## WEBVTT

 $1\ 00:00:00.000 -> 00:00:03.180 < v ->Hi$ , everyone, as we have long been </v> $2\ 00:00:03.180 \longrightarrow 00:00:04.876$  waiting for this time, 3 00:00:04.876 --> 00:00:09.320 Dr. Ana Vicedo-Cabrera will talk about  $4\ 00:00:09.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.320$  the most advanced sciences in how to attribute  $5\ 00:00:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.170$  the health impacts to climate change. 6 00:00:16.242  $\rightarrow$  00:00:19.170 Also Vicedo-Cabrera's current research 7 00:00:19.170  $\rightarrow$  00:00:22.180 develops along the intersection of epidemiology  $8\ 00:00:22.180 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.900$  and climate sciences to understand  $9\ 00:00:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.490$  how different climate factors  $10\ 00:00:26.490 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.960$  and other related environmental stresses 11  $00:00:28.960 \rightarrow 00:00:32.080$  affect health in the context of climate change. 12 00:00:32.080  $\rightarrow 00:00:36.890$  So she has many, many excellent publications  $13\ 00:00:36.890 \longrightarrow 00:00:39.410$  in the climate epidemiology field, 14 00:00:39.410 --> 00:00:42.860 including using the Multi-Country Multi-City Network  $15\ 00:00:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.520$  data to look at the health impacts also,  $16\ 00:00:45.520 \rightarrow 00:00:48.720$  and the health impact to heat-related mortality  $17\ 00:00:48.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.100$  including the one study 18 $00{:}00{:}50{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}53{.}900$  that she will be sharing with us today. 19 $00:00:53.900 \dashrightarrow 00:00:58.453$  But before we hand it over to Dr. Ana Vicedo-Cabrera,  $20\ 00:01:01.320 \rightarrow 00:01:05.570$  I want to just mention that housekeeping rules  $21\ 00:01:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.720$  that if you do have any questions, 22 00:01:07.720 --> 00:01:09.960 especially our online audience,  $23\ 00:01:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.807$  please feel free to type in your question in the Chat box,

24 00:01:13.807 --> 00:01:18.510 and we will have all the questions answered at last.

25 00:01:18.510 --> 00:01:20.660 So thank you, and without further ado, Ana.

 $26\ 00:01:23.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.897 < v \longrightarrow 00:01:27.89$ 

 $27\ 00:01:34.497 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.928$  Do you hear me?

28 00:01:35.928 --> 00:01:36.810 <v Host>Yeah, okay.</v> <v Attendee>Yes.</v>

29 00:01:36.810 --> 00:01:40.060 <v ->Yeah, perfect, so welcome, everybody,</v>

30 00:01:40.060 --> 00:01:41.920 and thank you very much

 $31\ 00:01:41.920 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.607$  for being here in this webinar.

 $32\ 00:01:43.607 \rightarrow 00:01:46.000$  And of course, thank you for the invitation

 $33\ 00:01:46.000 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.060$  to contribute to this event today.

 $34\ 00:01:49.060 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.930$  It's a great pleasure for me being here

 $35\ 00:01:51.930 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.240$  to talk about a topic that in a way,

36 00:01:54.240 --> 00:01:58.470 has been a bit of my nightmare, I must say,

 $37\ 00:01:58.470 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.403$  or a bit of my priority during the last,

38 00:02:01.403 --> 00:02:03.830 I would say, two, three years.

39 00:02:03.830 --> 00:02:07.080 And I believe that it might be one

40 00:02:07.080 --> 00:02:11.933 of my main research fields in the coming years as well.

41 00:02:13.360 --> 00:02:17.720 So I hope that basically, at the end of my presentation,

42 00:02:17.720 --> 00:02:22.720 you might have already some insights about this topic,

43 00:02:22.890  $\rightarrow 00:02:27.150$  and probably you might get inspired as well

44 00:02:28.100 --> 00:02:30.640 about the specific topic of attribution.

45 00:02:30.640 --> 00:02:34.617 So as you could see from the title, we'll talk about

46 00:02:34.617 --> 00:02:37.110 "Attribution of Health Impacts to Climate Change",

47 00:02:37.110 --> 00:02:40.083 and now, you will see that mostly of my presentation

 $48\ 00:02:40.083$  --> 00:02:44.190 will be focused on heat and health as an example.

49 00:02:44.190 --> 00:02:47.940 So let's start from there, from the very beginning.

50 00:02:47.940 --> 00:02:49.390 See if I can, okay?

 $51\ 00:02:49.390 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.390$  Yeah, so basically, heat is considered nowadays,

52 00:02:56.870  $\rightarrow$  00:02:59.000 an important environmental stressor.

53 00:02:59.000 --> 00:03:00.910 Very recently, it was estimated that

54 00:03:00.910 --> 00:03:05.910 around 1% of, sorry, 1% of all deaths globally

55 00:03:10.230 --> 00:03:11.420 can be attributed to heat.

56 $00:03:11.420 \dashrightarrow 00:03:13.270$  That translates around seven deaths

 $57\ 00:03:13.270 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.030$  per 100,000 population per year.

 $58\ 00:03:17.030 - 00:03:19.380$  And as well, it has been estimated

 $59\ 00:03:19.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:21.670$  that increase in morbidity, in particular,

 $60\ 00{:}03{:}21.670$  -->  $00{:}03{:}25.920$  for cardiovascular, respiratory, and mental disorders.

61 00:03:25.920 --> 00:03:29.360 And as well, it has been identified several,

62 00:03:29.360 --> 00:03:32.090 let's say, vulnerability populations

 $63\ 00:03:34.760 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.720$  such as elderly, pregnant women,

64 00:03:36.720 --> 00:03:38.920 chronic patients, and children,

 $65\ 00:03:38.920$  --> 00:03:42.060 and finally, it has been estimated an important burden

66 00:03:42.060 --> 00:03:43.615 in terms of economic costs,

 $67\ 00:03:43.615 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.550$  and also reduction in labor productivity.

 $68\ 00:03:45.550 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.290$  So every signal is taken together is considered

 $69\ 00:03:49.290 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.300$  that heat is an important element

70 00:03:52.300  $\rightarrow 00:03:55.631$  to be assessed in our field of climate change,

 $71\ 00:03:55.631 \rightarrow 00:03:57.970$  epidemiologic impact in particular with regards,

 $72\ 00:03:57.970 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.040$  let's say, climate change research

 $73\ 00:04:00.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.790$  and what is gonna happen in the next decade?

 $74\ 00:04:02.790 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.790$  So let's say, how heat affects health?

 $75\ 00:04:10.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.103$  In a way, we can see that first,

 $76\ 00:04:13.850 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.070$  the mechanism by which heat likely

 $77\ 00:04:16.070 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.210$  impacts human health are complex

 $78\ 00:04:18.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:20.083$  and understanding, let's say, how the body

79 $00{:}04{:}20.083 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}24.850$  reacts to heat has been the focus of decades of research

 $80\ 00:04:24.850 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.980$  in particular, in physiology.

81 00:04:27.980  $\rightarrow 00:04:30.890$  It stresses kind of the overarching term

 $82\ 00:04:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.320$  that is used for, let's say, to describe

83 00:04:34.320 --> 00:04:36.960 the response of human body to the exposure to heat,

 $84\ 00:04:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.600$  and usually happens when the body

 $85\ 00:04:39.600 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.130$  is overwhelmed by metabolic heat production.

 $86\ 00:04:42.130 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.673$  You can see here from this diagram,

 $87\ 00:04:43.673 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.600$  basically, our body, what it has to do

 $88\ 00:04:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.350$  is kind of react to the exposure to heat

89 $00:04:48.350 \dashrightarrow 00:04:50.590$  in several mechanisms to try to dissipate,

 $90\ 00:04:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.450$  or let's say, emit the overheating

91 00:04:52.450  $\rightarrow 00:04:55.240$  that we have in our body.

 $92\ 00:04:55.240 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.830$  And if in a way, this is not efficient,

 $93\ 00:04:57.830 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.460$  what we can create or let's say, can cost

94 $00{:}05{:}00{.}460$  -->  $00{:}05{:}02{.}980$  or through different mechanisms that eventually

95 00:05:02.980 --> 00:05:07.260 can damage different systems or organs in the body.

 $96\ 00:05:07.260 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.160$  In this nice review that was recently published,

 $97\ 00:05:12.160 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.549$  they summarized most of the areas,

 $98\ 00:05:14.549 \longrightarrow 00:05:15.900$  so the different mechanisms they have seen

 $99\ 00:05:15.900 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.563$  that actually, there are several,

 $100\ 00:05:18.670 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.410$  let's say, several organs that are directly

101 00:05:22.410 --> 00:05:25.210 affected by heat exposure through different mechanisms

 $102\ 00:05:25.210 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.720$  such as ischemia, heat cytotoxicity,

103 00:05:28.720 --> 00:05:31.190 inflammation, et cetera.

 $104\ 00:05:31.190 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.550$  This is from, let's say, physiological

 $105 \ 00:05:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.540$  mechanism important view.

106 00:05:34.540 --> 00:05:37.620 But if we, let's say, us, epidemiologists

107 00:05:37.620 --> 00:05:39.530 working on climate change research,

 $108\ 00{:}05{:}39{.}530$  -->  $00{:}05{:}43{.}710$  we know that we assess heat in a kind of different way.

109 00:05:43.710 --> 00:05:47.490 Basically, what we do is to have our wonderful,

110 00:05:47.490 --> 00:05:50.700 or let's say, so called exposure response functions,

111 00:05:50.700  $\rightarrow 00:05:53.140$  that in a way summarizes the association

 $112\ 00:05:53.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.780$  between the ambient temperature in this case,

113 00:05:56.780 --> 00:06:00.179 we do focus on heat, and specific health outcome,

114 00:06:00.179 --> 00:06:02.010 that is in this case, mortality.

 $115\ 00:06:02.010 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.650$  That basically, you see here

 $116\ 00:06:03.650 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.800$  in the y-axis is the relative risk,

117 00:06:06.800  $\operatorname{-->}$  00:06:09.000 and in x-axis is the temperature.

118 00:06:09.000 --> 00:06:10.880 In this case, representing this, let's say,

119 00:06:10.880 --> 00:06:15.030 association that usually is non-linear for the City of Rome,

 $120\ 00{:}06{:}15{.}030$  -->  $00{:}06{:}19{.}190$  and how we define heat is basically all temperatures

121  $00:06:19.190 \rightarrow 00:06:21.390$  above a specific threshold that we call

122 00:06:21.390 --> 00:06:23.180 temperature of minimum mortality

 $123\ 00:06:23.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.540$  that is tightly-defined from the curve

124 00:06:25.540 --> 00:06:27.550 that corresponds to the temperature

 $125\ 00:06:27.550 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.190$  for which the risk of dying is minimum.

 $126\ 00:06:30.190 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.030$  So every temperature above

127 00:06:32.030 --> 00:06:34.680 this threshold is considered heat.

128 00:06:34.680 --> 00:06:37.940 And we know that risk increases steeply

129 00:06:37.940 --> 00:06:40.410 from this point onwards, as you could see here

 $130\ 00:06:40.410 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.630$  in the curve, up to a maximum.

 $131\ 00:06:42.630 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.210$  So basically, this is how we assess heat,

132 00:06:46.210 --> 00:06:49.050 the effect of heat on health.

133 00:06:49.050 --> 00:06:52.040 But to make our life a little bit more complicated,

 $134\ 00:06:52.040 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.950$  we know that actually the effect of heat

 $135\ 00:06:54.950 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.200$  is very different across locations.

136 $00{:}06{:}57.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00.880$  I mean, we can assess this expression response function

137 00:07:00.880 --> 00:07:03.150 or curve from a specific population,

138 00:07:03.150 --> 00:07:06.350 but we know that we cannot extrapolate this curve

 $139\ 00:07:06.350 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.990$  to other locations because we know

 $140\ 00:07:07.990 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.810$  that vulnerability is very specific,

141  $00:07:10.810 \rightarrow 00:07:13.800$  very particular for a specific location.

142 00:07:13.800 --> 00:07:16.340 It's mostly because of the different combination

143 00:07:16.340 --> 00:07:18.540 of let's say, factors, so vulnerability factors

 $144\ 00:07:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.690$  or resiliency factors that make this population

145 00:07:21.690 --> 00:07:24.940 more or less resilient to an ambient temperature,

 $146\ 00:07:24.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.940$  in this case, for heat.

147 00:07:26.940 --> 00:07:31.290 So in a way, you could see that during the last years,

 $148\ 00:07:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.650$  there has been a lot of, let's say,

149 $00{:}07{:}33.650$  -->  $00{:}07{:}37.300$  developments in the field of climate change epidemiology,

 $150\ 00:07:37.300$  --> 00:07:41.510 and to clarify how heat affects health.

151 00:07:41.510 --> 00:07:45.160 But if we have to define specific moments in time

 $152\ 00{:}07{:}45.160$  -->  $00{:}07{:}48.680$  in the past but in a way constitute an important,

153 00:07:48.680 --> 00:07:52.030 let's say, kind of turning points,

154 00:07:52.030 --> 00:07:56.220 how we assess the effect of temperature on health,

 $155\ 00:07:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.110$  in what particular in public health

 $156\ 00:07:58.110 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.200$  is this event that happened in Europe in 2003

 $157\ 00:08:02.200 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.360$  is this massive European 2003 heat wave

158 00:08:06.360 --> 00:08:10.550 that affected very heavily Central Europe

159 00:08:10.550 --> 00:08:15.260 on the Southeast in over the Mediterranean area.

 $160\ 00:08:15.260 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.740$  And basically, what happened is that

 $161\ 00:08:17.740 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.190$  it was so massive, so unique that made

 $162\ 00:08:22.190 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.540$  that everybody turned their, let's say,

 $163\ 00:08:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.630$  focus, in particular, on public health on heat.

 $164\ 00:08:28.630 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.080$  Actually, a few years after that,

165 00:08:32.080 --> 00:08:36.180 there was an assessment in which they estimated

166 00:08:37.230 --> 00:08:42.230 that around 70,000 deaths could happen

 $167\ 00:08:44.360 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.370$  during this massive event.

168 00:08:46.370 --> 00:08:49.870 So in a way, it gave a kind of very clear idea 169 00:08:49.870 --> 00:08:52.270 about the severity of the event.

170 00:08:52.270 --> 00:08:53.957 And more importantly, what's at that time

171 00:08:53.957 --> 00:08:56.967 is really to say, "Okay, if this is happening now,

 $172\ 00:08:56.967 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.540$  "what would happen in the future?"

173 00:08:58.540 --> 00:09:01.080 So we know that probably due to climate change,

 $174\ 00:09:01.080 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.750$  these events will be much more frequent.

 $175\ 00:09:03.750 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.710$  So while the epidemiology is, let's say,

 $176\ 00:09:06.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.430$  as we were assessing what were the impacts

 $177\ 00:09:09.430 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.830$  of that event at that time, in particular,

 $178\ 00:09:12.830 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.940$  try to understand how we can implement,

179 00:09:14.940 --> 00:09:15.950 probably, health measures,

180 00:09:15.950 --> 00:09:20.370 how we can protect population from future events,

181 00:09:20.370 --> 00:09:24.607 climate science community, they were more thinking,

182 00:09:24.607 --> 00:09:28.457 "Okay, and what could have, in a way,

183 00:09:28.457 --> 00:09:33.370 "what was the role of climate change in this event?"

 $184\ 00:09:33.370 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.820$  In a way, there's this kind of very,

 $185\ 00:09:36.820 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.530$  not very good question,

 $186\ 00:09:38.530 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.840$  or let's say, an imposed question

187 00:09:40.840 --> 00:09:43.780 whether this 2003 heat wave was actually caused,

 $188\ 00:09:43.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.570$  in a very simplistic or deterministic sense,

189 00:09:46.570 --> 00:09:49.300 by a modification of external influences on climate.

 $190\ 00:09:49.300 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.680$  Basically, as we said it, due to the increase

191 00:09:51.680 --> 00:09:54.970 in concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

192 $00{:}09{:}54{.}970$  -->  $00{:}09{:}59{.}070$  Because we know that almost any such weather event

193 00:09:59.070 --> 00:10:01.440 might have occurred by chance in our world 194 00:10:01.440 --> 00:10:03.565 without climate change.

0

195 $00{:}10{:}03.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}05.113$  In a way, what we have to do is to think

 $196\ 00:10:05.113 \longrightarrow 00:10:06.590$  that in another perspective,

197 00:10:06.590 --> 00:10:09.760 or let's say, to put that question in a different way.

198 00:10:09.760  $\rightarrow$  00:10:13.140 Basically, it's how much did human activities 199 00:10:13.140  $\rightarrow$  00:10:15.590 increase the risk of occurrence

 $200\ 00:10:15.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.480$  or probability of this event?

201 00:10:17.480 --> 00:10:21.410 Or more specifically, did actually climate change

202 00:10:21.410 --> 00:10:25.400 alter the severity, frequency, or duration of the event?

 $203\ 00:10:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.517$  So this is exactly what attribution

 $204\ 00:10:27.517 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.540$  and detection studies does.

 $205\ 00:10:29.540 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.050$  It's a field that it has been, in a way,

 $206\ 00:10:33.050 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.702$  developed in the last years,

207 00:10:36.702 --> 00:10:37.823 in a way, it's more traditional

 $208\ 00:10:37.823 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.810$  from the climate science community,

 $209\ 00:10:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.830$  but not much on the epidemiological side.

 $210\ 00:10:42.830 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.820$  In a way, one of the first example

211 00:10:44.820 --> 00:10:49.050 was actually this study led by Peter Stott from the UK,

212 00:10:49.050 --> 00:10:51.800 in which actually they assessed

 $213\ 00:10:51.800 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.440$  what happened in this 2003 heat wave,

 $214\ 00:10:54.440 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.443$  and what they came up from this study

 $215\ 00:10:56.443 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.330$  is that it is very likely that human influence

 $216\ 00:11:00.330 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.150$  has at least doubled the risk of a heat wave,

 $217\ 00:11:03.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.220$  exceeding this threshold magnitude.

218 00:11:05.220 --> 00:11:07.180 So in a way, it's already posting,

219 00:11:07.180 --> 00:11:10.390 putting a certain name into this event,

 $220\ 00:11:10.390 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.100$  saying that probably climate change

 $221\ 00:11:13.100 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.140$  have altered the, let's say,

 $222\ 00:11:15.140 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.810$  probability of the occurrence of this event.

223 00:11:17.810 --> 00:11:22.490 So how this attribution and detection studies work?

224 00:11:22.490 --> 00:11:24.440 So basically, in a very simplistic way,

 $225\ 00:11:25.449 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.880$  what happens is that we model, let's say,

 $226\ 00:11:29.880 \longrightarrow 00:11:32.120$  we compare our current climate

 $227\ 00:11:32.120 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.630$  in presence of climate change

 $228\ 00:11:34.630 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.420$  that we can actually, in a way, estimate

229 00:11:39.420 --> 00:11:42.210 or let's say, mimic or get simulations

230 00:11:42.210 --> 00:11:45.360 based on these kind of climate models,

231 00:11:45.360 --> 00:11:48.610 in which they kind of try to mimic current conditions

232 00:11:48.610 --> 00:11:51.270 based on the what we know

233 00:11:51.270 --> 00:11:53.650 in terms of greenhouse gas emissions,

234 00:11:53.650 --> 00:11:58.080 and we compare it with a world without climate change.

 $235\ 00:11:58.080 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.220$  So basically, it's what you can see here.

 $236\ 00:12:00.220 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.804$  We compare it, here is in this curve

237 00:12:02.804 --> 00:12:05.300 is kind of simulated data just for you

 $238\ 00:12:05.300 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.240$  to illustrate this comparison

 $239\ 00:12:07.240 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.840$  in which we have our warming climate  $240\ 00:12:09.840 \longrightarrow 00:12:11.400$  that is increasing in red 241 00:12:11.400 --> 00:12:14.480 compared to a kind of climate-free, 242 00:12:14.480 --> 00:12:16.180 climate change-free environment  $243\ 00:12:16.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.300$  or what they called a naturalized scenario,  $244\ 00:12:20.300 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.000$  or let's say, without anthropogenic forcing.  $245\ 00:12:24.000 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.180$  So in a way, the difference  $246\ 00:12:25.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.060$  between these two scenarios would give us  $247 \ 00:12:28.060 \longrightarrow 00:12:33.060$  what is actually the contribution of anthropogenic forcing,  $248\ 00:12:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.970$  that eventually is what we want to know,  $249\ 00:12:34.970 -> 00:12:37.120$  what is the human influence in the climate  $250\ 00:12:37.120 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.680$  that actually might have altered the climate  $251\ 00:12:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.677$  in current period or historically,  $252\ 00:12:44.677 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.960$  during the last decades. 253 00:12:46.960 --> 00:12:51.960 So as I said, it's a field that has been developing  $254\ 00:12:52.670 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.460$  in the last years in particular  $255\ 00:12:54.460 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.710$  for the climatological statistics 256 00:12:55.710 --> 00:12:59.250 because of course, we know what is happening now. 257 00:12:59.250 --> 00:13:02.530 I mean, we can see whether these simulations  $258\ 00:13:02.530 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.790$  from these climate models really mimic  $259\ 00:13:05.790$  --> 00:13:10.050 what we are experiencing today based on observations.  $260\ 00:13:10.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.700$  but we don't have data what would have been  $261\ 00:13:12.700 \longrightarrow 00:13:14.070$  the world without climate change.  $262\ 00:13:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.060$  So in a way, we have to rely on these models 263 00:13:18.060 --> 00:13:19.780 that eventually, when you reduce this, 264 00:13:19.780 --> 00:13:22.880 let's say, forcing, so these inputs in your model, 265 00:13:22.880 --> 00:13:25.790 you're actually mimicking what would have been

 $266\ 00:13:25.790 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.490$  the world without climate change.  $267\ 00:13:28.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.870$  So in a way, you can see that  $268\ 00:13:29.870 \longrightarrow 00:13:30.997$  there are a lot of uncertainties. 269 00:13:30.997 --> 00:13:32.830 And of course, one thing 270 00:13:32.830 --> 00:13:36.450 that I would like you to put in your, 271 00:13:36.450 --> 00:13:38.540 kind of your front, in your forefront, 272 00:13:38.540 --> 00:13:40.530 is that when we talk about attribution  $273\ 00:13:40.530 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.520$  and detection studies, 274 00:13:41.520 --> 00:13:45.080 we talk about, basically, probability.  $275\ 00:13:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.480$  This is a term that you will say  $276\ 00:13:47.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.270$  that it's very pivotal in this story 277 00:13:50.270 --> 00:13:52.130 because in a way, it's not a matter of, 278 00:13:52.130 --> 00:13:54.480 okay, yes or no climate change  $279\ 00:13:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.810$  have caused this event.  $280\ 00:13:56.810 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.050$  It's whether climate change  $281\ 00:13:58.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.410$  has altered the probability of this event.  $282\ 00:14:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.630$  So basically, what we, let's say,  $283\ 00:14:04.630 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.840$  people working or researchers working in, 284 00:14:06.840 --> 00:14:10.150 in climate science, mostly on the part 285 00:14:10.150 --> 00:14:11.670 on attribution and detection studies,  $286\ 00:14:11.670 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.340$  what they do is to compare probabilities. 287 00:14:15.340 --> 00:14:17.010 As you could see here in red,  $288\ 00:14:17.010 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.140$  the probability of an event happening 289 00:14:19.140 --> 00:14:21.830 above a specific temperature threshold  $290\ 00:14:21.830 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.410$  compared to the same, let's say, threshold,  $291\ 00:14:24.410 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.363$  what would have been the probability  $292\ 00:14:25.363 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.330$  in a world without climate change  $293\ 00:14:27.330 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.403$  in this counterfactual scenario.  $294\ 00:14:31.460 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.250$  Let's say, in this nice review, 295 00:14:35.250 --> 00:14:39.313 this researcher, Fredi Otto from Oxford,  $296\ 00:14:40.460 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.350$  she very well described in this paper,

 $297\ 00:14:43.350 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.260$  in this review, in which basically,

298 00:14:45.260  $\rightarrow 00:14:47.380$  what she said is that out of this exercise,

299 00:14:47.380  $\rightarrow 00:14:50.050$  we would have four different outcomes.

 $300\ 00:14:50.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.580$  First, could have been made, let's say,

301 00:14:52.580 --> 00:14:54.700 that this event could have been made more likely

302 00:14:54.700 --> 00:14:59.120 because of the anthropogenic climate change, let's say,

303 00:14:59.120 --> 00:15:03.050 or it could have been made, let's say, less likely,

 $304\ 00:15:03.050 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.070$  or there is no detectable influence

 $305\ 00:15:05.070 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.527$  from anthropogenic climate change.

306 00:15:06.527 --> 00:15:09.520 And the last one, with our current understanding

 $307\ 00:15:09.520 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.940$  and available tools, we are unable to analyze

 $308\ 00:15:11.940 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.850$  the role of external drivers in this event.

 $309\ 00:15:14.850 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.890$  So basically, as you could see,

 $310\ 00:15:16.890 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.610$  is to see whether climate change

311 00:15:19.610 --> 00:15:23.307 altered the probability to make this more or less likely.

 $312\ 00:15:23.307 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.240$  And then we have resources,

313 00:15:25.240 --> 00:15:28.730 or let's say, our models can help us to really clarify

314 00:15:28.730 --> 00:15:33.490 whether these differences in probability is meaningful.

315 00:15:33.490 --> 00:15:37.280 So to understand the world, this work of attribution,

 $316\ 00:15:37.280 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.630$  is we have to talk about,

 $317\ 00:15:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.810$  and usually, you will see this plot

 $318\ 00:15:42.880 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.973$  in every study in this field.

319 00:15:46.390 --> 00:15:48.810 For us, epidemiologists, it's basically

 $320\ 00:15:48.810 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.530$  something that we, I mean, honestly,

321 00:15:50.530 --> 00:15:53.180 when I saw it, I don't know what the hell is this,

322 00:15:53.180 --> 00:15:56.210 but at some point, I found it very, very interesting.

 $323\ 00:15:56.210 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.460$  So I will try to guide you through this plot.

324 00:16:00.208 --> 00:16:03.110 You could see here in the y-axis

 $325\ 00:16:03.110 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.530$  is the monthly temperature equivalent.

326 00:16:06.740 --> 00:16:09.960 And basically, in the x-axis,

 $327\ 00:16:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.616$  you have what they call return time.

 $328\ 00:16:12.616 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.296$  It's a measure of, let's say,

 $329\ 00:16:15.296 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.360$  of probability or severity of an event.

330 00:16:17.360 --> 00:16:20.200 It's basically, you put in here in this point,

 $331\ 00:16:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.870$  what it's saying is an event

332 00:16:21.870 --> 00:16:23.150 has a return kind of time,

333 00:16:23.150 --> 00:16:27.130 or basically, it already happens 1 in 10 years.

334 00:16:27.130 --> 00:16:31.800 If you go in here, it's an event happening 1 in 100 years.

335 00:16:31.800 --> 00:16:34.070 So in a way, you could understand

 $336\ 00:16:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.967$  that the far you are from the origin,

 $337\ 00:16:37.967 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.490$  the more extreme an event could be

 $338\ 00:16:41.490 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.670$  or the less likely, as you could see here

 $339\ 00:16:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.010$  on the other side of the axis,

340 00:16:47.010 --> 00:16:49.140 less probable an event is.

 $341\ 00:16:49.140 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.080$  So basically, what they do, in this case,

342 00:16:51.080 --> 00:16:54.810 it's an example of the 2010 heat wave in Russia.

343 00:16:54.810  $\rightarrow$  00:16:58.610 And it's basically to compare this blue line,

344 00:16:58.610 --> 00:17:03.100 that in a way, is used based on this counterfactual world

 $345\ 00:17:03.100 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.500$  in which you have, basically,

 $346\ 00:17:04.500 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.220$  this is the probability of a specific,

347 00:17:06.220 --> 00:17:08.760 let's say, event happening at different times.

348 00:17:08.760 --> 00:17:10.960 And in red, the same,

349 00:17:10.960 --> 00:17:13.280 but in our world currently, in our world,

350 00:17:13.280 --> 00:17:14.710 let's say, in our world current conditions,

 $351\ 00:17:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.000$  so we don't have to worry.

 $352\ 00:17:16.000 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.160$  So if you go in this line,

 $353\ 00{:}17{:}19.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24.160$  this line is basically corresponds to this threshold

354 00:17:24.567 --> 00:17:27.050 that was, let's say, defined during this heat wave.

 $355\ 00:17:27.050 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.880$  But basically, this heat wave reached,

356 00:17:28.880 --> 00:17:32.097 I think, it was 24.5 degrees.

 $357\ 00{:}17{:}33{.}379$  -->  $00{:}17{:}35{.}590$  So in a way, according to these dimensions,

 $358\ 00:17:35.590 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.540$  what they say is that in current times,

359 00:17:39.540 --> 00:17:44.540 this event corresponds to approximately 1-in-50-years event,

360 00:17:46.380 --> 00:17:49.770 while in a world without climate change,

361 00:17:49.770 --> 00:17:54.200 this event would have corresponded to 1 in a 100 years.

 $362\ 00:17:54.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.640$  So basically, what has happened

363 00:17:55.640 --> 00:17:59.760 is that climate change has made the event more likely,

364 00:17:59.760 --> 00:18:02.560 let's say, from an event in a hypothetical world,

 $365\ 00:18:02.560 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.430\ 1$  in 100 years has become 1 in 50 years.

 $366\ 00:18:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.597$  So as you could see again,

 $367\ 00:18:09.597 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.120$  is the EDL changes in probability,

368 00:18:12.120 --> 00:18:16.240 making a specific event or a specific temperature threshold,

369 00:18:16.240 --> 00:18:18.410 make it more probable, let's say,

 $370\ 00:18:18.410 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.013$  going from 1 in 100 to 1 in 50 years.

371 00:18:23.100 --> 00:18:27.500 So as you could see, it's kind of something

 $372\ 00:18:27.500 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.190$  that is not very, for us as epidemiologists,

 $373\ 00:18:31.190 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.020$  a little bit difficult because in a way,

374 00:18:33.020 --> 00:18:34.620 it's just talking about probabilities,

 $375\ 00:18:34.620 \rightarrow 00:18:37.990$  but for us, translating this into health impacts,

 $376\ 00:18:37.990 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.630$  it requires a bit of work.

 $377\ 00:18:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.327$  But let's say that we're working on it.

378 00:18:42.327  $\rightarrow 00:18:46.160$  The idea is that this work of attribution

 $379\ 00:18:46.160 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.090$  has gained kind of a lot of attention

 $380\ 00:18:49.090 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.890$  during the last years.

 $381\ 00:18:50.890 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.033$  In particular, thinking about

 $382\ 00:18:52.033 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.820$  what happened this last summer.

383 00:18:53.820 --> 00:18:56.100 Surely, you might have heard,

 $384\ 00:18:56.100 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.660$  or even lived there, or suffered this event,

385 00:18:59.660 --> 00:19:03.330 this massive heat wave that happened in last summer

 $386\ 00:19:03.330 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.060$  in West, North in America.

 $387\ 00:19:05.060 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.550$  So in a way, what happened,

 $388\ 00:19:07.550 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.020$  we know there were few days,

389 00:19:11.020 --> 00:19:14.740 the group came with temperatures above record,

390 00:19:14.740 --> 00:19:18.340 and it was a lot of attention in media, et cetera.

 $391\ 00:19:18.340 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.281$  So while all this was happening,

 $392\ 00:19:21.281 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.280$  let's say, that there was an initiative

 $393\ 00:19:23.280 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.130$  from this World Weather Attribution initiative

 $394\ 00:19:27.130 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.840$  that it's a kind of, again,

 $395\ 00:19:29.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.780$  it's an initiative in which different researchers

 $396\ 00:19:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.447$  working on attribution studies put together

397 00:19:35.447 --> 00:19:39.260 and try to give answers about whether climate change

 $398\ 00:19:39.260 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.290$  might have had some role

399 $00{:}19{:}41.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}43.563$  in a specific extreme weather events.

 $400\ 00:19:44.490 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.630$  Not saying that to provide this evidence

401 00:19:47.630 --> 00:19:49.150 a year or two years after,

 $402\ 00{:}19{:}49{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}300$  it's really to provide this evidence in the coming weeks,

 $403\ 00:19:53.300 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.460$  because we know that times matter.  $404\ 00:19:55.460 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.470$  If we have suffered a heat wave like this,  $405\ 00:19:58.470 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.330$  it would have much more impact  $406\ 00:20:00.330 -> 00:20:04.670$  if this answer comes earlier in time  $407\ 00:20:04.670 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.930$  rather than wait years ahead  $408\ 00:20:07.930 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.120$  that people might completely forget  $409\ 00:20:10.120 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.860$  about the severity of this event. 410 00:20:11.860 --> 00:20:14.710 So the idea is that this group of researchers  $411\ 00:20:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.260$  and they did this analysis,  $412\ 00:20:16.260 \rightarrow 00:20:18.890$  and basically, what they came up with this  $413\ 00:20:18.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.420$  is that it would be virtually impossible 414 00:20:22.420  $\rightarrow 00:20:24.410$  without human-induced climate change.  $415\ 00:20:24.410 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.520$  At this event, it's estimated to be about 416 00:20:26.520 --> 00:20:30.040 1-in-1000-year event in today's climate.  $417\ 00:20:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.020$  So you can have from this sentence,  $418\ 00:20:33.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.180$  that this event was kind of unique,  $419\ 00:20:35.180 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.540$  very extreme, 1 in 1,000 year, it's a lot. 420 00:20:38.540 --> 00:20:40.280 And actually, they provided this plot.  $421\ 00:20:40.280 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.870$  You will see that it's very similar  $422\ 00:20:41.870 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.320$  to what I just shown.  $423\ 00:20:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:20:47.070$  And actually, this event that was in here  $424\ 00:20:47.070 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.730$  around 40, almost 40 degrees,  $425\ 00:20:49.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.790$  they saw that it was actually even outside  $426\ 00:20:52.790 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.520$  the probable range of events within a year,  $427\ 00:20:56.520 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.760$  within let's say, in our current climate. 428 00:20:59.760 --> 00:21:01.730 So in a way, it's saying already about  $429\ 00:21:01.730 \rightarrow 00:21:05.040$  this huge severity of this event that happened.  $430\ 00:21:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.913$  So this study and the savings they provide at this time,

431 00:21:09.913 --> 00:21:13.610 I said it was a couple of weeks after the event

432 00:21:13.610 --> 00:21:17.713 was very, very powerful because it's giving clear,

433 00:21:18.550 --> 00:21:22.080 let's say putting the finger into the idea 434 00:21:22.080 --> 00:21:23.500 of the role of climate change 435 00:21:23.500 --> 00:21:26.160 and the human influence in this event. 436 00:21:26.160 --> 00:21:29.090 So the message was very, very, very strong. 437 00:21:29.090 --> 00:21:30.910 At the same time, we have to bear in mind 438 00:21:30.910 --> 00:21:32.980 that surely you know that there was this, 439 00:21:34.140 --> 00:21:37.520 the new report of the IPCC, 440 00:21:37.520 --> 00:21:40.800 that part on "The Physical Science Basis" 441 00:21:40.800 --> 00:21:42.720 was already published in August. 442 00:21:42.720 --> 00:21:46.860 And the difference, let's say, 443 00:21:46.860 --> 00:21:53.770 really to put in more weight into the influence

 $445\ 00:21:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:21:56.320$  of the human activities on carbon,

446 00:21:56.320 --> 00:21:58.910 let's say, extreme weather events

447 00:21:58.910 --> 00:22:02.460 happening in today's world.

448 00:22:02.460 --> 00:22:07.200 So again, you can see that the idea of attribution

 $449\ 00:22:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.060$  is gaining much more attention lately,

450 00:22:10.060 --> 00:22:14.250 but more importantly, because we know

451 00:22:14.250  $\rightarrow 00:22:18.130$  that evidence from attribution studies

 $452\ 00:22:18.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.100$  can be used in lawsuits.

 $453\ 00:22:20.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.920$  Basically, has been used for a specific,

454 00:22:22.920 --> 00:22:27.150 let's say, companies, individuals, et cetera,

455 00:22:27.150 --> 00:22:30.750 to kind of give some complaints,

 $456\ 00:22:30.750 \longrightarrow 00:22:33.710$  or let's say, to ask for some compensations

457 00:22:33.710 --> 00:22:36.970 of a specific losses to, let's say, governments

458 00:22:36.970 --> 00:22:39.620 or companies emitting greenhouse gases.

 $459\ 00:22:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.010$  So the idea is that during the last years,

460 00:22:43.010 --> 00:22:45.960 it has been a tremendous increase in,

461 00:22:45.960 --> 00:22:48.100 let's say, different lawsuits

462 00:22:48.100 --> 00:22:50.910 that have been implemented against climate change

463 00:22:50.910 --> 00:22:54.171 using evidence from attribution and detection studies.

 $464\ 00:22:54.171 \longrightarrow 00:22:55.640$  In this plot, you can see that it actually

 $465\ 00:22:55.640 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.650$  was mostly during the second half

466 00:22:58.650 --> 00:23:02.460 of the previous decade that actually went super up.

467 00:23:02.460 --> 00:23:04.270 And most of these, let's say,

 $468\ 00:23:04.270 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.210$  these initiatives happened in the US.

469 00:23:08.210 --> 00:23:11.580 Most importantly, it's like, okay,

470 00:23:11.580 --> 00:23:13.070 we know that there's this tool,

471 00:23:13.070 --> 00:23:17.530 but we need scientific, robust scientific evidence

 $472\ 00:23:17.530 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.600$  that could help us to gain or let's say,

 $473\ 00:23:20.600 \longrightarrow 00:23:22.940$  to win these different, let's say,

 $474\ 00:23:22.940 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.120$  initiatives in the courts.

 $475\ 00:23:25.120 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.713$  At the same time, we know that,

 $476\ 00:23:27.890 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.720$  let's say, that the idea of these initiatives

 $477\ 00:23:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.950$  is that beyond individual litigant,

478 00:23:32.950 --> 00:23:35.730 but it is seek to advance climate policies,

 $479\ 00:23:35.730 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.590$  drive behavioral shifts by key actors,

 $480\ 00:23:38.590 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.750$  and or create awareness,

 $481\ 00:23:40.750 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.810$  and encourage public debate.

 $482\ 00:23:42.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.960$  So it goes beyond the idea of compensation.

483 00:23:44.960 --> 00:23:48.070 It's really to gain more weight,

484 00:23:48.070 --> 00:23:50.010 or let's say, to put more emphasis

485 $00{:}23{:}50.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52.870$  on the role of climate change on the different,

486 00:23:52.870  $\rightarrow$  00:23:54.240 let's say, events, extreme weather events

 $487\ 00:23:54.240 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.633$  that are happening.

 $488\ 00:23:56.742 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.960$  At the same time, it's something

 $489\ 00:23:58.960 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.890$  that has been in a way highlighted.

490 00:24:02.890 --> 00:24:06.763 That's why that nowadays, it's not an easy task.

 $491\ 00:24:07.860 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.410$  There are variants such as accessing to justice,

492 00:24:10.410 --> 00:24:14.740 and difficulties in dealing with scientific evidence,

 $493\ 00:24:14.740 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.490$  and the conservatism of many courts

 $494~00{:}24{:}19{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22{.}460$  that eventually confronted the different policy issues.

495 00:24:22.460 --> 00:24:25.110 So in a way, the idea is that

496 00:24:25.110 --> 00:24:27.450 there's a lot of now, research,

 $497\ 00:24:27.450 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.160$  going on, putting together climate science

498 00:24:31.160 --> 00:24:35.250 and low, try to gain or let's say,

499 00:24:35.250 -> 00:24:37.180 to create some synergies that eventually

50000:24:37.180 --> 00:24:41.080 would help advance this field on climate litigation.

501 00:24:41.080 --> 00:24:42.530 And one important, let's say,

 $502\ 00{:}24{:}42{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}45{.}450$  call that I take from a recent publication

503 00:24:45.450 --> 00:24:49.940 of a colleague of mine, of Rupert Stuart-Smith,

 $504\ 00:24:49.940 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.300$  they say that greater appreciation

 $505\ 00:24:52.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.900$  and exploitation of current methodologies

506 00:24:53.900 --> 00:24:58.250 in attribution science could address obstacles to causation

 $507\ 00:24:58.250 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.804$  and improve the prospects of litigation.

508 00:25:00.804 --> 00:25:02.097 So in a way, it's really saying,

 $509\ 00:25:02.097 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.907$  "Okay, we know that we can do something.

510 00:25:04.907 --> 00:25:07.957 "Law can be a very good path for doing that,

 $511\ 00:25:07.957 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.037$  "but probably, science is we need to, in a way,

512 00:25:11.037 --> 00:25:12.330 "advance knowledge in this field

 $513\ 00:25:12.330 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.987$  "and try to provide better, let's say,

514 00:25:14.987 --> 00:25:17.477 "scientific evidence that could help, let's say,

515 00:25:17.477 --> 00:25:20.950 "<br/>winning on these different initiatives in courts."

 $516\ 00:25:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.230$  So let's say that so far,

517 00:25:23.230 --> 00:25:28.230 we have been working more on the part on climate events,

 $518\ 00:25:29.050 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.883$  more on the weather events,

 $519\ 00:25:30.883 \longrightarrow 00:25:33.043$  whether one weather event can be attributed,

 $520\ 00:25:33.043 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.420$  attributed or let's say,

 $521\ 00:25:34.420 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.790$  how was the role of climate change.

 $522\ 00:25:36.790 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.370$  But what about health impacts?

 $523\ 00:25:39.370 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.810$  Okay, we know that one event

524 00:25:41.810 --> 00:25:44.870 might have been more frequent or more, let's say,

 $525\ 00{:}25{:}44.870$  -->  $00{:}25{:}47.200$  the probability has increased because of climate change,

526 00:25:47.200 --> 00:25:48.660 but at some point, we would like to know

 $527\ 00:25:48.660 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.710$  what this translates into health impacts.

 $528\ 00:25:51.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.167$  So, as I said, the idea is how much

529 00:25:54.167 --> 00:25:57.110 of the observed health burden during an extreme event

530 00:25:57.110  $\rightarrow 00:25:59.590$  can be attributed to human activities?

 $531\ 00:25:59.590 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.260$  Or more broadly, how much of the historical

 $532\ 00:26:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.270$  health burden of a climate-sensitive outcome

 $533\ 00:26:07.270 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.290$  can be attributed to climate change?

 $534\ 00:26:09.290 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.353$  So it's not an easy task.

 $535\ 00:26:11.353 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.730$  I mean, we know that in there,

536 00:26:13.730 --> 00:26:18.543 there might be some kind of different, let's say,

537 00:26:20.040 --> 00:26:22.420 developments in terms of methods, et cetera.

538 00:26:22.420 --> 00:26:24.350 And actually, one example, for example,

539 00:26:24.350 --> 00:26:28.240 you know that I found this article in The New York Times

540 00:26:28.240 --> 00:26:31.090 that was basically, they showed some calculations

 $541\ 00:26:31.090 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.283$  based on a recent report of the CDC,

 $542\ 00:26:35.370 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.150$  based on that, let's say, what has happened

543 00:26:37.150 --> 00:26:41.890 in these massive heat waves in the Northwest in the US.

544 00:26:41.890 --> 00:26:45.868 And actually, they just did a very simple estimation

545 00:26:45.868 --> 00:26:49.130 on the let's say, estimated the number of deaths

 $546\ 00:26:49.130 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.760$  that were kind of excess,

547 00:26:50.760 --> 00:26:53.050 or let's say, more than normal

548 00:26:53.050 --> 00:26:56.150 during that period of time, during the heat wave.

 $549\ 00:26:56.150 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.403$  Attributing that, let's say,

 $550\ 00:26:57.403 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.390$  that during this heat wave,

551 00:26:59.390 --> 00:27:03.360 more than 600 people died because that in a way,

 $552\ 00:27:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.870$  one could attribute to this heat wave.

 $553\ 00:27:07.870 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.280$  But the other question is how much actually

554 00:27:10.280 --> 00:27:13.600 of this burden can be attributed to human activities?

555 00:27:13.600 --> 00:27:15.760 Again, talking about the probabilities,

556 $00{:}27{:}15.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}19.070$  not to say yes or no, is to how much of this burden

557 00:27:19.070 --> 00:27:23.050 can be kind of attributed to these events.

 $558\ 00{:}27{:}23.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}27.660$  So one of the first exercise that has been done

559  $00:27:27.660 \rightarrow 00:27:29.427$  in terms of attribution of health impacts

560 00:27:29.427 --> 00:27:32.920 was this study done by Dann Mitchell

561 00:27:32.920 --> 00:27:35.500 in which they assessed what was the impact

 $562\ 00:27:35.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.360$  of the 2003 heat wave in London and in Paris.

 $563\ 00:27:39.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:40.350$  And actually, what they found

 $564\ 00:27:40.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.577$  is that anthropogenic climate change

 $565\ 00:27:41.577 \longrightarrow 00:27:44.350$  increased the risk of heat-related mortality

566 00:27:44.350 --> 00:27:49.110 in Central Paris by 70%, and by 20% in London.

 $567\ 00:27:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.330$  So eventually, what is really in here

 $568\ 00:27:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.620$  is saying that how much human

569 00:27:54.620 --> 00:27:56.530 or anthropogenic climate change

 $570\ 00:27:56.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.123$  has either the severity of this event

 $571\ 00:28:00.123 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.600$  in terms of how much to really put the value,

 $572\ 00{:}28{:}02{.}600$  -->  $00{:}28{:}06{.}050$  a number on this contribution in terms of health impacts.

 $573\ 00:28:06.050 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.817$  So in a way, you will see that

574 00:28:08.817 --> 00:28:09.990 it's clearly a different message

 $575\ 00:28:09.990 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.580$  compared to what I said before.

576 00:28:11.580 --> 00:28:14.540 It's not about the excess debt during that period,

 $577\ 00:28:14.540 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.960$  it's really to say how much,

578 00:28:15.960 --> 00:28:17.420 how many beds can be attributed

 $579\ 00:28:17.420 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.510$  to anthropogenic climate change.

 $580\ 00:28:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.157$  So let's say that traditionally,

 $581\ 00:28:22.157 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.000$  the way how we have assessed this

 $582\ 00:28:25.000 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.987$  is more into the future.

 $583\ 00:28:26.987 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.940$  Say compare in what has been there,

 $584\ 00{:}28{:}30{.}940$  -->  $00{:}28{:}33{.}960$  the health burden attributed to heat in current times

 $585\ 00:28:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.550$  compared to what will be in the future

586 00:28:36.550 --> 00:28:38.190 using climate change scenarios,

 $587\ 00:28:38.190 \rightarrow 00:28:40.660$  assuming that the difference between today

 $588\ 00:28:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:28:42.160$  and the future can be attributed

 $589\ 00:28:42.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.120$  to anthropogenic climate change.

 $590\ 00:28:44.120 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.550$  But you will see that from this idea

 $591\ 00:28:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.090$  of attribution studies is not about future,

 $592\ 00:28:49.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.230$  it's about present, okay?

593 00:28:51.230 --> 00:28:53.000 This is something that you should be reminded,

 $594\ 00:28:53.000 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.350$  is really to use historical events

 $595\ 00:28:55.350 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.580$  and try to see what has to be the footprint  $596\ 00:28:57.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.960$  of human activities in historical events. 597 00:29:00.960 --> 00:29:03.600 So when we talk about the tradition, as I said,  $598\ 00:29:03.600 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.933$  one could focus on, let's say,  $599\ 00:29:07.077 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.040$  on a specific event to say,  $600\ 00:29:09.040 \longrightarrow 00:29:10.460$  what they call event attribution 601 00:29:10.460 --> 00:29:12.300 for individual extreme weather events  $602\ 00:29:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.650$  as this example of Dann Mitchell,  $603\ 00{:}29{:}14.650$  -->  $00{:}29{:}18.680$  but another example is more on the trend attribution. 604 00:29:18.680 --> 00:29:20.890 Basically, for long-term changes  $605\ 00:29:20.890 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.079$  in the mean of climatological statistics. 606 00:29:23.079 --> 00:29:24.900 So not really to assess specific events, 607 00:29:24.900 --> 00:29:28.777 it's to see how much the observed trend  $608\ 00:29:28.777 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.470$  can be attributed to human activities. 609 00:29:32.470 --> 00:29:34.800 So basically, using this approach, 610 00:29:34.800 --> 00:29:36.690 not really to focus on extreme events,  $611\ 00:29:36.690 \rightarrow 00:29:40.390$  but on the trend during a period of time  $612\ 00:29:40.390 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.390$  is we did this analysis that it was, I mean, 61300:29:45.510 --> 00:29:47.870 I had the pleasure to lead together with my colleagues 614 00:29:47.870 --> 00:29:49.420 of the Multi-Country Multi-City 615 00:29:49.420 --> 00:29:50.700 Collaborative Research Network  $616\ 00:29:50.700 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.530$  was recently published is here. 617 00:29:52.530 --> 00:29:54.410 And this is the reason why I'm talking today 618 00:29:54.410 --> 00:29:57.280 about this topic, because thanks to this opportunity,  $619\ 00:29:57.280 \rightarrow 00:30:02.060$  I had really the option to dig a bit into this topic.

620 00:30:02.060 --> 00:30:05.480 So in a kind of general terms,

 $621\ 00:30:05.480 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.750$  this study like the general framework

62200:30:09.750 --> 00:30:14.750 was about combining data and methods in epidemiology

62300:30:15.410 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:30:20.170 with modeling, let's say, climate projections,

624 00:30:20.170 --> 00:30:24.880 climate, let's say, simulations of the past years,

 $625\ 00:30:24.880 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.610$  we were able to estimate how much

 $626\ 00:30:27.610 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.870$  of the observed heat-related mortality

627 00:30:30.870 --> 00:30:34.580 can be attributed to human-induced climate change.

 $628\ 00:30:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.500$  So I will go step by step.

 $629\ 00:30:37.500 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.770$  First, as I said, we used data from the

630 00:30:39.770 --> 00:30:42.300 Multi-Country Multi-City Collaborative Research Network

63100:30:42.300 --> 00:30:47.300 in 732 locations in 43 countries in the world.

632 00:30:47.950 --> 00:30:49.780 Here, you can see the different location

 $633 \ 00:30:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.330$  of the different places.

 $634\ 00:30:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.900$  And the idea is that we combine,

 $635\ 00:30:53.900 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.690$  let's say, we took all this data

 $636\ 00:30:55.690 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.243$  on observed temperature and mortality,

 $637\ 00:30:59.106 \longrightarrow 00:31:02.720$  and we derived this, the vulnerability function

638 00:31:02.720 --> 00:31:05.780 or the exposure response functions of each city.

63900:31:05.780 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:31:08.520 You've seen the state of the art methods

640 00:31:08.520 --> 00:31:09.790 in climate change epidemiology

 $641\ 00:31:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.930$  is basically to a stage and serious analysis

 $642\ 00:31:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.860$  with distributed lag non-linear models

 $643 \ 00:31:14.860 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.080$  and multivariate multilevel meta-regression.

644 00:31:17.080 --> 00:31:18.720 Yeah, it sounds super fancy,

645 00:31:18.720 --> 00:31:21.840 but in a ways, it's not as complicated,

646 00:31:21.840 --> 00:31:24.130 and you'll have all the information

647 00:31:24.130 --> 00:31:25.780 on the methods in the paper.

 $648\ 00:31:25.780 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.300$  I invite you to have a look,

649 00:31:27.300 --> 00:31:29.230 review if you would like to learn more

 $650\ 00:31:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.090$  about the methodological part.

 $651\ 00:31:31.090 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.610$  So basically, what we did, as I said,

 $652\ 00:31:32.610 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.798$  is to estimate the vulnerability of each city,

653 00:31:36.798 --> 00:31:41.210 which in a way, was already kind of an advancement

 $654\ 00:31:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.840$  compared to previous assessments.

 $655\ 00:31:42.840 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.280$  Because again, here, the idea is that we clearly  $656\ 00:31:45.280 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.590$  or we aim to assess the specific vulnerability  $657\ 00:31:49.590 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.520$  of each population to have a better estimation

 $658\ 00:31:52.520 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.500$  of heat-related mortality in each location.

65900:31:55.500 --> 00:31:58.760 And you see here that it was clearly heterogeneous.

 $660\ 00:31:58.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.873$  We saw as we found in previous assessment,

 $661\ 00:32:01.873 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.890$  that actually, most of higher risks

 $662\ 00{:}32{:}04.890$  -->  $00{:}32{:}08.670$  are usually found in Europe, in the Mediterranean area,

 $663\ 00:32:08.670 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.630$  and other locations in Asia.

664 00:32:11.630 --> 00:32:15.530 So as I said, we combined these exposure response curves

 $665\ 00:32:15.530 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.210$  with moderate climate data

 $666\ 00:32:18.210 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.930$  that we got from our colleagues from there,

 $667\ 00:32:20.930 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.240$  the DAMIP Project, this is

668 00:32:22.240 --> 00:32:24.473 the Detection Attribution Model Intercomparison Project

 $669\ 00:32:24.473 \rightarrow 00:32:28.500$  that is based on the last CMIP6 simulations.

 $670\ 00{:}32{:}28.500$  -->  $00{:}32{:}33.500$  And idea is that for each location in this assessment,

671 00:32:33.770 --> 00:32:38.770 we derive a series, let's say, of moderate pairs

 $672\ 00:32:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.250$  of moderate climate on daily temperature

 $673\ 00:32:43.250 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.260$  under current conditions

674 00:32:45.260 --> 00:32:48.291 and under our without climate change,

 $675\ 00:32:48.291 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.334$  that is our counterfactual scenario.

676 00:32:50.334 --> 00:32:54.380 Here, you have a kind of illustration of the trends.

 $677\ 00:32:54.380 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.380$  Basically, in red, you have the observed trend  $678\ 00:32:59.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.170$  with a warming trend.

 $679\ 00:33:01.170$  --> 00:33:04.070 That it mimics current conditions with climate change

 $680\ 00:33:04.070 \longrightarrow 00:33:06.590$  while the orange one mimics somewhere

 $681\ 00{:}33{:}06{.}590$  -->  $00{:}33{:}09{.}300$  without climate change in the absence of warming.

 $682\ 00{:}33{:}09{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12{.}130$  So basically, we focused in this period here

683 00:33:12.130 --> 00:33:17.130 between 19, yeah, 1990, oh, 1990, oops,

684 00:33:18.760 --> 00:33:23.640 I forgot, 1991 to 2006, 2018.

685 00:33:23.640 --> 00:33:24.990 Actually, sorry about the numbers,

 $686\ 00:33:24.990 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.230$  I'm very bad with that.

687 00:33:26.230 --> 00:33:28.280 And basically, what we did is as I said,

 $688\ 00:33:28.280 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.170$  for each location, we obtained these pairs,

 $689\ 00:33:33.170 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.400$  and we translated these observed,

 $690\ 00:33:36.400 --> 00:33:39.290$  or let's say, simulated temperature

 $691\ 00:33:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.920$  into hypothetical excess mortality

 $692\ 00:33:42.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.240$  under these two scenarios.

 $693\ 00:33:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.260$  And this is basically what you can see here

 $694\ 00:33:49.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.190$  in this panel A.

 $695\ 00:33:52.190 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.283$  In solid, you have the anthropogenic,

 $696\ 00:33:58.140 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.660$  let's say, the heat-related mortality

697 00:34:00.660 --> 00:34:02.530 under current condition, let's say,

 $698\ 00:34:02.530 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.880$  in presence of anthropogenic climate change,

 $699\ 00:34:04.880 \longrightarrow 00:34:07.910$  while in light here, these bars,

700 00:34:07.910 --> 00:34:11.370 you have what would have been heat the excess,

 $701\ 00:34:11.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.570$  or let's say the heat-related mortality

 $702\ 00:34:13.570 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.850$  in a world without climate change.

 $703\ 00:34:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.587$  So basically, we estimated on this

704 00:34:17.587 --> 00:34:20.960 for each of the 700 something locations,

 $705\ 00:34:20.960 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.030$  and we aggregated by country,

 $706\ 00:34:23.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.320$  and this is what you see here.

707 00:34:24.320  $\rightarrow$  00:34:27.360 And eventually, we estimated the difference

708 00:34:27.360 --> 00:34:30.700 in terms of excess mortality between these two scenarios.

 $709\ 00:34:30.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.230$  That is basically what you find here.

 $710\ 00:34:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.110$  So what we saw overall

 $711\ 00:34:35.110 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.110$  is that 0.98% of excess mortality,

712 00:34:41.490 --> 00:34:43.198 heat-related excess mortality

 $713\ 00:34:43.198 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.520$  in the counterfactual scenario,

 $714\ 00:34:44.520 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.440$  and of course, more excess mortality

 $715\ 00:34:47.440 \longrightarrow 00:34:48.750$  in the factor is null,

716  $00:34:48.750 \rightarrow 00:34:51.091$  that is with anthropogenic climate change

 $717\ 00:34:51.091 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.103$  that is currently slipping to 1.56%.

718 00:34:55.660 --> 00:34:57.510 So the difference between the two

719 00:34:57.510 -> 00:35:01.010 that is basically, this number here is 0.58%.

720  $00:35:02.531 \rightarrow 00:35:05.610$  It represents the all-cause mortality

721 00:35:05.610  $\rightarrow$  00:35:08.190 that can be attributed to heat induced

 $722\ 00:35:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.775$  by anthropogenic climate change.

723 00:35:10.775 --> 00:35:13.473 So the idea is that in a final step,

 $724\ 00:35:13.473$  --> 00:35:17.360 what we did is to kind of rescale this difference

 $725\ 00:35:17.360 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.370$  over the observed, or let's say, the impact

 $726\ 00{:}35{:}21.370$  -->  $00{:}35{:}24.610$  or the excess mortality in anthropogenic climate change.

727 00:35:24.610 --> 00:35:29.610 In a way to estimate what is the proportion of this,

 $728\ 00:35:30.290 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.740$  the excess mortality happening today,

729 00:35:32.740 --> 00:35:37.050 that can be attributed to human-induced climate change.

 $730\ 00:35:37.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:40.650$  So it's basically, what we try to illustrate here,

731 00:35:40.650 --> 00:35:45.650 and we found that overall, 37% of heat-related deaths

732 00:35:46.120 --> 00:35:49.160 can be attributed to human-induced climate change

733 00:35:49.160 --> 00:35:52.457 in this assignment, these locations that we included.

 $734\ 00:35:52.457 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.240$  And in a later step, what we did

 $735\ 00:35:54.240 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.510$  is to kind of extrapolate this

736 00:35:56.510 --> 00:36:00.130 and compute what would be the mortality rate

 $737\ 00:36:00.130 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.650$  attributed to heat-related or let's say,

738 00:36:03.650 --> 00:36:05.570 heat-induced climate change.

739 $00:36:05.570 \dashrightarrow 00:36:08.623$  So in here, what we observed that on average,

740 00:36:08.623 --> 00:36:13.623 2.2 deaths per 100,000 population per year

741 00:36:13.890 --> 00:36:18.490 can be attributed to heat induced in human influences,

 $742\ 00:36:18.490 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.710$  and let's say, of climate change.

743 00:36:20.710  $\rightarrow 00:36:22.590$  So as you could see in this assessment,

 $744\ 00:36:22.590 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.800$  it had very powerful message.

 $745\ 00:36:26.800 -> 00:36:31.460$  It's really we provide evidence on the clear

 $746\ 00:36:31.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.810$  to tell the impacts of climate change

747 00:36:33.810 --> 00:36:37.770 over health burden that we observed today.

748  $00:36:37.770 \rightarrow 00:36:39.460$  And you can see that, of course,

 $749\ 00:36:39.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.810$  this evidence can be very, very useful

 $750\ 00{:}36{:}41.810$  -->  $00{:}36{:}44.770$  for let's say, to support policy-making processes.

751 00:36:44.770 --> 00:36:45.950 And more importantly, I think,

 $752\ 00{:}36{:}45{.}950$  -->  $00{:}36{:}49{.}340$  it was about the key message about the relevance

 $753\ 00:36:49.340 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.950$  of these findings in terms of to put

75400:36:51.950 --> 00:36:55.040 a little bit more attention to what is happening,

755 00:36:55.040 --> 00:36:57.460 saying that climate change is not something

 $756\ 00:36:57.460 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.720$  that will happen in the future,

757 00:36:58.720 --> 00:37:02.370 it's already happening today.

 $758\ 00:37:02.370 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.760$  We can talk about the projections,

759 00:37:03.760 --> 00:37:05.690 but we cannot focus on your projections

760 00:37:05.690 --> 00:37:07.420 in terms of impacts of climate change

761  $00:37:07.420 \rightarrow 00:37:11.250$  is really that already we are suffering.

 $762\ 00:37:11.250 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.137$  So it's really to say, "Okay, we need to do,

763 00:37:14.137 --> 00:37:17.557 "<br/>or put more emphasis in terms of implementing

 $764\ 00:37:17.557 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.137$  "a strong mitigation policies to abate

765 00:37:20.137 --> 00:37:21.927 "this warming in the future,

766 00:37:21.927 --> 00:37:26.927 "but more importantly, to implement adaptation strategies

767 00:37:27.197 --> 00:37:31.057 "<br/>that would help us to reduce our vulnerability,

768  $00:37:31.057 \rightarrow 00:37:33.340$  "in this case, for heat."

769 00:37:33.340 --> 00:37:36.520 But of course, we had to acknowledge several limitations,

770 $00{:}37{:}36.520$  -->  $00{:}37{:}39.360$  and understood that, although it was one of the biggest,

 $771\ 00:37:39.360 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.660$  let's say, assessment on this field

 $772\ 00{:}37{:}40.660$  -->  $00{:}37{:}43.530$  in terms of attribution of health impacts,

 $773\ 00:37:43.530 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.620$  we know that for example,

 $774\ 00:37:44.620$  --> 00:37:47.850 it was cannot be considered a worldwide study  $775\ 00:37:47.850$  --> 00:37:50.741 because we focused our assessment on the locations

 $776\ 00:37:50.741 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.737$  that were already included in the MCC,

 $777\ 00:37:52.737 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.290$  and we know that there are important regions

778 $00{:}37{:}55{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}57{.}220$  in the world that were not covered.

779 00:37:57.220 --> 00:37:58.560 This is an important limitation

 $780\ 00:37:58.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.910$  that we have in our study environment directly

 $781\ 00:38:00.910 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.620$  because we are very much aware

782  $00:38:03.620 \rightarrow 00:38:05.570$  that vulnerability is very heterogenous

783  $00:38:07.080 \rightarrow 00:38:09.130$  and changes from one location to the other.  $784\ 00:38:09.130 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.933$  So at some point, we can extrapolate risk  $785\ 00:38:11.933 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.690$  that we observed in Europe 786 00:38:13.690 --> 00:38:16.760 into places like Africa or Asia.  $787\ 00:38:16.760 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.040$  So at some point, we need better data  $788\ 00:38:19.040 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.590$  that would help us to better identify  $789\ 00:38:21.590 - > 00:38:24.560$  or let's say, assess what is the vulnerability  $790\ 00:38:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.030$  of these locations that currently, 791 00:38:26.030 --> 00:38:28.260 are unobserved or unexplored.  $792\ 00:38:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.890$  On the other side as well,  $793\ 00:38:29.890 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.350$  something that we have to bear in mind,  $794\ 00:38:31.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.260$  we have to do a simplification in terms of risk.  $795\ 00:38:34.260 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.810$  We assume that, in a way,  $796\ 00:38:37.810 \longrightarrow 00:38:39.750$  we did a cultural adaptation in the sense  $797\ 00:38:39.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.600$  that we assumed a kind of average risk  $798\ 00:38:43.600 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.870$  across the 20 years, 30 years that we assessed. 799 00:38:46.870 --> 00:38:50.280 And the idea is that okay, it's likely,  $800\ 00:38:50.280 --> 00:38:52.680$  and we know that as you could see here in this plot  $801\ 00:38:52.680 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.990$  that actually, there might have been  $802\ 00:38:56.780 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.140$  a partial adaptation of the population to heat. 803 00:39:01.140 --> 00:39:02.890 Though at some point, we don't know  $804\ 00:39:03.919 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.990$  which impact this could have had  $805\ 00:39:04.990 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.670$  because probably, the idea is that probably,  $806\ 00:39:07.670 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.770$  at the end of the period, the risk  $807 \ 00:39:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.050$  might have been lower compared with the beginning. 808 00:39:12.050 --> 00:39:13.720 So eventually, as you could see,  $809\ 00:39:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.500$  we had to do a kind of group simplification  $810\ 00:39:16.500$  --> 00:39:19.060 and something as well that we have to bear in mind

811 00:39:19.060 --> 00:39:22.430 is that the risks that we applied to both scenarios

812 00:39:22.430 --> 00:39:23.740 is the observed risk.

 $813\ 00:39:23.740 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.953$  That is the one that we estimated

 $814\ 00:39:25.953 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.470$  in our world with climate change.

815 00:39:28.470 --> 00:39:30.820 So we don't know what would have been the risk

 $816\ 00:39:30.820 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.580$  without climate change.

817 00:39:32.580 --> 00:39:34.810 So again, it's very difficult,

818 00:39:34.810 --> 00:39:37.220 and I expected in the future,

 $819\ 00:39:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.530$  it's something that we will implement in them,

 $820\ 00:39:39.530 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.520$  in this field or in climate change epidemiology.

821 00:39:42.520 --> 00:39:45.740 And finally, the lack of epidemiological causal basis.

 $822\ 00:39:45.740 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.660$  This is important because this assessment

 $823\ 00:39:47.660 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.050$  is purely based on an ecological design

 $824\ 00:39:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.270$  that as most of the climate change

 $825\ 00:39:53.270 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.510$  and epidemiological studies.

 $826\ 00{:}39{:}55{.}510$  -->  $00{:}39{:}58{.}490$  So at some point, if we want to talk about the attribution,

 $827\ 00:39:58.490 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.280$  we have to improve our way,

 $828\ 00:40:01.280 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.600$  how we can assess causal links in this field.

82900:40:05.600 --> 00:40:09.710 So just as a kind of final wrap-up on this subject,

830 00:40:09.710 --> 00:40:11.190 and as I said, I really want you

 $831\ 00:40:11.190 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.170$  to make it fun about this kind of a study,

 $832\ 00:40:14.170 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.940$  is first, because as we know,

83300:40:17.940 --> 00:40:21.810 it can be a powerful tool for climate change policy,

834 00:40:21.810 --> 00:40:24.670 and as well, it can help understanding the mechanism

 $835\ 00:40:24.670 \longrightarrow 00:40:27.590$  by which climate change effects have.

836 00:40:27.590 --> 00:40:29.330 Can support in finding projections

 $837\ 00:40:29.330 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.030$  of future health effects of climate change,

838 00:40:32.030 --> 00:40:34.620 and as well, improve adaptation to climate change impacts

 $839\ 00:40:34.620 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.330$  and disaster recovery.

840 00:40:36.330 --> 00:40:38.630 As well, it can increase motivation

841 00:40:38.630 --> 00:40:40.500 for climate mitigation, as I said,

 $842\ 00:40:40.500 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.457$  just learning about what is happening today

 $843\ 00:40:42.457 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.520$  and the urgency to really do that.

844 00:40:45.590 --> 00:40:47.680 And also, demonstrate causal links

 $845\ 00:40:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.057$  between greenhouse gas emissions

846 00:40:49.057 -> 00:40:50.550 and climate change impacts

 $847\ 00:40:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.240$  that serve as a basis of evidence

848 00:40:52.240 --> 00:40:54.480 underpinning climate-related losses,

 $849\ 00:40:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.280$  as I said, previously.

 $850\ 00{:}40{:}56{.}280$  -->  $00{:}40{:}59{.}160$  And finally, what I believe is also very, very attractive.

 $851\ 00{:}40{:}59{.}160$  -->  $00{:}41{:}02{.}637$  It's an excellent platform for interdisciplinary research,

85200:41:02.637 --> 00:41:05.440 really to put together experts from different fields,

85300:41:05.440 --> 00:41:09.151 from climate science, working more on the modeling side,

854 00:41:09.151 --> 00:41:10.780 climate epidemiologists, working

85500:41:10.780 $\dashrightarrow >$ 00:41:12.787 on the ascertain the health impacts.

85600:41:12.787 --> 00:41:16.390 And at the later stage, other experts in other fields

 $857\ 00:41:16.390 \longrightarrow 00:41:18.260$  like the economy, law, et cetera,

 $858\ 00:41:18.260 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.440$  can take part on these investigations.

 $859\ 00:41:20.440 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.260$  So definitely, it's an excellent platform

860 00:41:22.260 --> 00:41:25.530 for latching our kind of research area,

861 00:41:25.530 --> 00:41:28.860 grab information, address knowledge from other fields

862 00:41:28.860 --> 00:41:31.200 and reach our risk portfolio,

863 00:41:31.200 --> 00:41:34.550 which I think is also very relevant for young researchers.

864 00:41:34.550 --> 00:41:36.983 And just as our final point,

865 00:41:38.567 --> 00:41:41.364 something that I think it has to do, bear in mind,

86600:41:41.364 --> 00:41:44.900 and as I said for me, this research field

867 00:41:44.900 --> 00:41:48.020 can be considered kind of very powerful research line

 $868\ 00:41:48.020 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.270$  in the future in climate change epidemiology.

869 00:41:52.130 --> 00:41:53.770 Let's say, climate attribution

 $870\ 00:41:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.760$  is something that has been developed

 $871\ 00:41:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.340$  for years in climate science sphere,

 $872\ 00:41:58.340 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.450$  but not much in epidemiology.

873 00:42:00.450 --> 00:42:05.450 And if we really want to advance in climate litigation,

87400:42:06.000 --> 00:42:09.270 really advance on the fight against climate change,

 $875\ 00:42:09.270 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.760$  we have to put a value on what is happening  $876\ 00:42:11.760 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.170$  in terms of extreme events,

877 00:42:13.170 --> 00:42:17.227 in terms of X is that burden, economic cost, et cetera.

 $878\ 00:42:17.227 \longrightarrow 00:42:20.720$  And all this can help people change your mind,

879 00:42:20.720 --> 00:42:24.040 and as well, help, advancing or let's say,

880 00:42:24.040 --> 00:42:27.490 winning different initiatives in courts, et cetera.

881 00:42:27.490  $\rightarrow 00:42:29.930$  So as important elements that I believe

 $882\ 00:42:29.930 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.470$  we should focus in the future,

 $883\ 00:42:31.470 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.460$  is first assess causality, use advanced methods

 $884\ 00:42:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.570$  in environmental epidemiology

 $885\ 00:42:36.570 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.330$  that help us to clarify causal links.

886 00:42:39.330 --> 00:42:42.720 Second point, to provide innovative frameworks

887 00:42:42.720 --> 00:42:45.680 that probably, I mean, you think about

 $888\ 00:42:45.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.350$  as the world attribution initiative,

88900:42:48.350 --> 00:42:52.050 they provided this evidence on the role of climate change.

 $890\ 00:42:52.050 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.930$  If we can couple this with health impacts,

 $891\ 00:42:54.930 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.620$  that could be even much more powerful.

 $892\ 00:42:57.620 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.330$  And finally, we have to think

893 00:42:59.330 --> 00:43:02.090 about how we can address this research question

894 00:43:02.090 --> 00:43:03.640 in a more broader perspective

89500:43:03.640 --> 00:43:05.600 and provide probably, global estimates

 $896\ 00:43:05.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.100$  that are closer to the, let's say,

 $897\ 00:43:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.870$  the real, what is happening today.

 $898\ 00:43:10.870 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.670$  So yeah, that's all.

899 00:43:12.670 --> 00:43:14.667 Thank you very much for your attention,

 $900\ 00:43:14.667 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.588$  and I'm happy to take questions, thank you.

901 00:43:18.588 --> 00:43:19.448 <v ->Thank you, Ana.</v>

 $902\ 00:43:19.448 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.570$  Thank you for the wonderful presentation.

903 00:43:20.570 --> 00:43:23.500 I think you gave a superb view

904 00:43:23.500 --> 00:43:26.740 like an introduction from kind of science, how to tackle

 $905\ 00:43:26.740 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.667$  and attribute extreme weather events,

 $906\ 00:43:28.667 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.680$  and these type of extreme events attribution

 $907\ 00:43:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.860$  to the trend attribution,

 $908\ 00:43:33.860 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.217$  and to the landmark study that you have,

909 00:43:36.217 --> 00:43:38.320 the MCC quality you've been working on.

 $910\ 00:43:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.940$  So thank you very much.

911 00:43:39.940 --> 00:43:42.507 And I think there will be a lot

 $912\ 00:43:42.507 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.710$  of questions from our audience.

913 00:43:44.710 --> 00:43:48.030 So while our online audience is typing

 $914\ 00:43:48.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.690$  your questions in the Chat box,

915 00:43:50.690 --> 00:43:54.850 we do have already collect some questions from our students.

 $916\ 00:43:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.550$  So there are several types of questions

917 00:43:58.648  $\rightarrow 00:44:01.100$  that students are particularly interested in.

918 00:44:01.100 --> 00:44:03.290 For example, the first type,

919 00:44:03.290 --> 00:44:06.170 I think for some of the students still wondering,

 $920\ 00:44:06.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.712$  you have given this great example

921 00:44:08.712 --> 00:44:11.640 of attributing heat-related mortality.

922 00:44:11.640 --> 00:44:14.150 So they're wondering if this type of technique 923 00:44:14.150 --> 00:44:17.030 can be used to attribute other extreme weather events,

924 00:44:17.030 --> 00:44:18.773 like hurricanes or wildfires?

925 00:44:20.560 --> 00:44:23.440 <v ->Yeah, exactly, I mean, as I said,</v>

926 00:44:23.440 --> 00:44:24.917 in this assessment, in this presentation,

927 00:44:24.917 --> 00:44:27.180 I focused on heat on health,

928 00:44:27.180 --> 00:44:28.450 because in a way, I mean, of course,

929 00:44:28.450 --> 00:44:30.541 it's a bit biased because it has been

930 00:44:30.541 --> 00:44:33.590 my research field for already several years,

 $931\ 00:44:33.590 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.210$  but we know that within attribution science,

 $932\ 00:44:38.210 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.720$  it's not only about heat waves.

933 00:44:39.720 --> 00:44:44.170 Actually, there's also a very new report

934 00:44:44.170 --> 00:44:49.160 published by this Global Weather Attribution initiative

935 00:44:49.160 --> 00:44:53.650 on the floods happening in Central Europe even this summer.

936 00:44:53.650 --> 00:44:56.370 Again, put in, estimated that actually

 $937\ 00:44:56.370 \longrightarrow 00:44:58.560$  the role of climate change was very substantial

938 00:44:58.560 --> 00:45:01.350 in let's say, in increasing the probability of this event.

939 00:45:01.350 --> 00:45:05.010 So definitely, this kind of framework

940 00:45:05.010 --> 00:45:07.860 can be extended to other extreme weather events.

941 00:45:07.860 --> 00:45:12.210 Of course, with some caveats and some limitations,

942 00:45:12.210 --> 00:45:16.630 but I believe that if we try to, let's say,  $943\ 00:45:16.630 \rightarrow 00:45:21.000$  it would be easy to adapt this framework  $944\ 00:45:21.000 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.410$  to other extreme weather events  $945\ 00:45:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.520$  if data, of course, is available. 946 00:45:26.520 --> 00:45:27.353 <v ->Thank you, Ana.</v>  $947\ 00:45:27.353 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.063$  I think we have a typo from our online audience. 948 00:45:30.900 --> 00:45:32.350 Exactly, the same question  $949\ 00:45:33.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.650$  some of the students are also asking. 950 00:45:36.490 --> 00:45:38.577 But Mona is asking, 951 00:45:38.577 --> 00:45:42.367 "Why is the A and B data missing environments 952 00:45:42.367 --> 00:45:44.010 "from most of Africa?" 953 00:45:44.010 --> 00:45:47.108 And also, it's kind of related to the question 954 00:45:47.108 --> 00:45:49.870 student's asking in the Multi-Country Multi-City  $955\ 00:45:49.870 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.054$  is that they only have South Africa,  $956\ 00:45:54.054 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.410$  doesn't have much of Africa. 957 00:45:56.410 --> 00:45:59.280 And also, one of my students is asking,  $958\ 00:45:59.280 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.020$  why there's no data from the South Pacific,  $959\ 00:46:03.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.822$  where she have experienced doing this one 960 00:46:06.822  $\rightarrow$  00:46:07.655 and like fuzzy. 961 00:46:07.655 --> 00:46:11.003 So why there's no such coverage? 962 00:46:12.370 --> 00:46:14.560 <v ->Well, maybe I can give you a little bit of story </v>963 00:46:14.560 --> 00:46:17.290 about how the MCC started. 964 00:46:17.290 --> 00:46:21.330 And basically, it was, I think in 2014 965 00:46:21.330 --> 00:46:24.170 during a conference, with a group of researchers 966 00:46:24.170 --> 00:46:27.930 working on climate change epidemiology,  $967\ 00:46:27.930 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.820$  mostly on the temperature-related health impacts.

968 00:46:30.820 --> 00:46:34.210 They had an informal meeting,

969 00:46:34.210  $\rightarrow$  00:46:35.850 and they were discussing the possibility

970 00:46:35.850 --> 00:46:38.900 of probably putting together some data from their countries.

971 00:46:38.900 --> 00:46:42.060 For example, one have data on temperature mortality

 $972\ 00:46:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.380$  in the UK, other have in Japan,

 $973\ 00:46:45.380 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.070$  the other one had in Spain.

974 00:46:47.070 --> 00:46:49.650 So eventually, they realized that,

975 00:46:50.847 --> 00:46:53.617 "Okay, maybe we can start putting all this data together

976 00:46:53.617 --> 00:46:55.797 "instead of assessing our impacts

977 00:46:55.797 --> 00:46:58.517 "or let's say, our estimates in our country,

978 00:46:58.517 --> 00:47:01.047 "it would be nice to compare different locations

979 00:47:01.047 --> 00:47:01.880 "at the same time."

 $980\ 00:47:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.573$  Because as I said, the idea of,

 $981\ 00:47:06.460 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.477$  the peculiarity in a way of temperature-related

 $982\ 00:47:10.477 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.910$  health impacts is that this,

 $983\ 00:47:12.910 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.830$  the effect is very dependent on the location.

984 00:47:15.830 --> 00:47:19.360 So it's nice to compare these estimates across locations

985 00:47:19.360 --> 00:47:20.971 to understand vulnerabilities

 $986\ 00:47:20.971 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.370$  and potential vulnerability factors.

987 00:47:22.370 --> 00:47:25.693 So as I said, it started kind of informal way,

988 00:47:25.693 --> 00:47:30.693 and they started opening the door to other collaborators

 $989\ 00:47:31.670 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.100$  and colleagues to work in,

990 00:47:33.100 --> 00:47:35.130 and eventually, it grew, grew, grew,

991 00:47:35.130 --> 00:47:38.400 grew until nowadays that we are around, I think,

992 00:47:38.400 --> 00:47:43.010 70 researchers from 43 countries

993 00:47:43.010 --> 00:47:44.820 with all these bunch of locations

 $994\ 00:47:44.820 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.260$  with different data sets.

995 00:47:46.260 --> 00:47:48.290 And also, not only focusing

 $996\ 00:47:48.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.440$  on the idea of temperature mortality,

997 00:47:51.440 --> 00:47:54.540 but also, air pollution, on projections,

998 00:47:54.540 --> 00:47:57.730 on I mean, in a way, it's a project

999 00:47:57.730  $\rightarrow 00:48:02.730$  that greatly grow in an exponential way.

 $1000\ 00{:}48{:}03.640$  -->  $00{:}48{:}07.710$  But the idea how this, then the beauty of this project,

1001 00:48:07.710 --> 00:48:11.100 how it's developed and how it started

 $1002\ 00:48:11.100 \longrightarrow 00:48:13.340$  is that it works in a very informal way

 $1003\ 00:48:13.340 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.196$  in the sense that the idea how you contribute,

 $1004\ 00{:}48{:}16.196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}20.190$  you take part of this consortium by providing data

1005 00:48:20.190 --> 00:48:22.370 on a specific country that is missing

1006 00:48:22.370 --> 00:48:27.120 because you had it because of your research or whatever.

1007 00:48:27.120 --> 00:48:29.290 And it's surprising that it is not directly funded.

1008 00:48:29.290 --> 00:48:30.590 I mean, it works, let's say,

 $1009 \ 00:48:30.590 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.570$  off each funds of each partner.

1010 00:48:33.570 --> 00:48:36.640 The reason why there are some places in the world

1011 00:48:36.640 --> 00:48:40.400 that is not, let's say, covered within this spread

 $1012\ 00:48:40.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.720$  is basically, because so far,

1013 00:48:42.720 --> 00:48:46.000 we didn't manage to get data from these locations.

1014 00:48:46.000 --> 00:48:48.810 And I mean, it's a problem of course,

 $1015 \ 00:48:48.810 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.240$  of places like in Africa,

 $1016 \ 00:48:51.240 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.950$  where good quality on mortality,

1017 00:48:53.950 --> 00:48:57.770 daily mortality in specific locations in Africa

 $1018 \ 00:48:57.770 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.430$  is very difficult to find.

 $1019\ 00:48:59.430 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.450$  Especially because at some point,

 $1020 \ 00:49:00.450 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.020$  whether you need this data is somehow

1021 00:49:03.020 --> 00:49:07.220 comparable in terms of quality and temporal scale.

 $1022 \ 00:49:07.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.420$  And especially, this idea

 $1023 \ 00:49:08.420 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.650$  that it should be daily mortality, et cetera,

 $1024\ 00:49:11.650 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.120$  because the part on them, whether we know

 $1025\ 00:49:14.120 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.480$  that is relatively easy to get it

 $1026\ 00:49:16.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.620$  from the analysis data, et cetera,

1027 00:49:19.620 --> 00:49:23.490 but the main limiting factor here is the mortality data.

1028 00:49:23.490 --> 00:49:24.980 And that's why in a way,

1029 00:49:24.980 --> 00:49:28.710 we didn't manage too far to kind of get this information

1030 00:49:28.710 --> 00:49:33.710 here in terms of observed mortality in this assessment.

1031 00:49:34.384 --> 00:49:37.070 However, very recently,

 $1032\ 00:49:37.070 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.580$  as I mentioned in my first slide,

1033 00:49:38.580 --> 00:49:41.610 we performed a global assessment

 $1034 \ 00:49:41.610 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.820$  in which basically, based on information

1035 00:49:43.820 --> 00:49:48.070 of the observed locations, our colleagues in Monash,

1036 00:49:48.070 --> 00:49:49.630 they managed to extrapolate

1037 00:49:49.630 --> 00:49:51.880 the risk in an observed location

1038 00:49:51.880 --> 00:49:55.070 and eventually, provide kind of comprehensive

 $1039\ 00:49:55.070 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.360$  assessment on the team,

1040 00:49:58.360 --> 00:50:02.220 non-optimal temperature-related mortality across the globe.

 $1041 \ 00:50:02.220 \longrightarrow 00:50:05.103$  I invite you to have a look in,

1042 00:50:06.340 --> 00:50:10.143 I think, it was recently published in (indistinct).

1043 00:50:10.143 --> 00:50:12.041 <v ->Thanks, Ana, I think,</v>

1044 00:50:12.041 --> 00:50:13.140 if you collect it with the history

 $1045 \ 00:50:13.140 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.800$  and also development for MCC,

 $1046 \ 00:50:14.800 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.840$  why it's not covered?

 $1047 \ 00:50:15.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:17.770$  And what's the most recent

1048 00:50:17.770 --> 00:50:21.160 that MCC predict in the temperature mortality

1049 00:50:21.160 --> 00:50:24.980 association in places where you don't have mortality data.

 $1050\ 00:50:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:50:26.980$  There are always a lot of questions,

 $1051 \ 00:50:26.980 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.350$  but I do have one kind of question

1052 00:50:30.350 --> 00:50:32.290 related to your answer.

1053 00:50:32.290 --> 00:50:36.280 This one student is kind of were astonished about

1054 00:50:36.280 --> 00:50:38.340 since the heat-related mortality risk

 $1055\ 00{:}50{:}38.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}42.290$  varies across places that you have shown me on slides.

 $1056\ 00:50:42.290 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.290$  So the question is why do places have,

 $1057\ 00:50:47.650 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.610$  even we have similar latitude,

 $1058\ 00:50:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.680$  maybe even with the same organization level,

 $1059\ 00{:}50{:}52{.}680$  -->  $00{:}50{:}56{.}323$  why do we have different heat-related mortality risk?

 $1060\ 00:50:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.380 < v \longrightarrow Well$ , it's a very good question, </v>

1061 00:51:00.380 --> 00:51:02.560 and I must say, difficult to answer

1062 00:51:02.560 --> 00:51:05.173 in a very clear way.

 $1063\ 00{:}51{:}11{.}317$  -->  $00{:}51{:}14{.}350$  In a way, we know that vulnerability to heat

1064 00:51:14.350 --> 00:51:16.270 or let's say, non-optimal temperature

1065 00:51:16.270 --> 00:51:21.270 depends on a complex network of different factors

 $1066\ 00:51:21.560 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.600$  that are highly interconnected.

1067 00:51:23.600 --> 00:51:25.640 It's not like we know so far

1068 00:51:25.640 --> 00:51:30.640 that what makes one city more vulnerable to the other

 $1069 \ 00:51:31.180 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.470$  is not because of one unique factor.

1070 00:51:33.470 --> 00:51:36.700 It's because of combination of different factors

1071 00:51:36.700 --> 00:51:39.570 that actually are very much dependent between each other.

1072 00:51:39.570 --> 00:51:42.200 Thinking that, for example, we published,

 $1073\ 00:51:42.200 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.030$  I think, it was in 2018, a study was led

1074 00:51:46.030 --> 00:51:47.853 by our colleague, Francesco Sera,

 $1075 \ 00:51:48.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.600$  in which we tried to assess specifically this,

1076 00:51:53.600 --> 00:51:57.600 to try to understand what were the contextual factors

1077 00:51:57.600 --> 00:52:00.830 defined at city level that can give us some hints

 $1078 \ 00:52:00.830 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.004$  about which locations are more vulnerable

 $1079\ 00:52:04.004 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.970$  in terms of higher excess mortality

 $1080\ 00:52:05.970$  --> 00:52:08.340 due to heat compared to others.

1081 00:52:08.340 --> 00:52:10.360 And eventually, what we saw in this assessment

 $1082\ 00:52:10.360 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.870$  is that it's not only one factor,

1083 00:52:12.870  $\rightarrow$  00:52:15.210 it was a combination of probably cities

 $1084 \ 00:52:15.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.330$  that are more urbanized,

 $1085 \ 00:52:17.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:20.470$  but also more unequal are those

 $1086 \ 00:52:20.470 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.650$  with a higher heat-related burden

1087 00:52:23.650 --> 00:52:26.830 compared to others with a lower level in this case.

1088 00:52:26.830 --> 00:52:29.860 Well, for cold, the story was much more complicated

 $1089 \ 00:52:29.860 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.790$  with no clear patterns around.

1090 00:52:31.790 --> 00:52:35.970 But again, the idea how all, let's say,

1091 00:52:35.970 --> 00:52:37.900 the main factors driving this difference

 $1092 \ 00:52:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.960$  is now adays, have very important

1093 00:52:39.960 --> 00:52:43.700 or very crucial point that we are trying to disentangle,

1094 00:52:43.700 --> 00:52:46.960 especially because we know that if we understand

 $1095\ 00:52:46.960 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.440$  what are the mechanism, let's say,

 $1096 \ 00:52:48.440 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.250$  the reasons why one city is more resilient

 $1097 \ 00:52:52.250 \longrightarrow 00:52:55.540$  compared to other, this can help us

1098 00:52:55.540 --> 00:52:58.680 to understand which mechanism in terms of adaptation

1099 00:52:58.680 --> 00:53:01.420 we can apply to other places to try to protect

1100  $00:53:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:53:03.840$  to reduce our vulnerabilities in the future.

1101 00:53:03.840 --> 00:53:07.860 So hopefully, if you ask me this question in a few years,

1102 00:53:07.860 --> 00:53:11.700 I hope I will answer this question,

1103 00:53:11.700 --> 00:53:14.820 but I think right now, it's very difficult to say.

1104 00:53:14.820 --> 00:53:17.753 <v ->Yeah, yeah, I think it's excellent answer now.</v>

1105 00:53:17.753 --> 00:53:20.110 So it's kind of related to one,

 $1106 \ 00:53:20.110 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.290$  our online audience questions

1107 00:53:22.290 --> 00:53:25.124 regarding the difference in the heat-related mortality,

1108 00:53:25.124 --> 00:53:27.817 whether it is rural or regional kind of communities.

1109 00:53:27.817 --> 00:53:29.560 I think it's more related

1110 00:53:29.560 --> 00:53:31.923 to Francesco Sera's paper you mentioned.

1111 00:53:33.840 --> 00:53:34.980 <v ->Yeah, in a way, I mean,</v>

 $1112 \ 00:53:34.980 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.500$  it's still that in this assessment,

 $1113 \ 00:53:36.500 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.210$  and I must say that in the MCC,

 $1114\ 00:53:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.520$  most of the locations that we have are cities.

 $1115 \ 00:53:42.520 \longrightarrow 00:53:45.910$  So in a way, the risks that we obtained

 $1116\ 00:53:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.160$  are mostly represented for urban locations.

1117 00:53:49.160 --> 00:53:51.920 This is one of our limitations in this assessment.

1118 00:53:51.920 --> 00:53:53.440 And probably, if you don't,

1119 $00{:}53{:}53{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}57{.}700$  you need to go a kind of national level assessment

1120 00:53:57.700 --> 00:54:02.010 in which you can better disentangle the different,

1121 00:54:02.010 --> 00:54:06.350 let's say, patterns in terms of vulnerability to heat

 $1122 \ 00:54:06.350 \ --> \ 00:54:09.350$  and cold in a rural versus urban.

1123 00:54:09.350 --> 00:54:12.453 And as I said, it's also it's a story that needs to,

 $1124 \ 00:54:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.670$  we need to address in the next years.

 $1125 \ 00:54:15.670 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.340$  And I know there are initiatives in terms

 $1126\ 00:54:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.720$  of nationwide assessments try to see patterns

1127 00:54:21.720 --> 00:54:25.080 between urban and rural locations, et cetera.

1128 00:54:27.010 --> 00:54:29.490 <v ->Yeah, I think kind of the final</v>

1129 00:54:29.490 --> 00:54:33.460 group of questions students and also online audience

1130 00:54:33.460 --> 00:54:35.870 is interested is adaptation.

1131 00:54:35.870 --> 00:54:40.610 So I mean, the adaptation matters

1132 00:54:40.610 --> 00:54:42.833 students are kind of wondering,

 $1133\ 00:54:44.280 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.740$  how must immediate needs to deal

 $1134\ 00:54:46.740 \longrightarrow 00:54:49.600$  with increasing temperature can be balanced

1135 00:54:49.600 --> 00:54:53.980 against the long-term goals of emission reduction?

1136 00:54:53.980 --> 00:54:58.120 Basically, asking using adaptation methods 1137 00:54:59.160 --> 00:55:03.980 to talk to the long-term global warming paths.

1138  $00:55:03.980 \rightarrow 00:55:06.790$  And also, if there are some studies like this,

1139  $00:55:06.790 \rightarrow 00:55:11.010$  are there any practical suggestions

1140 00:55:11.010 --> 00:55:13.850 on how local communities can do

 $1141 \ 00:55:13.850 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.300$  about the adaptation methods?

1142 00:55:16.730 --> 00:55:19.910 <v ->Yeah, and I must say it was one of the key messages</v>

1143 00:55:19.910 --> 00:55:22.860 of this assessment that yeah, I presented today,

 $1144\ 00:55:22.860 \longrightarrow 00:55:24.010$  in this attribution study,

 $1145\ 00:55:24.010 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.120$  because of course, we give a little bit,

 $1146\ 00:55:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.110$  it gives them the message about the urgency

 $1147\ 00:55:30.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.110$  in terms of abating or let's say,

 $1148\ 00:55:35.150 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.730$  reducing the warming in the future.

 $1149\ 00:55:37.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.050$  But more importantly, what it is saying

1150 00:55:40.050 --> 00:55:43.662 is that we really need to reduce our vulnerability

1151 00:55:43.662  $\rightarrow 00:55:45.680$  because the idea is that with mitigation,

 $1152\ 00:55:45.680 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.710$  we know that these benefits will come

1153 00:55:47.710 --> 00:55:50.550 in the next decades while with adaptation,

1154 00:55:50.550 --> 00:55:52.600 these benefits can come earlier.

 $1155\ 00:55:52.600$  --> 00:55:54.670 And probably, this can be even more efficient

1156 00:55:54.670 --> 00:55:57.140 compared to just waiting for, let's say,

1157 00:55:57.140 --> 00:56:00.630 the mitigation strategies to have some impacts.

1158 00:56:00.630 --> 00:56:01.843 And it's true that we have to think

 $1159\ 00:56:01.843 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.560$  about even in the best of the scenarios today,

 $1160\ 00:56:05.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.100$  in which we set emissions to zero,

1161 00:56:08.100 --> 00:56:11.180 we will be any way exposed to warmer climate

 $1162\ 00:56:11.180 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.550$  in the next decades.

1163 00:56:12.550 --> 00:56:14.440 So it's about, really again,

1164 00:56:14.440  $\rightarrow 00:56:16.500$  to put emphasis into the idea of adaptation

 $1165 \ 00:56:16.500 \longrightarrow 00:56:19.730$  that it might be the key on this story.

1166  $00:56:19.730 \rightarrow 00:56:24.170$  And with regards on how we can counteract

 $1167\ 00:56:24.170 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.560$  future warming in terms of how much

 $1168\ 00:56:27.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.640$  we can decrease our vulnerability

 $1169\ 00:56:29.640 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.440$  to counteract this warming.

1170 $00{:}56{:}31{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}34{.}190$  I know that there have been some initiatives

 $1171 \ 00:56:34.190 \longrightarrow 00:56:36.650$  of some studies published in the past.

1172 00:56:36.650 --> 00:56:41.010 For example, there's a study by our colleagues in Romania

1173 00:56:41.010 --> 00:56:44.540 that they simulate what this kind of how much

 $1174\ 00:56:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.227$  we would need to reduce our vulnerability

 $1175\ 00:56:47.227 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.450$  in the future to reduce or let's say,

1176 00:56:51.450 --> 00:56:55.610 to keep our heat-related deaths in the future constant

 $1177\ 00:56:55.610 \longrightarrow 00:56:58.000$  despite the global warming.

 $1178 \ 00:56:58.000 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.259$  So in a way, this is a very nice exercise.

1179 00:57:00.259 --> 00:57:02.190 That is certainly something that as well, I'm leading,

1180 00:57:02.190 --> 00:57:05.010 an initiative within the MCC to try to address this.

1181 00:57:05.010 --> 00:57:08.240 Because as well, this can help us about them,

1182 00:57:08.240 --> 00:57:12.690 how much we need to adapt to really do something,

1183 00:57:12.690 --> 00:57:14.747 to have some impacts in terms of reduction 1184 00:57:14.747 --> 00:57:17.170 of heat-related mortality.

 $1185\ 00:57:17.170 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.420$  Because imagine that if warming continues,

 $1186\ 00:57:21.420 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.210$  and let's say, the pace at which we adapt

1187 00:57:25.210 --> 00:57:28.940 is not quick enough, let's say,

1188 00:57:28.940 --> 00:57:30.780 to kind of counteract this warming,

1189 00:57:30.780 --> 00:57:33.570 we eventually will have the same heat-related deaths

1190  $00:57:33.570 \rightarrow 00:57:34.610$  today but in the future,

1191 00:57:34.610 --> 00:57:35.970 which of course, it would be fine.

 $1192\ 00:57:35.970 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.960$  But ideally, what we would like is that

1193 00:57:38.960 --> 00:57:40.550 the heat-related deaths happening today

 $1194\ 00:57:40.550 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.250$  won't happen in the future anyway.

1195 00:57:44.846 --> 00:57:45.679 <v ->Thank you, Ana.</v>

1196 00:57:45.679 --> 00:57:49.197 I think, I saw Tobias posts a comment,

1197 00:57:49.197 --> 00:57:50.900 "A really fantastic talk."

1198 00:57:50.900  $\rightarrow 00:57:55.900$  So I think is there are any final questions?

1199 00:57:58.460 --> 00:58:00.540 If there's no final question,

 $1200\ 00:58:00.540 \longrightarrow 00:58:02.550$  thank you, Ana, very much for this

1201 00:58:02.550 --> 00:58:04.170 really, really amazing talk.

1202 00:58:04.170 --> 00:58:05.860 And I think both the students

1203 00:58:05.860 --> 00:58:07.520 and I'm sure, our online audience

1204 00:58:07.520 --> 00:58:09.820 learned a lot from you, but thank you so much.

1205 00:58:10.730 --> 00:58:11.913 <v ->Thank you, thanks a lot</v>

 $1206\ 00:58:11.913 \longrightarrow 00:58:13.513$  for the invitation, my pleasure.