assessment team examined policy responses, developed an outlook to 2070 illustrating the benefits of political decisions made today and the risks to climate, human health and crop yields over the next decades if action is delayed. Placing a premium on robust science and analysis, the Assessment was driven by four main policy-relevant questions:

- Which measures are likely to provide significant combined climate and air-quality benefits?
- How much can implementation of the identified measures reduce the rate of global mean temperature increase by mid-century?
- What are the multiple climate, health and crop-yield benefits that would be achieved by implementing the measures?
- By what mechanisms could the measures be rapidly implemented?

In order to answer these questions, the Assessment team determined that new analyses were needed. The Assessment therefore relies on published literature as much as possible and on new simulations by two independent climate-chemistry-aerosol models: one developed and run by the NASA-Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) and the other developed by the Max Planck Institute in Hamburg, Germany (ECHAM), and run at the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission in Ispra, Italy. The specific measures and emission estimates for use in developing this Assessment were selected using the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies (IIASA GAINS) model. For a more detailed description of the modelling see Chapter 1.

<sup>1</sup> The Anchorage Declaration of 24 April 2009, adopted by the Indigenous People's Global Summit on Climate Change; the Tromsø Declaration of 29 April 2009, adopted by the Sixth Ministerial Meeting of the Arctic Council and the 8th Session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues under the United Nations Economic and Social Council (May 2009) called on UNEP to conduct a fast track assessment of short-term drivers of climate change, specifically BC, with a view to initiating the negotiation of an international agreement to reduce emissions of BC. A need to take rapid action to address significant climate forcing agents other than CO<sub>2</sub>, such as BC, was reflected in the 2009 declaration of the G8 leaders (Responsible Leadership for a Sustainable Future, L'Aquila, Italy, 2009).

## Box 1: What is black carbon?

Black carbon (BC) exists as particles in the atmosphere and is a major component of soot. BC is not a greenhouse gas. Instead it warms the atmosphere by intercepting sunlight and absorbing it. BC and other particles are emitted from many common sources, such as cars and trucks, residential stoves, forest fires and some industrial facilities. BC particles have a strong warming effect in the atmosphere, darken snow when it is deposited, and influence cloud formation. Other particles may have a cooling effect in the atmosphere and all particles influence clouds. In addition to having an impact on climate, anthropogenic particles are also known to have a negative impact on human health.

Black carbon results from the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, wood and other biomass. Complete combustion would turn all carbon in the fuel into carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). In practice, combustion is never complete and CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), organic carbon (OC) particles and BC particles are all formed. There is a close relationship between emissions of BC (a warming agent) and OC (a cooling agent). They are always co-emitted, but in different proportions for different sources. Similarly, mitigation measures will have varying effects on the BC/OC mix.

The black in BC refers to the fact that these particles absorb visible light. This absorption leads to a disturbance of the planetary radiation balance and eventually to warming. The contribution to warming of 1 gramme of BC seen over a period of 100 years has been estimated to be anything from 100 to 2 000 times higher than that of 1 gramme of CO<sub>2</sub>. An important aspect of BC particles is that their lifetime in the atmosphere is short, days to weeks, and so emission reductions have an immediate benefit for climate and health.




Credit: NASA-MODIS



Credit: Caramel/flickr

*High emitting vehicles are a significant source of black carbon and other pollutants in many countries.*

*Haze with high particulate matter concentrations containing BC and OC, such as this over the Bay of Bengal, is widespread in many regions.*



Credit: Luisa Molina

Some of the largest emission reductions are obtained using diesel particle filters on high emitting vehicles. The exhibits above are actual particulate matter (PM) collection samples from an engine testing laboratory (International Council of Clean Transportation (ICCT)).

## Box 2: What is tropospheric ozone?

Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) is a reactive gas that exists in two layers of the atmosphere: the stratosphere (the upper layer) and the troposphere (ground level to ~10–15 km). In the stratosphere, O<sub>3</sub> is considered to be beneficial as it protects life on Earth from the sun's harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation. In contrast, at ground level, it is an air pollutant harmful to human health and ecosystems, and it is a major component of urban smog. In the troposphere, O<sub>3</sub> is also a significant greenhouse gas. The threefold increase of the O<sub>3</sub> concentration in the northern hemisphere during the past 100 years has made it the third most important contributor to the human enhancement of the global greenhouse effect, after CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>.

In the troposphere, O<sub>3</sub> is formed by the action of sunlight on O<sub>3</sub> precursors that have natural and anthropogenic sources. These precursors are CH<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), VOCs and CO. It is important to understand that reductions in both CH<sub>4</sub> and CO emissions have the potential to substantially reduce O<sub>3</sub> concentrations and reduce global warming. In contrast, reducing VOCs would clearly be beneficial but has a small impact on the global scale, while reducing NO<sub>x</sub> has multiple additional effects that result in its net impact on climate being minimal.



Credit: Luisa Molina



Credit: Warren Gretz/DOE/NREL

Tropospheric ozone is a major constituent of urban smog, left Tokyo, Japan; right Denver, Colorado, USA



# Limiting Near-Term Climate Changes and Improving Air Quality

## Identifying effective response measures

The Assessment identified those measures most likely to provide combined benefits, taking into account the fact that BC and O<sub>3</sub> precursors are co-emitted with different gases and particles, some of which cause warming and some of which, such as organic carbon (OC) and sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) lead to cooling. The selection criterion was that the measure had to be likely to reduce global climate change and also provide air quality benefits, so-called win-win measures. Those measures that provided a benefit for air quality but increased warming were not included in the selected measures. For example, measures that primarily reduce emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> were not included.

The identified measures (Table 1) were chosen from a subset of about 2 000 separate measures that can be applied to sources in IIASA's GAINS model. The selection was based on the net influence on warming, estimated using the metric Global Warming Potential (GWP), of all of the gases and particles that are affected by the measure. The selection gives a useful indication of the potential for realizing a win for climate. All emission reduction measures were assumed to benefit air quality by reducing particulate matter and/or O<sub>3</sub> concentrations.

This selection process identified a relatively small set of measures which nevertheless provide about 90 per cent of the climate benefit compared to the implementation of all 2 000 measures in GAINS. The final analysis of the benefits for temperature, human health and crop yields considered the

emissions of all substances resulting from the full implementation of the identified measures through the two global composition-climate models GISS and ECHAM (see Chapter 4). One hundred per cent implementation of the measures globally was used to illustrate the existing potential to reduce climate and air quality impacts, but this does not make any assumptions regarding the feasibility of full implementation everywhere. A discussion of the challenges involved in widespread implementation of the measures follows after the potential benefit has been demonstrated.

## Achieving large emission reductions

The packages of policy measures in Table 1 were compared to a reference scenario (Table 2). Figure 2 shows the effect of the packages of policy measures and the reference scenario relative to 2005 emissions.

There is tremendous regional variability in how emissions are projected to change by the year 2030 under the reference scenario. Emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> – a major O<sub>3</sub> precursor and a potent greenhouse gas – are expected to increase in the future (Figure 2). This increase will occur despite current and planned regulations, in large part due to anticipated economic growth and the increase in fossil fuel production projected to accompany it. In contrast, global emissions of BC and accompanying co-emitted pollutants are expected to remain relatively constant through to 2030. Regionally, reductions in BC emissions are expected due to tighter standards on road transport and more efficient combustion replacing use of biofuels in the residential and commercial sectors,

**Table 1. Measures that improve climate change mitigation and air quality and have a large emission reduction potential**

Measure <sup>1</sup>	Sector
<b>CH<sub>4</sub> measures</b>	
Extended pre-mine degasification and recovery and oxidation of CH <sub>4</sub> from ventilation air from coal mines	Extraction and transport of fossil fuel
Extended recovery and utilization, rather than venting, of associated gas and improved control of unintended fugitive emissions from the production of oil and natural gas	
Reduced gas leakage from long-distance transmission pipelines	
Separation and treatment of biodegradable municipal waste through recycling, composting and anaerobic digestion as well as landfill gas collection with combustion/utilization	Waste management
Upgrading primary wastewater treatment to secondary/tertiary treatment with gas recovery and overflow control	
Control of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from livestock, mainly through farm-scale anaerobic digestion of manure from cattle and pigs	Agriculture
Intermittent aeration of continuously flooded rice paddies	
<b>BC measures (affecting BC and other co-emitted compounds)</b>	
Diesel particle filters for road and off-road vehicles	Transport
Elimination of high-emitting vehicles in road and off-road transport	
Replacing coal by coal briquettes in cooking and heating stoves	Residential
Pellet stoves and boilers, using fuel made from recycled wood waste or sawdust, to replace current wood-burning technologies in the residential sector in industrialized countries	
Introduction of clean-burning biomass stoves for cooking and heating in developing countries <sup>2,3</sup>	
Substitution of clean-burning cookstoves using modern fuels for traditional biomass cookstoves in developing countries <sup>2,3</sup>	
Replacing traditional brick kilns with vertical shaft kilns and Hoffman kilns	Industry
Replacing traditional coke ovens with modern recovery ovens, including the improvement of end-of-pipe abatement measures in developing countries	
Ban of open field burning of agricultural waste <sup>2</sup>	Agriculture

<sup>1</sup> There are measures other than those identified in the table that could be implemented. For example, electric cars would have a similar impact to diesel particulate filters but these have not yet been widely introduced; forest fire controls could also be important but are not included due to the difficulty in establishing the proportion of fires that are anthropogenic.

<sup>2</sup> Motivated in part by its effect on health and regional climate, including areas of ice and snow.

<sup>3</sup> For cookstoves, given their importance for BC emissions, two alternative measures are included.

although these are offset to some extent by increased activity and economic growth. The regional BC emission trends, therefore, vary significantly, with emissions expected to decrease in North America and Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and in Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and to increase in Africa and South, West and Central Asia.

The full implementation of the selected measures by 2030 leads to significant reductions of SLCF emissions relative to current emissions or to the 2030 emissions in the reference scenario (Figure 2). It also reduces a high proportion of the emissions relative to the maximum reduction from the implementation of all 2 000 or so measures in the GAINS model. The measures designed to

reduce BC also have a considerable impact on OC, total fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and CO emissions, removing more than half the total anthropogenic emissions. The largest BC emission reductions are obtained through measures controlling incomplete combustion of biomass and diesel particle filters.

The major sources of CO<sub>2</sub> are different from those emitting most BC, OC, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO. Even in the few cases where there is overlap, such as diesel vehicles, the particle filters that reduce BC, OC and CO have minimal effect on CO<sub>2</sub>. The measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> over the next 20 years (Table 2) therefore hardly affect the emissions of BC, OC or CO. The influence of the CH<sub>4</sub> and BC measures is thus the same regardless of whether the CO<sub>2</sub> measures are imposed or not.

### Reducing near-term global warming

The Earth is projected to continue the rapid warming of the past several decades and, without additional mitigation efforts, under the reference scenario global mean temperatures are projected to rise about a further 1.3°C (with a range of 0.8–2.0°C) by the middle of this century, bringing the total

warming from pre-industrial levels to about 2.2°C (Figure 3). The Assessment shows that the measures targeted to reduce emissions of BC and CH<sub>4</sub> could greatly reduce global mean warming rates over the next few decades (Figure 3). Figure 1 shows that over half of the reduced global mean warming is achieved by the CH<sub>4</sub> measures and the remainder by BC measures. The greater confidence in the effect of CH<sub>4</sub> measures on warming is reflected in the narrower range of estimates.

When all measures are fully implemented, warming during the 2030s relative to the present day is only half as much as if no measures had been implemented. In contrast, even a fairly aggressive strategy to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario does little to mitigate warming over the next 20–30 years. In fact, sulphate particles, reflecting particles that offset some of the committed warming for the short time they are in the atmosphere, are derived from SO<sub>2</sub> that is co-emitted with CO<sub>2</sub> in some of the highest-emitting activities, including coal burning in large-scale combustion such as in power plants. Hence, CO<sub>2</sub> measures alone may temporarily enhance near-term warming as sulphates are reduced (Figure 3;


**Table 2. Policy packages used in the Assessment**

Scenario	Description <sup>1</sup>
Reference	Based on energy and fuel projections of the International Energy Agency (IEA) <i>World Energy Outlook 2009</i> and incorporating all presently agreed policies affecting emissions
CH <sub>4</sub> measures	Reference scenario plus the CH <sub>4</sub> measures
BC measures	Reference scenario plus the BC measures (the BC measures affect many pollutants, especially BC, OC, and CO)
CH <sub>4</sub> + BC measures	Reference scenario plus the CH <sub>4</sub> and BC measures
CO <sub>2</sub> measures	Emissions modelled using the assumptions of the IEA <i>World Energy Outlook 2009</i> 450 Scenario <sup>2</sup> and the IIASA GAINS database. Includes CO <sub>2</sub> measures only. The CO <sub>2</sub> measures affect other emissions, especially SO <sub>2</sub> <sup>3</sup>
CO <sub>2</sub> + CH <sub>4</sub> + BC measures	CO <sub>2</sub> measures plus CH <sub>4</sub> and BC measures

<sup>1</sup> In all scenarios, trends in all pollutant emissions are included through 2030, after which only trends in CO<sub>2</sub> are included.

<sup>2</sup> The 450 Scenario is designed to keep total forcing due to long-lived greenhouse gases (including CH<sub>4</sub> in this case) at a level equivalent to 450 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> by the end of the century.

<sup>3</sup> Emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> are reduced by 35–40 per cent by implementing CO<sub>2</sub> measures. A further reduction in sulphur emissions would be beneficial to health but would increase global warming. This is because sulphate particles cool the Earth by reflecting sunlight back to space.



**Figure 2.** Percentage change in anthropogenic emissions of the indicated pollutants in 2030 relative to 2005 for the reference, CH<sub>4</sub>, BC and CH<sub>4</sub> + BC measures scenarios. The CH<sub>4</sub> measures have minimal effect on emissions of anything other than CH<sub>4</sub>. The identified BC measures reduce a large proportion of total BC, OC and CO emissions. SO<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are hardly affected by the identified CH<sub>4</sub> and BC measures, while NO<sub>x</sub> and other PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are affected by the BC measures.

temperatures in the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario are slightly higher than those in the reference scenario during the period 2020–2040).

The CO<sub>2</sub> measures clearly lead to long-term benefits, with a dramatically lower warming rate in 2070 than under the scenario with only near-term CH<sub>4</sub> + BC measures. Owing to the long residence time of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, these long-term benefits will only be achieved if CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions are brought in quickly. In essence, the near-term CH<sub>4</sub> and BC measures examined in this Assessment are effectively decoupled from the CO<sub>2</sub> measures both in that they target

different source sectors and in that their impacts on climate change take place over different timescales.


Near-term warming may occur in sensitive regions and could cause essentially irreversible changes, such as loss of Arctic land-ice, release of CH<sub>4</sub> or CO<sub>2</sub> from Arctic permafrost and species loss. Indeed, the projected warming in the reference scenario is greater in the Arctic than globally. Reducing the near-term rate of warming hence decreases the risk of irreversible transitions that could influence the global climate system for centuries.

## Staying within critical temperature thresholds

Adoption of the near-term emission control measures described in this Assessment, together with measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, would greatly improve the chances of keeping Earth's temperature increase to less than 2°C relative to pre-industrial levels (Figure 3). With the CO<sub>2</sub> measures alone, warming exceeds 2°C before 2050. Even with both the CO<sub>2</sub> measures and CH<sub>4</sub> measures envisioned under the same IEA 450 Scenario, warming exceeds 2°C in the 2060s (see Chapter 5). However, the combination of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and BC measures holds the temperature increase below 2°C until around 2070. While CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions even larger than those in the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario would of course mitigate more

warming, actual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over the past decade have consistently exceeded the most pessimistic emission scenarios of the IPCC. Thus, it seems unlikely that reductions more stringent than those in the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario will take place during the next 20 years.

Examining the more stringent UNFCCC 1.5°C threshold, the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario exceeds this by 2030, whereas the near-term measures proposed in the Assessment delay that exceedance until after 2040. Again, while substantially deeper early reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than those in the CO<sub>2</sub> measures scenario could also delay the crossing of the 1.5°C temperature threshold, such reductions would undoubtedly be even more difficult to achieve. However, adoption of the Assessment's near-term measures (CH<sub>4</sub> + BC) along with the CO<sub>2</sub> reductions would provide



**Figure 3.** Observed deviation of temperature to 2009 and projections under various scenarios. Immediate implementation of the identified BC and CH<sub>4</sub> measures, together with measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, would greatly improve the chances of keeping Earth's temperature increase to less than 2°C relative to pre-industrial levels. The bulk of the benefits of CH<sub>4</sub> and BC measure are realized by 2040 (dashed line). *Explanatory notes:* Actual mean temperature observations through 2009, and projected under various scenarios thereafter, are shown relative to the 1890–1910 mean temperature. Estimated ranges for 2070 are shown in the bars on the right. A portion of the uncertainty is common to all scenarios, so that overlapping ranges do not mean there is no difference, for example, if climate sensitivity is large, it is large regardless of the scenario, so temperatures in all scenarios would be towards the high-end of their ranges.



a substantial chance of keeping the Earth's temperature increase below 1.5°C for the next 30 years.

### **Benefits of early implementation**

There would clearly be much less warming during 2020–2060 were the measures implemented earlier rather than later (Figure 4). Hence there is a substantial near-term climate benefit in accelerating implementation of the identified measures even if some of these might eventually be adopted owing to general air-quality and development concerns. Clearly the earlier implementation will also have significant additional human health and crop-yield benefits.

Accelerated adoption of the identified measures has only a modest effect on long-term climate change in comparison with waiting 20 years, however (Figure 4). This reinforces the conclusion that reducing emissions of O<sub>3</sub> precursors and BC can have substantial benefits in the near term, but that mitigating long-term climate change depends on reducing emissions of long-lived greenhouse gases such as CO<sub>2</sub>.

### **Regional climate benefits**


While global mean temperatures provide some indication of climate impacts, temperature changes can vary dramatically from place to place even in response to relatively uniform forcing from long-lived greenhouse gases. Figure 5 shows that warming is projected to increase for all regions with some variation under the reference scenario, while the Assessment's measures provide the benefit of reduced warming in all regions.

Climate change also encompasses more than just temperature changes. Precipitation, melting rates of snow and ice, wind patterns, and clouds are all affected, and these in turn have an impact on human well-being by influencing factors such as water availability, agriculture and land use.


Both O<sub>3</sub> and BC, as well as other particles, can influence many of the processes that lead to the formation of clouds and precipitation. They alter surface temperatures, affecting evaporation. By absorbing sunlight in the atmosphere, O<sub>3</sub> and especially BC can affect cloud formation, rainfall and weather patterns. They can change wind patterns by affecting the regional temperature contrasts that drive the winds, influencing where rain and snow fall. While some aspects of these effects are local, they can also affect temperature, cloudiness, and precipitation far away from the emission sources. The regional changes in all these aspects of climate will be significant, but are currently not well quantified.

### **Tropical rainfall patterns and the Asian monsoon**

Several detailed studies of the Asian monsoon suggest that regional forcing by absorbing particles substantially alters precipitation patterns (as explained in the previous section). The fact that both O<sub>3</sub> and particle changes are predominantly in the northern hemisphere means that they cause temperature gradients between the two hemispheres that influence rainfall patterns throughout the tropics. Implementation of the measures analysed in this Assessment would substantially decrease the regional atmospheric heating by particles (Figure 6), and are hence very likely to reduce regional shifts in precipitation. As the reductions of atmospheric forcing are greatest over the Indian sub-continent and other parts of Asia, the emission reductions may have a substantial effect on the Asian monsoon, mitigating disruption of traditional rainfall patterns. However, results from global climate models are not yet robust for the magnitude or timing of monsoon shifts resulting from either greenhouse gas increases or changes in absorbing particles. Nonetheless, results from climate models provide examples of the type of change that might be expected. Shifts in the timing and strength of precipitation can have significant impacts on human well-being because of changes in water



**Figure 4.** Projected global mean temperature changes for the reference scenario and for the CH<sub>4</sub> and BC measures scenario with emission reductions starting immediately or delayed by 20 years.



**Figure 5.** Comparison of regional mean warming over land (°C) showing the change in 2070 compared with 2005 for the reference scenario (Table 2) and the CH<sub>4</sub> + BC measures scenario. The lines on each bar show the range of estimates.

supply and agricultural productivity, drought and flooding. The results shown in Figure 6 suggest that implementation of the BC measures could also lead to a considerable reduction in the disruption of traditional rainfall patterns in Africa.

### Decreased warming in polar and other glaciated regions


Implementation of the measures would substantially slow, but not halt, the current rapid pace of temperature rise and other changes already occurring at the poles and high-altitude glaciated regions, and the reduced warming in these regions would likely be greater than that seen globally. The large benefits occur in part because the snow/ice darkening effect of BC is substantially greater than the cooling effect of reflective particles co-emitted with BC, leading to greater warming impacts in these areas than in areas without snow and ice cover.

Studies in the Arctic indicate that it is highly sensitive both to local pollutant emissions and those transported from sources close to the Arctic, as well as to the climate impact of pollutants in the mid-latitudes of the northern hemisphere. Much of the need for


implementation lies within Europe and North America. The identified measures could reduce warming in the Arctic by about 0.7°C (with a range of 0.2–1.3°C) in 2040. This is nearly two-thirds of the estimated 1.1°C (with a range of 0.7–1.7°C) warming projected for the Arctic under the reference scenario, and should substantially decrease the risk of global impacts from changes in this sensitive region, such as sea ice loss, which affects global albedo, and permafrost melt. Although not identified as a measure for use in this Assessment, the control of boreal forest fires may also be important in reducing impacts in the Arctic.

The Antarctic is a far less studied region in terms of SLCF impacts. However, there are studies demonstrating BC deposition even in central portions of the continent, and reductions in O<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> should slow warming in places like the Antarctic Peninsula, currently the spot on the globe showing the most rapid temperature rise of all.

The Himalayas and the Tibetan Plateau are regions where BC is likely to have serious impacts. In the high valleys of the Himalayas, for example, BC levels can be as high as in



**Figure 6.** Change in atmospheric energy absorption (Watts per square metre, W/m<sup>2</sup> as annual mean), an important factor driving tropical rainfall and the monsoons resulting from implementation of BC measures. The changes in absorption of energy by the atmosphere are linked with changes in regional circulation and precipitation patterns, leading to increased precipitation in some regions and decreases in others. BC solar absorption increases the energy input to the atmosphere by as much as 5–15 per cent, with the BC measures removing the bulk of that heating. Results are shown for two independent models to highlight the similarity in the projections of where large regional decreases would occur.



a mid-sized city. Reducing emissions from local sources and those carried by long-range transport should lower glacial melt in these regions, decreasing the risk of impacts such as catastrophic glacial lake outbursts.

### **Benefits of the measures for human health**

Fine particulate matter (measured as  $PM_{2.5}$ , which includes BC) and ground-level  $O_3$  damage human health.  $PM_{2.5}$  causes premature deaths primarily from heart disease and lung cancer, and  $O_3$  exposure causes deaths primarily from respiratory illness. The health benefit estimates in the Assessment are limited to changes in these specific causes of death and include uncertainty in the estimation methods. However, these pollutants also contribute significantly to other health impacts including acute and chronic bronchitis and other respiratory illness, non-fatal heart attacks, low birth weight and results in increased emergency room visits and hospital admissions, as well as loss of work and school days.

Under the reference scenario, that is, without implementation of the identified measures, changes in concentrations of  $PM_{2.5}$  and  $O_3$  in 2030, relative to 2005, would have substantial effects globally on premature deaths related to air pollution. By region, premature deaths from outdoor pollution are projected to change in line with emissions. The latter are expected to decrease significantly over North America and Europe due to implementation of the existing and expected legislation. Over Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean, the number of premature deaths from these pollutants is expected to show modest changes under the reference scenario (Figure 7). Over Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia and Pacific, premature deaths are projected to decrease substantially due to reductions in  $PM_{2.5}$  in some areas. However, in South, West and Central Asia, premature deaths are projected to rise significantly due to growth in emissions.

In contrast to the reference scenario, full implementation of the measures identified in the Assessment would substantially improve air quality and reduce premature deaths globally due to significant reductions in indoor and outdoor air pollution. The reductions in  $PM_{2.5}$  concentrations resulting from the BC measures would, by 2030, avoid an estimated 0.7–4.6 million annual premature deaths due to outdoor air pollution (Figure 1).

Regionally, implementation of the identified measures would lead to greatly improved air quality and fewer premature deaths, especially in Asia (Figure 7). In fact, more than 80 per cent of the health benefits of implementing all measures occur in Asia. The benefits are large enough for all the worsening trends in human health due to outdoor air pollution to be reversed and turned into improvements, relative to 2005. In Africa, the benefit is substantial, although not as great as in Asia.

### **Benefits of the measures for crop yields**


Ozone is toxic to plants. A vast body of literature describes experiments and observations showing the substantial effects of  $O_3$  on visible leaf health, growth and productivity for a large number of crops, trees and other plants. Ozone also affects vegetation composition and diversity. Globally, the full implementation of  $CH_4$  measures results in significant reductions in  $O_3$  concentrations leading to avoided yield losses of about 25 million tonnes of four staple crops each year. The implementation of the BC measures would account for about a further 25 million tonnes of avoided yield losses in comparison with the reference scenario (Figure 1). This is due to significant reductions in emissions of the precursors CO, VOCs and  $NO_x$  that reduce  $O_3$  concentrations.

The regional picture shows considerable differences. Under the reference scenario,  $O_3$  concentrations over Northeast, Southeast

Asia and Pacific are projected to increase, resulting in additional crop yield losses (Figures 7 and 8). In South, West and Central Asia, both health and agricultural damage are projected to rise (Figure 8). Damage to agriculture is projected to decrease strongly over North America and Europe while changing minimally over Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean. For the whole Asian region maize yields show a decrease of 1–15 per cent, while yields decrease by less than 5 per cent for wheat and rice. These yield losses translate into nearly 40 million tonnes for all crops for the whole Asian region, reflecting the substantial cultivated area exposed to elevated O<sub>3</sub> concentrations in India – in particular the Indo-Gangetic Plain region. Rice production is also affected, particularly in Asia where elevated O<sub>3</sub> concentrations are likely to continue to increase to 2030. Yield loss values for rice are uncertain, however, due to a lack of experimental evidence on concentration-response functions. In contrast, the European and North American regional analyses suggest that all crops will see an improvement in yields under the reference scenario between 2005 and 2030. Even greater improvements would be seen upon implementation of the measures.

The identified measures lead to greatly reduced O<sub>3</sub> concentrations, with substantial benefits to crop yields, especially in Asia (Figure 8). The benefits of the measures are large enough to reverse all the worsening trends seen in agricultural yields and turn them into improvements, relative to 2005, with the exception of crop yields in Northeast and Southeast Asia and Pacific. Even in that case, the benefits of full implementation are quite large, with the measures reducing by 60 per cent the crop losses envisaged in the reference scenario.

It should be stressed that the Assessment’s analyses include only the direct effect of changes in atmospheric composition on health and agriculture through changes in exposure to pollutants. As such, they do not include the benefits that avoided climate change would have on human health and agriculture due to factors such as reduced disruption of precipitation patterns, dimming, and reduced frequency of heat waves. Furthermore, even the direct influence on yields are based on estimates for only four staple crops, and impacts on leafy crops, productive grasslands and food quality were not included, so that the calculated values are likely to be an



**Figure 7.** Comparison of premature mortality (millions of premature deaths annually) by region, showing the change in 2030 in comparison with 2005 for the reference scenario emission trends and the reference plus CH<sub>4</sub> + BC measures. The lines on each bar show the range of estimates.



Credit: Veerabhadran Ramanathan


The measures identified in the Assessment include replacement of traditional cookstoves, such as that shown here, with clean burning stoves which would substantially improve air quality and reduce premature deaths due to indoor and outdoor air pollution.

## Relative importance and scientific confidence in the measures

Methane measures have a large impact on global and regional warming, which is achieved by reducing the greenhouse gases  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{O}_3$ . The climate mitigation impacts of the  $\text{CH}_4$  measures are also the most certain because there is a high degree of confidence in the warming effects of this greenhouse gas. The reduced methane and hence  $\text{O}_3$  concentrations also lead to significant benefits for crop yields.

The BC measures identified here reduce concentrations of BC, OC and  $\text{O}_3$  (largely through reductions in emissions of  $\text{CO}$ ). The warming effect of BC and  $\text{O}_3$  and the compensating cooling effect of OC, introduces large uncertainty in the net effect of some BC measures on global warming (Figure 1). Uncertainty in the impact of BC measures is also larger than that for  $\text{CH}_4$  because BC and OC can influence clouds that have multiple effects on climate that are not fully understood. This uncertainty in global impacts is particularly large for the

underestimate of the total impact. In addition, extrapolation of results from a number of experimental studies to assess  $\text{O}_3$  impacts on ecosystems strongly suggests that reductions in  $\text{O}_3$  could lead to substantial increases in the net primary productivity. This could have a substantial impact on carbon sequestration, providing additional climate benefits.



**Figure 8.** Comparison of crop yield losses (million tonnes annually of four key crops – wheat, rice, maize and soy combined) by region, showing the change in 2030 compared with 2005 for the reference emission trends and the reference with  $\text{CH}_4$  + BC measures. The lines on each bar show the range of estimates.



Credit: Veerabhadran Ramanathan

*Widespread haze over the Himalayas where BC concentrations can be as high as in mid-sized cities.*



Credit: Govind Joshi

*Reducing emissions should lower glacial melt and decrease the risk of outbursts from glacial lakes.*

measures concerning biomass cookstoves and open burning of biomass. Hence with respect to global warming, there is much higher confidence for measures that mitigate diesel emissions than biomass burning because the proportion of co-emitted cooling OC particles is much lower for diesel.

On the other hand, there is higher confidence that BC measures have large impacts on human health through reducing concentrations of inhalable particles, on crop yields through reduced  $O_3$ , and on climate phenomena such as tropical rainfall, monsoons and snow-ice melt. These regional impacts are largely independent of the measures' impact on global warming. In fact, regionally, biomass cookstoves and open biomass burning can have much larger effects than fossil fuels. This is because BC directly increases atmospheric heating by absorbing sunlight, which, according to numerous published studies, affects the monsoon and tropical rainfall, and this is largely separate from the effect of co-emitted OC. The same conclusion applies with respect to the impact of BC measures on snow and ice. BC, because it is dark, significantly increases absorption of sunlight by snow and ice when it is deposited on these bright surfaces. OC that is deposited along with BC has very little effect on sunlight reflected by snow and ice since these surfaces are already very white. Hence knowledge of these regional impacts is, in some cases, more robust than the global impacts, and with respect to reducing regional impacts, all of the BC measures are likely to be significant. Confidence is also high that a large

proportion of the health and crop benefits would be realized in Asia.

### **Mechanisms for rapid implementation**

In December 2010 the Parties to the UNFCCC agreed that warming should not exceed  $2^\circ\text{C}$  above pre-industrial levels during this century. This Assessment shows that measures to reduce SLCFs, implemented in combination with  $\text{CO}_2$  control measures, would increase the chances of staying below the  $2^\circ\text{C}$  target. The measures would also slow the rate of near-term temperature rise and also lead to significant improvements in health, decreased disruption of regional precipitation patterns and water supply, and in improved food security. The impacts of the measures on temperature change are felt over large geographical areas, while the air quality impacts are more localized near the regions where changes in emissions take place. Therefore, areas that control their emissions will receive the greatest human health and food supply benefits; additionally many of the climate benefits will be felt close to the region taking action.

The benefits would be realized in the near term, thereby providing additional incentives to overcome financial and institutional hurdles to the adoption of these measures. Countries in all regions have successfully implemented the identified measures to some degree for multiple environment and development objectives. These experiences



Credit: Brian Yap

*Field burning of agricultural waste is a common way to dispose of crop residue in many regions.*

provide a considerable body of knowledge and potential models for others that wish to take action.

In most countries, mechanisms are already in place, albeit at different levels of maturity, to address public concern regarding air pollution problems. Mechanisms to tackle anthropogenic greenhouse gases are less well deployed, and systems to maximize the co-benefits from reducing air pollution and measures to address climate change are virtually non-existent. Coordination across institutions to address climate, air pollution, energy and development policy is particularly important to enhance achievement of all these goals simultaneously.

Many BC control measures require implementation by multiple actors on diffuse emission sources including diesel vehicles, field burning, cookstoves and residential heating. Although air quality and emission standards exist for particulate matter in some regions, they may or may not reduce BC, and implementation remains a challenge. Relevance, benefits and costs of different

measures vary from region to region. Many of the measures entail cost savings but require substantial upfront investments. Accounting for air quality, climate and development co-benefits will be key to scaling up implementation.

Methane is one of the six greenhouse gases governed by the Kyoto Protocol, but there are no explicit targets for it. Many CH<sub>4</sub> measures are cost-effective and its recovery is, in many cases, economically profitable. There have been many Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects in key CH<sub>4</sub> emitting sectors in the past, though few such projects have been launched in recent years because of lack of financing.

Case studies from both developed and developing countries (Box 3) show that there are technical solutions available to deliver all of the measures (see Chapter 5). Given appropriate policy mechanisms the measures can be implemented, but to achieve the benefits at the scale described much wider implementation is required.



Credit: US EPA

*To the naked eye, no emissions from an oil storage tank are visible (left), but with the aid of an infrared camera, escaping CH<sub>4</sub> is evident (right).*



## Box 3: Case studies of implementation of measures

### **CH<sub>4</sub> measures**

#### **Landfill biogas energy**

Landfill CH<sub>4</sub> emissions contribute 10 per cent of the total greenhouse gas emissions in Mexico. Bioenergia de Nuevo León S.A. de C.V. (BENLESA) is using landfill biogas as fuel. Currently, the plant has an installed capacity of 12.7 megawatts. Since its opening in September 2003, it has avoided the release of more than 81 000 tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub>, equivalent to the reduction in emissions of 1.7 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, generating 409 megawatt hours of electricity. A partnership between government and a private company turned a liability into an asset by converting landfill gas (LFG) into electricity to help drive the public transit system by day and light city streets by night. LFG projects can also be found in Armenia, Brazil, China, India, South Africa, and other countries.

#### **Recovery and flaring from oil and natural gas production**

Oil drilling often brings natural gas, mostly CH<sub>4</sub>, to the surface along with the oil, which is often vented to the atmosphere to maintain safe pressure in the well. To reduce these emissions, associated gas may be flared and converted to CO<sub>2</sub>, or recovered, thus eliminating most of its warming potential and removing its ability to form ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). In India, Oil India Limited (OIL), a national oil company, is undertaking a project to recover the gas, which is presently flared, from the Kumchai oil field, and send it to a gas processing plant for eventual transport and use in the natural gas grid. Initiatives in Angola, Indonesia and other countries are flaring and recovering associated gas yielding large reductions in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and new sources of fuel for local markets.

#### **Livestock manure management**

In Brazil, a large CDM project in the state of Minas Gerais seeks to improve waste management systems to reduce the amount of CH<sub>4</sub> and other greenhouse gas emissions associated with animal effluent. The core of the project is to replace open-air lagoons with ambient temperature anaerobic digesters to capture and combust the resulting biogas. Over the course of a 10-year period (2004–2014) the project plans to reduce CH<sub>4</sub> and other greenhouse gas emissions by a total of 50 580 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent. A CDM project in Hyderabad, India, will use the poultry litter CH<sub>4</sub> to generate electricity which will power the plant and supply surplus electricity to the Andhra Pradesh state grid.



*Farm scale anaerobic digestion of manure from cattle is one of the key CH<sub>4</sub> measures*

Credit: Raphael V/Mickr

## Box 3: Case studies of implementation of measures *(continued)*

### **BC measures**

#### **Diesel particle filters**

In Santiago, municipal authorities, responding to public concern on air pollution, adopted a new emissions standard for urban buses, requiring installation of diesel particle filters (DPFs). Currently about one-third of the fleet is equipped with filters; it is expected that the entire fleet will be retrofitted by 2018. New York City adopted regulations in 2000 and 2003 requiring use of DPFs in city buses and off-road construction equipment working on city projects. London fitted DPFs to the city's bus fleet over several years beginning in 2003. Low emission zones in London and other cities create incentives for diesel vehicle owners to retrofit with particle filters, allowing them to drive within the city limits. Implementation in developing regions will require greater availability of low sulphur diesel, which is an essential prerequisite for using DPFs.

#### **Improved brick kilns**

Small-scale traditional brick kilns are a significant source of air pollution in many developing countries; there are an estimated 20 000 in Mexico alone, emitting large quantities of particulates. An improved kiln design piloted in Ciudad Juárez, near the border with the United States of America, improved efficiency by 50 per cent and decreased particulate pollution by 80 per cent. In the Bac Ninh province of Viet Nam, a project initiated with the aim of reducing ambient air pollution levels and deposition on surrounding rice fields piloted the use of a simple limestone scrubbing emissions control device and demonstrated how a combination of regulation, economic tools, monitoring and technology transfer can significantly improve air quality.



Credit: Alba Corral Avitia



Credit: Robert Marquez

*A traditional brick kiln (left) and an improved (right) operating in Mexico.*

### **Potential international regulatory responses**

International responses would facilitate rapid and widespread implementation of the measures. Since a large portion of the impacts of SLCFs on climate, health, food security and ecosystems is regional or local in nature, regional approaches incorporating national actions could prove promising for their cost-effective reduction. This approach is still in its very early stage in most regions of the world. For example, the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution

(CLRTAP) recently agreed to address BC in the revision of the Gothenburg Protocol in 2011 and to consider the impacts of CH<sub>4</sub> as an O<sub>3</sub> precursor in the longer term.

Other regional agreements (Box 4) are fairly new, and predominantly concentrate on scientific cooperation and capacity building. These arrangements might serve as a platform from which to address the emerging challenges related to air pollution from BC and tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> and provide potential vehicles for finance, technology transfer and capacity development. Sharing good practices

## Box 4: Examples of regional atmospheric pollution agreements

The Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP) is a mature policy framework covering Europe, Central Asia and North America. Similar regional agreements have emerged in the last decades in other parts of the world. The Malé Declaration on Control and Prevention of Air Pollution and its Likely Transboundary Effects for South Asia was agreed in 1998 and addresses air quality including tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> and particulate matter. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Haze Protocol is a legally binding agreement addresses particulate pollution from forest fires in Southeast Asia. In Africa there are a number of framework agreements between countries in southern Africa (Lusaka Agreement), in East Africa (Nairobi Agreement); and West and Central Africa (Abidjan Agreement). In Latin America and the Caribbean a ministerial level intergovernmental network on air pollution has been formed and there is a draft framework agreement and ongoing collaboration on atmospheric issues under UNEP's leadership.

on an international scale, as is occurring within the Arctic Council, in a coordinated way could provide a helpful way forward.

This Assessment did not assess the cost-effectiveness of different identified measures or policy options under different national circumstances. Doing so would help to inform national air quality and climate policy makers, and support implementation on a wider scale. Further study and analyses of the local application of BC and tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> reduction technologies, costs and regulatory approaches could contribute to advancing adoption of effective action at multiple levels. This work would be best done based on local knowledge. Likewise further evaluation of the regional and global benefits of implementing specific measures by region would help to better target policy efforts. In support of these efforts, additional modelling and monitoring and measurement activities are needed to fill remaining knowledge gaps.

### Opportunities for international financing and cooperation

The largest benefits would be delivered in regions where it is unlikely that significant national funds would be allocated to these issues due to other pressing development needs. International financing and technology support would catalyse and accelerate the adoption of the identified measures at sub-national, national and regional levels,

especially in developing countries. Financing would be most effective if specifically targeted towards pollution abatement actions that maximize air quality and climate benefits.

Funds and activities to address CH<sub>4</sub> (such as the Global Methane Initiative; and the Global Methane Fund or Prototype Methane Financing Facility) and cookstoves (the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves) exist or are under consideration and may serve as models for other sectors. Expanded action will depend on donor recognition of the opportunity represented by SLCF reductions as a highly effective means to address near-term climate change both globally and especially in sensitive regions of the world.

Black carbon and tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> may also be considered as part of other environment, development and energy initiatives such as bilateral assistance, the UN Development Assistance Framework, the World Bank Energy Strategy, the Poverty and Environment Initiative of UNEP and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), interagency cooperation initiatives in the UN system such as the Environment Management Group and UN Energy, the UN Foundation, and the consideration by the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) of the institutional framework for sustainable development. These, and others, could take advantage of the opportunities identified in the Assessment to achieve their objectives.



Aerosol measurement instruments

Credit: John Ogren, NOAA

## Concluding Remarks

The Assessment establishes the climate co-benefits of air-quality measures that address black carbon and tropospheric ozone and its precursors, especially CH<sub>4</sub> and CO. The measures identified to address these short-lived climate forcers have been successfully tried around the world and have been shown to deliver significant and immediate development and environmental benefits in the local areas and regions where they are implemented.

Costs and benefits of the identified measures are region specific, and implementation often faces financial, regulatory and institutional barriers. However, widespread implementation of the identified measures can be effectively leveraged by recognizing that near-term strategies can slow the rate of global and regional warming, improving our chances of keeping global temperature increase below bounds that significantly lower the probability of major disruptive climate events. Such leverage should spur multilateral initiatives that focus on local priorities and contribute to the global common good.

It is nevertheless stressed that this Assessment does not in any way suggest postponing immediate and aggressive global action on anthropogenic greenhouse gases; in fact it requires such action on CO<sub>2</sub>. This Assessment concludes that the chance of success with such longer-term measures can be greatly enhanced by simultaneously addressing short-lived climate forcers.

The benefits identified in this Assessment can be realised with a concerted effort globally to reduce the concentrations of black carbon and tropospheric ozone. A strategy to achieve this, when developed and implemented, will lead to considerable benefits for human well-being.



Credit: Christian Lagarek

## Glossary

<b>Aerosol</b>	A collection of airborne solid or liquid particles (excluding pure water), with a typical size between 0.01 and 10 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) and residing in the atmosphere for at least several hours. Aerosols may be of either natural or anthropogenic origin. Aerosols may influence climate in two ways: directly through scattering or absorbing radiation, and indirectly through acting as condensation nuclei for cloud formation or modifying the optical properties and lifetime of clouds.
<b>Biofuels</b>	Biofuels are non-fossil fuels. They are energy carriers that store the energy derived from organic materials (biomass), including plant materials and animal waste.
<b>Biomass</b>	In the context of energy, the term biomass is often used to refer to organic materials, such as wood and agricultural wastes, which can be burned to produce energy or converted into a gas and used for fuel.
<b>Black carbon</b>	Operationally defined aerosol species based on measurement of light absorption and chemical reactivity and/or thermal stability. Black carbon is formed through the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, biofuel, and biomass, and is emitted in both anthropogenic and naturally occurring soot. It consists of pure carbon in several linked forms. Black carbon warms the Earth by absorbing heat in the atmosphere and by reducing albedo, the ability to reflect sunlight, when deposited on snow and ice.
<b>Carbon sequestration</b>	The uptake and storage of carbon. Trees and plants, for example, absorb carbon dioxide, release the oxygen and store the carbon.
<b>Fugitive emissions</b>	Substances (gas, liquid, solid) that escape to the air from a process or a product without going through a smokestack; for example, emissions of methane escaping from coal, oil, and gas extraction not caught by a capture system.
<b>Global warming potential (GWP)</b>	The global warming potential of a gas or particle refers to an estimate of the total contribution to global warming over a particular time that results from the emission of one unit of that gas or particle relative to one unit of the reference gas, carbon dioxide, which is assigned a value of one.
<b>High-emitting vehicles</b>	Poorly tuned or defective vehicles (including malfunctioning emission control system), with emissions of air pollutants (including particulate matter) many times greater than the average.
<b>Hoffman kiln</b>	Hoffmann kilns are the most common kiln used in production of bricks. A Hoffmann kiln consists of a main fire passage surrounded on each side by several small rooms which contain pallets of bricks. Each room is connected to the next room by a passageway carrying hot gases from the fire. This design makes for a very efficient use of heat and fuel.
<b>Incomplete combustion</b>	A reaction or process which entails only partial burning of a fuel. Combustion is almost always incomplete and this may be due to a lack of oxygen or low temperature, preventing the complete chemical reaction.
<b>Oxidation</b>	The chemical reaction of a substance with oxygen or a reaction in which the atoms in an element lose electrons and its valence is correspondingly increased.

<b>Ozone</b>	Ozone, the triatomic form of oxygen (O <sub>3</sub> ), is a gaseous atmospheric constituent. In the troposphere, it is created both naturally and by photochemical reactions involving gases resulting from human activities (it is a primary component of photochemical smog). In high concentrations, tropospheric ozone can be harmful to a wide range of living organisms. Tropospheric ozone acts as a greenhouse gas. In the stratosphere, ozone is created by the interaction between solar ultraviolet radiation and molecular oxygen. Stratospheric ozone provides a shield from ultraviolet B (UVB) radiation.
<b>Ozone precursor</b>	Chemical compounds, such as carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH <sub>4</sub> ), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC), and nitrogen oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> ), which in the presence of solar radiation react with other chemical compounds to form ozone in the troposphere.
<b>Particulate matter</b>	Very small pieces of solid or liquid matter such as particles of soot, dust, or other aerosols.
<b>Pre-industrial</b>	Prior to widespread industrialisation and the resultant changes in the environment. Typically taken as the period before 1750.
<b>Radiation</b>	Energy transfer in the form of electromagnetic waves or particles that release energy when absorbed by an object.
<b>Radiative forcing</b>	Radiative forcing is a measure of the change in the energy balance of the Earth-atmosphere system with space. It is defined as the change in the net, downward minus upward, irradiance (expressed in Watts per square metre) at the tropopause due to a change in an external driver of climate change, such as, for example, a change in the concentration of carbon dioxide or the output of the Sun.
<b>Smog</b>	Classically a combination of smoke and fog in which products of combustion, such as hydrocarbons, particulate matter and oxides of sulphur and nitrogen, occur in concentrations that are harmful to human beings and other organisms. More commonly, it occurs as photochemical smog, produced when sunlight acts on nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons to produce tropospheric ozone.
<b>Stratosphere</b>	Region of the atmosphere between the troposphere and mesosphere, having a lower boundary of approximately 8 km at the poles to 15 km at the equator and an upper boundary of approximately 50 km. Depending upon latitude and season, the temperature in the lower stratosphere can increase, be isothermal, or even decrease with altitude, but the temperature in the upper stratosphere generally increases with height due to absorption of solar radiation by ozone.
<b>Trans-boundary movement</b>	Movement from an area under the national jurisdiction of one State to or through an area under the national jurisdiction of another State or to or through an area not under the national jurisdiction of any State.
<b>Transport (atmospheric)</b>	The movement of chemical species through the atmosphere as a result of large-scale atmospheric motions.
<b>Troposphere</b>	The lowest part of the atmosphere from the surface to about 10 km in altitude in mid-latitudes (ranging from 9 km in high latitudes to 16 km in the tropics on average) where clouds and "weather" phenomena occur. In the troposphere temperatures generally decrease with height.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BC	black carbon
BENLESA	Latin America Bioenergia de Nuevo León S.A. de C.V.
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane
CLRTAP	Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
DPF	diesel particle filter
ECHAM	Climate-chemistry-aerosol model developed by the Max Planck Institute in Hamburg, Germany
G8	Group of Eight: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States
GAINS	Greenhouse Gas and Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies
GISS	Goddard Institute for Space Studies
GWP	global warming potential
IEA	International Energy Agency
IIASA	International Institute for Applied System Analysis
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LFG	landfill gas
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrogen oxides
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
OC	organic carbon
OIL	Oil India Limited
PM	particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> has a diameter of 2.5µm or less)
ppm	parts per million
SLCF	short-lived climate forcer
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulphur dioxide
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UV	ultraviolet
VOC	volatile organic compound
WMO	World Meteorological Organization



## Acknowledgements

The United Nations Environment Programme and World Meteorological Organization would like to thank the Assessment Chair and Vice-Chairs, the members of the High-level Consultative Group, all the lead and contributing authors, reviewers and review editors, and the coordination team for their contribution to the development of this Assessment.

The following individuals have provided input to the Assessment. Authors, reviewers and review editors have contributed to this report in their individual capacity and their organizations are mentioned for identification purposes only.

**Chair:** Drew Shindell (National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies, USA).

**Vice-chairs:** Veerabhadran Ramanathan (Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA), Frank Raes (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Luis Cifuentes (The Catholic University of Chile, Chile) and N. T. Kim Oanh (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand).

**High-level Consultative Group:** Ivar Baste (UNEP, Switzerland), Harald Dovland (Ministry of Environment, Norway), Dale Everts (US Environmental Protection Agency), Adrián Fernández Bremauntz (National Institute of Ecology, Mexico), Rob Maas (The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Netherlands), Pam Pearson (International Cryosphere Climate Initiative, Sweden/USA), Sophie Punte (Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities, Philippines), Andreas Schild (International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal), Surya Sethi (Former Principal Adviser Energy and Core Climate Negotiator, Government of India), George Varughese (Development Alternatives Group, India), Robert Watson (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK).

**Scientific Coordinator:** Johan C. I. Kuylenstierna (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK).

**Coordinating Lead Authors:** Frank Raes (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), David Streets (Argonne National Laboratory, USA), David Fowler (The Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), Lisa Emberson (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Martin Williams (King's College London, UK).

**Lead Authors:** Hajime Akimoto (Asia Center for Air Pollution Research, Japan), Markus Amann (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Susan Anenberg (US Environmental Protection Agency), Paulo Artaxo (University of Sao Paulo, Brazil), Greg Carmichael (University of Iowa, USA), William Collins (UK Meteorological Office, UK), Mark Flanner (University of Michigan, USA), Greet Janssens-Maenhout (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Kevin Hicks (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Zbigniew Klimont (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Kaarle Kupiainen (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Johan C. I. Kuylenstierna (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Nicholas Muller (Middlebury College, USA), Veerabhadran Ramanathan (Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA), Erika Rosenthal (Earth Justice, USA), Joel Schwartz (Harvard University, USA), Sara Terry (US Environmental Protection Agency), Harry Vallack (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Rita Van Dingenen (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Elisabetta Vignati (Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Italy), Chien Wang (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA).



**Contributing Authors:** Madhoolika Agrawal (Banares Hindu University, India), Kirstin Aunan (Centre for International Climate and Environmental Research, Norway), Gufran Beig (Indian Institute of Tropical Meteorology, India), Luis Cifuentes (The Catholic University of Chile, Chile), Devaraj de Condappa (Stockholm Environment Institute, USA), Sarath Guttikunda (Urban Emissions, India/Desert Research Institute, USA), Syed Iqbal Hasnain (Calicut University, India), Christopher Heyes (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Lena Höglund Isaksson (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Jean-François Lamarque (National Center for Atmospheric Research, USA), Hong Liao (Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China), Zifeng Lu (Argonne National Laboratory, USA), Vishal Mehta (Stockholm Environment Institute, USA), Lina Mercado (The Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), N. T. Kim Oanh (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand), T. S. Panwar (The Energy and Resources Institute, India), David Purkey (Stockholm Environment Institute, USA), Maheswar Rupakheti (Asian Institute of Technology-UNEP Regional Resource Center for Asia and the Pacific, Thailand), Michael Schulz (Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Norway), Stephen Sitch (University of Leeds, UK), Michael Walsh (International Council for Clean Transportation, USA), Yuxuan Wang (Tsinghua University, China), Jason West (University of North Carolina, USA), Eric Zusman (Institute for Global Environmental Studies, Japan).

**External Reviewers:** John Van Aardenne (European Environment Agency, Denmark), John Bachmann (Vision Air Consulting, USA), Angela Bandemehr (US Environmental Protection Agency), Ellen Baum (Clean Air Task Force, USA), Livia Bizikova (International Institute for Sustainable Development, Canada), Elizabeth Bush (Environment Canada), Zoë Chafe (University of California, Berkeley (Energy and Resources Group and School of Public Health), USA), Linda Chappell (US Environmental Protection Agency), Dennis Clare (Institute of Governance and Sustainable Development, USA), Hugh Coe (University of Manchester, UK), Benjamin DeAngelo (US Environmental Protection Agency), Pat Dolwick (US Environmental Protection Agency), Neil Frank (US Environmental Protection Agency), Sandro Fuzzi (Istituto di Scienze dell'Atmosfera e del Clima – CNR, Italy), Nathan Gillett (Environment Canada), Michael Geller (US Environmental Protection Agency), Elisabeth Gilmore (US Environmental Protection Agency), Peringe Grennfelt (Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Sweden), Andrew Grieshop (University of British Columbia, Canada), Paul Gunning (US Environmental Protection Agency), Rakesh Hooda (The Energy and Resources Institute, India), Bryan Hubbell (US Environmental Protection Agency), Mark Jacobson (Stanford University, USA), Yutaka Kondo (University of Tokyo, Japan), David Lavoué (Environment Canada), Richard Leitch (Environment Canada), Peter Louie (Hong Kong Environmental Protection Department, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China), Gunnar Luderer (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Germany), Andy Miller (US Environmental Protection Agency), Ray Minjares (International Council on Clean Transportation, USA), Jacob Moss (US Environmental Protection Agency), Brian Muehling (US Environmental Protection Agency), Venkatesh Rao (US Environmental Protection Agency), Jessica Seddon (Wallach) (US Environmental Protection Agency), Marcus Sarofim (US Environmental Protection Agency), Erika Sasser (US Environmental Protection Agency), Sangeeta Sharma (Environment Canada), Kirk Smith (University of California, USA), Joseph Somers (US Environmental Protection Agency), Darrell Sonntag (US Environmental Protection Agency), Robert Stone (The Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA), Jessica Strefler (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Germany).



**Review Editors:** Umesh Kulshrestha (Jawaharlal Nehru University, India), Hiromasa Ueda (Kyoto University, Japan), Piers Forster (University of Leeds, UK), Henning Rodhe (Stockholm University, Sweden), Madhav Karki (International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal), Ben Armstrong (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK), Luisa Molina (Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Molina Center for Energy and the Environment, USA), May Ajero (Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities, Philippines).

**Coordination team:** Volodymyr Demkine (UNEP, Kenya), Salif Diop (UNEP, Kenya), Peter Gilruth (UNEP, Kenya), Len Barrie (WMO, Switzerland), Liisa Jalkanen (WMO, Switzerland), Johan C. I. Kuylenstierna (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Kevin Hicks (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK).

**Administrative support:** Nyokabi Mwangi (UNEP, Kenya), Chantal Renaudot (WMO, Switzerland), Emma Wright (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK), Tim Morrissey (Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, UK).

UNEP and WMO would also like to thank the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), UK; Joint Research Centre (JRC)-European Commission, Italy; International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), Nepal; and International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Austria for hosting the Assessment scoping and production meetings and the following individuals from around the world for their valuable comments, provision of data and advice:

Joseph Alcamo (UNEP, Kenya), Sribas Bhattacharya (Stockholm Environment Institute, Sweden), Banmali Pradhan Bidya (International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal), Tami Bond (University of Illinois, USA), David Carlson (International Polar Year/British Antarctic Survey, UK), Bradnee Chambers (UNEP, Kenya), Paolo Cristofanelli (EVK2CNR, Italy), Janusz Cofala (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Prakash Manandhanr Durga (Department of Hydrology and Meteorology, Nepal), David Fahey (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory, USA), Sara Feresu (Institute of Environmental Studies, Zimbabwe), Francis X. Johnson, (Stockholm Environment Institute, Sweden), Rijan Bhakta Kayastha (Kathmandu University, Nepal), Terry Keating (US Environmental Protection Agency), Marcel Kok (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Netherlands), Richard Mills (International Union of Air Pollution Prevention and Environmental Protection Associations, UK and Global Atmospheric Pollution Forum), Lev Neretin, (UNEP, USA), Neeyati Patel (UNEP, Kenya), Kristina Pistone (Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA), Peter Prokosch (GRID-Arendal, Norway), Mark Radka (UNEP, France), N. H. Ravindranath (Centre for Sustainable Technologies, India), A. R. Ravishankara (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA), Lars-Otto Reiersen (Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Norway), Vladimir Ryabinin (WMO, Switzerland), Wolfgang Schöpp (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria), Basanta Shrestha (International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal), Clarice Wilson (UNEP, Kenya), Ron Witt (UNEP, Switzerland), Valentin Yemelín (GRID-Arendal, Norway).

## **About the Assessment:**

Growing scientific evidence of significant impacts of black carbon and tropospheric ozone on human well-being and the climatic system has catalysed a demand for information and action from governments, civil society and other main stakeholders. The United Nations, in consultation with partner expert institutions and stakeholder representatives, organized an integrated assessment of black carbon and tropospheric ozone, and its precursors, to provide decision makers with a comprehensive assessment of the problem and policy options needed to address it.

An assessment team of more than 50 experts was established, supported by the United Nations Environment Programme, World Meteorological Organization and Stockholm Environment Institute. The Assessment was governed by the Chair and four Vice-Chairs, representing Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean and North America regions. A High-level Consultative Group, comprising high-profile government advisors, respected scientists, representatives of international organizations and civil society, provided strategic advice on the assessment process and preparation of the *Summary for Decision Makers*.

The draft of the underlying Assessment and its *Summary for Decision Makers* were extensively reviewed and revised based on comments from internal and external review experts. Reputable experts served as review editors to ensure that all substantive expert review comments were afforded appropriate consideration by the authors. The text of the *Summary for Decision Makers* was accepted by the Assessment Chair, Vice-Chairs and the High-level Consultative Group members.

[www.unep.org](http://www.unep.org)

United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552 - 00100 Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: +254 20 762 1234  
Fax: +254 20 762 3927  
e-mail: [uneppub@unep.org](mailto:uneppub@unep.org)  
[www.unep.org](http://www.unep.org)



This document summarizes findings and conclusions of the assessment report: **Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone**. The assessment looks into all aspects of anthropogenic emissions of black carbon and tropospheric ozone precursors, such as methane. It analyses the trends in emissions of these substances and the drivers of these emissions; summarizes the science of atmospheric processes where these substances are involved; discusses related impacts on the climatic system, human health, crops in vulnerable regions and ecosystems; and societal responses to the environmental changes caused by those impacts. The Assessment examines a large number of potential measures to reduce harmful emissions, identifying a small set of specific measures that would likely produce the greatest benefits, and which could be implemented with currently available technology. An outlook up to 2070 is developed illustrating the benefits of those emission mitigation policies and measures for human well-being and climate. The Assessment concludes that rapid mitigation of anthropogenic black carbon and tropospheric ozone emissions would complement carbon dioxide reduction measures and would have immediate benefits for human well-being.

The Summary for Decision Makers was prepared by a writing team with inputs from the members of the High-level Consultative Group and with support from UNEP and WMO. It is intended to serve decision makers at all levels as a guide for assessment, planning and management for the future.

ISBN: 978-92-807-3142-2  
Job. No: DEW/1352/NA