

# Global Calculator Transport Scenarios Workshop

Feedback notes from experts and next steps

**Camille Cauchois**

[ccauchois@wri.org](mailto:ccauchois@wri.org)

**Erin Cooper**

[ecooper@wri.org](mailto:ecooper@wri.org)

**Benoit Lefevre, PhD**

[benoit.lefevre@wri.org](mailto:benoit.lefevre@wri.org)

**Julien Pestiaux**

[jpe@climact.com](mailto:jpe@climact.com)


January 28, 2014

**CLIMACT**



WORLD  
RESOURCES  
INSTITUTE

 **EMBARQ**  
[www.embarq.org](http://www.embarq.org)

 The purpose of the “*Global Calculator Transport Scenarios Workshop: Feedback from experts and next steps*” document is to present the notes from the workshop that took place on January 15, 2014 and the next steps that followed for the expert participants.

Please note that:

- the relevant comments have now been addressed – this note is intended to indicate some of the early engagement we went through for the transport sector
- the transport sector is still a work in progress and we welcome comments on the latest version

Expert participants who attended the workshop are listed below.

**Other experts were also subsequently contacted and involved in the definition of the method and the lever levels.**

- Rafael Acevedo- InterAmerican Development Bank
- Arturo Ardila- World Bank
- Magdala Arioli- EMBARQ Brasil
- William Chernicoff- Toyota
- Erin Cooper- EMBARQ
- Laetitia da Blanc- French Institute of Science and Technology for Transport, Development and Networks
- Cristiano Façanha- International Council on Clean Transportation
- Daniela Facchini- EMBARQ Brasil
- Joanne Green- Clean Air Institute
- Anthony Greszler- Volvo
- Dario Hidalgo- EMBARQ
- Benoit Lefevre- EMBARQ
- Julien Pestiaux- Climact
- Sophie Punte- Smart Freight Centre
- Greg Rucks- Rocky Mountain Institute
- Sun Shengyang- GIZ

## Tool Discussion

1. **Credibility**
  - Need more transparency on how each level translates into its GHG impact
  - Showcase the credibility of the tool
2. **Use of the tool**
  - Include caveat or warning at the beginning about the uncertainty of the data and that this tool should not be the only thing to rely on in making policy decisions
  - Need more clarity on the *strategic* use of the tool
  - Emphasize that the tool showcases relative difference in outcomes in order to drive further investigation/effort rather than providing definitive results
  - Concern over the high potential of manipulation and how users will report their results
  - Highlight that the tool compares *effort* between different *sectors*
3. **Target audience of the tool**
  - Concern over the average citizen user v. educated policy maker
  - Desire to test what specific countries commitments are
4. **Complexity-on-Demand**
  - Desire for experts to be able to download the excel sheet behind the tool, input their own data and still view the outcomes; however there is high potential for manipulation if all users are able to do this.
    - How will they view the output from the excel sheet?
  - Inclusion of *sub-levers* for the topics that have more scientific uncertainty
    - Biofuels
    - Agriculture
    - Transport—black carbon
  - Comment section or “Wikipedia” style platform where people can upload their results and comments
  - Since each factor has its own separate debate, there needs to be a way to change the data in order to produce more trustworthy results for the user
  - Emphasize that all sectors do interact
  - Can the user interpolate between levels (e.g. Level 1.2/level 3.4 etc?)
5. **Level of uncertainty** around the data
  - Concern over the fixed data set that goes into the tool
  - Can we turn the data into ranges?
  - Need to make the tool extremely transparent to the user and show how we are trying to get as close to the latest scientific knowledge as possible
  - Is it the same annual rate for 40 years?
  - An interface or link to a more detailed model for each lever (e.g. link to specific biofuel modeling tool)
6. **Co-Benefits**
  - Ability for user to select a co-benefit and see the impacts on their specific co-benefit, not just GHG emissions
  - Will also increase the appeal because countries can focus on their specific interests
7. **Regional variation**
  - Concern over the ‘global citizen’ with the amount of regional variation that exists
  - Can we build in more explicit regional variation and specificity?
  - Need to connect users to the regional level and set a pathway/framework for people to move forward if they want a more localized model
  - How do we link this global tool to countries specific interests?

## Lever Discussion

### 1. Reality check

- Strong doubt around possibility of Level 4
- IEA data will be key to making it believable
- Where does Business as Usual fit into the levels?

### 2. Annual transport demand per person

- Level 4 completely impossible due to growth in developing countries and they want a lifestyle more similar to US/Europe
- Level 4 should reflect *everything* you can possibly do
- Study by Rocky Mountain Institute that achieved a 50% reduction of vkt in the US
- Check IEA's predictions—uncertainty around their 2-degree scenario projections
- Discussion on where IEA's scenarios fit in: Level 1=6°/Level 2=4°/Level 3=2° and Level 4=all possibilities based on the literature
- Concern over wishful thinking versus reality—numbers could be misleading due to regional variation
- Can passenger activity be broken down into regional levels?

### 3. Passenger transport modal shift

- Concern over the possibility that non-motorized transport will actually decrease as affluence increases
- Should NMT be split between walk and bike?
- Is it possible for cities to maintain a 33-33-33 split while developing?
- Concern that Level 4 is not possible—can't convert a Sao Paulo into a Copenhagen. Alternative would be to group the world in a number of types of cities, and to get these type of cities to evolve to a certain ideal mix.

### 4. Technology and Energy Efficiency

- a. No one believes the passenger vehicle types for any of the levels—baseline for electric is too high
- b. IEA's data are probably the most accurate and refined for this topic
- c. Skepticism over the growth of electric vehicles—sales do not precisely correlate with fleet on the ground
- d. We need to check what is feasible based on the evolution of yearly sales and turnover (also statistically not all cars are at the average and so some will remain). It will be very important here to continue to consider what portion of the future fleet will be 2 and 3 wheelers and the technology shift time for those vehicles, as well as bounds to future vehicle growth
- e. Need to consider the actual fleet turn-over rate

## Next Steps

1. Identify additional experts
2. Identify clear roles for experts to stay involved in the project
3. Create sub-groups for specific topics
4. Discuss required interactions with other sectors