

ADVANCE WRITTEN TESTIMONY

Richard C. J. Somerville

Scripps Institution of Oceanography

University of California, San Diego

Hearing on “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations”

Subcommittee on Energy and Power

Committee on Energy and Commerce

U. S. House of Representatives

Tuesday, March 8, 2011

2123 Rayburn House Office Building

1. Introduction

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you concerning the science of climate change. I am a climate scientist and have more than 40 years experience in that field of science. I hold a B. S. degree in meteorology from Pennsylvania State University, granted in 1961, and a Ph. D. degree in meteorology from New York University, granted in 1966. My main professional focus throughout my career has been research in weather and climate. Since 1979, I have been a professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego (UCSD). In 2007, I formally retired from teaching graduate-level courses there, but I remain active in research, advising graduate students, and outreach. My current title there is Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor. More details about my professional activities and my research are available at the following web sites:

<http://richardsomerville.com>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Somerville

In giving testimony in this hearing before this Subcommittee, I appear as an individual scientist, speaking only for myself, not on behalf of my employer or any other organization. My current research is on understanding and modeling clouds and cloud feedbacks and related aspects of the climate system. This current research is sponsored by two Federal agencies, the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE). In the past, I have also carried out research sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In all cases, this research support has been in the form of grants awarded competitively after peer review.

Prior to joining Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UCSD, in 1979, I did research at NOAA and NASA laboratories, at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences at New York University. My current part-time, post-retirement salary at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UCSD, is funded partly by that organization and partly by my research grants described above. The out-of-pocket expenses that I have incurred in order to be present at this hearing will be reimbursed in part by Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UCSD, and in part by Climate Communication LLC, an organization for which I consult, affiliated with Aspen Global Change Institute, a Colorado nonprofit corporation. Climate Communication LLC is devoted to improving the effective communication of sound climate science. Once again, I emphasize that the views expressed in my written and oral testimony before this Subcommittee are entirely my own, and I am speaking here only as an individual scientist and not as the representative of any of these organizations or any other organization.

The comprehensive Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), published in 2007, authoritatively evaluates climate change science published in the peer-reviewed technical research literature up to about mid-2006. Viewed from the perspective of what is known now, in early 2011, the report is thus inevitably somewhat out of date. I am a Coordinating Lead Author of AR4. This jargon term denotes a scientist who co-headed the writing team for a chapter of AR4. The report AR4 has three major parts, denoted by Working Groups One, Two, and Three. My

contribution to AR4 was as part of Working Group One (WG1), which is devoted to the physical science of climate change. The other two working groups are concerned with several other aspects of climate change such as mitigation, adaptation, impacts and vulnerability.

In early 2007, at the time of the publication of WG1 of AR4, the mainstream global community of climate scientists already understood from the most recent research that the latest observations of climate change were disquieting. In the words of a research paper published at the same time as the release of AR4 WG1, a paper for which I am a co-author, “observational data underscore the concerns about global climate change. Previous projections, as summarized by IPCC, have not exaggerated but may in some respects even have underestimated the change” (Rahmstorf et al. 2007).

Now, in 2011, more recent research and newer observations have demonstrated that climate change continues to occur, and in several aspects the magnitude and rapidity of observed changes frequently exceed the estimates of earlier projections, including those of AR4. In addition, the case for attributing much observed recent climate change to human activities is even stronger now than at the time of AR4.

Several recent examples, drawn from many aspects of climate science, but especially emphasizing atmospheric phenomena, support this conclusion. These include temperature, atmospheric moisture content, precipitation, and other aspects of the hydrological cycle.

Motivated by the rapid progress in research, a recent scientific synthesis, *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* (Allison et al. 2009), has assessed recent climate research findings, including:

- Measurements show that the Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets are losing mass and contributing to sea level rise.
- Arctic sea-ice has melted far beyond the expectations of climate models.
- Global sea level rise may attain or exceed 1 meter by 2100, with a rise of up to 2 meters considered possible.
- In 2008, global carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels were about 40% higher than those in 1990.
- At today's global emissions rates, if these rates were to be sustained unchanged, after only about 20 more years, the world will no longer have a reasonable chance of limiting warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius, or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, above 19th-century pre-industrial temperature levels. This is a much-discussed goal for a maximum allowable degree of climate change, and this aspirational target has now been formally adopted by the European Union and is supported by many other countries, as expressed, for example, in statements by both the G-8 and G-20 groups of nations.

The Copenhagen Diagnosis also cites research supporting the position that, in order to have a reasonable likelihood of avoiding the risk of dangerous climate disruption, defined by this 2 degree Celsius (or 3.6 degree Fahrenheit) limit, global emissions of greenhouse

gases such as carbon dioxide must peak and then start to decline rapidly within the next five to ten years, reaching near zero well within this century.

The Copenhagen Diagnosis is available at www.copenhagendiagnosis.org.

The remainder of my present testimony summarizes the rapid recent progress in climate change scientific research and relates it to recent developments in the politics and public perceptions of climate change.

2. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its 2007 report

We can begin by looking back at the last IPCC report and asking some key questions:

1. What is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and how does it work?
2. Were the main conclusions in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), published in 2007, correct?
3. How has climate science changed since the scientific papers that were assessed in AR4?

IPCC was founded in 1988. Bolin (2007) has documented the history of IPCC. To date, IPCC has produced four major Assessment Reports (ARs). The average interval between reports is about six years:

1990: First AR (FAR)

1995: Second AR (SAR)

2001: Third AR (TAR)

2007: Fourth AR (AR4)

In 2013, the Fifth AR (AR5) is expected. During the 20 years since the publication of the First Assessment Report, great progress has been made in climate change science. As an example, much more observational data has become available, and computer simulations of the climate system have made great advances in physical comprehensiveness and realism, and also in computational resolution.

The Working Group One (physical science) part of AR4 was written by 152 scientists, called "Lead Authors." 22 of the 152 are called "Coordinating Lead Authors." These 22 are the scientists who led the writing teams for each of the eleven chapters. I was a Coordinating Lead Author for AR4. In this testimony, however, I am speaking as an individual scientist, not representing IPCC or any other organization.

The WG1 portion of the 2007 IPCC report (AR4) is about 1,000 pages long and took three years to write. During the writing, more than 30,000 review comments, from both governments and individuals, were received on three separate drafts of the report. The authors' written responses to every review comment are in the public record. The open and transparent nature of the IPCC process, the multiple stages of peer review, and the

credentials of the authors, all contribute to the stature of the report.

The relentless upward trend in the amount (“concentration”) of carbon dioxide or CO₂ in the atmosphere continues. In fact, the concentration now is increasing more rapidly than before. Charles David Keeling, who in 1958 began these key observations of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, died in 2005. However, other scientists are now continuing the meticulous measurements that he undertook, initially made with an instrument that he invented. There is no doubt whatever that the increasing CO₂ concentrations are caused by human activities, primarily by the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas), but also importantly by land use changes, especially agriculture and deforestation.

3. The international scientific congress in Copenhagen in March 2009

There were two noteworthy climate meetings in Copenhagen in 2009. The more famous one, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) meeting, was held in Copenhagen in December 2009. This was the 15th Conference of the Parties (COP15). The UNFCCC is the document to which the countries that had ratified it were parties. This document has as its goal avoiding dangerous human-caused interference to the climate system. The United States and virtually every other country of the world is a party to the UNFCCC. The primary scientific input to the COP15 negotiations was, of course, AR4, the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), published in 2007. This report, and many other recent IPCC documents,

are available at www.ipcc.ch and are also published by Cambridge University Press.

However, new scientific developments occur continually. Since the publication of the AR4 IPCC report, new knowledge has emerged that furthers our understanding of climate change, including the impacts of human influence on the climate. To bring this new knowledge together, about nine months before COP15, another international congress, called Climate Change: Global Risks, Challenges and Decisions, was held, also in Copenhagen, from 10-12 March 2009. One must keep in mind that the AR4 IPCC report was published in 2007, and the most recent papers that it assesses were published in 2006.

The Copenhagen congress in March 2009 covered more recent research results, but the conclusions of this meeting did not go through any procedure resembling the long IPCC process of multiple drafts and extensive review. Nor did the March 2009 Copenhagen meeting report have the full participation of many expert authors, as did the IPCC. This fact illustrates the inevitable trade-off between the slow and painstaking IPCC process and faster but less thorough summaries and assessments of recent science.

We now consider some of the key results presented at the March 2009 Copenhagen meeting. Temperature is the single most important climate variable. Let us first consider recent temperature trends. IPCC in 2007 concluded, “Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea

level.”

The 2007 IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) described “an unambiguous picture of the ongoing warming of the climate system.” This trend is continuing. Small year-to-year differences in global average temperatures are unimportant in evaluating long-term trends. During a warming trend, a given year is not always warmer than all the previous years, because the ongoing warming is sometimes temporarily masked by internal climate variability, a normal and natural phenomenon. For example, 2008 was slightly cooler globally than 2007, in part because a La Niña occurred in 2008 (NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 2009). Such natural events can lead to slight temporary cooling. Solar output was also at its lowest level of the satellite era, another temporary cooling influence.

Quantitatively, the global average near-surface atmospheric temperature in 2008 was only about 0.1 deg C less than in the years immediately preceding it. Such a small difference over such a short time is not statistically significant in evaluating trends. It is noteworthy that 2008, while at the time it may have been the coolest year since 2000, was one of the ten warmest years since instrumental records began in mid-19th century, and the most recent ten-year period is still warmer than the previous ten-year period. The long-term trend is clearly still a warming trend (NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 2009). Its magnitude is about 0.2 degrees Celsius per decade, consistent with IPCC AR4 projections. This is equivalent to about one third of a degree Fahrenheit per decade.

Our knowledge of the causes of this trend has also improved. IPCC said in 2007, “Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations.” Science never provides absolute certainty. Here, ‘*very likely*’ is calibrated language used by IPCC to express the degree of scientific uncertainty or the possible range of given scientific findings. In this terminology, used consistently in AR4, “*very likely*” means at least 90% probable.

Thanks to recent research, we have learned that by far the greatest part of the observed century-scale warming is due to human rather than natural factors (Lean and Rind, 2008). These scientists analyzed the role of natural factors (e. g., solar variability, volcanoes) versus human influences (e. g., added man-made greenhouse gases and aerosols) on temperatures since 1889. They found, for example, that the sun contributed only about 10% of surface warming in the last century and a negligible amount in the last quarter century, thus contributing far less than had been estimated in earlier assessments.

Recent research has also clarified our understanding of a warming trend in the atmosphere above the lowest layers near the Earth’s surface. By reducing errors in temperature measurements, a warming in the tropical upper troposphere, 10 to 15 kilometers (roughly 6 to 10 miles) above the surface, is now apparent in observations, thus reconciling different measurement data and model simulations (Thorne, 2008). A new method based on wind observations (Allen and Sherwood, 2008) shows a similar

warming trend in the upper troposphere, consistent with model results.

The climatic roles of clouds, and of small liquid or solid particles (“aerosols”) in the atmosphere, are among the subjects where intensive research is occurring and progress is being made, but only the results of future research can settle several interesting and important scientific questions. AR4 affirmed this conclusion, and it is still true.

In the 2007 IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), projections were made that future climates would generally have more precipitation at high latitudes and less in the subtropics, where many major deserts exist. However, at that time, no observational studies could be cited defining precipitation trends on a fifty-year time scale. Now such trends have been identified in measurements. For example, Zhang et al. (2007) found that precipitation has been reduced in the subtropics but has increased in middle latitudes, consistent with model projections of human-caused global warming.

Recent research and new observations have decisively settled the question of whether a warming climate will lead to an atmosphere containing more water vapor, and if so, whether the additional water vapor will add to the greenhouse effect, augmenting the warming. The answers to both these questions are yes. Water vapor does become more plentiful in a warmer atmosphere (Dessler et al., 2008). Satellite data show that atmospheric moisture content over the oceans has increased since 1998, with human causes being responsible (Santer et al., 2007).

Recent research has also found that precipitation tends to increase as atmospheric water

vapor content increases (Wentz et al., 2007; Allan and Soden, 2008). These conclusions strengthen those of earlier studies.

In the remainder of this portion of my testimony, I briefly summarize several important findings from recent research. Further details, and citations of many of the original papers in the peer-reviewed literature, on which these summary statements are based, may be found in *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* (Allison et al. 2009).

Only a small fraction of the heat gained by the planet in recent decades is stored in the atmosphere. By far the largest portion of heat stored is to be found in the ocean. Recently developed observational advances, such as the deployment of a widespread fleet of thousands of autonomous instrumented floats, have greatly improved our knowledge of ocean heat content. Current estimates indicate that ocean warming is about 50% greater than had been previously reported by the IPCC.

Increased melting of the large polar ice sheets contributes to the observed increase in sea level. Observations of the area of the Greenland ice sheet that has been at the melting point temperature for at least one day during the summer period shows a 50% increase during the period 1979 to 2008. The Greenland region experienced an extremely warm summer in 2007. The whole area of south Greenland reached the melting temperatures during that summer, and the melt season began 10-20 days earlier and lasted up to 60 days longer in south Greenland, compared with Greenland as a whole.

In addition to melting, the large polar ice sheets lose mass by ice discharge, which also

depends on regional temperature changes. Satellite measurements of very small changes in gravity have revolutionized the ability to estimate loss of mass from these processes. The Greenland ice sheet has been losing mass at a rate of about 179 Gt/yr since 2003. Here Gt is an abbreviation for gigaton, or one billion metric tons.

One of the most dramatic developments since the last IPCC Report is the rapid reduction in the area of Arctic sea ice in summer. A new minimum in Arctic sea ice was observed only a few months after the publication of AR4. In summer 2007, the minimum area covered by sea ice in the Arctic decreased by about 2 million square kilometers as compared to previous years. In 2008 and subsequently, the decrease has been almost as dramatic. This decreasing ice coverage is important for climate on a larger scale for several reasons, including that an ice-free ocean is far less reflective and so absorbs more heat than an ice-covered ocean. Thus, the loss of Arctic sea ice triggers a strong feedback that amplifies the warming.

The global carbon cycle is in strong disequilibrium because of the input of CO₂ into the atmosphere from fossil fuel combustion and land use change. Total emissions have grown at about 2% per year since 1800. However, fossil fuel emissions have accelerated since 2000 to grow at about 3.4% per year, an observed growth rate that is at or even somewhat beyond the upper edge of the range of growth rates in IPCC scenarios. Total CO₂ emissions are responsible for about two thirds of the growth of all greenhouse gas radiative forcing. Here radiative forcing is a technical term quantifying the effect on the Earth's heat balance.

I shall next comment briefly about some key aspects of the impacts of climate change, treated mainly in WG2 and WG3 of the IPCC reports. The IPCC in its Third Assessment Report (2001) attempted to assess scientific evidence available at the time in terms of “reasons for concern.” The resulting visual representation of that synthesis, the so-called “burning embers diagram,” shows the increasing risk of various types of climate impacts with an increase in global average temperature. Using the same methodology, the same diagram of reasons for concern has been updated by several authors (Smith et al 2009). Although there inevitably is some subjectivity in any such exercise, the results are provocative and disquieting.

Several conclusions follow from the updated “burning embers diagram” and associated recent findings. First, the risks of climate change impacts now tend to appear at lower global average temperature increases. Second, a 2 deg C (or 3.6 deg F, where deg means degree) limit of warming relative to pre-industrial temperatures, which was widely thought in 2001 to be sufficient to avoid serious risks, now appears to be less adequate. Third, the risks of large-scale discontinuities are now considered to be greater than previously thought.

In summary, although a 2 deg C (or 3.6 deg F) rise in temperature above pre-industrial temperature levels remains the most commonly quoted limit for avoiding dangerous climate change, there is now a serious case to be made that even this level of warming nevertheless carries significant risks of harmful impacts for society and for the

environment.

According to the IPCC analysis in AR4, atmospheric CO₂ concentration should not exceed 400 ppm (parts per million by volume) of CO₂ if the global temperature rise is to be kept within 2.0 – 2.4°C. Today, the average CO₂ concentration is about 390 ppm, and is rising by about 2 ppm per year. The 2007 concentration of all greenhouse gases, both CO₂ and non-CO₂ gases, was about 463 ppm in CO₂-equivalents. Adjusting this concentration for the cooling effects of aerosols yields a CO₂-equivalent concentration of 396 ppm. A recent study estimates that a concentration of 450 ppm CO₂-equivalents (including the cooling effect of aerosols) would give only a 50-50 chance of limiting the temperature rise to 2°C or less. In this discussion, the term “CO₂-equivalents” refers to facilitating comparisons by converting the effects of other factors to the equivalent amount of carbon dioxide.

Thus, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations are already at levels predicted to lead to global warming of between 2.0 and 2.4°C. The conclusion from both the IPCC and subsequent analyses is blunt and stark – immediate and dramatic emission reductions of all greenhouse gases are urgently needed if the 2 deg C (or 3.6 deg F) limit is to be respected. This scientific conclusion illustrates a key point, which is that it will be governments that will decide, by actions or inactions, what level of climate change they regard as tolerable. This choice by governments may be affected by risk tolerance, priorities, economics, and other considerations, but in the end it is a choice that humanity as a whole, acting through national governments, will make. Science and scientists will

not and should not make that choice. After governments have set a tolerable limit of climate change, however, climate science can then provide valuable information about what steps will be required to keep climate change within that limit.

Humanity is now committing future generations to a strongly altered climate. Even beyond the current century, there are major implications for longer-term climate change. Warmer temperatures and changes in precipitation caused by CO₂ emissions from human activity are largely irreversible on human time scales. Atmospheric temperatures are not expected to decrease for many centuries to millennia, even after human-induced greenhouse gas emissions stop completely (Matthews and Caldeira 2008; Solomon et al. 2009; Eby et al. 2009).

A recent analysis of several decades of data in the western United States suggests that as much as 60% of the hydrological changes in this region are due to human activities. This trend, if sustained, has profound consequences for the future water supply of this already water-stressed part of the world (Barnett et al. 2008).

One complex climate model that had been modified to include recent advances in understanding of the carbon cycle, natural climate factors, and other elements, then produced twice as large a global average temperature increase at the end of the 21st century as it had before the model was modified: 5.2 °C in the new model run compared to 2.4 °C for the older version of the model (Sokolov et al. 2009).

Many recent aspects of observed climate change reveal a more rapid pace than had been foreseen by recent model projections. Thus, recent revisions of projected climate change exceed earlier estimates, and it is increasingly clear that the projections reported in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report in 2007 may well have underestimated the pace of current climate change. This conclusion cited earlier, by Rahmstorf et al. (2007), which coincidentally appeared at the same time when the WG1 portion of AR4 was published, in February 2007, thus could stand as a conclusion for this entire survey of the results of climate change science:

“Overall, these observational data underscore the concerns about global climate change. Previous projections, as summarized by IPCC, have not exaggerated but may in some respects even have underestimated the change, in particular for sea level.”

4. How *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* came to be written

The Copenhagen Diagnosis (Allison et al. 2009) is a report published online in November 2009. It is available for download at www.copenhagendiagnosis.com and www.copenhagendiagnosis.org. A group of 26 climate scientists wrote *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*. All are active researchers. They come from 8 countries and include 3 women and several younger scientists. I am one of the 26 scientists who wrote this report. Our group is private, independent, and unaffiliated with any organization. We speak only for ourselves, not for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) or anyone else.

We are self-selected and self-organized. We have no official leader or formal structure. About half of us are IPCC authors, so we know first-hand what preparing such an assessment entails and what scientific standards it should meet. Our report is firmly based on the more than 200 peer-reviewed papers we cite.

Our aim was to write a readable, short, authoritative report summarizing relevant peer-reviewed climate change research appearing since the cut-off publication date (about mid-2006) for papers assessed in the most recent (2007) IPCC assessment. Like IPCC, we insisted on being policy-relevant but policy-neutral. We thought that such an update was needed to inform the UN climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December 2009, because there has been so much important recent research. It seemed obvious to us that somebody ought to prepare such an update, so we simply decided to accept this responsibility ourselves. The veracity and value of this report thus rests entirely on the scientific credibility of its authors as well as that of the peer-reviewed publications we cite. Any errors or shortcomings in our report are also the sole responsibility of the 26 named authors.

We worked on this document for about a year. Many of us met in Copenhagen in March 2009, at the time of the congress described above, to organize the work and to agree on deadlines, topics, chapter lengths, etc. In deciding who would be in the group of authors, our primary criterion was scientific expertise on one or more of the various topics that we thought needed to be covered. We sought scientists with excellent research reputations, willing and able to work to deadlines, fluent in English, and able to function as part of a

writing team. Typically, one author would draft a given chapter, then several others of the group would review and revise it, and finally the entire group would consider the revised draft and reach consensus.

The Climate Change Research Centre at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia contributed some staff support, e.g., for developing the web site. A grant paid essential costs such as printing and travel to our meeting in Copenhagen. Nobody had any influence whatever on the contents of the report other than the 26 authors. We, the authors of *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*, all freely contributed our time and expertise. None of us were paid anything from any source to write this report.

In *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*, the reader is hearing directly from the 26 scientists who wrote it. We made all our own editorial decisions, such as to include special sections of the report, called “boxes.” These boxes deal with common misconceptions. We also decided what each of our chapters would be about and how long they would be. In short, we authors enjoyed complete autonomy to design and write our report as we wished.

The Copenhagen Diagnosis is emphatically not an attack on IPCC or a repudiation of the IPCC process or the 2007 IPCC assessment report. We simply considered that the significance of very recent research, and of many climate observations made after the AR4 IPCC assessment was written, together with novel and important improvements in several areas of scientific tools and technology, all deserved to be brought to the attention of the Copenhagen negotiators, the media, governments, corporations and the global

public. Our goal was to write in plain English and to make our report accessible to all.

The Copenhagen Diagnosis is about climate change science, not policy. For example, we summarize recent research underpinning the scientific rationale for large and rapid reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions, in order to reduce the likelihood of dangerous man-made climate change. However, we have no political or policy agenda, and we do not speak to the issue of formulating policies to achieve such reductions in emissions. As scientists, when climate change research is relevant to public policy, we consider it important to bring that research to the attention of the wider world. We are convinced that sound science can and should inform wise policy. This conviction led us to write *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*. In this testimony, I also have no political or policy agenda. I am simply summarizing my view of the current state of scientific understanding.

5. Main findings of *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*

According to *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* (Allison et al. 2009), the most significant recent climate change findings are:

Surging greenhouse gas emissions: Global carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels in 2008 were nearly 40% higher than those in 1990. Even if global emission rates are stabilized at present-day levels, just 20 more years of emissions would give a 25%

probability that warming exceeds 2 deg C, even with zero emissions after about 2030.

Every year of delayed action, to decrease greenhouse gas emissions, increases the chances of exceeding 2 deg C warming. Again, 2 deg C is 3.6 deg F.

Recent global temperatures demonstrate human-induced warming: Over the past 25 years temperatures have increased at a rate of about 0.19 deg C per decade, in very good agreement with predictions based on greenhouse gas increases. Even over the past ten years, despite a decrease in solar forcing, the trend continues to be one of warming. Natural, short-term fluctuations are occurring as usual, but there have been no significant changes in the underlying warming trend.

Acceleration of melting of ice-sheets, glaciers and ice-caps: A wide array of satellite and ice measurements now demonstrate beyond doubt that both the Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets are losing mass at an increasing rate. Melting of glaciers and ice caps in other parts of the world has also accelerated since 1990.

Rapid Arctic sea-ice decline: Summer melting of Arctic sea-ice has accelerated far beyond the expectations of climate models. The area of sea-ice melt during 2007-2009 was about 40% greater than the average prediction from IPCC AR4 climate models.

Current sea-level rise underestimated: Satellites show recent global average sea-level rise to be about 80% above past IPCC predictions. This acceleration in sea-level rise is consistent with a doubling in contribution from melting of glaciers, ice caps, and the

Greenland and West-Antarctic ice-sheets.

Sea-level predictions revised: By 2100, global sea-level is likely to rise at least twice as much as projected by Working Group 1 of the IPCC AR4. For unmitigated emissions, the rise may well exceed 1 meter. The upper limit has been estimated as about 2 meters sea level rise by 2100. Sea level will continue to rise for centuries after global temperatures have been stabilized, and several meters of sea level rise must be expected over the next few centuries.

Delay in action risks irreversible damage: Several vulnerable elements in the climate system (e.g. continental ice sheets, Amazon rainforest, West African monsoon and others) could be pushed towards abrupt or irreversible change if warming continues in a business-as-usual way throughout this century. The risk of transgressing critical thresholds (“tipping points”) increases strongly with ongoing climate change. Thus, waiting for higher levels of scientific certainty could mean that some tipping points will be crossed before they are recognized.

The turning point must come soon: If global warming is to be limited to a maximum of 2 deg C (or 3.6 deg F) above pre-industrial values, global emissions need to peak between now and 2020 and then decline rapidly. To stabilize climate, a decarbonized global society – with near-zero emissions of CO₂ and other long-lived greenhouse gases – needs to be reached well within this century. More specifically, the

average annual per-capita emissions will have to shrink to well below 1 metric ton CO₂ by 2050. This is 80 to 95% below the per-capita emissions in developed nations in 2000.

In this testimony, I give only the above brief summary of *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*.

The full report is available at www.copenhagendiagnosis.com.

6. COP15 in Copenhagen, December 2009

At the beginning of December 2009, one might have naively anticipated that the increasingly somber and compelling results of climate change science would have led the governments of the world to produce an agreement to rapidly reduce global emissions of greenhouse gases. Indeed, such an agreement at COP15 in Copenhagen in 2009 had been widely expected after COP13 in Bali two years earlier. Many observers had predicted that a binding treaty, with clear and firm targets and timetables and enforcement mechanisms, was achievable. Furthermore, as we have seen, the passage of time had seen a strengthening of the scientific rationale for such an agreement. This is apparent in the conclusions of AR4 as strengthened by subsequent research summarized in *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*.

However, the outcome of the COP15 climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December 2009 disappointed almost everybody. The final "agreement" among a few countries, known as the Copenhagen Accord (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Accord), was brokered by the US and China at the last minute. This document has no legally

binding status and is simply an aspirational statement. It is better than nothing, and one must hope for further progress in the future. However, there is no sign, in this minimal diplomatic result, of the clear need for urgency based on solid climate change science.

Yet many countries have already agreed on the firm aspirational goal of limiting global warming to 2 degrees Celsius (or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) above nineteenth-century “pre-industrial” temperatures, in order to have a reasonable chance for avoiding dangerous human-caused climate change.

Setting such a goal is a political decision, as I stressed earlier. However, now that the goal is set, at least by several countries, science can say with confidence that meeting the goal requires that *global* greenhouse gas emissions must peak within the next decade and then decline rapidly. We say that emphatically in the 2009 report *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*, where we also cite the peer-reviewed research on which this statement is firmly based, such as that of Meinshausen et al (2009).

We scientists have been aware of this urgency for more than 30 years. The authoritative IPCC report in 2007 emphasized it. My popular book *The Forging Air: Understanding Environmental Change* (Somerville, 2008) cited, “the need to act soon if sensible targets are to be met, the fact that the needed reductions in greenhouse gas emissions will be large, and the fact that both developed and developing countries must be involved.”

These results are sensitive to assumptions, of course. Meinshausen et al. (2009) conclude

that, "the probability of exceeding 2 deg C rises to 75% if 2020 emissions are not lower than 50 Gt CO₂ equiv. (25% above 2000)."

We relied on this paper and others in reaching our conclusion in *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* that, "the required decline in emissions coupled with a growing population will mean that by 2050, annual per capita CO₂ emissions very likely will need to be below 1 ton." Obviously, that will be very tough to achieve.

When I say that we scientists have known about the urgency for more than 30 years, I have one especially important scientific research paper in mind, among others. That paper is by Siegenthaler and Oeschger (1978). Here is the conclusion taken from its summary (page 389):

"For a prescribed maximum increase of 50 percent above the preindustrial carbon dioxide level, the production could grow by about 50 percent until the beginning of the next century, but should then decrease rapidly."

So "production" (meaning emissions) has to peak and then quickly decline early in the current (21st) century. This 1978 result came from simple models and the limited data available in the 1970s. We know much more today about the quantitative aspects of this prediction, and the caveats and other details. However, the essential scientific foundation was already clear more than 30 years ago, at least to two insightful Swiss scientists, Siegenthaler and Oeschger. That is the message I wish to emphasize in my testimony

here: the need to drastically reduce global greenhouse gas emissions is urgent, and the urgency is scientific, not political.

Mother Nature herself thus imposes a timescale on when emissions need to peak and then begin to decline rapidly. This urgency is therefore not ideological at all, but rather is due to the physics and biogeochemistry of the climate system itself. Diplomats and legislators, as well as heads of state worldwide, are powerless to alter the laws of nature and must face scientific facts and the hard evidence of scientific findings.

Thus, it is profoundly regrettable that what I must characterize as dithering and procrastination at COP15 in Copenhagen continued a year later in December 2010 at COP16 in Cancun, Mexico. The enduring failure to achieve meaningful international agreements, informed by sound climate science, must inevitably have serious consequences for the degree of climate disruption that the Earth will undergo.

7. Public perceptions and the politics of climate change

In late November 2009, at about the same time that *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* was released, a crime was committed in which thousands of emails of prominent climate scientists were illegally obtained from a server at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom. These emails, which appear to be authentic, were published online and extensively discussed in the press and the blogosphere.

Extremely serious questions were immediately raised. Is the science of global warming indeed valid, or has it been proven fundamentally incorrect by this episode of emails stolen from a climate research center in England? The short answer is that the hacked emails do not undermine the science in any way.

There is no doubt that the emails have embarrassed several climate scientists. Writing what they thought were private messages to their close colleagues, they expressed themselves in intemperate language. Angered by what they regarded as intolerable harassment by repeated and unreasonable demands from some of their critics, they lashed out and expressed extreme frustration in these private emails to one another.

Edited excerpts from the emails do read poorly, especially out of context, and they might lead some people to conclude that climate research must involve biased, power-hungry, and unprincipled scientists. Following the release of the emails, many in the blogosphere and media, and some politicians, immediately appointed themselves prosecutor, judge and jury. There was little chance to mount a defense in this rush to judgment.

Time has now passed. During the year following the release of the emails, several independent investigations were carried out, and we now have the results of these inquiries. The outcome of all of these investigations has been to exonerate the scientists from accusations of fraud, incompetence, and dishonesty. Many of the specific charges made against the scientists have been shown to be entirely false. For example, cherry-

picked words like “trick” turn out to be innocent jargon. In science, a "trick" is not an underhanded tactic to conceal the truth. It is simply a clever way to solve a technical problem, like finding solutions to certain equations. “Trick” here is a jargon term, a word that means one thing to scientists, something else to bridge players, and something altogether different to dog trainers. Context matters.

Much has also been made of unsuccessful demands for temperature data to be released from the research center at East Anglia. In fact, the scientists did resist such demands. Not all the legal issues in question here have yet been completely resolved. They involve freedom of information laws in countries other than the United States, as well as the proprietary restrictions attached to some data by the organizations that originally supplied the data. Nearly all the data in question, however, is freely available from several sources. Several other climate research centers worldwide independently monitor and analyze global temperatures, using essentially the same original data, and their findings closely confirm the ones from the English center. The notion that the main scientific results of modern climate change research might be upset by the release of additional data is not credible.

In my opinion, the most serious charge by far made against the emailing group of climate scientists is that they blocked publication by other scientists with whom they disagreed, and that they prevented the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, from considering the findings of those other scientists in its 2007 assessment report, AR4. Research papers by Soon and Baliunas and by McIntyre and McKittrick were alleged to

be in that category.

The facts, however, as brought out in the investigations that have now concluded, are that in these cases, good scientific practice worked exactly as it should. The papers by these authors were indeed published. Other scientists carefully considered them and did further research and published it too. The IPCC cited and discussed all this in its landmark Fourth Assessment Report, published in 2007. This is the relevant passage from page 466 of that report:

“The ‘hockey stick’ reconstruction of Mann et al. (1998) has been the subject of several critical studies. Soon and Baliunas (2003) challenged the conclusion that the 20th century was the warmest at a hemispheric average scale. They surveyed regionally diverse proxy climate data, noting evidence for relatively warm (or cold), or alternatively dry (or wet) conditions occurring at any time within pre-defined periods assumed to bracket the so-called ‘Medieval Warm Period’ (and ‘Little Ice Age’). Their qualitative approach precluded any quantitative summary of the evidence at precise times, limiting the value of their review as a basis for comparison of the relative magnitude of mean hemispheric 20th-century warmth (Mann and Jones, 2003; Osborn and Briffa, 2006). Box 6.4 provides more information on the ‘Medieval Warm Period’.

“McIntyre and McKittrick (2003) reported that they were unable to replicate the results of Mann et al. (1998). Wahl and Ammann (2007) showed that this was a consequence of differences in the way McIntyre and McKittrick (2003) had

implemented the method of Mann et al. (1998) and that the original reconstruction could be closely duplicated using the original proxy data. McIntyre and McKittrick (2005a,b) raised further concerns about the details of the Mann et al. (1998) method, principally relating to the independent verification of the reconstruction against 19th-century instrumental temperature data and to the extraction of the dominant modes of variability present in a network of western North American tree ring chronologies, using Principal Components Analysis. The latter may have some theoretical foundation, but Wahl and Amman (2006) also show that the impact on the amplitude of the final reconstruction is very small ($\sim 0.05^{\circ}\text{C}$; for further discussion of these issues see also Huybers, 2005; McIntyre and McKittrick, 2005c,d; von Storch and Zorita, 2005).”

It is a standard tactic of many climate “skeptics” or “contrarians” (terms commonly used to denote those who reject central findings of mainstream climate change science) to try to frame this issue in terms of the whole edifice of modern climate science hanging from some slender thread. Thus, if a given scientist uses intemperate language, or a particular measurement is missing from an archive, or a published paper has a minor mistake in it, the whole unstable scientific structure comes tumbling down, or so the skeptics would have people believe.

In fact, climate change science is not at all fragile or vulnerable, and there are multiple lines of evidence in support of every one of its main conclusions. That is what the 2007 IPCC AR4 report says. It remains definitive.

Historians of science tell us that the overwhelming degree of scientific agreement on climate change is rare for such a complex issue. A Galileo does come along every few hundred years to reveal fundamental errors in the prevailing understanding and thus to revolutionize a branch of science. However, almost all the people who think they are a Galileo are simply wrong. Facts matter.

Minor errors have been found in the IPCC reports, though not in the WG1 (physical science) portion of AR4, and IPCC has acknowledged these errors and taken steps to reduce the likelihood of such errors in future reports. Scientists are humans, thus imperfect, and it would be amazing if not a single minor error could be found in a report of some 3,000 pages. It is noteworthy, however, that since the WG1 AR4 report was published in 2007, no reputable scientist has yet been able to point to a major conclusion of this IPCC report, and then point to a persuasive body of peer-reviewed published research that proves that conclusion wrong. *The Copenhagen Diagnosis* has similarly not been challenged successfully. Science can never provide absolute certainty, and any scientific finding is always subject to review and revision on the basis of further research. However, it is highly unlikely that the bedrock conclusions of modern climate science will be proven wrong. Indeed, the most recent research further supports and underscores the fundamental scientific result that manmade climate change is real and serious.

8. A scientific response to climate skeptics or contrarians

Although the expert community is in wide agreement on the basic results of climate change science, as assessed in AR4 and *The Copenhagen Diagnosis*, much confusion exists among the general public and politicians in many countries, as polling data convincingly shows.

In my opinion, many people need to learn more about the nature of junk or fake science, so they will be better equipped to recognize and reject it. There are a number of warning signs that can help identify suspicious claims. One is failure to rely on and cite published research results from peer-reviewed journals. Trustworthy science is not something that appears first on television or the Internet. Reputable scientists first announce the results of their research by peer-reviewed publication in well-regarded scientific journals. Peer review is not a guarantee of excellent science, but the lack of it is a red flag. Peer review is a necessary rather than a sufficient criterion.

Another warning sign is a lack of relevant credentials on the part of the person making assertions, especially education and research experience in the specialized field in question. For example, it is not essential to have earned a Ph. D. degree or to hold a university professorship. It is important, however, that the person be qualified, not in some general broad scientific area, such as physics or chemistry, but in the relevant specialty. Accomplishments and even great distinction in one area of science do not qualify anybody to speak authoritatively in a very different area. We would not ask even an expert cardiologist for advice on, say, dentistry. One should inquire whether the

person claiming expertise in some area of climate science has done first-person research on the topic under consideration and published it in reputable peer-reviewed journals. Is the person actively participating in the research area in question, or simply criticizing it from the vantage point of an outsider? One should be suspicious of a lack of detailed familiarity with the specific scientific topic and its research literature. Good science takes account of what is already known and acknowledges and builds on earlier research by others.

Other warning signs include a blatant failure to be objective and to consider all relevant research results, both pro and con a given position. Scientific honesty and integrity require wide-ranging and thorough consideration of all the evidence that might bear on a particular question. Choosing to make selective choices among competing evidence, so as to emphasize those results that support a given position, while ignoring or dismissing any findings that do not support it, is a practice known as “cherry picking” and is a hallmark of poor science or pseudo-science.

Mixing science with ideology or policy or personalities is never justified in research. Scientific validity has nothing to do with political viewpoints. There are no Republican or Democratic thermometers. Whether a given politician agrees or disagrees with a research finding is absolutely unimportant scientifically. Science can usefully inform the making of policy, but only if policy considerations have not infected the science. Similarly, one should always be alert to the risk of bias due to political viewpoints, ideological preferences, or connections with interested parties. All sources of

funding, financial interests and other potential reasons for bias should be openly disclosed.

Finally, we must always be alert for any hint of delusions of grandeur on the part of those who would insist that they themselves are correct, while nearly everyone else in the entire field of climate science is badly mistaken. Scientific progress is nearly always incremental, with very few exceptions. Occasionally, an unknown lone genius in a humble position, such as the young Einstein doing theoretical physics while working as a clerk in a patent office, does indeed revolutionize a scientific field, dramatically overthrowing conventional wisdom. However, such events are exceedingly rare, and claims to be such a lone genius deserve the most severe scrutiny. For every authentic Einstein, there must be thousands of outright charlatans, as well as many more ordinary mortals who are simply very badly mistaken.

I have attempted to summarize a number of key points and scientific results in a recently published essay in *Climatic Change* (Somerville 2011), which I paraphrase here:

1. The essential findings of mainstream climate change science are firm. The world is warming. There are many kinds of evidence: air temperatures, ocean temperatures, melting ice, rising sea levels, and much more. Human activities are the main cause. The warming is not natural. It is not due to the sun, for example. We know this because we can measure the effect on the Earth's energy balance of man-made carbon dioxide, and it is much stronger than that of changes in the sun, which we also measure.

2. The greenhouse effect is well understood. It is as real as gravity. The foundations of the science are more than 150 years old. Carbon dioxide in the atmosphere amplifies the natural greenhouse effect and traps heat. We know carbon dioxide is increasing because we measure it. We know the increase is due to human activities like burning fossil fuels because we can analyze the chemical evidence for that.

3. Our climate predictions are coming true. Many observed climate changes, like rising sea level, are occurring at the high end of the predicted changes. Some changes, like melting sea ice, are happening faster than the anticipated worst case. Unless mankind takes strong steps to halt and reverse the rapid global increase of fossil fuel use and the other activities that cause climate change, and does so in a very few years, severe climate change is inevitable. Urgent action is needed if global warming is to be limited to moderate levels.

4. The standard skeptical or contrarian arguments have been refuted many times over in technical papers published in the peer-reviewed scientific research literature. The refutations are now readily available to the broad public and are summarized on many web sites and in many books. For example, natural climate change like ice ages is irrelevant to the current warming. We know why ice ages come and go. That is due to changes in the Earth's orbit around the sun, changes that take thousands of years. The warming that is occurring now, over just a few decades, cannot possibly be caused by such slow-acting processes. But it can be caused by man-made changes in the greenhouse

effect.

5. Science has its own high standards. It does not work by unqualified people making claims on television or the Internet. It works by scientists doing research and publishing it in carefully reviewed research journals. Other scientists examine the research and repeat it and extend it. Valid results are confirmed, and wrong ones are exposed and abandoned. Science is self-correcting. People who are not experts, who are not trained and experienced in this field, who do not do research and publish it following standard scientific practice, are not doing science. When they claim that they are the real experts, they are just plain wrong.

6. The leading scientific organizations of the world, like national academies of science and professional scientific societies, have carefully examined the results of climate science and endorsed these results. It is silly to imagine that thousands of climate scientists worldwide are engaged in a massive conspiracy to fool everybody. The first thing that the world needs to do if it is going to confront the challenge of climate change wisely is to learn about what science has discovered and accept it.

--

REFERENCES

Allan, R. P. and B. J. Soden. 2008. Atmospheric warming and the amplification of precipitation extremes. *Science*, **321**, 1481-1484.

Allen, R. J. and S. C. Sherwood. 2008. Warming maximum in the tropical upper troposphere deduced from thermal winds. *Nature Geoscience*, **1**, 399-403.

Allison, I., N. L. Bindoff, R.A. Bindshadler, P.M. Cox, N. de Noblet, M.H. England, J.E. Francis, N. Gruber, A.M. Haywood, D.J. Karoly, G. Kaser, C. Le Quéré, T.M. Lenton, M.E. Mann, B.I. McNeil, A.J. Pitman, S. Rahmstorf, E. Rignot, H.J. Schellnhuber, S.H. Schneider, S.C. Sherwood, R.C.J. Somerville, K. Steffen, E.J. Steig, M. Visbeck, A.J. Weaver. *The Copenhagen Diagnosis: Updating the World on the Latest Climate Science*. The University of New South Wales Climate Change Research Centre, Sydney, Australia, 60pp., 2009. <http://www.copenhagendiagnosis.com>

Barnett, T. P., D. W. Pierce, H. G. Hidalgo, C. Bonfils, B. D. Santer, T. Das, G. Bala, A. W. Wood, T. Nozawa, and A. A. Mirin. 2008. Human induced changes in the hydrology of the western United States. *Science*, **319**, 1080.

Bolin, B. 2007. *A History of the Science and Politics of Climate Change: The Role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Dessler, A. E., Z. Zhang, and P. Yang. 2008. Water-vapor climate feedback inferred from climate fluctuations, 2003–2008, *Geophysical Research Letters*, **35**, L20704, doi:10.1029/2008GL035333.

Eby, M., K. Zickfeld, A. Montenegro, D. Archer, K. J. Meissner, and A. J. Weaver. 2009. Lifetime of anthropogenic climate change: millennial time scales of potential CO₂ and

surface temperature perturbations. *Journal of Climate*, **22**, 2501-2511.

Lean, J. L., and D. H. Rind. 2008. How natural and anthropogenic influences alter global and regional surface temperatures: 1889 to 2006. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **35**, L18701, doi:10.1029/2008GL034864.

Matthews, H. D., and K. Caldeira. 2008. Stabilizing climate requires near zero emissions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **35**:L04705.

Meinshausen, M., N. Meinshausen, W. Hare, S. C. B. Raper, K. Frieler, R. Knutti, D. J. Frame, and M. R. Allen. 2009. Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2 deg C. *Nature*, **458**, 1158-1163.

NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies. 2009. GISS Surface Temperature Analysis. Global Temperature Trends: 2008 Annual Summation. <http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/2008/> (accessed 17 August 2009).

Rahmstorf, S., A. Cazenave, J. A. Church, J. E. Hansen, R. F. Keeling, D. E. Parker, R. C. J. Somerville, 2007: Recent climate observations compared to projections. *Science*, **316**, 709.

Santer, B. D., C. Mears, F. J. Wentz, K. E. Taylor, P. J. Gleckler, T. M. L. Wigley, T. P. Barnett, J. S. Boyle, W. Brüggenmann, and N. P. Gillett. 2007. Identification of human-induced changes in atmospheric moisture content. *Proceedings of the National Academy*

of Sciences, **104**:15248.

Siegenthaler, U., and H. Oeschger. 1978. Predicting future atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. *Science*, **199**, 388-395.

Smith, J. B., S. H. Schneider, M. Oppenheimer, G. W. Yohe, W. Hare, M. D.

Mastrandrea, A, Patwardhan, I. Burton, J. Corfee-Merlot, C. H. D. Magadza, H.-M.

Füssel, A. B. Pittock, A. Rahman, A. Suarez, and J.-P. van Ypersele. 2009: Assessing dangerous climate change through an update of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) “reasons for concern.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, published online February 26, 2009, doi: 10.1073/pnas.0812355106. Available at <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2009/02/25/0812355106>.

Sokolov, A. P., P. H. Stone, C. E. Forest, R. Prinn, M. C. Sarofim, M. Webster, S.

Paltsev, C. A. Schlosser, D. Kicklighter, S. Dutkiewicz, J. Reilly, C. Wang, B. Felzer, and H. D. Jacoby. 2009. Probabilistic forecast for 21st century climate based on uncertainties in emissions (without policy) and climate parameters. *Journal of Climate*, DOI: 10.1175/2009JCLI2863.1.

Solomon, S., G. K. Plattner, R. Knutti, and P. Friedlingstein. 2009. Irreversible climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**:1704-1709.

Somerville, R.C.J. 2008. *The Forgiving Air: Understanding Environmental Change, Second Edition*. American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, 224 pp.

Somerville, R. C. J. 2011: How much should the public know about climate science? *Climatic Change*, **104**, 509-514. doi:10.1007/s10584-010-9938-y.

Thorne, P. W. 2008. The answer is blowing in the wind. *Nature Geoscience*, **1**, 347-348.

Wentz, F. J. et al. 2007. How much more rain will global warming bring? *Science*, **317**, 233-235.

Zhang, X., F. W. Zwiers, G. C. Hegerl, F. H. Lambert, N. P. Gillett, S. Solomon, P. A. Stott, and T. Nozawa. 2007. Detection of human influence on twentieth-century precipitation trends. *Nature*, 448:461.