

Name

Robert Proctor

Email

robsproc@hotmail.com

Question 1 - Climate science

The committee should also take into account additional research to understand whether the IPCC report is fully up to date and ensures that the pre-cautionary principle is applied. It would seem crazy to me to set a target that proves inadequate, we need to be sure that whatever target we choose has the maximum chance of success. We are dealing with the future of civilisation here as well as our planets ecosystems. We need to be as certain as we can be that whatever target we set will prevent catastrophic climate change. Xu and Ramanathan 2018 report and various others detailed here <http://www.climatecoded.org/2018/04/15c-of-warming-is-closer-than-we.html>

Surely we have to be bold enough to absolutely make sure these more severe scenarios are not met which may mean a far more drastic approach to carbon emissions well beyond even 0 carbon emissions by 2050.

Question 2 - CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions

We have to use a pre-cautionary approach and assume a worst case scenario. When we are potentially talking about the end of civilisation as we know it a conservative approach to this could be failing future generations. We are also not taking methane release from the melting permafrost into account in the IPCC report and therefore the likely speed of increase in global temperatures could be significantly underestimated.

Sea ice is declining even faster than the worst case scenario in the IPCC report

<http://edition.cnn.com/2007/TECH/science/05/02/arctic.ice/>

Also we know that the oceans are absorbing more heat than the IPCC report modelled by between 10-70%

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-46046067>

Is this due to methane release or some other feedbacks we haven't observed or understood. Whatever the reason it shows that we need to take more caution than even the IPCC report suggests and act even more urgently.

Question 3 - Effort share

We have benefitted from fossil fuel use to develop into the wealthy country we see today. Therefore, we should de-carbonise more quickly than other developing countries. We have a moral duty to do this.

Question 4 - International collaboration

We must lead the way and others will follow. You can look at countless examples where a nation has led the way and others have followed. E.g plastic bag charges in Wales, now happening across the UK. Timescales on the banning of sales of Internal combustion engine vehicles by Norway and we have followed to a lesser extent. It also sends a clear message, we are the 6th largest economy in the World so it will give a clear direction to industry that in order to access this market they need to adapt and it also encourages others to make similar steps.

That is what true leadership looks like and we shouldn't shy away from it.

Question 6 - Hard-to-reduce sectors

We either need to accept that and look at ways we can sequester carbon. Tree planting seems to be the best way of doing this. Alternatively if that is not possible then we have to accept that we will need to change our lifestyles accordingly until the technology catches up with our desire for these areas. We must take it into account otherwise we risk losing our ability to influence the climate system.

Question 7 - Greenhouse gas removal

We need to take this seriously and invest in ways of taking carbon out of the atmosphere. I think tree planting is the clearest way of doing this and has so many other benefits so lets start with a monumental effort to maintain our forests and plant more. We should invest in developing other technologies but we can't rely on them at the moment.

Question 8 - Technology and innovation

Policy will drive innovation. Humans are experts at finding ways to solve problems, but we have to force industry into delivering the innovation. Why would they if they don't need to, innovation is risky and costly and there will be winners and losers but overall if we have clear tough, far reaching policies in place I have no doubt we are capable of turning this around.

Question 9 - Behavioural change

We can't rely on this. We need to bring people with us but ultimately we have to create a system that doesn't allow people to make bad choices. Look at recycling in Wales a great success but it happened because local authorities were forced into making the changes financially and they worked with people to make recycling easy and just throwing rubbish away difficult.

Question 10 - Policy

Stop extracting fossil fuels, fracked gas and open cast coal mines.
Stop expanding airports
Stop building new roads and instead invest in public transport
Make all new homes fit for purpose which is zero carbon
Ban cars from city centres they are not good ways of travelling around cities in any case.
All new cars Electric by 2025 is possible, certainly by 2030 as a minimum.
Massive re-forestation programme across the UK
Stop subsidising fossil fuels
Allow onshore wind development in England
Zero carbon Britain sets a course of action so lets follow it. Ultimately we need to get across the scale of the problem to the public, a crisis requires drastic action not tinkering. Tell people the truth and act as if the truth is real.
These could all be implemented tomorrow and would show the scale of the crisis.

Question 11 - Costs, risks and opportunities

The cost of inaction is far greater than the cost of action. Stop worrying about cost we can afford it so lets just do it. It may turn out that we could have done it slightly more cheaply but look at the example of renewable energy. What was considered an expensive form of energy is now the cheapest form of new energy available. Mass scaling up of initiatives and investment in technologies can massively decrease the cost and we will all benefit in the long run.
The cost of inaction could be the end of civilisation as we know it so any cost is justified but we may need to make sure that we do not leave people behind so the more well off cover more of the cost. Generally they use more carbon anyway so that is an equitable approach.

Question 12 - Avoided climate costs

The IPCC cover this well but there views could be conservative so we risk everything if we do not act as quickly as we can. The cost could be our survival as a species, or the ability of future generations to have the same opportunities as us. I for one would be prepared to give up many of my luxuries I know enjoy to enable future generations to have a much more secure and positive future. What would you give up for your child? I would give up everything for my children and I am sure most people would if they really understood what is at stake.

Question 13 - Devolved administrations

Test beds for different initiatives and more freedom to take a lead. Also they have more to gain from new industries and technologies.