

List of Working Group III AR5 Errors in the Summary for Policymakers

The Summary for Policymakers (SPM) of the Working Group III (WGIII) contribution to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change was approved and accepted by the IPCC Panel on 12 April 2014. The version that was released on that date was subject to copy edit and final layout.

A set of errors in the SPM was identified by the authors of the report after release of the SPM Brochure (May version). These errors have been handled in accordance with the Error Protocol and were approved during the 40th Session of the IPCC from 27-31 October 2014 in Copenhagen.

The published version of the SPM is now posted on www.mitigation2014.org. All errors have been corrected and the errata of the May version of the SPM are given below. The WGIII report will be published by Cambridge University Press in winter 2014/2015.

WGIII AR5 SPM – Errata to SPM Brochure (May version)

Corrections of content-related errors

Section SPM.3, Page 9 The bracket “(median values; the range is 2.5°C to 7.8°C when including climate uncertainty, see Table SPM.1)” should read: “(range based on median climate response; the range is 2.5°C to 7.8°C when including climate uncertainty, see Table SPM.1)”

Section SPM.4.1, Table SPM.1, Footnote 2 The bracket “(median: 3.7–4.8°C)” should read: “(range based on median climate response: 3.7–4.8°C)”.

Section SPM.4.1, Table SPM.1, Footnote 5 The sentence “To evaluate the GHG concentration and climate implications of these scenarios, the MAGICC model was used in a probabilistic mode (see Annex II).” should read: “To evaluate the CO₂eq concentration and climate implications of these scenarios, the MAGICC model was used in a probabilistic mode (see Annex II).”

Section SPM.4.1, Table SPM.1, Footnote 12 The sentence “The latter type of scenarios, in general, have an assessed probability of *more unlikely than likely* to exceed the 2 °C temperature level, while the former are mostly assessed to have an *unlikely* probability of exceeding this level.” should read: “The latter type of scenarios, in general, have an assessed probability of *more unlikely than likely* to stay below the 2 °C temperature level, while the former are mostly assessed to have an *unlikely* probability of staying below this level.”

Section SPM.4.1, Page 13 The sentence “There is only limited evidence on the potential for large-scale deployment of BECCS, large-scale afforestation, and other CDR technologies and methods.” should read: “There is uncertainty about the potential for large-scale deployment of BECCS, large-scale afforestation, and other CDR technologies and methods.”

Section SPM.4.1, Footnote 16 The sentence “In addition, a large proportion of the new scenarios include net negative emissions technologies (see below). [...] Scenarios with higher emissions in 2050 are characterized by a greater reliance on Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) technologies beyond mid-century.” should read: “In addition, a large proportion of the new scenarios include Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) technologies (see below). [...] Scenarios with higher emissions in 2050 are characterized by a greater reliance on CDR technologies beyond mid-century.”

Section SPM.4.1, Page 14 The sentence “[...]; a larger reliance on CDR technologies in the long-term (Figure SPM.4, top panel); and higher transitional and long-term economic impacts (Table SPM.2).” should read: “[...]; a larger reliance on CDR technologies in the long-term; and higher transitional and long-term economic impacts (Table SPM.2, orange segment).”

Section SPM.4.1, Page 17 The sentence “The limited number of published studies consistent with this goal produces scenarios that are characterized by [...]” should read: “Scenarios associated with the limited number of published studies exploring this goal are characterized by [...]”

Section SPM.4.1, Footnote 20 The sentence “In these scenarios, the cumulative CO₂ emissions range between 655 and 815 GtCO₂ for the period 2011–2050 and between 90 and 350 GtCO₂ for the period 2011–2100.” should read: “In these scenarios, the cumulative CO₂ emissions range between 680 and 800 GtCO₂ for the period 2011-2050 and between 90 and 310 GtCO₂ for the period 2011-2100.”

Section SPM.4.2.4, Footnote 26 The sentence “In many models that are used to assess the economic costs of mitigation, carbon price is often used as a proxy to represent the level of effort in mitigation policies (see WGIII AR5 Glossary).” should read: “In many models that are used to assess the economic costs of mitigation, carbon price is used as a proxy to represent the level of effort in mitigation policies (see WGIII AR5 Glossary).”

Changes to figures and figure captions

All figures and figure captions in the SPM of WG III were approved by the Panel subject to final quality check and copy edit. The changes shown below are presented to ensure complete transparency of the process.

Section SPM.3, Figure SPM.3 The x-axis label “1971-1980, 1981-1990, 1991-2000, 2001-2010” should read: “1970-1980, 1980-1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010”. The y-axis label “Decadal Change in Emissions [GtCO₂]” should read: “Change in Annual CO₂ Emissions by Decade [GtCO₂/yr]”.

Section SPM.3, Figure SPM.3 – Caption The sentence “Decomposition of the decadal change in total global CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion by four driving factors; population, income (GDP) per capita, energy intensity of GDP and carbon intensity of energy.[...] Total decadal changes are indicated by a triangle. Changes are measured in gigatonnes (Gt) of CO₂ emissions per decade; income is converted into common units using purchasing power parities.” should read: “Decomposition of the change in total annual CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion by decade and four driving factors; population, income (GDP) per capita, energy intensity of GDP and carbon intensity of energy. [...] Total emission changes are indicated by a triangle. The change in emissions over each decade is measured in gigatonnes of CO₂ per year [GtCO₂/yr]; income is converted into common units using purchasing power parities.”

Section SPM.4.1, Figure SPM.4 – Upper Panel The figure now includes F-gases in the four RCP lines and thus correctly displays all GHG emissions (Kyoto basket) in the RCP emission pathways.

Section SPM.4.1, Figure SPM.5 – Caption The sentence “The implications of different 2030 GHG emissions levels (left panel) for the rate of CO₂ emissions reductions (middle panel) and low-carbon energy upscaling from 2030 to 2050 (right panel) in mitigation scenarios reaching about 450 to 500 (430 – 530) ppm CO₂eq concentrations by 2100.” should read: “The implications of different 2030 GHG emissions levels (left panel) for the rate of CO₂ emissions reductions from 2030 to 2050 (middle panel) and low-carbon energy upscaling from 2030 to 2050 and 2100 (right panel) in mitigation scenarios reaching about 450 to about 500 (430 – 530) ppm CO₂eq concentrations by 2100.”

The sentence “Annual rates of historical emissions change (sustained over a period of 20 years) are shown in grey.” should read: Annual rates of historical emissions change between 1900-2010 (sustained over a period of 20 years) and the average annual emissions change between 2000-2010 are shown in grey.”