

## Scenarios: Detlef van Vuuren

Q: Concerning the uncertainty of models the question came up, even if there is uncertainty, if it is not clear where we are heading.

A: In this context the long and short term trends have to be distinguished. For example it has been shown that the IPCC Scenarios first over but then underestimated emissions. Conclusively, scenarios have to be reevaluated.

Q: With respect to the difference between scenarios based on story lines and probabilistic scenarios: If story lines are representing better the future development, how can we improve their presentation and communication?

A: As a solution it was suggested to combine both types and to be probabilistic within storyline models since probabilistic models tend to overestimate themselves.

Q: Isn't it dangerous that probabilistic scenarios are pushing you in one direction?

A: Scenarios are no predictions. Nonetheless there is a point. But how do you want to evaluate the reaction of policy makers in a model?

Q: How to motivate decision makers to take scenarios more into account?

A: There are examples where they have been taken into account (e.g. IPCC resulted in the 2°C Goal and the MA resulted in parliament discussions)

Q: You grouped the B2 IPCC scenario with the business as usual scenarios, how that?

A: B2 has a regional focus on environment and it was difficult to assess each region. Therefore it was assumed that there are some regional projects which are successful and some which are not. So we assumed business as usual.

Q: It seems as if scenarios are not suitable to predict future trends. Do we maybe need other scenarios?

A: We have to account for uncertainty and integrate it more while being objective.

Q: Often the medium scenarios are chosen, but if we want to apply the precautionary approach we should rather choose the worst case.

A: The storyline scenarios are open for underlying models which is an advantage and can take these things into account.

A2: Further, optimistic IPCC scenarios seem to be more and more unrealistic. If we want to avoid climate change, we have to achieve low emissions, but asking economists this is just unrealistic.

A3: How low should low scenarios be? In the end scenarios are based on scientific methods but there are subjective assumptions as well.

Q: If you communicate emission scenarios as high, medium and low scenarios, it seems as if the medium scenario would be ok, but an increase of 2°C can not be ok.

A: It depends on your audience and you have to communicate your scenarios in a way that people stay interested.

Q: But you are not playing games. And people who are loosing interest were not really on board before.

A: But engaging people is very important.

Q (comment): But how do you engage people? Cite Baroso: CC is dangerous so we need economic growth. That does not make sense.

Q: Instead of using low emission scenarios wouldn't it be better to use later starting points of

reducing emissions?

A: There is no way we delay emission reduction. We have to start soon and include China and India.

WC: There has been the opinion that the only way to avoid climate change is to overshoot emissions now and then calm down. Statements like this are very dangerous. How can we be serious later, if we are not now.

*Lisa Freudenberger*