

Interactive comment on “The impact of model variation in CO₂ and temperature impulse response functions on emission metrics” by D. J. L. Olivié and G. P. Peters

K.T. Tanaka (Referee)

katsumasa.tanaka@env.ethz.ch

Received and published: 25 September 2012

Overall comments

This study emulates various carbon cycle and climate models by using impulse response functions (IRFs) and investigates how the model differences lead to differences in emission metrics such as the GWP, GTP, and iGTP. The relaxation time scales and associated weights of the IRFs estimated in this study synthesize the results of several intercomparison projects. The authors show a usefulness of IRFs to gain new insights into different models. This study is based on a substantial numerical work using datasets from several intercomparison projects.

C436

However, I have several reservations with the manuscript as it stands.

1) I would first suggest that the authors compare their results with those of previous studies (e.g. (Joos et al., 2012; Reisinger et al., 2010; Wuebbles et al., 1995)). In the current manuscript the actual scientific contribution of this study to the literature is not very clear because the paper does not integrate previous studies in the discussion.

- (Reisinger et al., 2010) is a major study that quantifies systematically the uncertainties in the GWP and GTP based on not only model differences but also historical constraints. This paper under review does not characterize the uncertainty by using historical observations. (Reisinger et al., 2010) is touched upon in the introduction but deserves more discussion.

- In addition, the goal of this study looks similar to that of (Joos et al., 2012), which is not cited in this paper. (Joos et al., 2012) looks into the responses of various carbon cycle and climate models to CO₂ pulse emissions and discusses the influence of model differences on metric values. Because it appears that the same group is involved in this paper, the authors could provide in-depth comparisons between these two papers.

- Furthermore, (Wuebbles et al., 1995) is also a relevant study that investigates the uncertainty in the GWP, which could be discussed in this paper.

2) My second comment is related to the nonlinearity. Applications of a linear IRF, which is used by the analysis here, are by construction valid within the linear range of the global carbon cycle (below about the CO₂ concentration of 550 ppm) (Hasselmann et al., 1993; Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann, 1987). Although the authors acknowledge the linear limit in the introduction, from my reading they actually fit linear IRFs on the C4MIP output in which the models are run till 2100 (reaching 700 to 1,000 ppm). I speculate this created a bias in the estimates of the C4MIP IRF parameters. To extend the applicability of a linear IRF beyond its linear range, one needs to consider the dynamic equilibrium for the ocean carbonate species under rising atmospheric CO₂ concentration, which affects the ocean CO₂ uptake (Hooss et al., 2001). A detailed

C437

biogeochemical underpinning is provided in (Tanaka et al., 2007). Or, a quicker fix in this case would be to fit the IRF on the C4MIP data only till 2050, which is when the atmospheric CO₂ concentration does not substantially exceed 550ppm.

3) The IRF based on the C4MIP dataset shows a nearly constant airborne fraction beyond just a few years after the emission (Figure 1). This strong short-term response contradicts with the behaviors of the C4MIP models and is also not consistent with the current understanding on the global carbon cycle (Archer et al., 2009). I think that the C4MIP IRF requires further investigation. This problem may be caused by how the C4MIP IRF has been calibrated (issue #2 above), but I am not sure what the reason exactly is. The paper attributes this peculiar behavior of the C4MIP IRF to the rising emissions (Page 953, Lines 2-8). But I think that the rising emissions do not explain the short term response of the C4MIP IRF – the rising emissions are more relevant to the uncertainty ranges of IRF parameters, as the conclusion of this paper states that “the gradual evolution of the CO₂ emission scenario in C4MIP makes it difficult to uniquely determine the CO₂ IRF”. Because the IRF accounts for multiple time scales of the carbon cycle response, the emission pathway should not influence the estimates of the IRF parameters (as long as it is applied within its linear range). Note that, if one attempts to estimate a single time constant (equivalent to an IRF with just one decaying constant), the emission pathway would influence the apparent CO₂ time scale (Archer et al., 2009). Related debates are summarized in (Tanaka et al., 2012).

4) The current manuscript narrowly focuses on the IRF approach. I believe that adding some background discussions would broaden the perspective of the paper. Various types of models are used in computing metrics ((Tanaka et al., 2010); see Figures 1 and 2 for references therein). Why are the authors revisiting the linear IRF approach? What are the advantages of an IRF over a (more complex) simple carbon cycle and climate model to probe the uncertainties in metrics? Why is the linear IRF in spite of its limitation for applications? These questions do not have to be the ones to be discussed in the paper, but I think addressing this type of broad questions would benefit the paper.

C438

5) The limitations of the metric results in terms of the type of uncertainties explored are discussed at the end of the paper, but those could be brought up upfront. It is not a problem that this study explores the uncertainties in metrics arising only from the model differences (i.e. without looking at those characterized by historical constraints). But the paper could state clearly at the beginning that this study does not fully explore the uncertainties in the CO₂ response because the focus of this study is the differences in the models used in various intercomparison projects. It could also be stated at the beginning that the analysis does not consider the uncertainties related to non-CO₂ components. It is not clear how these unaccounted uncertainties would play out and affect metric ranges. Furthermore, it may be worth pointing out the importance of the time horizon – as the metric results show implicitly, the choice of the time horizon in many cases influences more strongly the metric values than the choice of models.

I brought up several issues with the current manuscript above. However, the paper will potentially be an interesting contribution to the literature. As a final remark, I felt that there is a room for improvement in terms of the presentation of this paper. It is my overall impression that the paper (including the abstract) can be shortened by improving the wording, polishing the text, removing redundancies, and etc. Also note that, because of the issue #2, which might significantly affect the metric estimates, I did not review the part dealing with the results for metrics (Sections 4.2 to 4.4). I have detailed comments (see Supplementary pdf).

References

Archer, D., Eby, M., Brovkin, V., Ridgwell, A., Cao, L., Mikolajewicz, U., Caldeira, K., Matsumoto, K., Munhoven, G., Montenegro, A., Tokos, K., 2009. Atmospheric lifetime of fossil fuel carbon dioxide. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences* 37, 117-134.

Hasselmann, K., Sausen, R., Maier-Reimer, E., Voss, R., 1993. On the cold start problem in transient simulations with coupled atmosphere-ocean models. *Climate Dy-*

C439

namics 9, 53-61.

Hooss, G., Voss, R., Hasselmann, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Joos, F., 2001. A nonlinear impulse response model of the coupled carbon cycle-climate system (NICCS). *Climate Dynamics* 18, 189-202.

Joos, F., Bruno, M., Fink, R., Siegenthaler, U., Stocker, T.F., Le Qu  l  , C., Sarmiento, J.L., 1996. An efficient and accurate representation of complex oceanic and biospheric models of anthropogenic carbon uptake. *Tellus B* 48, 397-417.

Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J.S., Peters, G.P., Enting, I.G., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V., Burke, E.J., Eby, M., Edwards, N.R., Friedrich, T., Fr  licher, T.L., Halloran, P.R., Holden, P.B., Jones, C., Kleinen, T., Mackenzie, F.T., Matsumoto, K., Meinshausen, M., Plattner, G.-K., Reisinger, A., Segschneider, J., Shaffer, G., Steinacher, M., Strassmann, K., Tanaka, K., Timmermann, A., Weaver, A.J., 2012. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussion* 12, 19799-19869.

Maier-Reimer, E., Hasselmann, K., 1987. Transport and storage of CO₂ in the ocean – an inorganic ocean-circulation carbon cycle model. *Climate Dynamics* 2, 63-90.

Reisinger, A., Meinshausen, M., Manning, M., Bodeker, G., 2010. Uncertainties of global warming metrics: CO₂ and CH₄. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37, L14707.

Tanaka, K., Berntsen, T., Fuglestedt, J.S., Rypdal, K., 2012. Climate effects of emission standards: the case for gasoline and diesel cars. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46, 5205-5213.

Tanaka, K., Kriegler, E., Bruckner, T., Hooss, G., Knorr, W., Raddatz, T., 2007. Aggregated Carbon Cycle, Atmospheric Chemistry, and Climate Model (ACC2) – description of the forward and inverse modes, Reports on Earth System Science. Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, Hamburg, p. 188.

C440

Tanaka, K., Peters, G.P., Fuglestedt, J.S., 2010. Policy Update: Multicomponent climate policy: why do emission metrics matter? *Carbon Management* 1, 191-197.
Wuebbles, D.J., Jain, A.K., Patten, K.O., Grant, K.E., 1995. Sensitivity of direct global warming potentials to key uncertainties. *Climatic Change* 29, 265-297.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-syst-dynam-discuss.net/3/C436/2012/esdd-3-C436-2012-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on *Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss.*, 3, 935, 2012.

C441