

- Paul Venezia
- Reality Check
- Strategic Developer
 Ask the Headhunter®
 Sustainable IT

- TreeHugger
- Ecolron Ecotality
- DD's Eco Notes
- Green Options blogGreen Wombat
- Green TechnoLog
- · Sustainable Log
- EnergyRefuge
- RSS FEEDS

 Database Underground
 Real World SOA
 Zero Day The Storage Network
Grid Meter
Grid Meter
Geeks in Paradise
ITXtreme with Paul Ryan

ITXtreme with Paul Ryan

ITXtreme with Paul Ryan

ITXTEME

IT

Enterprise Desktop
 IT Exec-Connect Chat
 Inside IT Exec-Connect

BLOGROLL

- FcoGeek

- Flex Your Power
 Andrew Winston
- Test Center Daily

The report, by the way, was written by an independent trio of experts: Christina Ross, manager of technical services at LaCroix Davis, Evan Mills, staff scientist at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and Sean B. Hecht, executive director of The Environmental Law Center at UCLA School of Law. Available now, it also will appear in a forthcoming joint issue of the Stanford Environmental Law Journal and the Stanford Journal of International Law. It's a well-written, well-researched piece, too, and it makes for some interesting, if not troubling, reading.

Notably, the paper focuses on the insurance industry, but it mentions various industries. The info is undoubtedly relevant to just about any organization.

So let's examine some of the legal risks associated with global climate changes outlined in the study: One potential scenario is that you're a service provider — maybe a hosted application company, an Internet provider, or an outsourced datacenter. Your local utility loses power due to climate-change-related weather conditions, such as a major hurricane. You can't maintain SLAs for your customers, and you've suddenly got costly legal troubles on your hands.

"Uptime is everything for these companies, and there's going to be more power outages, more stress on the electrical grid, "Mills says. "If IT operators aren't prepared, they may cause financial injuries to third parties."

The authors do offer some mitigation for this scenario. Among them: developing a business continuity plan; searching for alternative energy carriers other than electric, which is "particularly vulnerable,"; and investing in demand-side energy management and

Or think Enron, but instead of the CEOs and other higher-ups fudging the financial on time Lindi, but inseed in the CLUS and office inject-ups usually in the manufactors, they're fudging the data about the company's environmental impact. 'Directors and officers' actions (or lack thereof) in managing climate change risks may depress shareholder value, and their disclosures about climate change risks are governed by specific federal laws that may subject them to personal liability," the report notes.

This type of scandal also could leak out to the public, tarnish a company's reputation, and result in a drop in stock prices. Next stop: court.

Another potential legal threat: A company could find itself sued because its products (for the IT industry, a server, perhaps) are less energy efficient than those of its competitors, thus producing more GHGs. A plaintiff could argue that he or she was harmed by climate change due the product's design defects. The report notes that this would be difficult to demonstrate in court, but the company would still incur legal fees (and bad press).

Ads by techwords beta See your link here

1 of 2 5/31/07 2:06 PM How this works

Top News 155
Columnists 155
Tech Watch 155
Test Center Reviews 155
Applications 155
App Development 155
App Development 155
E-Business Solutions & Strategies 155
Security 155
Operating 155
Operating Systems 155
Platforms 155
Security 155
Standards & Protocols 155
Storage 155
Telecommunications 155
Wireless 155
Wireless 155
Web Services 155

The mitigation here should be pretty obvious, though perhaps easier said than done: Work to stay ahead of the curve in terms of product development. Fortunately, we're seeing plenty of innovation from hardware makers in their server and chip designs.

Alternatively, a company could also find itself being sued for bringing harm to individual or a class, or to a city through pollution, due to its general GHG emissions. This, too, would be difficult to prove in court, but there would be pesky legal fees, increased insurance rates, bad PR, and the like.

One of the mitigations is repeated time and again in the report to address just about every potential legal threat: reduce greenhouse-gas emissions and participate in emissions-offset activities.

Hardly anyone (exceptions might include certain types of lawyers and litigants) wants to see any of the litigation scenarios enumerated in the study (of which I've just scratched the surface). They're all-around bad: bad for business, bad for our health, bad for the environment.

The good news is, there are plenty of ways for companies to reduce the threats and the associated costs. At the same time, cutting your carbon emissions means you're cutting your power consumption, which translates into not just reduced risks but reduced bills.

"Limiting Liability in the Greenhouse" is available here [PDF]. Again, I highly recommend you read it if you're all at concerned about the legal implications of global warming, the impact it might have on your insurance, the future of your business, or global warming.

Posted by Ted Samson on May 31, 2007 12:03 AM

E-mail This | Print This | Digg This | Slashdot It! | Add to del.icio.us

Comments

NASA Administrator Not Sure Global Warming A Problem http://www.npr.org

CO2 Does NOT cause cliamte change http://www.inteliorg.com/co2_climate_change.html

Posted by: Dr Coles at May 31, 2007 07:31 AM

That interview with NASA's administrator is pretty interesting, and certainly demonstrative that not everyone is convinced of the potential dangers of global warming. Here's a more direct link to the interview. http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=22729

The fact remains, though, that it's becoming increasingly recognized as a problem by many scientists, political leaders, business leaders, and individuals across the globe. Companies certainly have the choice of ignoring the noise and not making changes to their business practices, but doing so leaves them exposed to litigation, not to mention potential fines from the government as more legislation comes down the pike.

Posted by: Ted Samson at May 31, 2007 08:30 AM

Post a comment	
Name:	
Email Address:	
URL:	
,	
Remember me? C Yes C No Comment:	
]	
890563	
Preview	
Post	

Check out our latest electronic newsletters.

www. infoworld.com/ newsletters

NEW NEWSLETTERS
Open Enterprise
Off the Record
SMB Channel
Government Channel

HOME NEWS COLUMNS BLOGS PODCASTS VIDEOS TECHNOLOGIES TEST CENTER EVENTS CAREERS IT EXEC-CONNECT About | Advertise | Awards | Store | Contact Us

Copyright © 2007, Reprints, Permissions, Licensing, IDG Network, Privacy Policy, Terms of Service.

All Rights reserved. InfoWorld is a leading publisher of fectivology information and product reviews on topics including viruses, phishing, worms, frevalls, security, servers, storage, networking, wireless, databases, and wes services.

CIO :: ComputerWorld :: CSO :: GamePro :: Games.net :: IDG Connect :: IDG World Expo JavaWorld :: LinuxWorld :: MacUser :: Macworld :: Network World :: PC World :: Playlist

2 of 2 5/31/07 2:06 PM