



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
 ISSN Online: 2394-5869
 Impact Factor: 5.2
 IJAR 2018; 4(5): 388-394
 www.allresearchjournal.com
 Received: 27-03-2018
 Accepted: 28-04-2018

Jan-Erik Lane
 Jan-Erik Lane, Professor
 Emeritus a UNIGE, Geneva.
 Florent Dieterlen, Scholar,
 Geneva, Switzerland

Florent Dieterlen
 Jan-Erik Lane, Professor
 Emeritus a UNIGE, Geneva.
 Florent Dieterlen, Scholar,
 Geneva, Switzerland

Modelling Asia: S global warming future

Jan-Erik Lane and Florent Dieterlen

Abstract

Examining the future energy plans for the Asian giants economically, one cannot observe de-carbonisation in accordance with the COP21 Treaty. For sure, there is more of reliance upon renewables, but energy consumption is projected to grow most considerable. Modelling the energy-emission conundrum, one understands that de-carbonisation may be an illusion, used in the politics of the UNFCCC meetings (Conka, 2015; Vogler, 2016). East, South East and South Asia are merging as economic dominants, but they have little preparation for de-carbonisation.

Keywords: Global warming modelling, de-carbonisation, Keeling curve, methane, chaos theory

1. Introduction

The Asian economic miracle is pushing ahead at full speed, with East, South East and South Asia becoming the dominant players in the global market economy together Pacific nation Australia. With fast population growth, these countries make economic growth the first priority, as to be able to raise affluence per capita and reduce poverty/ To succeed in this policy ambition, they need energy, very much energy. Relying upon fossil fuels, Asia has become the largest emitter of CO₂s. In 2017, the governments of Asia's nations promised to conduct a radical de-carbonisation policy to halt climate change. Let us model this collision between economic growth and de-carbonisation for Asia, excluding the Arab world as well as Russia and the Khanates. Figure 1 shows how Asia became leading emissions region of CO₂.

Correspondence
Jan-Erik Lane
 Jan-Erik Lane, Professor
 Emeritus a UNIGE, Geneva.
 Florent Dieterlen, Scholar,
 Geneva, Switzerland




Fig 1: Region and CO₂s

Now, the countries in the world have formed a common pool regime (CPR) to save the atmosphere from more GHGs, focusing only upon the CO₂s. The global de-carbonisation plan in the COP21 Treaty includes:

- i. Stall the rise if CO₂s by 2020 (GOAL I);
- ii. Decreasing the CO₂s by 30-40% by 2030 (GOAL II);
- iii. More or less full de-carbonisation by around 2075 (GOAL III);
- iv. Decentralised implementation under international oversight, financial support and technical assistance.

These are enormous goals, as only one country – Uruguay – is near GOAL I and GOAL II. Can they be implemented? Will the Asian miracle economies implement them or will they renege in this giant *ocean PD game* (Prisoner’s dilemma)? Only Japan has decreasing CO₂ curves today.

In 2017, the countries in the world formed a common pool regime (CPR) to save the atmosphere from more GHGs, focusing only upon the CO₂s. The global de-carbonisation plan in the COP21 Treaty includes:

- i. Stall the rise if CO₂s by 2020 (GOAL I);
- ii. Decreasing the CO₂s by 30-40% by 2030 (GOAL II);
- iii. More or less full de-carbonisation by around 2075 (GOAL III);
- iv. Decentralised implementation under international oversight, financial support and technical assistance.

These are enormous goals, as only one country – Uruguay – is near GOAL I and GOAL II. Can they be implemented? Will the Asian miracle economies implement them or will they renege in this giant *ocean PD game* (Prisoner’s dilemma)? Only Japan has decreasing CO₂ curves today. One country has already defected, namely the US.

2. Theory: Modelling GDP - Energy - Emissions

To grasp the complexity of climate change, one can make use of a few models that account for much of increase in greenhouse gases (GHG). Global warming further aggravated environmental destruction, but environmental degradation includes more than climate change.

a) Kaya Model

The basic model of carbon emissions is the so-called Kaya model, or Kaya’s identity: Future carbon emissions depend on changes in Population (in billions), economic activity as GDP per capita (in thousands of \$US/ person year), energy intensity in Watt years / dollar, and carbon intensity of energy as Gton C as CO₂ per TeraWatt year.” (<http://climatemodels.uchicago.edu/kaya/kaya.doc.html>)

It is proper to formulate it as a stochastic law-like proposition, where coefficients will be estimate using various data sets, without any assumption about stable universal parameters. Thus, we have this equation format for the Kaya probabilistic law-like proposition, as follows: (E2) Multiple Regression: $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + \dots + bXt + u$. Thus, using the Kaya model for empirical research on global warming, the following anthropogenic conditions would affect positively carbon emissions: (E3) CO₂:s = F(GDP/capita, Population, Energy intensity, Carbon intensity), in a stochastic form with a residual variance. The Kaya model findings show that total CO₂:s go with larger total GDP. An empirical estimation of the probabilistic Kaya model for 2014 points at GDP, and energy as keys:

(E4) $k1= 0,68, k2=0,85, k3=0,95, k4=0,25; R2= 0,895$.

Note: $LN CO_2 = k1*LN (GDP/Capita) + k2*(dummy for Energy Intensity) + k3*(LN Population) + k4*(dummy for Fossil Fuels/all Dummy for fossils 1 if more than 80 % fossil fuels; k4 not significantly proven to be non-zero, all others are. (N = 59)$
 Figure 2 shows the connection between GDP and energy for the last nearly 30 years. Energy comes in every sector in the economy and living standards cannot be raised without some form of energy.




Fig 2: GDP and energy 1990-2016

The enormous increase in energy is set to continue in the 21st century, as almost all governments aim for economic growth. De-carbonisation is the promise to undo these dismal links by making GDP and energy consumption rely upon carbon neutral energy resources, like modern renewables and atomic energy.

Figure 3 shows the global connection between energy consumption and CO₂ emissions.




Fig 3: Energy and CO₂:s: $y = 1,01x; R^2 = 0,99$

Source: BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2017, <http://www.bp.com/statisticalreview>; Janssens-Maenhout, G., Crippa, M., Guizzardi, D., Muntean, M., Schaaf, E., Olivier, J.G.J., Peters, J.A.H.W., Schure, K.M., Fossil CO₂ and GHG emissions of all world countries, EUR 28766 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2017, ISBN 978-92-79-73207-2, doi:10.2760/709792, JRC107877

There is a one-to-one relationship over time between energy consumption and CO₂ emissions. The Asian continent is the largest GHG emitter of all continents on Planet Earth. The cost is clear, as the Asian Development Bank states about one of its most vibrant parts:

Southeast Asia is also becoming a larger contributor to global GHG emissions, with the fastest growth in carbon dioxide emissions in the world between.... Deforestation and land degradation have been driving most of the

emissions to date. Given the region’s vulnerability to climate change, curtailing global emissions growth should be a priority consideration, to which the region can make an important contribution. (ADB, 2015: Foreword)

The ADB calls for anti-global warming policies, recommending carbon capture and sequestration. This technique would allow for continued high economic growth, but it is neither safe nor least expensive, as solar power parks offer a better technique, given much sun in this region.

b) Keeling Model

The basic model of the relationship between emissions and temperature rise is the Keeling curve, but it only includes the CO₂s of the GHGs. We employ the general formula: $dT = \lambda * dF$, where ‘dT’ is the change in the Earth’s average surface temperature, ‘λ’ is the climate sensitivity, usually with degrees Celsius per Watts per square meter ($^{\circ}C/[W/m^2]$), and ‘dF’ is the radiative forcing. To get the calculations going, we start from lambda between 0.54 and 1.2, but let’s take the average = 0.87. Thus, we have the formula (Myhre et al, 1998) [31]: Formula: $(1) 0.87 \times 5.35 \times \ln(C/280)$.

Diagram 1 shows how CO₂ emissions may raise temperature to 4-5 degrees:




Diagram 1: CO₂s and temperature rise in Celsius

The UNFCCC with its annual meetings have aimed at halting temperature rise at 1.5 degrees, but it will not succeed, because other GHGs are also augmenting (Prinn, 2013) [32]. Thus, there are several greenhouse gases, but the two biggest are the CO₂s and methane. The UNFCCC has concentrated upon halting and reducing carbon dioxide, but now we are about to face a methane threat.

c) Dieterlen Model

We shall use the methane concentration curve from mid-2013 to beginning of 2017 issued by NOAA ESRL https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/, gently suggested by Dlugokencky and Kuniyuki. Why mid 2013? Because it is the last maximum of the second derivative before 2017. Since then, the curve is approximately linear, and we will derive its equation hereunder. Any decrease in methane concentration is very unlikely, as the main sources (in decreasing importance order) generally increase:

a) Agriculture emissions increase with the increase of population, the increase in meat diet in developing countries and the temperature increasing the metabolism of microbes in rice agriculture.

- b) Wetlands emissions do not diminish yet, as the microbial chemical activity will increase with temperature for many years.
- c) Fossil fuel production and use does not diminish, and was underestimated by industry - fracking (Fred Pearce, http://e360.yale.edu/features/methane_riddle_what_is_causing_the_rise_in_emissions).
- d) Biomass burning does not diminish; therefore the primary forest diminishes in the tropics, leading also to a decrease in animal, vegetal and cultural (Indigenous People) diversities and an increase in biosphere entropy.
- e) Other natural emissions

The most important contribution to the recent rise of methane concentration is mainly due to the increase in activity by microbes, present in points a), b) and d) (Nisbet, in the above reference), mainly in the tropics. This study suggests the positive feedback of the chemical increase of activity of microbes is starting now, yielding a quasi-exponential curve in the near future, or at least a steeper curve.

We will derive examples of future increase in methane concentration due to such a positive feedback, in addition to a linear approximation. For this, we will not simulate differential equations, which would be the best option, but simulate the hypothetical solution of a transition (bifurcation) between 2 steady-states, with an S-shaped function (which approximates the bifurcation between 2 steady-states) multiplied (to have continuity) by the linear approximation. We shall approximate the S-shape curve by a transitory (5 years) exponential curve in continuity with the linear approximation.

The present (November 2017) quasi-linear curve starts mid 2013 (2013.5) and its ordinate is approximately 1813 ppb. We will use as a last value at start of 2017 (2017), and the function is approximately 1846 ppb. a straightforward calculation gives the slope: it is approximately 10 ppb/year. Therefore the equation for the future curve if there is no vicious circle (positive feedback) is: $(2) y = 10 (t - 2013.5) + 1813$, where t is the time when one wants to know the CH₄ concentration, and y is the future CH₄ concentration in ppb. From this equation, one can estimate the approximate the temperature rise due by methane, by applying to y the formula (1), and multiply it by 25. It will be valid for close future, but will probably be underestimated for farther future, where it will probably closer to an exponential.




Diagram 2: Projected increase in methane

d) Kuznets Model

Countries with lots of CO₂ are big population countries with an advanced or emerging economy. Asia has more than the

world population and these countries are determined to catch-up with the West. Figure 4 shows that there is no Kuznets' curve (first rising, then descending) for CO₂: richer countries emit more CO₂

than poor ones. International aviation is a very major source of CO₂ emissions, and it is booming.




Fig 4: GDP-COP for all countries

The GHG emissions go with GDP growth, as the intermediate link is the ever expanding energy demand from GDP expansion. Several Asian economies are now either mature, catch-up or taking-off economies in terms of the classical models of GDP (Rostov, 1960; Barro, 1991; Barro, & Sala-i-Martin, 1992, 1995) [34, 24, 25, 26].

3. Global Energy: Asian surging demand

The greenhouse gases (GHG) have anthropogenic sources, being linked with socio-economic development or economic growth via the consumption of energy, especially the burning of fossil fuels, use of cement and the emission of methane from land sinks, cows, microbes, etc. The UNFCCC has focused on halting CO₂s and decreasing them

in a gigantic de-carbonisation policy globally in this century.

Since 1970, global energy consumption has more than tripped. And the share of Asia has increased phenomenally. The Asian economic miracle started in Japan after the Second War, spread to the four miracles-Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore-only to include mainland China since 1980, in order to further widening to South East Asia and South Asia plus Kazakhstan as well as the Middle East oil and gas tycoons (Figure 2). Now Asia has more than 50% of all energy consumption and it is more than 80 percent fossil fuels, globally. In several Asian countries, fossil fuels make up 90 percent of energy consumption.




Fig 2: Global energy

<http://www.climatedepot.com/2017/06/21/reality-check-85-of-global-energy-consumption-based-on-fossil-fuels/>

This economic revolution has made Asia harbor the set of factories of the world, thus increasing quickly affluence and wealth as well as succeeding in diminishing poverty. But energy transformation requires huge changes in Asia, like the elimination of coal as soon as possible.

4. Management strategies for decarbonisation

The UNFCCC suggests a decentralized management strategy for de-carbonisation. Reflecting the enormous differences in available energy resources in the member states of COP21 Treaty, each government must develop a

strategy for achieving Goal I, Goal II and Goal III. The COP 24 in Poland 2018 may wish to concentrate upon the following measures start credible de-carbonisation:

- 1) Phasing out coal power plants; convincing a few countries like India and Australia not to build new ones;
- 2) Replace wood coal with natural gas – small or large scale, stopping deforestation and the use of charcoal in households in poor nations, giving them free small gas ovens;
- 3) Turn some countries away from massive dam constructions towards solar power parks, like Brazil and India, as the environmental damages are too big;
- 4) Help some countries maintain their huge forests: Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia, Russia, Congo, India, etc.;
- 5) Abstain from expensive and unsafe carbon sequestration techniques in favour of electricity: solar power and electrical vehicles.
- 6) The promise of financial support-Super Fund-has to be clarified about both funding and budgeting. A

- 7) The resort to atomic power plants is highly contested. Nuclear power gets safer and safer, but the problem of storing the used uranium has no solution yet, although Finland says it knows how. Old atomic plants could be made much safer in France and Germany for instance. Full scale climate change would be worse than single nuclear disasters.
- 8) Massive construction of solar power and wind power plants in all countries, as well as stimulate small scale solar power; Solar power parks: How many would be needed to replace the energy cut in fossil fuels and maintain the same energy amount, for a few selected countries with big CO2 emissions? Table 1 has the answer.

Table 1: Number of Ouarzazate plants necessary in 2030 for COP21’s GOAL II: (Note: Average of 250 - 300 days of sunshine used for all entries except Australia, Indonesia, and Mexico, where 300 - 350 was used).

Nation	Co2 reduction pledge / % of 2005 emissions	Number of gigantic solar plants needed (Ouarzazate)	Gigantic plants needed for 40 % reduction
China	none ⁱ	0	3300
India	none ⁱⁱ	0	600
Japan	26	460	700
South Korea	37	260	280
Philippines	70	70	40
Indonesia	29	120	170
Thailand	20 - 25 ^{iv}	50	110
Iran	4 - 12 ^{iv}	22	220
Malaysia	none ⁱⁱ	0	80
Pakistan	none ⁱⁱ	0	60
Bangladesh	3,45	2	18
Australia	26 - 28	130	190
World	N/A	N/A	16000

Notes: 1. The United States has pulled out of the deal; 2) No absolute target; 3) Pledge is above current level, no reduction; 4) Upper limit dependent on receiving financial support; 5) EU joint pledge of 40 % compared to 1990

5. Climate change and chaos theory

The most recent news about the severe negative impacts of global warming is an article in *Science* saying 1/4ths of the oceans have become oxygen empty-deoxygenation killing fishing and local people livelihood. Can the chaos approach help analysis these drastic changes and their consequences? Chaos was discovered in the 60s by E. Lorenz, who was studying equations ("differential equations") applied to climate. He found a system of three such equations, coupled with a positive feedback and a negative feedback, which could not be predicted in the future. When trying to predict the evolution, two starting conditions very close one to each other will have two very different evolutions. Even if the 2 initial conditions are infinitesimally close! That's why the "butterfly effect" started to be cited: if a small (infinitesimally) variation of weather (the "wind" produced by a butterfly) would imply a

big variation in the weather far from there. In fact, this is wrong, because the Lorenz equations are too simple for climate, and are simply wrong for climate. So chaos equations are useless to predict, even if climate is chaotic. But there are other coupled differential equations, which can help predict things in climate. They are simpler mathematically than chaos, but they have also at least a positive feedback and a negative feedback. How do they predict? They are unstable for certain conditions (for example for methane above a given concentration), and we can calculate this instability. Therefore, we can know when the system (climate) will jump from one state to another. Practically, it can be: Earth temperature jumps form 17 degrees in 5 years to 20 degrees in 6 years. The positive feedback is necessary for the system to jump, and the negative feedback is necessary for the system to be stable when it doesn't jump.

The climatic system (a few climatic variables, as temperature, CO₂ and methane concentrations, and maybe one or 2 other variables) is modelled thanks to a method that transforms chronological data (e.g. monthly data) into those equations.

A stability analysis on a parameter (methane concentration, if we did not put methane as a variable but as a parameter), would see when the system gets unstable, if it does. Without methane, it did not become unstable, but with methane, it likely becomes unstable.

One can show the system as arrows between the variables: each arrow showing if variable A increases or decreases, this affects variable B. This gives an image which shows how the system works, out from the equations directly, and out of the historical data also. One can be sure that the release of massive methane from the melting permafrost will force the Keeling curve upwards, perhaps with a *chaotic jump*. This may herald *Hawking irreversibility*.

6. Conclusion

China invests in both nuclear power and modern renewables. Yet, it has magnificent economic ambitions over the next decades: (i) Airports and own constructed aircraft; (ii) Largest air traffic in the world; (iii) Biggest car market in the world' (iv) More SUVs and ever larger engines; (v) The New Silk Road: infra structure expansion into Central Asia, Pakistan and the Middle East. Air and sea transportation adds much to CO₂ emissions. Even if electrical cars are launched massively in China, one must ask where the electricity comes from.

Ramesh (2015) ^[33] insists that India cannot alone uplift its million poor without coal power. In addition, families in India rely much upon wood and charcoal – traditional renewables. The country is investing in nuclear power and modern renewables. However, its hydro power suffers from water scarcity-a positive feedback loop from climate change.

To come to grips with its enormous GHG emissions, South Korea has attempted to reduce its coal dependency. Thus, it engaged upon a most ambition nuclear program, as its force is the largest power source in the world. South Korea with its advanced technology can build new and better as well as safer atomic power plants, also constructing them abroad. But the new president hesitates about nuclear power, like the European governments, and has launched a new energy strategy based massively upon natural gas (LNG), imported mainly from Australia and Indonesia. But it will still result in CO₂ emissions higher than GOAL II in CO₂1. And international maritime transportation is a major source of CO₂s. The LNG option may also appear attractive to Japan, hesitant about the use of atomic power. But LNG is NOT de-carbonisation.

Indonesia is a coming giant, both economically and sadly in terms of pollution. The upward trend in GDP-CO₂ for Indonesia reminds of that for China and India. However, matters are even worse for Indonesia, as the burning of the rain forest on Kalimantan and Sumatra augments the GHG emissions very much. Figure 4 presents the energy mix for this huge country in terms of population and territory.




Fig 1: Indonesia total primary energy consumption, 2013

Only 4 per cent comes from hydro power with almost 80 per cent from fossil fuels and the remaining from biomass, which alas also pollutes. Indonesia cannot control the illegal burning and cutting down of its rain forest. Thus, it is a very major contributor to global warming.

7. References

1. Sources: Solar power
2. Paris 2015: Tracking country climate pledges. Carbon Brief, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/paris-2015-tracking-country-climate-pledges>

3. EDGAR v 4.3.2, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC)/PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), release version 4.3.2. <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu>, 2016 forthcoming
4. Janssens-Maenhout, G., Crippa, M., Guizzardi, D., Muntean, M., Schaaf, E., Olivier, J.G.J., Peters, J.A.H.W., Schure, K.M.: Fossil CO₂ and GHG emissions of all world countries, EUR 28766 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2017, ISBN 978-92-79-73207-2, doi:10.2760/709792, JRC107877. World Bank Data Indicators, <http://data.worldbank.org>
5. CO₂ Emission Reduction With Solar
6. <http://www.solarmango.com/in/tools/solar-carbon-emission-reduction>
7. GDP sources:
8. World Bank national accounts data - data.worldbank.org
9. OECD National Accounts data files
10. GHG and energy sources:
11. World Resources Institute CAIT Climate Data Explorer - cait.wri.org
12. EU Joint Research Centre Emission Database for Global Atmospheric
13. Research - <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php>
14. UN Framework Convention on Climate Change -
15. http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/ghg_data_unfccc/time_series_annex_i/items/3814.php
16. International Energy Agency. Paris.
17. Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC.
18. BP Energy Outlook 2016.
19. EU Emissions Database for Global Research EDGAR,
20. <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>
21. World Bank Data Indicators, data.worldbank.org
22. British Petroleum Statistical Review of World Energy, 2016.
23. Asian Development Bank. Southeast Asia and the economics of global climate stabilization. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2015.
24. Barro RJ. Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1991; 106(2):407-443. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937943>
25. Barro RJ, Xavier Sala-i-Martin X. Convergence. *Journal of Political Economy*. 1992; 100(2):223-251. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261816>
26. Barro RJ, Xavier Sala-i-Martin X. *Economic Growth*. McGraw Hill, 1995.
27. Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment (USGCRP, 2017) <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/4174364/Climate-Science-Special-Report-2017.pdf>
28. Conka K. *Un Finished Foundation. The United Nations and Global Environmental Governance*. Oxford: OUP, 2015.
29. Kaya Y, Yokoburi K. *Environment, energy, and economy: Strategies for sustainability*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 1997.
30. Lorenz EN. Three approaches to atmospheric predictability, in *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*. 1969; 50:345-349.
31. Myhre G, Highwood EJ, Shine KP, Stordal F. New estimates of radiative forcing due to well mixed greenhouse gases, in *Geophysics Research Letters*, 1998; 25(14):2715-2718.
32. Prinn R. 400 ppm CO₂? Add Other GHGs, and It's Equivalent to, 2013, 478. ppm (<http://oceans.mit.edu/news/featured-stories/5-questions-mits-ron-prinn-400-ppm-threshold>)
33. Ramesh J. *Green Signals: Ecology, Growth and Democracy in India*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2015.
34. Rostow WW. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
35. Sachs JD. *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
36. Stern N. *The Economics of Climate Change*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
37. Stern N. *What are we waiting for?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015.
38. Vogler J. *Climate Change in World Politics*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Palgrave, 2016.

¹ No absolute target

Conca (2015) and Vogler (2016) have shown in inquiries into how the UN has handled the climate change that the Great Powers use the fragmented UN structure to delay real action against global warming. They move the key issue of global warming and decarbonisation around, from arena to arena, just to delay concrete measures. The question of climate change is mixed with general environmental protection or the idea of a new sustainable economy, often utopian proposals. "What are we waiting for?", ask economist Stern (2015). Reply: G20 real action. The G20 group of nations is responsible for more than 3/3rds of the CO₂ emissions. They do not face enormous transaction cost like the UNFCCC. They can act and not only make enquiries, like the IPCC. But they rely upon resilience: Let each country respond to climate change. Global warming leads to enormous externalities (Stern, 2007). It requires global policy responses, where only the G20 group can lead. They must pay for the costs they place upon others. It is in their own interests. But we have seen above that they have little readiness to fulfill the COP21 Treaty goals, eliminating coal, cutting down oil and gas. Instead, they plan for a 20-30 % increase in energy consumption, especially on the Asian continent. The chaotic developments in climate change will be conducive to chaotic changes in social systems and economic activity, leading to massive people mobility.