

This file has been cleaned of potential threats.

If you confirm that the file is coming from a trusted source, you can send the following SHA-256 hash value to your admin for the original file.

64765e08bfde90e0cdd7660f0c4903d8908d4bdf96be2ea1b55fa1b0dc9316f9

To view the reconstructed contents, please SCROLL DOWN to next page.

**The text that follows is a REPRINT.
O texto que segue é um REPRINT.**

Please cite as:

Favor citar como:

Fearnside, P.M. 2014. What role for short-lived climate pollutants in mitigation policy? *Science Online comment on J.K. Shoemaker et al., Science 342: 1323-1324 (2013).* <http://comments.sciencemag.org/content/10.1126/science.1240162>

ISSN: 0036-8075

Copyright: American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)

The original publication is available at

O trabalho original está disponível em:

<http://www.sciencemag.org>

<http://comments.sciencemag.org/content/10.1126/science.1240162>

Science 13 December 2013:
Vol. 342 no. 6164 pp. 1323-1324
DOI:10.1126/science.1240162

Policy Forum

What Role for Short-Lived Climate Pollutants in Mitigation Policy?

J. K. Shoemaker, D. P. Schrag, M. J. Molina, V. Ramanathan | [6 Comments](#)

Philip Fearnside

Shoemaker et al. (1) raise the important issue of comparing benefits of reducing emissions of “short-lived” black carbon (BC) and methane (CH₄) with “long-lived” carbon dioxide (CO₂). They believe trading between CO₂ and CH₄ “should be discouraged” and compare three scenarios: one reducing CO₂ emissions through 2050 by 20%, a second reducing BC by 80% and CH₄ by 40%, and a third reducing all three pollutants by the same percentages. Obviously, the third scenario results in the greatest mitigation. However, the scenarios are not normalized by the cost of achieving the specified reductions, and the third (recommended) scenario presumably costs as much as the other two combined. The most efficient way to distribute funds among options is to have them compete with each other through a market mechanism, rather than a central authority setting targets for each gas or mitigation type, much as production targets were decreed in the former Soviet economy. While markets can be tweaked and channeled to maximize non-climate benefits (and avoid perverse impacts), exchangeability is essential. CH₄ emissions from tropical dams add to controversies over carbon credit for hydropower (2-4). Reducing methane emission has rapid benefits for slowing temperature increase (essential to avoid surpassing the 2°C threshold now agreed as “dangerous”). The weight giving to methane must reflect the importance for human society of this key role (5, 6). PHILIP M. FEARNSIDE
National Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. E-mail:
pmfearn@inpa.gov.br

References

1. J.K. Shoemaker et al., *Science* 342, 1323 (2013). doi: 10.1126/science.1240162.
2. P.M. Fearnside, *Mitig Adapt. Strat. Global Change* 18, 691. (2012). doi:10.1007/s11027-012-9382-6.

3. P.M. Fearnside, *Carbon Manage.* 4, 681. (2013). doi: 10.4155/CMT.13.57.

4. P.M. Fearnside, S. Pueyo, *Nature Climate Change* 2, 382. (2012). doi:
10.1038/nclimate1540.

5. P.M. Fearnside, *Environ. Conserv.* 24, 64 (1997). doi: 10.1017/S0376892997000118.

6. P.M. Fearnside, *Ecolog. Econ.* 41, 21 (2002). doi: 10.1016/S0921-8009(02)00004-6.

Submitted on Thu, 07/10/2014 - 16:00