

## ***Interactive comment on “Accounting for the climate-carbon feedback in emission metrics” by Thomas Gasser et al.***

**Thomas Gasser et al.**

gasser@iiasa.ac.at

Received and published: 2 March 2017

This paper is a well-written, carefully constructed, and valuable contribution to the metrics literature. This paper improves upon the existing approach of incorporating climate-carbon feedbacks into GWP calculations and will constitute a very useful resource for subsequent assessments that will update these climate metrics. However, we strongly recommend the authors reconsider their recommendation to use the version of the GWP calculated with the climate-carbon feedback as the primary metric.

Thank you for your support.

As noted in the manuscript, AR4 inconsistently calculated GWP's by including climate-carbon feedbacks for CO<sub>2</sub> perturbations but not for non-CO<sub>2</sub> perturbations. This in-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



consistency was noted in AR5 which presented climate metrics both with and without climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO<sub>2</sub> perturbations (based on Arora et al., 2013 and Collins et al., 2013), and we agree with the authors that this inconsistency should be resolved. The use of a climate-carbon feedback that more realistically incorporates an eventual relaxation back to a prior equilibrium for a pulse of climate change, as is presented in this paper, is an improvement to the calculation of a GWP that includes climate-carbon feedbacks. However, one option that was overlooked in AR5, and is presented as a secondary option in this paper, is to remove the climate-carbon feedbacks from both the CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> perturbations. We argue that for reasons of simplicity and transparency, that removing the climate-carbon feedback entirely is preferable for calculating GWPs for the use of policymakers.

GWPs have found favor among the metrics community for two primary reasons: ease of computation and simplicity/transparency. Including climate-carbon feedbacks may partially negate both of these benefits of the metric. Without climate-carbon feedbacks, one can calculate the absolute GWP for any given gas (with a known lifetime and radiative forcing) in a simple two-step process. Relative GWP then requires only the use of a previously-calculated 4-exponential function for CO<sub>2</sub>. However, the calculation of an absolute GWP with climate-carbon feedbacks is apparently a 10 step process (see Figure 4). Including the climate-carbon feedbacks is also shown in this paper to require additional assumptions beyond gas lifetime and radiative efficiency (the only two parameters necessary for the calculation of a traditional GWP). Requiring this choice reduces both the simplicity and transparency inherent in the GWP. Inclusion of climate-carbon feedbacks makes the value of the GWP dependent on attributes of the model chosen – its climate sensitivity, its rate of ocean uptake of heat, and how the carbon cycle changes in response to warming. This kind of additional complexity has been noted as a drawback of the GTP in comparison to the GWP. Incidentally, as the last equation on page 6 shows, the GTP is now effectively a necessary step in calculating the GWP using the methodology in this paper. This approach also requires additional, somewhat arbitrary choices: for example, the authors chose a climate change step of

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

+0.2 degC to be approximately consistent with the peak warming of a 100 GtC pulse of CO<sub>2</sub> and the approach of Joos et al. (2013), though Figure 3 shows that for step sizes smaller than 1 degree, this choice does not appear to have a large impact.

Rows 5 and 6 of Table 2 demonstrate that there is little added value in terms of accuracy for the GWP when including the climate-carbon feedback (the 100 year GWP is particularly important as the metric in the most widespread use). The difference between the GWP calculated with and without climate-carbon feedbacks is less than 2% for any the 5 substances considered for any timeframe. This small improvement in accuracy of the 100 year GWP comes at the cost of complexity and lack of transparency as previously discussed. Moreover, despite the good work done by the authors in this paper, it is unclear to what extent use of a different model, parameters, or other choices could lead to changes in this small adjustment to the GWP.

The authors do note that “our results raise the question of whether the climate-carbon feedback should be included in emission metrics”, and yet, they “recommend using the metrics shown in this fourth row of Table 2, since they are the most consistent, robust and up-to-date metrics available” (and even raise questions about what other feedbacks should be included, such as climate-wetlands feedbacks). We would strongly recommend that the authors reconsider this recommendation.

The authors should continue to present the most up-to-date metrics based on their carbon-cycle models, but we believe that the authors should in fact endorse the use of the GWP without the climate-carbon feedback (in either the numerator or denominator). The authors show that including the climate-carbon feedback offers a slight improvement in accuracy, but in our opinion, that improvement in accuracy is far outweighed by the double drawbacks of increased difficulty of computation and loss of simplicity and transparency.

Recommending the use of metrics without the feedback would mean highlighting the 3rd equation in Appendix C.1, as it would then be possible to calculate the GWP for any

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

arbitrary non-CO<sub>2</sub> gas given lifetime and radiative efficiency values. The authors could encourage other carbon-cycle modelers to similarly calculate carbon dioxide response functions without the inclusion of carbon-climate feedbacks such that a future IPCC assessment could draw from multiple studies to inform its GWP calculations.

We are, however, less opposed to the inclusion of climate-carbon feedbacks in the calculation of GTPs. Including the feedback in GTPs results in larger impacts than when considering the GWPs (almost 30% as the authors note, for the case of 20 year GTPs and either BC or SO<sub>2</sub>). Additionally, the additional computational cost, increase in complexity, and loss of transparency are much less powerful arguments when applied to the GTP in contrast to the GWP, since many of those drawbacks are inherent in GTP calculations in the first place.

Again, we commend the authors on an extremely interesting, robust, elegant, and useful analysis, but ask the authors to take our comments into account.

This comment makes a very strong case against including the feedback in GWPs. And we do agree with most of the points made. This is actually a debate we had, amongst authors, and in the first submitted version of the paper we settled on recommending including the feedback because we also had the absolute metrics in mind. Sometimes, AGWPs and AGTPs are used as very simple models of climate change. In this case, including the feedback improves the accuracy of the representation of the system.

However, we have decided that in the revised version there will be no recommendation at all. Partly because we cannot clearly recommend one of the two options, but mostly because we now think that making any recommendation would make this paper too controversial, and would weaken its more scientific/methodological aspects.

We initially wrote the paper as a research paper. And though we understand that a part of the community is eagerly waiting for a recommendation and consistently updated metrics, we believe our paper is not the place where this should happen. A commentary or perspective paper could follow, of course, but we are not convinced it

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

is our role to lead such a paper (although we can surely contribute). As the sought recommendations ultimately concern more the user community, maybe this community should be the one making those recommendations.

So in concrete terms, in the text, we have removed all previous recommendations, and rewritten the first paragraph of section 5.2:

“In the case of absolute metrics – both AGWPs and AGTPs – these changes are substantial since we are adding a positive feedback to the model. Therefore, the choice of including or excluding the feedback may ultimately depend on the application of the metrics. On the one hand, for the sake of simplicity and transparency, the feedback could be excluded from the evaluation of GWPs, since it avoids the trouble of the five convolutions shown in figure 4. On the other hand, if absolute (e.g. time-varying) metrics are used as a first-order model of climate change, one may prefer including the climate-carbon feedback to have a better representation of the system.”

and a part of the conclusion:

“Ultimately, whether emission metrics should include the climate-carbon feedback is a decision for the user, and we only recommend consistency in the way feedbacks are included or excluded. The trade-off between simplicity and transparency on the one hand, and accuracy of representation on the other hand, has to be weighed by the final user.”

We note as a relevant comparison, that Reisinger et al. (2011) calculated the effect on GWPs of using different RCPs to project future concentrations, and found that GWPs could change by 10 to 30% for N<sub>2</sub>O, -10 to 20% for CH<sub>4</sub>, and 2 to 36% for the halo-carbons. However, the community has to date retained the assumption of constant background concentration, presumably in order to preserve simplicity and to avoid the necessity of choosing a single future emissions scenario (or combination of scenarios). The effect of this simplifying assumption is an order of magnitude larger than that

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

resulting from the inclusion of climate-carbon feedbacks.

Yes, just as we point out that the background strongly affects the calibrated IRF (and subsequent metrics). We've added a sentence to note the larger effect of the background: "[Variation in the metrics' value from including/excluding the feedback] are also less in magnitude than those induced by the choice of the protocol used to calculate the metrics, such as the background conditions (e.g. Reisinger et al., 2011), or by the choice of a given time horizon (see e.g. table 2)."

Page 1, line 14: "the IPCC presented tentative values": The text of AR5 was not clear that the climate-carbon feedback values were to be considered "tentative", nor does this match the way that the AR5 values have been perceived and used by the community.

Removed. (But see next point.)

Page 2, line 16: "The standard metrics provided in the fifth assessment report": Similarly, the text of AR5 was not clear that the version of the metric that did not include climate-carbon feedbacks for non-CO2 gases (and was therefore "inconsistent"), should have been considered "the standard metric".

We disagree with this comment: the huge table at the end of chapter 8 of IPCC is the main product of this section of the report.

However, we agree that the fact that it was published as an appendix (because of its size) made it difficult for the metric-user community to perceive which of the two tables (w/ & w/o feedback) was the main product. . .

Page 11, line 16: The phrasing of the following sentence could be improved: "which is itself the value chosen by Joos et al. (2013) – and therefore by the IPCC": while the IPCC implicitly endorsed the approach of Joos et al., there was no explicit determina-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

tion that 100 GtC or +0.2 degrees C is the optimal value to use. The IPCC can be limited by the literature available, and the choice of a given paper to support a parameter choice does not necessarily indicate endorsement of all the choices made within that paper. A preferable phrasing would be, “which is itself the value chosen by Joos et al (2013), which provided the carbon lifetime used by the IPCC” or something along those lines.

Agreed. The end of the sentence is now: “chosen by Joos et al. (2013) and used in the IPCC AR5.”

Page 11, line 18: the text refers to “Figure 5” as an illustration of the GTP calculation process, but should be corrected to refer to Figure 4.

Yes, we have corrected the numbering.

Page 14, line 6: the authors do note that the inclusion of the feedback has less than a 10% impact on GWPs and GTPs, but the fact that the impact is less than 2% for other GWPs, even for short-lived species, for any time horizon, is an important distinction that is not sufficiently emphasized in the text. GTPs and GWPs are clearly impacted very differently here.

We have reformulated the discussion to more clearly separate the effect on GWPs and GTPs:

“We have found that including or excluding the climate-carbon feedback in a consistent manner does not greatly change the values of the relative GWPs (only about 2%). In the case of relative GTPs, the change is slightly larger for greenhouse gases (less than 10%) and becomes even larger for very short-lived species and over short time-horizons (greater than 30%).”