

Commentary on Benefits Assessment

**EC4MACS Workshop on the Review of Modelling
Methodology, IIASA, October 5th, 2009**

Pete Roberts



concaawe

Summary (1)

- 
- To date, no review comments posted on EC4MACS web site on this modelling element, so following observations offered solely by this Commentator on behalf of Concaawe
 - **General:** Welcome decision under EC4MACS that comparison of cost and benefits should remain outside optimisation process [See page 2 penultimate paragraph of interim report “Benefits Assessment and Comparison of Costs and Benefits”, 20/07/08]
 - *With a focus on uncertainties, decision rightly recognises need for transparency in an already complex modelling system*
 - *Perhaps worth adding that the level of management of any risk (via mitigation policies) needs to be conducted in the wider context of a “multi-risk world” i.e. the question of how far should we go in managing a particular risk cannot be made by a model*
 - **PM Impacts:** Concerns over WHO position of equal potency of primary and secondary
 - *With likelihood that Eutrophication will return as strong driver under Gothenburg/NECD (compared to CAFE) multi-effects modelling will tend to place even more emphasis on secondary PM reductions; this runs counter to the toxicological community view of the importance of primary combustion sources; Can uncertainty scenarios help here if primary and secondary concentration fields are made available?*

Summary (2)

- **Differences in Sectoral Potencies:** Importance of the findings of EuroDelta recognised at the last TFIAM poses question of how this might be accounted for in current policy round
 - New “Sector Specific” (or appropriately grouped sectors) probably cannot be developed in time for Gothenburg
 - However, could some sensitivity analysis impacts/benefits be performed post GAINS based on sectoral allocations made within GAINS?
 - Likely to be important for co-benefits determination of C&E which largely targets Power Generation

- **Valuation of VOLY:** Would like to see more transparency in the discussion of the more recent data on “stated preference” surveys coming from NEEDS and DEFRA in interim/final reporting
 - *A clear comparison of the frequency distribution of survey results*
 - *Clearer “apples with apples” comparisons of median values e.g. what were the NEEDS updated values of median?*

study	Median	Mean
NEWEXT	54000	125000
NEEDS	20200	40000

- *Should use full distributions in benefit assessments (cf CONCAWE reports).*
- *Why is VOSL being retained when health community recommends change in average life expectancy as only robust measure of chronic mortality due to fine particulates?*

Summary (3)

- **Agricultural Yield Loss:** How to bring in vexed question of paying for set aside at the same time as giving policy monetary value to yield loss?
- **Valuation of Ecosystem Damage :** Appreciate recognition that in this difficult area significantly more work needs to be done before such valuations can be made in a way that informs robust policy responses