

# C-ROADS: CLIMATE -- RAPID OVERVIEW AND DECISION-SUPPORT SIMULATOR

19 December 2008

Tom Fiddaman<sup>1</sup>, John Sterman<sup>2</sup>, Andrew P. Jones<sup>3</sup>, Elizabeth R. Sawin<sup>3</sup>, Lori S. Siegel<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ventana Systems

<sup>2</sup> MIT Sloan School of Management, System Dynamics Group

<sup>3</sup> Sustainability Institute

## Motivation

Research shows that many people, including highly educated adults with substantial training in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics, misunderstand the fundamental dynamics of the accumulation of carbon and heat in the atmosphere (1, 2). Such misunderstandings can prevent decision-makers from recognizing the long-term climate impacts likely to emerge from specific policy decisions.

Furthermore, people charged with making decisions related to climate change – climate professionals, corporate and government leaders, and citizens – may understand the emissions reduction proposals of individual nations (such as those proposed under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change process) but lack tools for assessing the likely collective impact of those individual proposals on future atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations, temperature changes and other climate impacts.

These challenges to effective decision-making in regard to climate change are typical of the challenges facing decision makers in other dynamically complex systems. Research shows that people often make suboptimal, biased decisions in dynamically complex systems characterized by multiple positive and negative feedbacks, time delays, and nonlinear cause-and-effect relationships (3, 4, 5). In such situations computer simulations offer laboratories for learning and experimentation and can help improve decision-making (6, 7). Critical climate policy decisions will be made at the local, national, and global scales in the coming months and years. Key stakeholders need transparent tools grounded in the best available science to provide decision support for real-time exploration of different policy options (8).

## Purpose and Use

We created the Climate Rapid Overview And Decision-support Simulator (C-ROADS) to provide a transparent, accessible, real-time decision-support tool that encapsulates the insights of more complex models. The simulator helps decision makers improve their understanding of the planetary system's responses to changes in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil fuel use, emissions from land use practices, and changes in other greenhouse gasses (Figure 1). C-ROADS has been used in strategic planning sessions for decision-makers from government, business and civil society and in interactive role-playing policy exercises (9). An online version for broad use is currently under development.

C-ROADS provides a consistent basis for analysis and comparison of policy options, grounded in well-accepted science. By visually and numerically conveying the projected aggregated impact of national-level commitments to GHG




Figure 1. C-ROADS Structure

emission reductions the model allows users to see and understand the gap between ‘policies on the table’ and actions needed to stabilize GHG concentrations and limit the risks of “dangerous anthropogenic interference” in the climate. In this way C-ROADS offers decision makers a way to determine if they are on track towards their goals, and to discover – if they are not on track – what additional measures would be sufficient to meet those goals.

### The Simulator

C-ROADS has been constructed using the tools of System Dynamics (7), a methodology for creating simulation models that help people improve their understanding of complex situations and how they evolve over time. The simulation model is based on the biogeophysical and integrated assessment literature and includes representations of the carbon cycle, other GHGs, radiative forcing, global mean surface temperature, and sea level change. Consistent with the principles articulated by, e.g., Socolow and Lam (10), the simulation is grounded in the established literature yet remains simple enough to run quickly on a laptop computer.

The model uses historical data through the most recent available figures, including country-level GDP and population, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuels (FF) and from changes in land use (11, 12). Scenarios for the future including Business As Usual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions projections are calibrated to the IPCC SRES scenarios (13) with the World Energy Outlook (14) growth allocations between regions. Population




Figure 2. Representative C-ROADS behavior for a scenario based on the IPCC A1FI emissions scenario. (A) Fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the 14 regions represented in C-ROADS. (B) Resulting atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. (C) Resulting global temperature change relative to pre-industrial temperatures. (D) Resulting sea level rise. The model also allows Monte-Carlo simulations to generate the probability distributions of outcomes over important uncertainties such as climate sensitivity, carbon uptake, and sea level rise.

projections are based on the United Nations' World Population forecasts (15).

The core carbon cycle and climate sector of the model is based on Dr. Tom Fiddaman's 1997 MIT dissertation (16). The model structure draws heavily from Goudrian and Ketner (17) and Oeschger and Siegenthaler, et al. (18). The sea level rise sector is based on Rahmstorf (19). In the current version of the simulation, temperature feedbacks to the carbon cycle are not included.

Model users determine the path of net GHG emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> from FF and land use, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration from afforestation), at the country or regional level, through 2100. The model calculates the path of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHG concentrations, global mean surface temperature, and sea level rise resulting from these emissions (Figure 2).

The user can choose the level of regional aggregation. Currently, users may choose to provide emissions inputs for three, seven, or fourteen different blocs of countries, depending on the purpose of the session. Outputs may be viewed for any of these aggregation levels. Other key variables such as per capita emissions, energy and carbon intensity of the economy (e.g., tonnes C per dollar of real GDP), and cumulative emissions are also displayed.

The model allows users to test a wide range of policy proposals for future emissions. Users can specify emissions reductions at a chosen annual rate (e.g., x%/year, beginning in a specified year), a target for emissions as a fraction of a

specified base year (e.g., x% below 1990 by 2050), or reductions in emissions intensity (e.g., reducing emissions per unit of real GDP x% below today's level by 2050). Users can select the years in which the policies would go into force, the target years, and other attributes to capture a wide range of policy proposals (Figure 3). Users may also simulate specific sets of commitments, such as those under discussion by national governments, or those proposed by academic or advocacy groups.




Figure 3. User options for specifying policy proposals for future emissions for a representative nation (US). Users can specify emissions reductions at an annual rate (A), as a fraction of a specified base year (B), or as a reduction in emissions intensity (C).

### Important Features

C-ROADS emphasizes:

- Transparency: equations are available, easily auditable, and presented graphically.
- Understanding: model behavior can be traced through the model structure to determine the causal factors contributing to results; we don't say "because the model says so."
- Flexibility: the model supports a wide variety of user-specified scenarios at varying levels of complexity.
- Consistency: the simulator is consistent with historic data, the structure and insights from larger models, and the IPCC AR4.
- Accessibility: the model runs with a user-friendly graphical interface on a laptop computer in real time.

- Robustness: the model captures uncertainty around the climate outcomes associated with emissions decisions through Monte-Carlo simulations.
- The model can be readily revised and expanded based on user feedback and new developments in climate science, and as new data become available.

### **Simulation Validation**

C-ROADS is not a substitute for larger integrated assessment models or detailed General Circulation Models (GCMs) (20). Rather, C-ROADS is designed to capture the key insights from such models and make them available for rapid policy experimentation.

The model has been subjected to a suite of rigorous tests, documented in the C-ROADS reference guide. Model output has been tested against the output of large, disaggregated models such as MAGICC (21), BERN (22), ISAM (23), MiniCAM (24), AIM (25), CETA (26) and MERGE (27) and the resulting temperature output of C-ROADS has been found to align very closely under a range of emissions scenarios including those in the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC (28).

### **The Team**

C-ROADS was developed by Ventana Systems, Sustainability Institute, and the MIT System Dynamics Group, as part of Climate Interactive, a multi-organization effort to make climate simulations useful to decision makers, enabling effective action to stabilize the climate.

For more information, contact Drew Jones or Beth Sawin, Sustainability Institute:

[apjones@sustainer.org](mailto:apjones@sustainer.org)

[bethsawin@sustainer.org](mailto:bethsawin@sustainer.org)

## References

---

- 1 Sterman, J. and L. Booth Sweeney. 2007. Understanding Public Complacency About Climate Change: Adults' Mental Models of Climate Change Violate Conservation of Matter. *Climatic Change* 80, 213-238.
- 2 Sterman, J. 2008. Risk Communication on Climate: Mental Models and Mass Balance. *Science* 322, 532.
- 3 Brehmer, B. 1989. Feedback Delays and Control in Complex Dynamic Systems, in Miling, P. and E. Zahn (eds.), *Computer Based Management of Complex Systems*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 189-196.
- 4 Kleinmuntz, D. and J. Thomas. 1987. The Value of Action and Inference in Dynamic Decision-Making. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 39(3), 341-364.
- 5 Sterman, J. 1989. Misperceptions of Feedback in Dynamic Decision Making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43(3), 301-335.
- 6 Morecroft, J.D.W. and J.D. Sterman, Eds. 1994. *Modeling for Learning Organizations*. Portland, OR: Productivity Press.
- 7 Sterman, J.D. 2000. *Business Dynamics*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw Hill.
- 8 Corell, R.W., Lee, K., and P.C. Stern. *Strategies and Methods for Climate-related Decision Support*. In press.
- 9 See the Copenhagen Climate Exercise, <http://climateinteractive.wordpress.com/2008/09/25/the-copenhagen-climate-exercise/>
- 10 Socolow, R.H. and S.H. Lam. 2007. Good Enough Tools for Global Warming Policy Making. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* (2007) 365, 897-934.
- 11 Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (CDIAC). 2004. By nation: [http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndp030/CSV-FILES/nation.1751\\_2004.csv](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndp030/CSV-FILES/nation.1751_2004.csv). Globally: [http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndp030/CSV-FILES/global.1751\\_2004.csv](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/ftp/ndp030/CSV-FILES/global.1751_2004.csv). Last updated 2004.
- 12 Conference Board and Groningen Growth and Development Centre, Total Economy Database, January 2008.
- 13 Nakicenovic, N. and R. Swart, Eds. 2000. *Special Report on Emissions Scenarios*.: Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- 14 International Energy Agency (IEA). 2007. World Energy Outlook (WEO).
- 15 United Nations. 2004. *World Population to 2300*.
- 16 Fiddaman, T.S. 1997. Feedback Complexity in Integrated Climate-Economy Models. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Doctoral Dissertation.
- 17 Goudriaan, J. and P. Ketner. 1984. A Simulation Study for the Global Carbon Cycle, including Man's Impact on the Biosphere. *Climatic Change* 6, 167-192.
- 18 Oeschger, H., U. Siegenthaler, et al. 1975. A Box Diffusion Model to Study the Carbon Dioxide Exchange in Nature. *Tellus XXVII*(2), 167-192.
- 19 Rahmstorf, S. 2007. A Semi-Empirical Approach to Projecting Future Sea Level Rise. *Science* 315, 368-370.
- 20 [www.aip.org/history/sloan/gcm/intro.html](http://www.aip.org/history/sloan/gcm/intro.html)
- 21 Wigley, T.M.L. and S.C.B. Raper. 1992. Implications for climate and sea level of revised IPCC emissions scenarios. *Nature* 357, 293-300.
- 22 Joos, F., I. C. Prentice, S. Sitch, R. Meyer, G. Hooss, G.-K. Plattner, S. Gerber, and K. Hasselmann. 2001. Global warming feedbacks on terrestrial carbon uptake under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) emission scenarios. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15, 891-908.
- 23 Manne, A.S. and R.G. Richels. 1997. Energy Modeling Forum (EMF) 14.
- 24 Edmonds, J., Richels, R., and T. Wigley. 1997. Energy Modeling Forum (EMF) 14.
- 25 Matsuoka et al., 1994. Scenario analysis of global warming using the Asian-Pacific integrated model. *Energy Policy*, 23(4/5), 357-372.
- 26 Peck, S. and T. Teisberg. 1997. Energy Modeling Forum (EMF) 14.
- 27 Manne, A.S. and R.G. Richels. 1997. Energy Modeling Forum (EMF) 14.
- 28 Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M. Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M., and H.L. Miller, Eds. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.