

# An Economist Tries to Grapple with Catastrophic Climate Change

Martin L. Weitzman **European Lecture Tour** (May-June, 2011)

---

*A Black Swan is a highly improbable event with three principal characteristics: it is unpredictable; it carries a massive impact; and, after the fact, we concoct an explanation that makes it appear less random, and more predictable than it was – Nassim Taleb*

---

*The climate system is an angry beast and we are poking it with sticks  
– Wally Broecker*

## Preliminary Probing and Basic Issues

- Climate change characterized by deep structural uncertainties and an inability to exclude catastrophes. Sample of worrisome aspects:
- 800K Antarctic ice core record of CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature.
- Methane hydrates in permafrost and continental shelves.
- Unlimited downside liability. All eggs in one planetary basket.
- How bad might it get? With what probabilities? Do bad consequences increase faster or slower than probabilities decline?
- Are conclusions from existing CBAs and IAMs robust to the modeling of climate extremes? Is policy advice robust?
- Spirit of these numerical exercises: They are a bit wild, and I am a bit wild in presenting them, but no sense in pretending false precision. Exercises motivated by the need to perform simple and transparent “stress tests” on climate-change CBAs and IAMs.
- Representative of a line of research. Major finding: “robustness of non-robustness” in big-picture climate change economics.

# Climate Sensitivity as Prototype Example of Uncertainty

- What is equilibrium climate sensitivity? What are its strengths and weaknesses as an aggregate measure and as a prototype example?
- Why is climate sensitivity uncertain? What is its PDF? How should we extrapolate its tail probabilities?
- If climate sensitivity is an *example* of uncertainty, then what is the ultimate reduced-form PDF whose fat tail *really* concerns us? ... and the answer is ...  $\ln D$ , where  $D \equiv B - W$ .
- Who knows how fat is the upper tail of the PDF of  $\ln D$ ? ... and the answer is ... Nobody. Very long chain of very uncertain links.
- Is climate change policy better conceptualized as warding off deterministic damages or as buying an insurance policy against bad damages from bad temperatures? What difference does it make?
- How should the upper-half tail of the PDF of climate sensitivity be calibrated? ... and the answer is ... consistent with IPCC-AR4, here I calibrate  $P[S \geq 3] = 50\%$  and  $P[S \geq 4.5] = 15\%$ .

## Upper Tail of Climate Sensitivity PDF (two examples)

- *Fat-tailed* (polynomial or slower decline) **P**areto or **P**ower PDF:

$$f_{\mathbf{P}}(S) = 38.75958 S^{-3.969362}$$

- *Thin-tailed* (exponential or faster decline) **N**ormal PDF:

$$f_{\mathbf{N}}(S) = \frac{1}{1.4473 \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(S-3)^2}{2(1.4473)^2}\right)$$

$\widehat{S} =$	3°C	4.5°C	6°C	8°C	10°C	12°C
$\text{Prob}_{\mathbf{P}}[S \geq \widehat{S}]$	.5	.15	.06	.027	.014	.008
$\text{Prob}_{\mathbf{N}}[S \geq \widehat{S}]$	.5	.15	.02	.003	$7 \times 10^{-7}$	$3 \times 10^{-10}$

- How do we know if tail is Normal or Power or any other form of PDF?
- Are there plausible mechanisms via which thin-tailed PDFs (like Normal) become fat-tailed PDFs (like Student-t)?
- Why does the economics of climate change seem especially vulnerable to fat-tailed uncertainty?

## Probabilities of T as Function of G=GHG Concentrations


- Transformation of variables:  $T = [\ln(G/280) / \ln 2] \times S$
- Transformation of PDFs:  
 $\psi_I(T | G) = f_I(T / [\ln(G/280) / \ln 2]) / [\ln(G/280) / \ln 2]$   
for  $I = \{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}\}$
- Probabilities of exceeding temperature changes  $T = 5^\circ\text{C}$  and  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$  for given  $G = \text{ppm of CO}_2\text{e}$ . (Why are  $T = 5^\circ\text{C}$  and  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$  chosen as “iconic” temperature change examples?)

<b>G:</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>900</b>
Median T	1.5°	2.5°	3.3°	4.0°	4.5°	5.1°
Prob <sub>P</sub> [ $T \geq 5^\circ\text{C}$ ]	1.5%	6.5%	15%	25%	38%	52%
Prob <sub>N</sub> [ $T \geq 5^\circ\text{C}$ ]	$10^{-6}$	2.0%	14%	29%	42%	51%
Prob <sub>P</sub> [ $T \geq 10^\circ\text{C}$ ]	.20%	.83%	1.9%	3.2%	4.8%	6.6%
Prob <sub>N</sub> [ $T \geq 10^\circ\text{C}$ ]	$10^{-30}$	$10^{-10}$	$10^{-5}$	.1%	.64%	2.1%

## What are Damages of Ruinous Climate Change?!?

- Typical multiplicative quadratic damages:  $Y(T) = Y / (1 + \gamma T^2)$ .
- Why may be OK for small  $T$ . Why may be questionable for big  $T$ .
- No one knows damages for high global-average temperature changes.
- For want of better analogue, try something *really* wild here.
- Suppose person pays  $\Delta M$  for decreasing probability of death by  $\Delta P$ .
- VSL=Value of a Statistical Life =  $\Delta M / \Delta P$ .
- Extremely rough empirical estimate: VSL  $\approx$  200 years of income.
- Crazy-tentatively identify “death of the planet” with  $T=10^\circ\text{C}$ .
- Willingness to pay (income-years foregone) to keep  $G$  at 280 ppm.

$G$ :	400	500	600	700	800	900
$W_P[T \geq 10^\circ\text{C}]$	.4	1.7	3.8	6.4	9.6	13
$W_N[T \geq 10^\circ\text{C}]$	$\approx 0$	$\approx 0$	$\approx 0$	.16	1.2	4.2

- Includes *only* willingness to pay to reduce tail catastrophe:  $T \geq 10^\circ\text{C}$ .
- *Overestimate*: impact will be centuries hence. Discounting, anyone?
- *Underestimate*: death of Earth bigger than death of John Smith. 

## Concluding Questions and Comments

- Stress tests and sensitivity to how disasters are modeled and parameterized: is the glass half-empty or half-full?
- What about caveats, limitations? Will dynamics restore robustness?
- What about role of learning and mid-course corrections?
- What makes climate change so resistant to crisp policy conclusions?
- What is the appropriate role of climate change CBAs and IAMs?
- Should we inform policy makers about our inability to give robust policy advice in almost-unique case of climate change CBA?
- Beware of idea that a false impression of precision or robustness is required because “we have to recommend *something*”?
- Should we do more research about fatness of extreme tails of PDFs relative to more research about central tendencies? Is this “science”?
- Beware of fighting fat-tailed problems with fat-tailed solutions?
- Should we hope for the best but prepare for the worst by contingency planning for bad outcomes? Is there a possibly important niche role for last-resort options like geoengineering?