

**Environmental
Donors**

**CONTRIBUTION
GUIDE**

2009

**Global Warming
Programs Ranked**

20 Ratings
US & International
Environmental
Organizations,
Campaigns &
Coalitions

WWF • EDF • Greenpeace
Sierra Club • NRDC
NWF • 350.org • Audubon Society
and more...

US Environmental Donors Contribution Guide 2009

Ranking of Adequacy in Presenting Climate Change Risk

& Survey of Position on 350 ppm

December 30, 2009

Summary.

The 2009 US Environmental Donor Report evaluates major US environmental organizations and campaigns on how clearly each distinguishes between competing perceptions of climate risk and where each stands on 350 ppm. Websites of sixteen organizations and four campaigns/coalitions were evaluated on the following criteria:

1. whether climate change risk is *clearly distinguished from other issues*;
2. whether a distinction is made between *cataclysmic and incremental* climate change;
3. whether 350 ppm (or lower) is endorsed;¹
4. whether immediate, significant and just global action commensurate with the scale and speed of the crisis, aimed at meeting 350 ppm is called for, and;
5. whether climate policy is presented with *clarity and prominence*.

Just 4 out of 20 groups surveyed have endorsed 350 ppm or lower (one is unclear). Commentary and complete results are attached. Summary appears on following page.

Contact: Ken Ward
617.435.4919
greenhousejp@gmail.com

¹ Unless otherwise stated, organizations endorsing Waxman-Markey, Kerry-Boxer, ACES and/or UN IPCC 4th Report are assumed to support a 450 ppm standard.
2009 US Environmental Donor Report

US Environmental Donors Contribution Guide 2009

December 30, 2009

SUMMARY

ranking	organization	350 ppm	450 ppm	unclear
*****	350.org	✓		
	Climate S.O.S.	✓		
****	Friends of the Earth USA	✓		
	Rainforest Action Network	✓		
***	Greenpeace USA			✓
	National Wildlife Federation (NWF)		✓	
**	Environment America		✓	
	Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)		✓	
	League of Conservation Voters (LCV)		✓	
	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)		✓	
	The Sierra Club		✓	
	1Sky		✓	
*	World Resources Institute (WRI)		✓	
	World Wildlife Federation (WWF)		✓	
	US Climate Action Partnership (USCAP)		✓	
zero	Defenders of Wildlife		✓	
	National Audubon Society		✓	
	The Nature Conservancy		✓	
	Union of Concerned Scientists		✓	
	The Wilderness Society		✓	

US Environmental Donors Contribution Guide 2009

*Ranking of Adequacy in Presenting Climate Change Risk
& Survey of Position on 350 ppm*

December 30, 2009

Nature of the peril. The greatest, and possibly final challenge facing humanity is overcoming our apparent inability to come to grips with climate change risk. The failure of leadership in Copenhagen is not merely the deferment of action, it is more profoundly a failure to define risk. Before there can be useful debate between courses of action, we must question whether climate, or indeed any great matter, can properly be addressed if there is no commonly agreed definition of the crisis.

What is the nature of the peril?

- Is it, as Dr. James Hansen and others convincingly argue, an extraordinary risk of runaway global warming, with feedback loops driving temperatures rapidly toward the point of no return and high probability of ice shelf destabilization and rapid sea level rise, a view summed up in the shorthand 350 ppm?² Will our young people come of age as global ecosystems are wrenched apart and civilization turns to ashes in their hands?

- Or, is the threat incremental and linear, as defined in the IPCC 4th Report (summarized in the twin objective of restraining global temperature rise below 2°C and peaking at 450 ppm), and therefore treatable by negotiated, moderate measures, as the Copenhagen dénouement implies?³

On this distinction hinges the fate of the world. Failure to come to terms with whether climate change is immediate and cataclysmic or long-range and incremental means that our objectives are fuzzy and solutions are considered in a vacuum, animated by vague forebodings, but unaccountable, and even non-comparable, to any absolute standard.

What is most striking about the present state of affairs is not that reasonable people should disagree over such a fraught choice. The evidence is imperfect, and there are several plausible courses of action, and rational debate is hampered by a host of factors ranging from cognitive dissonance, which slows absorption and retrieval of information, to the warping affect of profits so immense that they bend the collective instinct for self-preservation. As Barbara Tuchman observed, advancements in science, engineering, medicine, creative arts and even moral understanding have not been matched by similar growth in governance, which remains little improved since Classical antiquity. There are reasons aplenty why there should be great and contentious disagreement over how terminal our position is, and therefore, how imperative and on what scale should be our response.

² The core story articulated by Dr. James Hansen and corroborated by a mountain of evidence, may be summarized as follows:

Humankind must return the amount of carbon in the atmosphere, measured in parts per million (ppm) to below 350 ppm almost immediately (we are at 390 ppm now and rising). If we do not do so, a host of problems, many already evident, will arise or worsen, and impacts tend to accelerate the warming process. One impact stands alone as the gravest threat: rapid sea level rise caused by swift disintegration of massive ice shelves in Greenland and Antarctica. Another destabilizing impact is more immediate - the loss of drinking and agriculture water supplies in South America and the Himalayan watershed, which rely upon glacier melt.

³ A third groupings of views, that climate change is fabricated, inconsequential or even beneficial, is not treated in this analysis.

Failure to ask the questions. What *is* incomprehensible, is that such a sharp distinction in world views should go unremarked and largely un-debated. Every forum, domestic and international, has to some extent knowingly rejected strenuous efforts by a handful of scientists, advocates and national leaders to focus on this fundamental question. The best and the brightest in the Obama administration, Congress, the private sector, labor and virtually every other economic, social and civic sector have quietly, independently and seemingly unconcernedly chosen to view conflicting world views etched in black and white as merely shades of grey.

Where, when and by what agency might things have gone differently? Who has the responsibility and resources to break the cognitive and political log jam? The assumption of this report is that major US environmental organizations and the private foundations that underwrite their climate program are directly and singularly responsible for defining the terms of the climate debate.

If we bend over backwards – in effect, let bygones be bygones – and accept every rationale for why major US environmental organizations have heretofore avoided an intramural conflict over the definition of climate risk and have failed to endorse one clear global objective or bright line, the abysmal failure of Copenhagen, despite a global groundswell generated by the 350.org campaign, and the latest climate science evidence, puts a coda on such forbearance.

Even if every other organized sector in society chooses to keep its head firmly in the sand, environmentalists cannot continue to do so. It's an either/or choice that cannot be avoided:

- either US environmental leaders and organizations accept the precautionary climate science story⁴ and endorse the bright line standard of 350 ppm, or less; *or*,
- the arguments of Dr. James Hansen and others must be convincingly refuted, and a case for moderate risk addressed by incremental policy and consensus political action vindicated.

The aim of this report, the first annual US Environmental Donors Report, is to provide environmentalists and climate action advocates, supporters and contributors with a concise summary of where major US and international environmental organizations, climate coalitions and campaigns stand in recognizing the divide between cataclysmic and incremental world views, summarized in the shorthand 350 ppm vs. 450 ppm, presenting a summary of climate policies and analysis by major environmental organizations in their own words.⁵

Methodology. Websites of major organizations, campaigns and coalitions addressing climate change in the US were reviewed on 2-3 occasions between December 23-26. Each site was surveyed, beginning on the homepage, following links relating to climate risk. Definitions and positions responding to the above questions were identified, the number of

⁴ Several prominent advocates, including Bill McKibben, argue that the “precautionary principle” is no longer relevant to climate change, given that the process is already well underway. While this is inarguably true, it remains the case that preemptive action is still required in order to avoid the “point of no return,” past which reinforcing impacts guarantee warming of a speed and extent that global ecosystems and civilization cannot survive. It is not longer accurate to invoke the precautionary principle to avoid climate change, but it is still accurate to say that without precautionary action cataclysmic climate change is inevitable.

⁵ The assumption, it should be acknowledged, is that bringing environmental organization to a point of conflict will result in an institution-wide embrace of 350 ppm and, logically, disassociation from the Markey/Kerry/ACES legislation, which is based on 450 ppm. This aim is unlikely to be shared by every reader, but this should not detract from the value of the report, for those donors and supporters who agree that the matter needs to be decided by rational consideration and debate rather than slouching toward a decision without grappling with the fundamentals.

pages and links required to find answers tabulated, and form and context of presentation analyzed. Every opportunity to download material was accepted. Where a given organization presented no specifics on the question of 350 ppm versus 450 ppm, the organization's search engine was used to search for the terms "350 ppm", "450 ppm", and "Dr. James Hansen". Only search results linked to organizational documents or policy were followed.

A survey of the websites of sixteen environmental and climate action organizations and three standing coalitions and campaigns was conducted between December 23-26, 2009⁶ to answer the following five groups of questions:

Relative risk? Does the organization present climate change prominently? Where, for example, does the problem appear in relationship to other issues?

Cataclysmic vs. incremental risk? Does the organization differentiate between incremental and abrupt climate change? Does the organization highlight the risk of ice shelf break-up and rapid sea level rise? (or and other catastrophic impact, e.g. collapse of water supply from Himalayan & South American glaciers, widespread crop failure, or other?). Within what timeframe does the organization present significant climate change impacts? Are tipping points, feedback loops and point of no return discussed? Does the organization reference Hansen, et. al., the UN IPCC 4th Report, the Stern Report or other major analyses?

Endorse 350 ppm or lower? Does the organization endorse 350 ppm or lower? (or 450 ppm or any other goal of climate action?). Does the organization recognize other positions and address major points under debate?⁷

Action to meet 350 ppm? Does the organization call for immediate and significant action to replace fossil fuels through energy efficiency, renewable energy and other benign options? Does the organization press for significant financing and other support from US and other nations that have benefited from fossil fuels?

Clarity & prominence. A final category considers the constellation of details that determine how effectively an organization's position on the above questions is conveyed. How many pages from the home page is the climate problem addressed?, for example. How succinct is the climate story? Is a clear position on 350 ppm versus 450 ppm presented and, if so, where? This category reflects the experience of a random web surfer. If it isn't on at least the third page, then it doesn't exist.

Purpose-built climate entities, including 1Sky, 350.org and U.S. CAP, were automatically awarded 1 star in the category of "relative risk."

The survey was conducted by Ken Ward, co-founder of the Jamaica Plain Green House, which is affiliated with 350.org and Climate S.O.S.

Similar surveys have been conducted at roughly 6 month intervals for the last 3 years by the principle author, permitting results in the 12/2009 survey to be checked against the historical record for consistency. In three instances, where website information was particularly at odds

⁶ Two additional organizations, We Can Solve It and MoveOn.org could not be surveyed due to roadblocks encountered in website navigation.

⁷ Some organizations appear to be in transition, or are perhaps attempting to straddle conflicting positions. Where contradictory impressions are conveyed without explanation (as for example, those groups which both endorse Markey/Kerry/ACES legislation and supported the Oct. 24th International Day of Climate Action for 350 ppm), the organization's position was categorized as "unclear."
2009 US Environmental Donor Report

with past survey results, or internally contradictory, organizations were invited to clarify their position. None chose to do so.

Conclusion. Only two entities – 350.org, the Climate S.O.S. Coalition – state clearly and emphatically that tipping points for major earth systems may already have been breached (and the world is rapidly approaching the climate point of no return), endorse 350 ppm or lower as the bright line standard, and call for global action and financing of appropriate speed and scale.

One organization, Friends of the Earth, clearly adheres to these policies, but does not clearly state its positions. Greenpeace has refrained from formally endorsing 350 ppm in the past, but committed significant resources to 350.org’s Oct. 24th International Day of Climate Action, leaving some confusion about where precisely the organization stands. National Wildlife Federation has published the single best summary of recent climate science – [Urgency of Recent Science](#), March 2009 by Amanda Staudt – which acknowledges that “450 ppm CO2 is a gamble...” and to keep risk of cataclysmic change below 30%, we will need to stabilize at 350 ppm, but does not make this recommendation.

All other major US environmental organizations and coalitions are effectively silent on the central question of defining the greatest global threat. Some straddle the matter. EDF, for example, describes catastrophic risks, but sidesteps a bright line definition and neither presents nor defends its sponsorship of federal legislation that aims only for 450 ppm (and sets out tepid and in urgent measures that are highly unlikely to reach even that).

It is striking that the number of groups receiving zero (6) and one star (3) total almost half the those surveyed. The essential non-engagement of nearly half the major US environmental organizations on the central matter before us is nothing short of astonishing. Within this group, the Union of Concerned Scientists stands out as particularly problematic in its effective disregard of major climate science findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendations. We recommend that contributors and donors take the following action(s):

- Give substantial support to the handful of campaigns and organizations which specifically endorse 350 ppm, and are awarded four or five stars – that is, 350.org, Climate S.O.S. and its coalition members and Friends of the Earth, awarded
- Contribute to the two organizations that have almost, not but quite, accepted 350 ppm – Greenpeace USA and National Wildlife Federation – but take the time to urge their formal endorsement.
- Withhold contributions and membership renewals from organizations you have, in the past supported, until the organization(s) endorse 350 ppm and communicate that message.
- Make no new contributions or donations, and decline membership in any organization with zero or one star.

For more information, contact:

Ken Ward, Jamaica Plain Green House
133 Bourne Street, Jamaica Plain, MA 02130 USA
617.435.4919 greenhousejp@gmail.com

Entity	Commentary	Rating		
ORGANIZATIONS				
1	Defenders of Wildlife	Defenders of Wildlife does not directly address climate on the homepage, but lists global warming under a pulldown programs menu, where it identifies “ <i>global warming as one of the gravest threats facing wildlife today.</i> ” Defenders neither defines the problem, nor endorses a global standard, and supports ACES legislation. No search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	zero
2	Environment America	Environment America emphasizes “clean energy” program on its home page and includes “stopping global warming” as the second item on its main menu. Several action items appear under “global warming solutions” and following text: “ <i>Global warming is the one of the most profound threats of our time. From dangerous heat waves and shrinking snowpack to extreme drought and increased wildfires, the dangers of global warming are cause for immediate action.</i> ” No search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence	
			total	*
3	Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)	Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) highlights global warming on home page and lists climate first on issues list. 2nd page is headlined “Stabilizing the Earth’s Climate to Preserve Life” and text reads: “ <i>Global warming is the most profound environmental challenge of our time — and it is accelerating at an alarming rate. Carbon dioxide levels are higher than they’ve been in two million years. The latest evidence indicates this crisis is much worse than previously thought. The Greenland Ice Sheet is melting faster than predicted and could begin to raise sea levels significantly. Rising waters threaten to submerge 52 low-lying island states by mid-century.</i> ” No additional information is provided on sea level, though menu of impacts includes “Nearing the Tipping Point?” discussing limits on ocean thermal and CO2 uptake. EDF endorses ACES. No relevant search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
			total	**
4	Friends of the Earth USA	Friends of the Earth (FOE) highlights climate on home page and lists global warming as first issue on menu. FOE writes, “ <i>The latest science tells us that the threat posed by the climate emergency is so dire, and the emissions reductions needed to prevent widespread catastrophe so substantial, that our society must change in sweeping, fundamental ways. The climate crisis cannot be solved with moderate change and incremental progress.</i> ” FOE endorses 350 ppm, but does not broadcast the position.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	*
			action to meet 350 ppm?	*
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	****
5	Greenpeace USA	Greenpeace presents several climate-related stories on home page and lists “global warming and energy” first in menu. Greenpeace International statement on Copenhagen notes, “ <i>There is a very real possibility that climate feedback mechanisms will result in a sudden and irreversible climate shift. No one knows how much global warming it would take to trigger such a doomsday scenario.</i> ” GPUS identified potential Antarctic ice shelf collapse, observing “ <i>the chances of this are considered ‘low’ in the IPCC’s Third Assessment report, recent research indicates new evidence of massive ice discharge from the WAIS.</i> ” GPUS opposes ACES, actively supported Oct. 24th Day of Action for 350 and includes liberal references to 350 ppm, 350.org and Bill McKibben in its blogs, but does not do so on main web pages nor policy material. It therefore remains unclear whether the organization explicitly endorses 350 ppm, though it does call for swift and large scale action and reject incremental steps.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	*
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	***
6	League of Conservation Voters (LCV)	LCV features energy and climate issues on home page and links to the LCV website, “It’s Getting Hot in Here.” LCV notes that a “ <i>2 degree increase would equal the warmest temperatures in 500,000 years. At that point in time, sea levels were 16 feet higher. Three million years ago, the Earth’s temperature was 5 degrees warmer and sea levels were 80 feet higher. Although life will survive significant increases in temperature, global warming will leave us with a vastly different planet than the one we inherited.</i> ” LCV endorses ACES. No search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	**

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
7	National Audubon Society	National Audubon does not reference climate on the home page, but lists “global warming” in issue menu and notes that <i>“The Greenland ice sheet could disappear in several thousand years.”</i> Audubon references UN IPCC 4th Report, and supports ACES, No search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	zero
8	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	Natural Resources Defense Council highlights global warming on home page with multiple followup links. The page “Consequences of Global Warming on Glaciers and Sea Levels” does not address sea level, though text in another section notes, <i>“Current rates of sea-level rise are expected to increase as a result both of thermal expansion of the oceans and melting of most mountain glaciers and partial melting of the West Antarctic and Greenland ice caps. Consequences include loss of coastal wetlands and barrier islands, and a greater risk of flooding in coastal communities.”</i> NRDC Washington, DC Climate Director Dan Lashof made this comment in March, 2008: <i>“Hansen is upping the ante again with his conclusion that current concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (about 385 ppm) are already in dangerous territory and that we should be aiming to lower concentrations back to 350 ppm, rather than aiming to stabilize them at about 450 ppm, as I and many other advocates of climate protection have previously called for. Many will again feel that Hansen has gone too far, but given his track record Hansen’s latest conclusions must be taken very seriously. And few would argue that we wouldn’t all be better off had we responded more forcefully to Hansen’s first warning,”</i> but there has been no further commentary. NRDC is an endorser of ACES legislation.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	**
9	National Wildlife Federation (NWF)	National Wildlife Federation features climate on home page and lists Global Warming on its main menu, which is described as “the single biggest threat to wildlife today... happening faster than predicted even several years ago.” The NWF “Urgency of Recent Science” report, written by Amanda Staudt and released in March, 2009 is the single best summary identified in the review. Staudt wrote that “sea-level rise as a consequence of global warming is a foregone conclusion. It only remains to be seen how much and how quickly. The 2007 IPCC report projected global average sea-level rise of 7 to 23 inches by the 2090s. ² This calculation did not take into account compelling new evidence of recent rapid melting in Greenland and Antarctica. ³ that if continued could	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
		lead to sea-level rise of 5 or 6 feet this century... [which] would cause havoc for coastal communities and ecosystems.” Stuard observes the “450 ppm CO2 is a gamble. Even if we are willing to accept the inevitable impacts associated with a 2°F warming above today’s levels, it is by no means certain that stabilizing CO2 at 450 ppm will enable us to keep warming that low. In fact, stabilizing at 450 ppm CO2 provides only a 50 percent chance of holding warming to less than 2°F. To reduce the likelihood of exceeding 2°F to less than 30 percent, we would need to stabilize CO2 at 350 ppm,” however NWF has not endorsed the position.	clarity and prominence?	*
			total	

10	The Nature Conservancy	The Nature Conservancy includes references to carbon impact on home page and list climate change as the fourth of five initiatives, about which it says “If we don’t act now, we will leave a much larger problem to our children. The good news is that, if we all join in to stop climate change, we can reduce its impact on our lives, on our environment and on future generations.” Climate change impacts are listed as “stronger hurricanes, more drought and increased coral deaths.” The Nature Conservancy is a member of U.S. Climate Action Partnership and supports ACES legislation. No relevant search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	zero
11	Rainforest Action Network	Rainforest Action Network showcases Coal River Mountain campaign opposing mountaintop removal coal mining and lists global warming among its campaigns, about which it says “Global warming is the most urgent issue of our time... Scientists predict that unless humans significantly reduce carbon emissions, sea levels will rise, and weather patterns will shift violently. Human-caused pollution has left our planet on the verge of a tipping point at which ecosystems will die and release massive amounts of CO2. If that happens, the changes to the climate could be irreversible, countless species will go extinct, and our economic and cultural way of life will be forever altered.” While it is known to the author that RAN is one of the handful of organizations that have endorsed 350 ppm, the position is not presented on the RAN website.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	*
			action to meet 350 ppm?	*
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	****
12	The Sierra Club	The Sierra Club presents climate as a top priorities on homepage, lists several climate topics under goals and includes “Climate Recovering Partnership” link. The Club stresses solutions and action and does not present a comprehensive assessment of impacts. A summary statement says that “to avoid climate catastrophe, greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. must peak in the coming decade, decline steadily, and reach a level close to zero by mid-century.” In the pdf publication, “Climate	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
		close to zero by mid-century. In the publication, "Climate Recovery Partnership Prospectus," the Club says "Most scientists agree that CO2 levels must peak below 450 parts per million (PPM) to have a 50 percent chance of avoiding catastrophic climate change. To stabilize the climate, those concentrations must then fall back to 350 ppm." The Club endorses ACES.	endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	**
13	Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)	The Union of Concerned Scientists lists global warming as one of several issues on homepage menu, and says, "Global warming is one of the most serious challenges facing us today. To protect the health and economic well-being of current and future generations, we must reduce our emissions of heat-trapping gases by using the technology, know-how, and practical solutions already at our disposal." The pdf publication "Climate Change in America" concludes that, "If global warming emissions continue unabated, every region in the country will confront large costs from climate change in the form of damages to infrastructure, diminished public health, and threats to vital industries employing millions of Americans." UCS endorses the ACES House version. No search results returned.	distinguish climate risk?	
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	zero
14	The Wilderness Society	The Wilderness Society references climate as one of several issues on homepage and "global warming" on page three as one of several issues, about which it says, "There's no doubt, global warming is affecting the world we live in and the wild lands we cherish. Rising sea levels, shrinking wetlands and more frequent wildfires are just a few of the effects we're already seeing. Warmer temperatures also mean animals and plants are struggling to adapt as their habitats change.... Our own lives will be profoundly impacted as well, if we don't get serious about fixing the problem." No search results are returned for 350 ppm, 450 ppm or Dr. James Hansen.	distinguish climate risk?	
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	zero
15	World Resources Institute (WRI)	The World Resources Institute presents climate as one of several issues on home page and says "The threat of global climate change is a paramount challenge. If greenhouse gas emissions are not brought under control, the resulting rise in temperatures will adversely affect human communities and natural systems around the world." Search for 350 ppm returns no policy documents, nor references to Dr. James Hansen.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	*
16	World Wildlife Federation	World Wildlife Federation highlights climate on home page and lists reducing global carbon footprint as one of two goals, about which it says, <i>“Declining glaciers, changing weather patterns, and dying corals are some of the well-known impacts of climate change – but people around the world are also witnessing many others, from reduced stock fertility and misplaced penguins to tidal surges and increased heat-induced illnesses.”</i> A search for 350 ppm returns the WWF pdf report Clean Economy, Clean Planet, which states <i>“It should be noted that even in the 450 policy scenario there is a 50% probability that temperature increases will exceed 2°C. It we are to stand a real chance of preventing worse damage to (inter alia) ice shields, forests and small island nations, we must eventually be below 350 ppm CO,”</i> but there is no indication that WWF has endorsed the standard. WWF has endorsed ACES legislation. Dr. James Hansen was awarded the WWF 2006 Conservation Medal.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	
			total	*
COALITIONS & CAMPAIGNS				
1	1Sky	1Sky is a campaign <i>“created in 2007 to focus the power of millions of concerned Americans on a single goal: bold federal action by 2010 that can stem global warming.”</i> 1Sky says of the climate crisis the <i>“ small changes in the earth’s temperature can contribute to wholesale disruption of natural systems. The Arctic ice cap and Antarctic ice sheets are melting much faster than expected, at rates 30 years ahead of predictions made by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Unless we act decisively, climactic disruptions threaten to drastically alter our way of life.”</i> 1Sky endorses ACES. Search for 350 ppm returns links to Bill McKibben, a 1Sky Board member, but no policy statements are identified.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	*
			total	
2	350.org	<i>“350.org is an international campaign dedicated to building a movement to unite the world around solutions to the climate crisis--the solutions that science and justice demand.”</i> 350.org homepage text reads: <i>“Copenhagen Conclusion Needed: 350</i>	distinguish climate risk?	*

Entity		Commentary	Rating	
		homepage text reads, "Copenhagen Conclusion: Needed: 550 ppm, Negotiated: 770 ppm. Verdict: NOT DONE YET." 350.org describes climate risk as, "Accelerating arctic warming and other early climate impacts have led scientists to conclude that we are already above the safe zone at our current 390 ppm, and that unless we are able to rapidly return to 350 ppm this century, we risk reaching tipping points and irreversible impacts such as the melting of the Greenland ice sheet and major methane releases from increased permafrost melt."	differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	*
			action to meet 350 ppm?	*
			clarity and prominence?	*
			total	**** *
3	Climate S.O.S.	"Climate SOS is a new and expanding network of individuals and organizations concerned with ensuring that U.S. climate legislation effectively rises to the challenges we face from global warming." the Climate SOS platform says, "Any effective climate legislation must be based in the best available scientific advice. Current scientific evidence clearly indicates the safe upper limit of atmospheric greenhouse gases to be somewhere between 300 – 350 parts-per-million carbon dioxide equivalent (ppm CO2-eq), in order to avoid catastrophic warming."	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	*
			endorse 350 ppm?	*
			action to meet 350 ppm?	*
			clarity and prominence?	*
			total	**** *
4	U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP)	"United States Climate Action Partnership (USCAP) is a groups of businesses and leading environmental organizations that have come together to call on the federal government to quickly enact strong national legislation to require significant reductions of greenhouse gas emissions." USCAP "agrees that the science is sufficiently clear to justify prompt action to protect our environment. Each year of delayed action to control emissions increases the risk of unavoidable consequences that could necessitate even steeper reductions in the future, with potentially greater economic cost and social disruption." USCAP endorses ACES legislation. No search is available on USCAP website.	distinguish climate risk?	*
			differentiate cataclysmic risk?	
			endorse 350 ppm?	
			action to meet 350 ppm?	
			clarity and prominence?	*
			total	*