

meteoLCD Weblog

A weblog on climate, global change and climate measurements

« [EEA report on climate change](#)

[BNA Monitorbericht "Energie der Zukunft"](#) »

EEA climate change report (continued)

This is my second discussion of the EEA report. I shall give some citations (in italics) and add my comments. The report says clearly that "climate change" covers both changes due to natural processes and human activity.

CC = climate change, ACC = anthropogenic CC

A. From the Summary

p.15:

The causes of the most costly climate impacts are projected to differ strongly across Europe

The causes : is it what causes the impact (i.e. storminess) or is it the causes of (A)CC (i.e. GHG emissions)? Later this fuzziness is cleared: the causes = the climate parameters, i.e. storminess, heat, sea levels etc.

Current global actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions ('mitigation') are insufficient to constrain the temperature increase to 2 °C

The causal inference " increase of GHG emissions -> increase in global (regional) T " is accepted without any discussion (even if the last 15 years show that this inference has not been observed).

p16 to p. 18: **OBSERVED IMPACTS of CC**

This is quite an important chapter: when there are clear observed impacts of ACC than mitigation and adaptation are reasonable policies. When the observed impacts can not be related to human activity, only adaptation is left.

In the summary the time period over which these impacts are told to have been observed is not specified; some supplementary details are found in the Technical Summaries (TS)

- *increase in flood number* -> report says is due to LU changes and better reporting

- *increase in temperature of water lakes* -> report does not specify if this is the case during the last decade but TS says it is during the last 100 years

- *reduction in forest growth due to storminess* -> **but report said above that increased storminess can not be attributed to CC**, so there is here a clear contradiction or at least an inconsequential reasoning.

- *increase in forest fires in the Mediterranean region from 1900 to 2000, but decrease thereafter*. So all is well....

- *thousands of premature deaths per year due to tropospheric ozone* -> **but report says contribution of CC is difficult to quantify**. I am very skeptical on that huge number, even if it is parroted from report to report.

- *future impacts of CC can be substantially reduced by an ambitious mitigation policy*. What if the majority of the observed changes are natural? What are these mitigation policies -> reduction in GHG emissions?

- *Energy: reduced demand for heating (particularly in northern and north-western Europe) but increased demand for cooling (particularly in southern Europe)*. Where is the problem?

- *This report aims at providing a strong knowledge base for the development and implementation of adaptation strategies and actions at both national and EU levels*. Here no mention anymore of **mitigation!**

- *The observed increase in damage costs from extreme weather events is mainly due to increases in population, economic wealth and human activities in hazard-prone areas and to better reporting*. Exactly what researchers like Pielke Jr. have found, but what causes problems to the climate alarmists!

- *Estimates of the total costs of future climate change on the European economy are currently not available!* Not surprisingly, as most changes are pure speculation that do not allow any serious estimation.

-*The average temperature over land in Europe in the last decade was 1.3 °C warmer than the preindustrial level*, Yes, maybe (but not sure, as UHI is unknown and data unreliable); also unknown what part of this increase is due to natural evolution (end of LIA, long oceanic and solar cycles....)

p. 18:

The indicators informing this assessment are based mainly on EU-wide research and on global databases. In the future some indicators on climate impacts and adaptation may be based on data collected from member countries. These regional data are missing in this report. We need regional precise data, not global wishywashy...

Page 19 and following hold the technical summary tables, which are easy to read but difficult to accept uncritically.

B. Chapter 1. (p. 30 and following)

Currently there is a lack of sufficient observations of impacts of climate change on various environmental and socio-economic systems and on human health

There is no reporting of climate change impacts and vulnerability data and information from EU Member States to the European Commission or EEA.

This admission shows a big feebleness of the report: most data must be fetched from global observations and probably lack regional precision! What is acknowledged in the report:

Thus the indicators presented in this report are based on data from in situ and satellite monitoring programmes, from national and EU research programmes and from a few global databases.

A very curious sentence is this:

The report furthermore aims to achieve consistency, to the extent feasible, with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report on 'Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX)' (IPCC, 2012), the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5)

As for the moment the definitive AR5 is totally unknown (only drafts float around), **how can there be any consistency between this EEA report and the future AR5?** Or does that mean, as we know in advance that AR5 will be especially alarmist, so this report stays on the same line?

...to be continued

Share this:



Related

[NAP book \(2\)](#)
February 22, 2011

[EEA report on climate change](#)
November 25, 2012

[EEA report: chapter 5.3 to the end](#)
October 5, 2008
In "News"

This entry was posted on November 26, 2012 at 08:12 and is filed under Uncategorized. You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed. You can [leave a response](#), or [trackback](#) from your own site.

Leave a comment