Frequently Asked Questions

FAQ 8.2 | Do Improvements in Air Quality Have an Effect on Climate Change?

Yes they do, but depending on which pollutant(s) they limit, they can either cool or warm the climate. For example, whereas a reduction in sulphur dioxide (SO$_2$) emissions leads to more warming, nitrogen oxide (NO$_x$) emission control has both a cooling (through reducing of tropospheric ozone) and a warming effect (due to its impact on methane lifetime and aerosol production). Air pollution can also affect precipitation patterns.

Air quality is nominally a measure of airborne surface pollutants, such as ozone, carbon monoxide, NO$_x$, and aerosols (solid or liquid particulate matter). Exposure to such pollutants exacerbates respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, harms plants and damages buildings. For these reasons, most major urban centres try to control discharges of airborne pollutants.

Unlike carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) and other well-mixed greenhouse gases, tropospheric ozone and aerosols may last in the atmosphere only for a few days to a few weeks, though indirect couplings within the Earth system can prolong their impact. These pollutants are usually most potent near their area of emission or formation, where they can force local or regional perturbations to climate, even if their globally averaged effect is small.

Air pollutants affect climate differently according to their physical and chemical characteristics. Pollution-generated greenhouse gases will impact climate primarily through shortwave and longwave radiation, while aerosols can in addition affect climate through cloud–aerosol interactions.

Controls on anthropogenic emissions of methane (FAQ 8.2, Figure 1) to lower surface ozone have been identified as ‘win–win’ situations. Consequences of controlling other ozone precursors are not always as clear. NO$_x$ emission controls, for instance, might be expected to have a cooling effect as they reduce tropospheric ozone, but their impact on CH$_4$ lifetime and aerosol formation is more likely instead to cause overall warming.

Satellite observations have identified increasing atmospheric concentrations of SO$_2$ (the primary precursor to scattering sulphate aerosols) from coal-burning power plants over eastern Asia during the last few decades. The most recent power plants use scrubbers to reduce such emissions (albeit not the concurrent CO$_2$ emissions and associated long-term climate warming). This improves air quality, but also reduces the cooling effect of sulphate aerosols and therefore exacerbates warming. Aerosol cooling occurs through aerosol–radiation and aerosol–cloud interactions and is estimated at $-0.9$ W m$^{-2}$ (all aerosols combined, Section 8.3.4.3) since pre-industrial, having grown especially during the second half of the 20th century when anthropogenic emissions rose sharply. (continued on next page)

[Diagram showing the impact of pollution controls on specific emissions and climate impact. Solid black line indicates known impact; dashed line indicates uncertain impact.]
Black carbon or soot, on the other hand, absorbs heat in the atmosphere (leading to a 0.4 W m$^{-2}$ radiative forcing from anthropogenic fossil and biofuel emissions) and, when deposited on snow, reduces its albedo, or ability to reflect sunlight. Reductions of black carbon emissions can therefore have a cooling effect, but the additional interaction of black carbon with clouds is uncertain and could lead to some counteracting warming.

Air quality controls might also target a specific anthropogenic activity sector, such as transportation or energy production. In that case, co-emitted species within the targeted sector lead to a complex mix of chemistry and climate perturbations. For example, smoke from biofuel combustion contains a mixture of both absorbing and scattering particles as well as ozone precursors, for which the combined climate impact can be difficult to ascertain.

Thus, surface air quality controls will have some consequences on climate. Some couplings between the targeted emissions and climate are still poorly understood or identified, including the effects of air pollutants on precipitation patterns, making it difficult to fully quantify these consequences. There is an important twist, too, in the potential effect of climate change on air quality. In particular, an observed correlation between surface ozone and temperature in polluted regions indicates that higher temperatures from climate change alone could worsen summertime pollution, suggesting a ‘climate penalty’. This penalty implies stricter surface ozone controls will be required to achieve a specific target. In addition, projected changes in the frequency and duration of stagnation events could impact air quality conditions. These features will be regionally variable and difficult to assess, but better understanding, quantification and modelling of these processes will clarify the overall interaction between air pollutants and climate.

One reason an expert judgment estimate of ERF due to aerosol–radiation and aerosol–cloud interaction is provided rather than ERF due to aerosol–cloud interaction specifically is that the individual contributions are very difficult to disentangle. These contributions are the response of processes that are the outputs from a system that is constantly readjusting to multiple nonlinear forcings. Assumptions of independence and linearity are required to deduce ERF due to aerosol–radiation interaction and ERF due to aerosol–cloud interaction (although there is no a priori reason why the individual ERFs should be simply additive). Under these assumptions, ERF due to aerosol–cloud interaction is deduced as the difference between ERF due to aerosol–radiation interaction and ERF due to aerosol–radiation interaction alone. This yields an ERF due to aerosol–cloud interaction estimate of −0.45 W m$^{-2}$ which is much smaller in magnitude than the −1.4 W m$^{-2}$ median forcing value of the models summarized in Figure 7.19 and is also smaller in magnitude than the AR4 estimates of −0.7 W m$^{-2}$ for RF due to aerosol–cloud interaction.

8.3.4.4 Black Carbon Deposition in Snow and Ice

Because absorption by ice is very weak at visible and ultraviolet (UV) wavelengths, BC in snow makes the snow darker and increases absorption. This is not enough darkening to be seen by eye, but it is enough to be important for climate (Warren and Wiscombe, 1980; Clarke and Noone, 1985). Several studies since AR4 have re-examined this issue and find that the RF may be weaker than the estimates of Hansen and Nazarenko (2004) in AR4 (Flanner et al., 2007; Koch et al., 2009a; Rypdal et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2013). The anthropogenic BC on snow/ice is assessed to have a positive global and annual mean RF of +0.04 W m$^{-2}$, with a 0.02–0.09 W m$^{-2}$ 5 to 95% uncertainty range (see further description in Section 7.5.2.3). This RF has a two to four times larger global mean surface temperature change per unit forcing than a change in CO$_2$.

In Figure 8.8, the time evolution of global mean RF due to BC on snow and ice is shown based on multi-model simulations in ACCMIP (Lee et al., 2013) for 1850, 1930, 1980 and 2000. The results show a maximum in the RF in 1980 with a small increase since 1850 and a 20% lower RF in 2000 compared to 1980. Those results are supported by observations. The BC concentration in the Arctic atmosphere is observed to be declining since 1990, at least in the Western Hemisphere portion (Sharma et al., 2004), which should lead to less deposition of BC on the snow surface. Surveys across Arctic during 1998 and 2005 to 2009 showed that the BC content of Arctic snow appears to be lower than in 1984 (Doherty et al., 2010) and found BC concentrations in Canada, Alaska and the Arctic Ocean (e.g., Hegg et al., 2009), about a factor of 2 lower than measured in the 1980s (e.g., Clarke and Noone, 1985). Large-area field campaigns (Huang et al., 2011; Ye et al., 2012) found that the BC content of snow in northeast China is comparable to values found in Europe. The steep drop off in BC content of snow with latitude in northeast China may indicate that there is not much BC in the Arctic coming from China (Huang et al., 2011; Ye et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013). The change in the spatial pattern of emission of BC is a main cause for the difference in the temporal development of RF due to BC on snow and ice compared to the BC from RF due to aerosol–radiation interaction over the last decades.