

## Chapter 9: Understanding and Attributing Climate Change

**Coordinating Lead Authors:** Gabi Hegerl, Francis Zwiers

**Lead Authors:** Pascale Braconnot, Nathan Gillett, Yong Luo, Jose Marengo, Neville Nicholls, Joyce Penner, Peter Stott

**Contributing Authors:** M. Allen, C. Ammann, N. Andronova, R. Betts, A. Clement, W. Collins, S. Crooks, T. Delworth, R. van Dorland, C. Forest, P. Forster, H. Goosse, J. Gregory, D. Harvey, F. Joos, G. Jones, J. Kenyon, J. Kettleborough, R. Knutti, H. Lambert, M. Lavine, D. Levinson, V. Masson, T. Nozawa, B. Otto-Bliesner, D. Pierce, S. Power, D. Rind, L. Rotstayn, B. D. Santer, C. Senior, S. Stark, D. Stone, S. Tett, P. Thorne, M. Wang, B. Wielicki, T. Wong, L. Xu, X. Zhang, E. Zorita

**Review Editors:** David Karoly, Laban Ogallo, Serge Planton

**Date of Draft:** 12 August 2005

**Notes:** This is the TSU compiled version

### Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
9.1 Introduction.....	7
9.1.1 <i>What do we mean by Climate Change and Climate Variability?</i> .....	7
9.1.2 <i>What do we mean by Climate Change Detection and Attribution?</i> .....	7
9.1.3 <i>The Basis from Which we Begin</i> .....	9
9.1.4 <i>Scope of this Chapter</i> .....	11
9.2 Radiative Forcing and Climate Response .....	12
9.2.1 <i>Radiative Forcing Estimates Used to Simulate Climate Change</i> .....	12
9.2.2 <i>Spatial and Temporal Patterns of the Response to Different Forcings and their Uncertainties</i> .....	15
9.2.3 <i>Implications for Understanding 20th Century Climate Change</i> .....	17
9.2.4 <i>Summary</i> .....	18
9.3 Understanding Pre-Industrial Climate Change .....	19
9.3.1 <i>Why do we Consider Pre-Industrial Climate Change?</i> .....	19
9.3.2 <i>Records of Past Climate Changes</i> .....	20
9.3.3 <i>What can we Learn from the LGM and the Mid-Holocene?</i> .....	21
9.3.4 <i>What can we Learn from the Past 1000 Years?</i> .....	22
9.3.5 <i>Summary</i> .....	24
9.4 Understanding of Air Temperature Change During the Industrial Era .....	24
9.4.1 <i>Global Scale Surface Temperature Change</i> .....	24
9.4.2 <i>Regional Surface Temperature Change</i> .....	32
9.4.3 <i>Surface Temperature Extremes</i> .....	35
9.4.4 <i>Free Atmosphere Temperature</i> .....	37
9.4.5 <i>Summary</i> .....	40
9.5 Understanding of Change in Other Variables during the Industrial Era .....	41
9.5.1 <i>Ocean Climate Change</i> .....	41
9.5.2 <i>Atmospheric Circulation Changes</i> .....	43
9.5.3 <i>Precipitation</i> .....	47
9.5.4 <i>Cryosphere Changes</i> .....	51
9.5.5 <i>Summary</i> .....	52
9.6 Observational Constraints on Climate Sensitivity .....	53
9.6.1 <i>Estimates of Climate Sensitivity Based on Instrumental Observations</i> .....	54
9.6.2 <i>Estimates of Climate Sensitivity Based on Paleoclimatic Data</i> .....	57
9.6.3 <i>Summary of Observational Constraints for Climate Sensitivity</i> .....	60
Question 9.1: Can Individual Extreme Events be Explained by Climate Change?.....	62
Question 9.2: Can the Warming of the 20th Century be Explained by Natural Variability?.....	63
References .....	65
Appendix 9.A: Methods Used to Detect Externally Forced Signals.....	86

1        9.A.1 *Optimal Fingerprinting* ..... 86  
2        9.A.2 *Methods of Inference* ..... 86  
3        Appendix 9.B: Methods Used to Estimate Climate Sensitivity and Aerosol Forcing ..... 88  
4        Tables ..... 90  
5  
6

## 1 **Executive Summary**

2  
3 Evidence of the effect of external influences, both anthropogenic and natural, on the climate system has  
4 continued to accumulate since the TAR. Anthropogenic warming of the climate system is pervasive and can  
5 be detected in temperature observations taken at the surface, in the free atmospheric and in the oceans. It is  
6 very likely that the warming during the past half century is not solely due to known natural internal and  
7 external causes, and virtually certain that it is not due to natural internal climate variability alone. The  
8 warming occurred in both oceans and atmosphere, and took place at a time when non-anthropogenic forcing  
9 factors would likely have produced cooling and when the combined effect of known sources of  
10 anthropogenic forcing would have been very likely to produce a warming. It is likely that greenhouse gas  
11 forcing during the past half century caused greater warming than observed, with some of the greenhouse-  
12 induced warming being offset by cooling caused by aerosol and other forcings. Anthropogenic warming has  
13 now been detected on continental and sub-continental scales in a range of studies, and evidence is emerging  
14 that surface temperature extremes have likely been affected. In addition, anthropogenic influence is  
15 becoming apparent in other diverse parts of the climate system including the atmospheric circulation, the  
16 hydrological cycle and the cryosphere.

17  
18 While many uncertainties remain, the physical consistency of the many different lines of evidence now  
19 available supports the conclusion that anthropogenic forcing is responsible for many of the changes in the  
20 climate system observed over the past century. Further evidence supporting this conclusion comes from  
21 many paleoclimatic studies indicating that the late 20th century was likely warmer than at any time during  
22 the past 1000 years, and that this warming took place at a time when non-anthropogenic factors would likely  
23 have produced cooling.

24  
25 Our confidence in this assessment is increased by the preponderance of evidence that is now available from  
26 the large number of studies that have been performed. Many separate studies have now shown that climate  
27 change on global and continental scales during the past half century is consistent with anthropogenic forcing,  
28 and inconsistent with natural forcing or natural internal climate variability. These studies have used different  
29 detection and attribution techniques, applied them to different variables, used different climate models, and  
30 used different observational data sets. Each individual result has been assessed using a statistical method that  
31 limits the probability of obtaining spurious detection results by random chance to a low level. While these  
32 results are not completely independent, the chance that all results are spurious is very small.

### 33 *Warming of the climate system is pervasive:*

34 Anthropogenic warming of the climate system is pervasive and can be detected in temperature observations  
35 taken at the surface, in the free atmospheric and in the oceans  
36

37  
38 We now have 6 more years of high quality instrumental surface data. These observations show continued  
39 warming, and include extreme events such as the unprecedented 2003 European heat wave (Chapter 3). Each  
40 of the last six years numbers amongst the ten warmest years on record globally<sup>1</sup>; even though several of  
41 those years were La Niña years (which tend to lead to cooler global temperatures). The global mean  
42 temperature averaged over land and ocean surfaces during the period 1901–2004 increased by 0.75°C  
43 (Chapter 3). It is very unlikely that this change is due to natural causes (natural internal variability, or natural  
44 external forcing) alone.

45  
46 Multi-signal detection and attribution analyses, which explore the joint roles of greenhouse gas and other  
47 anthropogenic and natural forcing agents, clearly indicate a response to greenhouse gas forcing. These results  
48 are robust to the choice of analysis technique and climate model, and have taken into account modelling,  
49 forcing, and observational uncertainty. The contribution of greenhouse gases to the global mean temperature  
50 change during the 20th century is likely to have been larger than the observed warming, with some of the  
51 greenhouse-induced warming being offset by cooling caused by aerosol and other forcings.

52  
53 Further evidence has accumulated that there has been a significant anthropogenic influence on the  
54 temperature of the free atmosphere since radiosonde measurements became available in the late 1950s. The

---

<sup>1</sup> To be updated prior to publication. The six-year period referred to is 1999–2004. The 10 warmest years on record, in order, are 1998, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2001, 1997, 1995, 2000, 1999 and 1991.

1 observed pattern of tropospheric warming and stratospheric cooling can be attributed to the influence of  
2 anthropogenic forcing, particularly greenhouse gases and stratospheric ozone depletion, while the influence  
3 of greenhouse gas increases can be separated from other forcings. The combination of a warming  
4 troposphere and a cooling stratosphere has led to an increase in the height of the tropopause that is likely due  
5 to greenhouse gas and stratospheric ozone changes.  
6

7 It is very likely that anthropogenic forcing has contributed to the warming of the upper several hundred  
8 meters of the ocean that has been observed during the latter half of the 20th century. Combined  
9 anthropogenic and natural external influences have also been detected in changes in the heat content of the  
10 upper 2000 meters of the ocean, although there is considerable uncertainty in observed heat content changes  
11 that arises from the sparse and infrequent sampling of many parts of the ocean.  
12

13 *Regional surface temperatures have likely been affected by anthropogenic forcing:*

14 Several studies have shown that the anthropogenic signal in surface temperature changes is now detectable in  
15 continental and sub continental scale land areas. The ability of models to simulate many aspects of the  
16 temperature evolution on these scales and the detection of significant anthropogenic effects on individual  
17 continents provide compelling evidence for human influence on the climate. Although it is generally more  
18 difficult to attribute temperature changes to individual forcings in continental and sub continental regions,  
19 than to attribute global scale changes, human influence has been clearly identified in a variety of different  
20 studies in a number of disparate regions. As with the multiple lines of evidence available on global scales,  
21 the chance that all regional results in different parts of the globe are spurious is very small, particularly  
22 considering that different regions are affected by different uncertainties in observations, external forcings  
23 and internal variability.  
24

25 *Surface temperature extremes have likely been influenced by anthropogenic forcing:*

26 Many indicators of impact-relevant surface temperatures, including the annual numbers of frost days, warm  
27 days and cold days, and other indicators such as the diurnal temperature range and the growing season  
28 length, show changes consistent with those anticipated from anthropogenic warming. Anthropogenic  
29 influence has been detected in some of these indices, including indices of extremely warm nights, cold days  
30 and cold nights. However, the same study was unable to identify anthropogenic influence in indices of  
31 extremely warm days on broad spatial scales. Nonetheless, there is evidence that anthropogenic forcing has  
32 substantially increased the risk of extremely warm summer conditions regionally, such as those that  
33 accompanied the unprecedented 2003 European heat wave.  
34

35 *Anthropogenic influence is becoming apparent in other parts of the climate system:*

36 Recent decreases in Arctic sea ice extent are unlikely to be due to natural variability and agree with model-  
37 simulated anthropogenic changes. There is evidence of a decreasing trend in global snow cover, and  
38 widespread melting of glaciers, consistent with a widespread warming. Glaciers continue to retreat almost  
39 everywhere, with some exceptions such as in Northern Europe, where increases in precipitation appear to be  
40 increasing glacier volumes. These changes are generally consistent with those expected under anthropogenic  
41 forcing.  
42

43 Significant trends in the Northern and Southern Annular Modes, which correspond to sea level pressure  
44 reductions over the poles, are likely to be partly related to human activity. While models reproduce the sign  
45 of the Northern Annular Mode trend, the simulated response is too small. Nonetheless, models including  
46 both greenhouse gas and stratospheric ozone changes simulate a realistic trend in the Southern Annular  
47 Mode, leading to a detectable human influence on global sea level pressure.  
48

49 Evidence of the impact of external influences on the hydrological cycle is emerging. An anthropogenic  
50 influence on annual total precipitation has not been detected, consistent with 20th century climate  
51 simulations. However, there is some evidence that volcanic forcing has caused variability in global land-area  
52 total precipitation for physical reasons that are understood, although the model simulated changes are  
53 generally underestimated and not obtained with all models. Increases in heavy precipitation in some regions  
54 of the globe appear to be consistent with increases that are expected to occur with increasing anthropogenic  
55 forcing, although these changes are not yet clearly distinguishable from natural variability. A recent  
56 detection study attributed increased continental runoff observed in the latter decades of the 20th century to  
57 suppression of transpiration due to CO<sub>2</sub>-induced stomatal closure. Observed increases in the global

1 frequency of drought in the second half of the 20th century have been reproduced with a model by taking  
2 anthropogenic and natural forcing into account. Observed changes in monsoon and Sahel rainfall appear to  
3 be related to changes in observed sea surface temperature conditions, which may in turn, have been affected  
4 by external forcing changes.

5  
6 *Climate models are able to reproduce climate conditions in the recent geologic past:*

7 The same coupled climate models used to predict future climate have been used to understand and reproduce  
8 climatic conditions in periods of the recent geologic past, such as the Last Glacial Maximum and the Mid-  
9 Holocene. The Last Glacial Maximum features strong changes in external forcing relative to the present,  
10 while the Mid Holocene forcing exhibits a substantial change in seasonal forcing from today. Hence both  
11 provide a valuable test bed for climate models, particularly their feedbacks. While many aspects of these past  
12 climates are still uncertain, climate models are successful in reproducing their broad features when forced  
13 with boundary conditions and radiative forcing for those periods.

14  
15 *Estimates of the climate sensitivity are now better constrained by observations:*

16 There has been extensive study of climate sensitivity and feedbacks since the TAR, using a variety of models  
17 and data, including instrumental data, new reconstructions of the NH temperature record of the past  
18 millennium, and other periods in paleo-climate history such as the LGM. Estimates of sensitivity, their  
19 uncertainties and the ability of observable quantities to constrain these estimates are now much better  
20 understood. Climate feedbacks are very likely positive and the equilibrium climate sensitivity to CO<sub>2</sub>  
21 doubling very likely exceeds 1°C. Best estimates of climate sensitivity from various studies range from 1.5  
22 to 4.5°C, but it remains difficult to constrain the upper limit. In contrast, the transient climate response is  
23 well constrained from observations and is very unlikely to be greater than 4.5°C per century in response to a  
24 1% per year increase in CO<sub>2</sub>.

25  
26 *Overall consistency of evidence:*

27 Although uncertainties remain, the overall evolution of the climate over the 20th century is largely consistent  
28 with expectations based on the simulated response to external forcing. This consistency is apparent in many  
29 types of observations, including surface and free atmospheric temperature; top of atmosphere radiation  
30 anomalies; some large scale features of the atmospheric circulation; some aspects of precipitation and the  
31 hydrological cycle, ocean temperature and heat content; and sea-ice extent. Our confidence in our assessment  
32 of the role of humans in the recent climate evolution has increased considerably since the TAR because the  
33 anthropogenic signal has emerged in more aspects of the climate system, because models have been further  
34 improved, and because some apparent inconsistencies in the observational record (notably that for  
35 tropospheric temperatures) have been largely resolved.

36  
37 *Remaining uncertainties:*

38 Estimates of radiative forcing change are still quite uncertain and limit the reliability of detection and  
39 attribution results. This is particularly the case for aerosol and other non-greenhouse gas anthropogenic  
40 forcings, and for low-frequency solar forcing. While uncertainties in the amplitude of the climate response to  
41 these forcings can be accounted for in detection approaches, uncertainties in the space-time pattern of the  
42 response can affect both detection and attribution results.

43  
44 The effects of uncertainties in forcing and the simulated responses on detection and attribution results have  
45 not yet been fully explored. Furthermore, some potentially important forcings such as carbonaceous aerosols  
46 have not yet been considered in most formal detection and attribution studies, although their potential effects  
47 on the 20th century climate have been evaluated with a range of models. Consequently, it is possible that  
48 detection and attribution results are somewhat more uncertain than estimated. However, the robustness of  
49 surface temperature attribution results to forcing and response uncertainty has been explored with respect to  
50 a range of models, forcing representations and analysis procedures. Results suggest that it is very unlikely  
51 that these uncertainties are large enough to negate detection and attribution findings. There are greater  
52 uncertainties with respect to other variables, such as surface pressure and precipitation, because simulated  
53 responses to 20th century forcing change are in qualitative, but not good quantitative agreement with  
54 observations of these variables. The extent to which observational uncertainty, errors in forcing and errors in  
55 model physics contribute to these differences is not presently understood.

1 The estimates of internal variability used in detection and attribution studies, which are derived from climate  
2 models, have been increasingly scrutinized. Comparisons of model simulated variability with instrumental  
3 and proxy data have increased confidence that climate models simulate reasonable amounts of internal  
4 variability. However, uncertainties remain because the available observational records are influenced by  
5 external forcing, and because they are not long enough in the case of instrumental data, or precise enough in  
6 the case of proxy reconstructions, to provide accurate estimates of variability on decadal and longer time  
7 scales. Estimates of the internal climate variability of variables other than surface temperature, such as  
8 rainfall and ocean heat content, are more uncertain, in large part because of the limited observational  
9 resources available for these variables.

10  
11 We have increased confidence that the temperature in the free troposphere is increasing, though uncertainty  
12 remains in both the radiosonde and satellite records, and this affects the confidence in the size of the  
13 estimated anthropogenic contribution to free atmospheric temperature change.

14  
15 We are beginning to develop an understanding of changes in extremes, and an ability to assess forced  
16 changes in the frequency and intensity of extremes from observations and to assess changing risks of  
17 extremes. Incomplete global data sets for extremes analysis and model uncertainties still restrict detection  
18 studies of extremes.

19  
20 We have improved our understanding of the causes of uncertainty in estimates of equilibrium climate  
21 sensitivity. These uncertainties, which include uncertainty in non-greenhouse gas forcing, particularly by  
22 aerosols, and ocean heat uptake as well as observational uncertainties in the preindustrial period, limit our  
23 ability to tightly constrain the upper confidence limit on likely values of the climate sensitivity. Furthermore,  
24 the upper limit for equilibrium climate sensitivity is much more difficult to constrain from observations of  
25 transient climate changes than the transient climate response.

26  
27

## 9.1 Introduction

### 9.1.1 What do we mean by Climate Change and Climate Variability?

In order to understand climate change we must also understand natural climate variability. In the following we refer to climate variability that occurs in the absence of external forcing as *internal climate variability*. This variability originates from the chaotic, nonlinear interactions within and between the various components of the climate system. Internal variability is present on all time scales. Atmospheric processes that generate internal variability are known to operate on timescales ranging from virtually instantaneous (e.g., the triggering of convection) up to years (e.g., tropospheric-stratospheric or inter-hemispheric exchange). Other components of the climate system, such as the ocean and the large ice-sheets, tend to operate on longer time scales. These separate components involve processes that produce internal variability directly, but they also produce long timescale variability by integrating variability from the rapidly varying atmosphere (Hasselmann, 1976).

The internal climate variability is difficult to estimate because all climate observations are influenced, at least to some extent, by variations in external forcing. Estimates of internal variability can be obtained from models or observations if suitable assumptions are made. One such assumption is that the characteristics of the internal variability are not sensitive to small changes in external forcing. Another related assumption is that the statistics of the climate variability are constant, or stationary, when the climate is in equilibrium with a fixed forcing regime. Although it is not certain such assumptions are justified, there is little evidence to the contrary from either the climate history of the past few thousand years or from modelling studies.

*Climate change* refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer (see Glossary). Climate change defined in this way may be due to natural internal processes or external forcings, or to anthropogenic forcings. In this chapter, climate change refers mainly to change due to external forcings, while changes due to internal climate system processes are considered to be part of the climate's internal variability.

In order to understand the origins of observed climate variations, much research is performed to distinguish between natural internal climate variability and changes that are forced externally. Some external influences, such as changes in solar radiation and volcanism, occur naturally and can be considered part of the natural variability of the climate system. Other external changes, such as the change in the composition of the atmosphere that began with the industrial revolution, and land-use change, are the result of human activity. Distinguishing between the effects of external influences and natural internal climate variability requires comparison between changes that are expected to result from external forcing and observed changes. The expectations are often quantified with climate models that are run with prescribed changes in external forcing. The most rigorous assessment which observed changes are due to forcing is obtained in detection and attribution studies.

### 9.1.2 What do we mean by Climate Change Detection and Attribution?

The concepts of climate change “detection” and “attribution” used in this chapter remain primarily as they were defined in the TAR (IPCC 2001; Mitchell et al., 2001). We use the same definition of attribution, which is discussed briefly below, but now use a more precise definition of detection than was given in the TAR. Specifically, we take *detection* to be the identification of one or more expected responses to changes in external forcing (for example, the climate response to greenhouse gas or volcanic forcing) in climate observations. This evaluation is often performed by estimating the amplitudes of the expected responses from *observations* and then determining whether these estimates are larger than might have been produced by random chance by internal climate variability alone. Note that the detection of an effect of an external forcing on the climate does not necessarily imply that the effect is important in the sense of having a major impact on the environment, biota, or human society. Consideration of such impacts is outside the scope of this chapter and Working Group.

Most studies use climate models to predict the expected responses to external forcing, and these predictions are usually represented as patterns of variation in space, time, or both. Climate modes are an appropriate tool

1 for this purpose because they effectively integrate much our theoretical knowledge of the operation of the  
2 climate system. The patterns of expected response, which are commonly referred to as *fingerprints*, are  
3 usually derived from ensemble simulations with coupled climate models. Thus the hypotheses that are tested  
4 in most climate change detection studies have a firm basis in our understanding of the operation of the  
5 climate system.

6  
7 Because detection studies are necessarily statistical in nature, the inferences that can be made about whether  
8 an external influence has been detected can never be absolutely certain. It is always possible that a result that  
9 is found to be significant, at say the 5% level, could simply reflect a rare event that would have occurred in  
10 any case with less than 1 chance in 20 in an unchanged climate. The risk of such spurious detection can be  
11 diminished by appealing to corroborating lines of evidence that help to increase confidence in a result by  
12 producing a physically consistent view of the likely cause for the changes.

13  
14 While the approach used in most detection studies assessed in this chapter is to determine whether  
15 observations exhibit the expected response to anomalous external forcing, for many decision-makers a  
16 question posed in a different way may be more pertinent. For instance, they may ask, “Are the continuing  
17 drier-than-normal conditions in the Sahel due to human causes?” Such questions are difficult to respond to  
18 because of a statistical phenomenon known as “selection bias”. The fact that the questions are “self selected”  
19 from the observations (only large observed climate anomalies in a historical context would be likely to be the  
20 subject of such a question) makes it difficult to assess their statistical significance from the same  
21 observations (see for example von Storch and Zwiers, 1999). Nevertheless, there is a need for answers for  
22 such questions, and examples of studies that attempt to do so are discussed in this chapter. A promising  
23 approach, which has now been applied in at least one study, is to use information from both models and  
24 observations combined to estimate the impact of external forcing on the risk of specific types of rare events.

25  
26 Detection does not immediately imply attribution of the detected change to the assumed cause. As noted in  
27 the SAR (IPCC, 1996) and the TAR, unequivocal attribution would require controlled experimentation with  
28 our climate system. That, of course, is not possible, and thus from a practical perspective, attribution of  
29 anthropogenic climate change is understood to mean

- 30 (a) detection as defined above,
- 31 (b) demonstration that the detected change is “consistent with the estimated responses to the given  
32 combination of anthropogenic and natural forcing”, and
- 33 (c) demonstration that the detected change is “not consistent with alternative, physically-plausible  
34 explanations of recent climate change that exclude important elements of the given combination of  
35 forcings” (IPCC, 2001).

36  
37 As discussed above, a key ingredient in all detection and attribution research is an estimate of the internal  
38 climate variability on the timescales considered, usually decades or longer. The residual variability that  
39 remains in instrumental observations after the estimated effects of anomalous external forcing have been  
40 removed is sometimes used to estimate internal variability. However, these estimates are uncertain because  
41 the instrumental record is short relative to the timescales of interest, and because of uncertainties in the  
42 forcings and the estimated responses. Thus internal climate variability is most often estimated from long  
43 control simulations produced with coupled climate models, which are used as a substitute for long records of  
44 observations of the unperturbed climate system. Therefore, the validation of model internal variability,  
45 through process studies and statistical comparisons with observed variability, provides important support for  
46 research that aims at understanding climate change (see Chapter 8). Detection studies often include specific  
47 steps to compare variability estimated from models with observed residual variability. Furthermore, although  
48 millennial forcing and proxy temperature reconstructions remain uncertain (see Chapter 6), comparison  
49 between climate simulations of the last millennium and proxy reconstructions also help to increase the  
50 confidence in model estimated internal variability.

51  
52 A necessary part of any analysis that attributes climate change to specific causes is to determine whether the  
53 observed change is consistent with an estimate of the response to historical forcing, and to consider whether  
54 it can be explained by alternative hypotheses. The assessment of the consistency between an observed  
55 change and the estimated response to a hypothesized forcing is more challenging than the hypothesis testing  
56 that is performed in detection research (Appendix 9.A). In this case, the detection question is augmented  
57 with an evaluation of whether the amplitude of the hypothesized pattern of change estimated from



1 observations is consistent with expectations. If so, the evidence for a causal connection is substantially  
2 increased. Note however, that consistency findings form only a part of the evidence that is used in attribution  
3 studies. Another key element is the evaluation of multiple lines of evidence, and the evaluation of the extent  
4 to which they are physically consistent.

5  
6 A further part of an attribution analysis is ruling out that the observed change is not consistent with  
7 alternative explanations that exclude important elements of the given combination of forcings. This is done  
8 most reliably if the individual responses to the forcing agents that are hypothesized to have had an important  
9 influence on the climate are evaluated simultaneously and their influence on observations is separated from  
10 each other (see Appendix A). For example, the attribution of recent warming to greenhouse gas forcing  
11 becomes more reliable if the influences of other external forcings, for example solar forcing, are explicitly  
12 accounted for in the analysis. This is an area of research with considerable challenges because different  
13 forcing factors may lead to similar large-scale spatial patterns of response (see Section 9.2).

14  
15 Model and forcing uncertainties are important considerations in attribution research. Ideally, the assessment  
16 of model uncertainty should include uncertainties in model parameters (as explored by multi-model  
17 ensembles, Chapter 8), and in the representation of physical processes in models. Such an assessment is not  
18 yet available. While research with that goal in mind is underway, computing constraints continue to limit  
19 progress in this area. Structural model uncertainties, such as those that result from the use of different types  
20 of parameterizations of atmospheric convection, are even more difficult to evaluate, although model  
21 intercomparison studies (see Chapter 8) continue to improve our appreciation of these uncertainties. The  
22 effects of forcing uncertainties, which can be considerable for some forcing agents, such as solar forcing and  
23 that due to natural and anthropogenic aerosols (see Section 9.2), also remain difficult to evaluate. Detection  
24 and attribution results that are based on several models or several forcing histories do provide information on  
25 the effects of model and forcing uncertainty that leads towards a more reliable attribution of climate change  
26 to a cause. Such results suggest that while model uncertainty is important, key results, such as attribution of a  
27 human influence on climate during the latter half of the 20th century, are robust.

28  
29 Results where attribution is not achieved, for example, where an expected pattern of change is detected, but  
30 with an amplitude that is substantially different from that simulated by models, can still provide some  
31 understanding of climate change but need to be treated with caution (examples are given in Section 9.5).

32  
33 Furthermore, for many variables, full detection and attribution studies are not feasible for a variety of  
34 reasons. Nonetheless, research that describes observed changes and offers physical explanations, for  
35 example, through numerical simulation with atmospheric, ocean or climate models, contributes substantially  
36 to our understanding of climate change and is therefore discussed in this chapter. This is particularly the case  
37 for variables such as rainfall which are less reliably modelled or observed, or respond less strongly to  
38 external forcing. For such variables, successful modelling of past changes contributes to our understanding  
39 of climate change and increases confidence in the ability of models to simulate future changes. Therefore, an  
40 important part of this chapter is to integrate the lines of evidence for detection and particularly for attribution  
41 of climate change.

### 42 43 **9.1.3 The Basis from Which we Begin**

44  
45 Evidence of a human influence on the recent evolution of the climate has accumulated steadily during the  
46 past 2 decades. The first IPCC Assessment Report (IPCC, 1990) contained little observational evidence of a  
47 detectable anthropogenic influence on climate. However, six years later the IPCC WG1 Second Assessment  
48 Report (SAR; IPCC, 1996) concluded that there had been a “discernible” human influence on the climate of  
49 the 20th century. Considerably more evidence accumulated during the subsequent five years, such that the  
50 TAR (IPCC, 2001) was able to draw a much stronger conclusion, not just on the detectability of a human  
51 influence, but on its contribution to climate change during the 20th century. The accumulation of evidence  
52 since the TAR, and our growing understanding of uncertainties, are summarized in Table 9.1.1. Subsequent  
53 sections of this chapter will assess that evidence in detail. Here we briefly review the state of knowledge as it  
54 existed at the time of the TAR.

55  
56 [INSERT TABLE 9.1.1 HERE]

1 The evidence that was available at the time of the TAR was broad and varied. Analysis of a range of several  
2 reconstructions of Northern Hemisphere surface temperature of the last several hundred to 1,000 years that  
3 had become available indicated that 20th century temperature changes were “unusual and unlikely to be  
4 entirely natural in origin”, even taking into account the large uncertainties in paleo-reconstructions. Using  
5 results from a range of detection studies of the instrumental record, and output from several climate models  
6 for fingerprints and estimates of internal climate variability, it was found that the warming over the 20th  
7 century was “very unlikely to be due to internal variability alone as estimated by current models”.

8  
9 Simulations of global mean 20th century temperature change that took anthropogenic greenhouse gases and  
10 sulphate aerosols as well as natural forcing changes into account were found to be generally consistent with  
11 observations. In contrast, simulations of the response to natural forcings alone indicated that these may have  
12 contributed to the observed warming in the first half of the 20th century, but could not explain the warming  
13 in the second half of the 20th century, nor the observed changes in the vertical structure of the atmosphere.

14  
15 Attribution studies had begun to use techniques to determine whether there was evidence that the responses  
16 to several different forcing agents were simultaneously present in observations, mainly of surface  
17 temperature and, to some extent, of temperature in the free atmosphere. Despite some problems, such as  
18 degeneracy between similar responses to different forcings, a distinct greenhouse gas signal was detectable  
19 whether or not other external influences were explicitly considered. The simulated greenhouse gas response  
20 was generally found to be consistent with the observed greenhouse response on the scales that were  
21 considered. Also, in most studies, the estimated rate and magnitude of warming over the second half of the  
22 20th century due to increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases alone was found to be comparable with,  
23 or larger than, the observed warming. This result was found to be robust to attempts to account for  
24 uncertainties (such as observational uncertainty and sampling error in estimates of the climate’s response to  
25 external forcing, as well as assumptions made and techniques used in detection and attribution studies).  
26 These findings were reflected in the TAR’s strong conclusion on the anthropogenic contribution to climate  
27 change during the latter half of the 20th century.

28  
29 The TAR also reported on a wide range of evidence of qualitative consistencies between observed climate  
30 changes and model responses to anthropogenic forcing, including global warming, increasing land-ocean  
31 temperature contrast, diminishing Arctic sea ice extent, glacial retreat and increases in precipitation at high  
32 Northern latitudes. However, there was also some concern about simulations showing a faster rate of  
33 warming in the mid- to upper troposphere over the satellite period than seemed consistent with the  
34 observations based on the satellite and radiosonde tropospheric temperature records that were available at the  
35 time.

36  
37 A number of uncertainties remained at the time of the TAR. For example, the apparent discrepancies  
38 between the vertical profile of temperature change in the troposphere in the observations then available and  
39 models had been reduced, but not resolved. Also, large uncertainties remained in estimates of internal  
40 climate variability from models and observations. However, it was concluded that even substantially inflated  
41 (doubled or more) estimates of model simulated internal variance were unlikely to be large enough to nullify  
42 the detection of an anthropogenic influence on climate. Uncertainties were also reported in our knowledge of  
43 external forcing. Large uncertainties were identified in anthropogenic aerosol forcing and response, and it  
44 was noted that some other anthropogenic factors, such as organic carbon, black carbon, biomass aerosols,  
45 and changes in land use, had not been included in detection and attribution studies. Uncertainties were also  
46 noted in reconstructions of solar and volcanic forcing, and in the magnitude of the climate response,  
47 particularly to solar forcing or in the model response to sulphate aerosol forcing. These uncertainties  
48 contributed to uncertainties in results from detection and attribution studies. Particularly, estimates of the  
49 contribution to the 20<sup>th</sup> century warming by natural forcings and anthropogenic forcings other than  
50 greenhouse gases showed some discrepancies with model simulations and were model dependent. These  
51 results made it difficult to attribute the observed climate change to one specific combination of  
52 anthropogenic and natural influences.

53  
54 The TAR concluded that “in the light of new evidence and taking into account the remaining uncertainties,  
55 most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse  
56 gas concentrations”.

#### 9.1.4 *Scope of this Chapter*

We conclude this section by briefly discussing the scope of this chapter and by providing the reader with a road map of the following sections. As signalled by its title, the objective of this chapter is to understand observed climate changes that are reported in Chapters 3 to 5 as expressions of climate variability and externally forced climate change. Climate models, which integrate our theoretical understanding of the functioning of the climate system, are used to interpret those changes where possible. Our ability to interpret some changes, particularly for non-temperature variables, is limited at times by uncertainties in the available models, observations and external forcing estimates.

Thus, the scope of this chapter is wider than that of previous “detection and attribution” chapters in the SAR (Santer et al., 1996a) and the TAR (Mitchell et al., 2001). We do assess six more years of detection and attribution research, work that has ventured into some exciting and important new areas including detection of anthropogenic changes on regional scales, in extremes and in variables other than temperature. However, we also attempt to place the detection and attribution work in the context of a broader understanding of a changing climate by synthesizing information on climate forcing, variability and change from several other chapters.

The body of this chapter starts with a description of forcing changes and their uncertainties during the recent history of the climate system, and a brief summary of the climate response associated with these forcings (Section 9.2). The description of the response focuses on the similarities, differences and uncertainties in the climate’s response to those forcing changes, because this has important implications on the attribution of observed changes to causes. The description of forcings also includes an assessment of studies that use so-called “top-down” methods. Such methods use the observed climate change to make inferences about the likely magnitude of uncertain external forcings to constrain estimates of uncertain forcings, for example, by identifying ranges of net aerosol forcing that yield simulations of 20th century climate change that are consistent with observed climate change given uncertainties in models and observations. This section thus attempts a synthesis that draws heavily on Chapters 2 and 8 of this report.

Section 9.3 follows with a synthesis of paleo-climate material that draws very heavily on Chapter 6. This section confines itself to three periods in recent climate history (the last millennium, the time of the last glacial maximum at 21,000 years before present, and a period in the Holocene that is approximately 6,000 years before present). These are periods for which we have relatively large amounts of proxy data, and a relatively good understanding of the climate’s forcing regime. They are therefore periods that can be used to gain insights into the link between external forcing and climate. Moreover, the temperature history of the most recent one to two millennia is very important for placing modern secular climate change in context and understanding the climate response to natural forcing.

Section 9.4 focuses on understanding instrumental era temperature change. This section, which draws heavily on Chapters 3 and 8, reports recent developments in the detection and attribution of the effects of external influences on the surface and free atmospheric temperature, on global and regional scales, and using a range of techniques. This section extends and strengthens many of the lines of evidence that were described in the TAR and sharpens estimates of the human contribution to global surface temperature change observed during the past century. It also describes an emerging body of work that attempts to link external forcing changes with the possibility of changes in the intensity and/or frequency of extreme temperature events.

The objective of the following Section 9.5 is to assess large scale climate change in other variables and climate components. This section draws heavily on Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 8. Where possible, it attempts to identify links between related changes, such as those linking some aspects of sea-surface temperature change with precipitation change. It also discusses the role of external forcing, drawing where possible on formal detection studies. We include in this section discussion of: (a) ocean climate changes, where there is evidence of an anthropogenic influence on ocean heat content; (b) atmospheric circulation changes, where there is evidence of an anthropogenic influence on the surface pressure distribution; (c) precipitation change, where, for example, there is evidence that natural forcing, may have influenced global mean precipitation rates during the 20th century, and that persistent sea-surface temperature variations may have influenced local and regional rainfall distributions, such as in the Sahel; (d) cryosphere change; and (e) sea-level change, both of which again show some evidence of an anthropogenic influence.

1  
2 Finally, we conclude the chapter with a section that assesses studies that have attempted to use instrumental  
3 observations or paleoclimatic data to constrain estimates of key climate parameters such as its equilibrium  
4 sensitivity to the doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Many of these studies rely heavily on detection and  
5 attribution methods (in essence, they ask what range of parameters of interest produces simulations of the  
6 instrumental or millennium climate histories that are consistent with observations of these periods).  
7

## 8 **9.2 Radiative Forcing and Climate Response**

9  
10 Much research, including recent work that will be assessed in subsequent parts of this chapter, has used  
11 climate model simulations forced with estimates of historical forcing changes to understand and interpret  
12 climate change since the industrial revolution and during other parts of climate history, such as the last  
13 millennium. These results are affected both by uncertainties in model simulations and in observations.  
14 Uncertainties in simulations result from uncertainties in the radiative forcings that are used, and from model  
15 uncertainties that affect the simulated responses to the forcings. Both the uncertainty in external forcing and  
16 in the model response will affect the so-called “fingerprints” of climate change (see Appendix 9.A), and  
17 hence results of studies comparing simulated with observed changes.  
18

19 Detection and attribution methods scale the response patterns to different forcings to obtain the best match to  
20 observations, thus errors in the magnitude of the forcing or the magnitude of a model’s response to  
21 anomalous forcing, should not affect detection results provided that the space-time pattern of the response is  
22 correct. However, for a model simulation to be considered consistent with the observations the scaling  
23 should be consistent with unity when bottom-up forcing estimates are prescribed in the model. For detection  
24 studies, if the space-time pattern of response is incorrect, then the scaling, and with it detection and  
25 attribution results, will be further affected.  
26

27 In this section, we review the estimated ranges of forcing over the last 150 years, how models respond to  
28 different forcings, forcing uncertainties and implications for simulated responses and climate change  
29 detection and attribution.  
30

### 31 **9.2.1 Radiative Forcing Estimates Used to Simulate Climate Change**

#### 32 *9.2.1.1 Summary of forcing estimates for the instrumental period*

33 Radiative forcing is defined as “the change in net (down minus up) irradiance (solar plus long-wave; in W  
34 m<sup>-2</sup>) at the tropopause after allowing for stratospheric temperatures to readjust to radiative equilibrium, but  
35 with surface and tropospheric temperatures and state held fixed at the unperturbed values” (see Chapter 2).  
36 Radiative forcing change since 1750 is reviewed in detail in Chapter 2. It describes estimated forcing change  
37 resulting from increases in long-lived greenhouse gases (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, halocarbons), stratospheric ozone  
38 decrease, tropospheric ozone increase, sulphate aerosols, nitrate aerosols, black carbon (BC) and organic  
39 matter from fossil fuel burning, biomass burning aerosols, mineral dust aerosols, land use change, indirect  
40 aerosol effects on clouds, aircraft cloud effects, variability in solar forcing, and stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O increase  
41 from CH<sub>4</sub>. These forcings and their estimated 90% confidence intervals (given in parentheses as a percentage  
42 of the central estimate) are well mixed greenhouse gases: 2.58 W m<sup>-2</sup> (10%), stratospheric ozone: -0.10 W  
43 m<sup>-2</sup> (40%), tropospheric ozone: 0.40 W m<sup>-2</sup> (50%), total direct aerosol forcing: -0.2 W m<sup>-2</sup> (100%) of which  
44 sulphate forcing (-0.4 W m<sup>-2</sup>) and fossil fuel BC (+0.3 W m<sup>-2</sup>) are largest, first indirect aerosol forcing from  
45 tropospheric aerosols: -1.2 W m<sup>-2</sup> (30%), aviation induced contrails: 0.01 W m<sup>-2</sup> (200%) and aviation  
46 induced ice clouds: (range from 0 to 0.05 W m<sup>-2</sup>), surface albedo change: -0.03 W m<sup>-2</sup> (235%), stratospheric  
47 H<sub>2</sub>O: 0.13 W m<sup>-2</sup> (200%), and low-frequency changes in solar radiation: +0.1 W m<sup>-2</sup> (200%). While several  
48 of the IPCC AR4 models have included many of these (e.g., the long-lived greenhouse gases, direct and  
49 indirect sulphate aerosol, stratospheric and tropospheric ozone changes, black and organic carbon aerosols  
50 from fossil fuels, land use change effects on surface albedo, volcanic and solar irradiance changes) for the  
51 purpose of simulating the 20th century climate, most detection studies to date have used model runs with a  
52 more limited set of forcings. The total net forcing from the bottom up studies is 1.53 W m<sup>-2</sup> (67%) giving a  
53 likely range for the total net forcing of 0.48 to 2.58 W m<sup>-2</sup> although a forcing close to zero is possible. The  
54 observed warming trend over the 20th century provides only a weak constraint on this large range of forcing  
55 estimates, as is further discussed in the following subsection. Nevertheless, it is the spatial-temporal pattern  
56

1 that is most important in detection and attribution studies rather than the specific sensitivity of the model and  
2 forcing values used.

### 3 4 9.2.1.2 Summary of “Top Down” estimates of aerosol forcing

5 “Bottom up approaches” to estimating forcing derive the forcing either from a model simulation based on  
6 estimated emissions or from a model simulation constrained by observations. These might yield a total net  
7 radiative forcing over the 20th century that could be close to zero or even negative (Boucher and Haywood,  
8 2001). Net forcing close to zero allows high values of climate sensitivity to be consistent with the warming  
9 trend of the 20th century. However, net negative forcing would be impossible to reconcile with instrumental  
10 observations unless the entire warming were due to natural internal variability, which is effectively ruled out  
11 if the natural variability in unforced climate models (or the amount of variability in paleo reconstructions that  
12 is not explained by external forcing) is taken as the measure of internal variability (Mitchell et al., 2001; see  
13 also Section 9.3.4 and 9.4.1.3).

14  
15 Detection and attribution methods can increase the ability to distinguish between responses to different  
16 external forcings by using not only a global average forcing and response, but also the spatial and temporal  
17 patterns of climate response. Results from detection studies or related approaches can therefore be used to  
18 draw conclusions about the magnitude of uncertain forcings. This is done using “top down” methods (see  
19 Section 9.6 and Appendix 9.B). These methods have been used to constrain both climate sensitivity and one  
20 or more forcings as well as other uncertain climate parameters (see Wigley, 1989; Schlesinger and  
21 Ramankutty, 1992; Wigley et al., 1997; Andronova and Schlesinger, 2001; Andronova et al., 2005; Forest et  
22 al., 2001, 2002, 2005; Knutti et al., 2002, 2003; Harvey and Kaufmann, 2002; Stott et al., 2005b; see Table  
23 9.2.1).

24  
25 Different top-down approaches consider different external forcings as is summarized in Table 9.2.1. One  
26 type of top-down method is to determine the magnitude of the response to different external forcing agents  
27 from ranges of scaling factors for the climate change fingerprints that are derived from detection analyses  
28 (see Section 9.4.1.4). These effectively give the range of fingerprint magnitudes (for example, for the  
29 combined temperature response to different aerosol forcings) that are consistent with observed climate  
30 change. Scaling factors on a coupled climate model’s response to well-mixed greenhouse gases and its  
31 response to aerosol forcing can be used to infer the likely range of the combined aerosol forcing that is  
32 consistent with the observed record. This exploits the fact that the forcing from well-mixed greenhouse gases  
33 is well known, and therefore errors in the model’s transient sensitivity can be separated from errors in  
34 aerosol forcing in the model (assuming that errors in a model’s sensitivity to greenhouse forcing and aerosol  
35 forcing are similar - see Gregory et al., 2002a; Allen et al., 2005; Table 9.2.1). By scaling up or down spatio-  
36 temporal patterns of response, this technique takes account of gross errors in models but does not fully  
37 account for modelling uncertainty in patterns of temperature response to uncertain forcings.

38  
39 [INSERT TABLE 9.2.1 HERE]

40  
41 A more involved approach uses the response of Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (see Table  
42 8.8.2) or simple climate models to explore the range of forcings and climate parameters that yield results that  
43 are consistent with observations. Like detection methods, these approaches assess the fit of space-time  
44 patterns, or spatial means in time, to surface, atmospheric or ocean temperatures. They then assess the  
45 probability of combinations of climate sensitivity and net aerosol forcing based on the fit between  
46 simulations and observations (see Section 9.6 and Appendix 9.B for further discussion). These are essentially  
47 Bayesian approaches (Appendix 9.B), where prior assumptions for ranges of external forcing, which are  
48 often obtained from bottom up approaches, are updated using the observed climate change, yielding posterior  
49 distributions of external forcing magnitude that are consistent with observed climate change. As summarized  
50 in Anderson et al. (2003), the resulting range is generally narrower than the range from bottom up  
51 approaches due to the additional information used. However, the bottom-up approaches yield the forcing that  
52 results from a particular mechanism, whereas the top-down approaches yield the net forcing for the set of  
53 mechanisms that have a similar forcing pattern to that assumed a priori.

54  
55 Studies attempt to separate greenhouse gas and aerosol effects by making use of either the hemispheric  
56 gradient in forcing, or the difference in the temporal variation in the relative aerosol and greenhouse gas  
57 forcing. Aerosol forcing appears to have grown rapidly during the period from 1945 to 1980, while

1 greenhouse gas forcing grew more slowly. Global sulphur emissions (and thus, sulphate aerosol forcing)  
2 levelled off after 1980 (see Chapter 2.), further rendering the time evolution of aerosols and greenhouse  
3 gases distinct. As long as the temporal pattern of variation in aerosol forcing is approximately correct, the  
4 need to achieve a reasonable fit to the temporal variation in temperature can provide a useful constraint on  
5 the net aerosol radiative forcing (as found, for example, by Harvey and Kaufmann, 2002).

6  
7 A number of the ensemble-based studies cited in Table 9.2.1 find that the net aerosol forcing over the 20th  
8 century is negative but that to be consistent with the observed warming, it is estimated to be less than  
9 approximately  $-1.7 \text{ W/m}^2$ . Harvey and Kaufmann (2002), who use an approach that focuses on the IPCC  
10 range of climate sensitivities, further conclude that global mean forcing from fossil fuel-related aerosols is  
11 “unlikely” to have exceeded  $-1.0 \text{ W/m}^2$  in 1990 and that global mean forcing from biomass burning and  
12 anthropogenically-enhanced soil dust aerosols is “unlikely” to have exceeded  $-0.5 \text{ W/m}^2$  in 1990. Results  
13 from top-down approaches (Table 9.2.1) suggest that total aerosol forcing may be somewhat weaker than the  
14 best estimates given in Section 9.2.1.1.

15  
16 There is a range of uncertainties in these estimates. For example, some studies use the difference between  
17 Northern and Southern Hemisphere mean temperature to separate the greenhouse gas and aerosol forcing  
18 effects (e.g., Harvey and Kaufmann, 2002; Andronova and Schlesinger, 2001). However, the ratio of  
19 Northern to Southern Hemisphere forcing by industrial aerosols is not accurately known (see Section  
20 9.2.2.2). Also, it is necessary to account for hemispheric asymmetry in tropospheric ozone forcing.  
21 Additionally, aerosols from biomass burning could be an important fraction of the total aerosol forcing  
22 although they have little hemispheric asymmetry. Furthermore, results will be only as good as the spatial or  
23 time pattern that is assumed in the analysis, and missing forcings may hamper the interpretation of results.  
24 Nevertheless, if interpreted carefully and considering the assumptions used, the top down results do provide  
25 valuable additional information on the possible range of forcings.

### 26 27 *9.2.1.3 Radiative forcing of preindustrial climate change*

28 Here we briefly discuss the radiative forcing estimates used for understanding climate during the periods  
29 discussed in Section 9.3 of this chapter and used in estimates of climate sensitivity based on paleoclimatic  
30 records (Section 9.6.2), namely the last millennium, the mid-Holocene, and the Last Glacial Maximum.

31  
32 Changes in the Earth’s orbital parameters have been identified as the pacemaker of climate change on the  
33 glacial to interglacial timescale (e.g., Berger, 1988). These orbital variations, which can be calculated with  
34 strong confidence from astronomical laws (Berger, 1978), force climate variations by changing the seasonal  
35 and latitudinal distribution of solar insolation (see Chapter 6).

36  
37 Solar insolation was similar to today during the LGM (21000 years ago). The major forcing for the Earth's  
38 climate at this time came from the presence of large ice-sheets in the northern hemisphere (Peltier 1994,  
39 2004), and from the reduced atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration (185 ppm from recent ice core estimates, see  
40 Monnin et al 2001). These reduced  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations changed the radiative forcing by about  $-1.9$  to  $-2.6$   
41  $\text{W/m}^2$  (best guess  $-2.2 \text{ W/m}^2$ ; see Chapter 6). Using several model simulations, the albedo forcing of the ice-  
42 sheet was estimated to range broadly from  $-2$  to  $-4.3 \text{ W/m}^2$  (Chapter 6). These forcing changes are thought  
43 to be the result of ocean, vegetation and other feedbacks (Chapter 6). The radiative forcing from increased  
44 atmospheric aerosols (dust primarily) has been estimated to be about  $-1 \pm 0.5 \text{ W/m}^2$  (Chapter 6).

45  
46 Changes in orbital forcing during the mid-Holocene lead to a 5% increase of summer insolation in the  
47 northern hemisphere compared to the present. This corresponds to a negligible annual mean forcing of  $0.011$   
48  $\text{W/m}^2$ , and a  $27 \text{ W/m}^2$  change in the magnitude of the seasonal cycle in forcing averaged over the northern  
49 hemisphere together with a  $-1 \text{ W/m}^2$  change in the southern hemisphere.

50  
51 Over the last millennium, changes in the Earth's orbit have had little impact on annual mean insolation. They  
52 lead to a reduction (increase) of summer (winter) insolation of  $0.33 \text{ W/m}^2$  ( $0.83 \text{ W/m}^2$ ) at  $45^\circ\text{N}$  (Goosse et al.  
53 2005), and a diminution of the magnitude of the insolation mean seasonal cycle of  $0.4 \text{ W/m}^2$  in the northern  
54 hemisphere. Changes in insolation are thought to have arisen mainly from small changes in solar irradiance,  
55 although both timing and magnitude of past solar radiation fluctuations are highly uncertain (see Chapters 2  
56 and 6; Gray et al., 2005; Lean et al., 2002). The other source of natural forcing results from explosive  
57 volcanism that introduces aerosols into the stratosphere (Robock and Free, 1995; IPCC, 2001), leading to a

1 global forcing of a few W/m<sup>2</sup> (depending on the strength of the eruption) during the year following the  
2 eruption. Several reconstructions are available that have been used to force climate models either for the last  
3 two millennia (Crowley, 2000, updated), or the last 500 years (Robertson et al., 2001; see also Jones and  
4 Mann, 2004 for a review). There is close agreement on the timing of large eruptions in the various  
5 compilations of historic volcanic activity, but uncertainty on the order of 50% for the size of individual  
6 eruptions (Crowley, 2000, updated; Robertson et al., 2001, see Zorita et al., 2004 for a comparison; see also  
7 Chapter 6), and on the order of 35% for the overall amplitude of volcanic forcing (Crowley, 2000, updated).  
8 Different reconstructions identify similar periods when eruptions happened more frequently. These changes  
9 in the frequency of eruptions may induce inter-decadal climate variability in reconstructions (see Section  
10 9.3.4).

11  
12 During the cool period of the Late Maunder Minimum (approximately 1675–1715), sunspots were generally  
13 missing, and solar irradiance is believed to have been smaller than before and after. This period will be used  
14 in Section 9.6 to discuss climate sensitivity; therefore we discuss its radiative forcing estimates here. The  
15 estimated difference between present day solar irradiance and the late Maunder Minimum is  $-1.1 \text{ W/m}^2$  (best  
16 estimate, range  $-0.5$  to  $-2 \text{ W/m}^2$ , Chapter 2), but with large uncertainties. This leads to a best estimate  
17 radiative forcing of  $-0.2 \text{ W/m}^2$  ( $-0.1$  to  $-0.35 \text{ W/m}^2$  67% confidence interval; note that solar forcing from  
18 1750 to the present is estimated having increased by  $0.1 \text{ W/m}^2$ , Chapter 2). Many radiative forcing changes,  
19 particularly those associated with industrialization, are very similar from the present to the Maunder  
20 Minimum as they are from the present to preindustrial (total forcing estimated of  $-1.53 \text{ W/m}^2$ , see Section  
21 9.2.1.2). This yields an approximate net radiative forcing of  $-1.63 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  between the late Maunder  
22 Minimum and the present, with large uncertainties.

## 23 9.2.2 *Spatial and Temporal Patterns of the Response to Different Forcings and their Uncertainties*

### 24 9.2.2.1 *Spatial and temporal patterns of response*

25  
26 Our ability to distinguish between climate responses to different external forcing factors depends on the  
27 extent to which those responses are distinct. Figure 9.2.1 shows the zonal average temperature response to  
28 several different forcing agents over the last 100 years as computed in the PCM climate model (Santer et al.,  
29 2003a), while Figure 9.2.2 shows the zonal average temperature response to fossil fuel black carbon and  
30 organic matter, and to the combined effect of these forcings together with biomass burning aerosols  
31 computed with the CSIRO climate model (Penner et al., 2005). These figures illustrate that the modelled  
32 vertical and zonal signature of the temperature response varies with the forcing. Greenhouse gas forcing  
33 produces a warming in the troposphere, with cooling above, and somewhat more warming near the surface in  
34 the NH due to its larger land fraction (Figure 9.2.1d). In contrast, sulphate aerosol forcing results in cooling  
35 throughout most of the atmosphere, with greater cooling in the NH due to its higher aerosol loading (Figure  
36 9.2.1c); thereby partially offsetting the greater NH greenhouse gas induced warming. The combined effect of  
37 tropospheric and stratospheric ozone forcing (Figure 9.2.1e) is to warm the troposphere and cool the  
38 stratosphere, particularly at high latitudes where stratospheric ozone loss has been greatest. These responses  
39 are distinct from those to the natural forcings. Solar forcing results in general warming of the body of the  
40 atmosphere (Figure 9.2.1a) with a pattern of surface warming that is similar to that of greenhouse gas  
41 warming, but differently from greenhouse warming, solar forced warming extends throughout the  
42 atmosphere. Volcanic forcing, on the other hand, results in warming in the lower stratosphere and near the  
43 surface at high latitudes, with cooling elsewhere. The net effect of all forcings combined is a pattern of  
44 Northern Hemisphere temperature change near the surface that is dominated by the positive forcings  
45 (primarily greenhouse gases), and cooling in the stratosphere that results predominantly from greenhouse gas  
46 and stratospheric ozone forcing. Results obtained with the CSIRO model (Figure 9.2.2) suggest that black  
47 carbon, organic matter and biomass aerosols would further enhance the Northern Hemisphere warming that  
48 is shown in Figure 9.2.1e. On the other hand, indirect aerosol forcing from fossil fuel aerosols may be larger  
49 than the direct effects that are represented in the CSIRO model, in which case the Northern Hemisphere  
50 warming could be somewhat diminished.

51  
52  
53 [INSERT FIGURE 9.2.1 HERE]

54  
55 [INSERT FIGURE 9.2.2 HERE]

1 One possible line of observational evidence that reflective aerosol forcing has been changing over time  
2 comes from satellite observations of changes in top of atmosphere (TOA) outgoing shortwave flux. Such  
3 forcing changes would be reflected in changes in surface radiation fluxes and surface warming. There has  
4 been continuing interest in this possibility (Stanhill and Cohen, 2001; Gilgen et al., 1998; Liepert, 2002).  
5 Called “global dimming”, this phenomena has recently reversed since about 1990, with surface solar  
6 radiation fluxes as inferred from a combination of ISCCP data and model-results now apparently increasing  
7 and top-of-atmosphere ISCCP fluxes decreasing (Pinker et al., 2005; Wild et al., 2005; Wielicki et al., 2005).  
8 The consistency between the IPCC AR4 models and these more recent analyses is shown in Figure 9.2.3  
9 where the top-of-atmosphere (TOA) outgoing flux from the models is compared with that measured by the  
10 ERBS satellite (Wong et al., 2005) and inferred by ISCCP. Overall, the model range and the observational  
11 range encompass each other closely, and both have small downward trends, which appear slightly smaller in  
12 most models than in the observations. Differences between simulated and satellite trends are significant for  
13 only a few models.

14  
15 [INSERT FIGURE 9.2.3 HERE]

16  
17 The TOA flux changes displayed in Figure 9.2.3 are sensitive to changes in cloudiness (with decreasing  
18 cloudiness consistent with decreasing TOA fluxes) and changes in scattering aerosols. TOA fluxes are not as  
19 sensitive to changes in absorbing aerosols although the surface flux anomalies would be sensitive to both  
20 changes in absorbing and scattering aerosols as well as changes in cloudiness. Changes to the surface  
21 irradiance may be examined using the ISCCP FD data (Zhang et al., 2004). Romanou et al. (2005) compare  
22 the regional surface irradiance changes in a multi-model mean from a subset of the AR4 models shown here.  
23 They demonstrate that some of the regional trends present in the data are indeed present in the models,  
24 though the regional trends in the model-mean data set are smaller than those in the satellite-derived data set.

25  
26 Figures 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 also show that the spatial signature of a climate model’s response is seldom like that  
27 of the forcing. This comes about because climate system feedbacks vary spatially. For example, sea ice  
28 albedo feedbacks tend to enhance the high latitude response of both a positive forcing, such as that by CO<sub>2</sub>,  
29 and a negative forcing such as that by sulphate aerosol (e.g., Rotstayn and Penner, 2001; Mitchell et al.,  
30 2001). Cloud feedbacks can affect both the spatial signature of the response to a given forcing and the sign of  
31 the change in temperature relative to the sign of the radiative forcing. Heating by black carbon can decrease  
32 cloudiness (Ackerman et al., 2000). If the black carbon is near the surface, it may warm surface  
33 temperatures, while if it is at higher altitudes it may cool surface temperatures (Hansen et al., 1997; Penner et  
34 al., 2003). Therefore, the strength of the feedbacks within a climate model, and indeed, whether those that  
35 are important to determining the response to a given forcing are included, will help determine the spatial  
36 signature of its response. Additional factors that affect the spatial pattern of response include differences in  
37 thermal inertia between land and sea areas, and the lifetimes of the various forcing agents. Shorter lived  
38 agents, such as aerosols as opposed to well mixed greenhouse gases, tend to have a more distinct spatial  
39 pattern of forcing, and can therefore also be expected to have some locally distinct response features.

40  
41 The pattern of response to a radiative forcing can also be altered quite substantially if the atmospheric  
42 circulation is affected by the forcing. Modelling studies and data comparisons suggest that volcanic aerosols  
43 (e.g., Kirchner et al., 1999; Shindell et al., 2001b, Stenchikov et al., 2005), greenhouse gas changes (e.g.,  
44 Fyfe et al., 1999; Shindell et al., 1999; Rauthe et al., 2004), and possibly changes in solar irradiance  
45 (Shindell et al., 2001b) can alter the North Atlantic Oscillation or the Northern Annular mode. For example,  
46 volcanic eruptions are often followed by a positive phase of the NAM or NAO (e.g., Stenchikov et al.,  
47 2005); leading to Eurasian winter warming that may reduce the overall cooling effect of volcanic eruptions  
48 on annual averages, particularly over Eurasia.

49  
50 The temporal evolution of the different forcings (see Chapter 2, Figure 2.9.3 generally helps to distinguish  
51 the responses to the given forcings. For example, Santer et al. (1996b, c) pointed out that a temporal pattern  
52 in the hemispheric temperature contrast would be expected in the second half of the 20th century with the  
53 southern hemisphere warming more than the northern hemisphere for the first two decades of this period and  
54 the northern hemisphere warming more than the southern hemisphere subsequently, as a result of temporal  
55 changes in the relative strengths of the greenhouse gas and aerosol forcings. However, it should be noted that  
56 the integrating effect of the oceans (Hasselmann, 1976) results in climate responses that are more similar in  
57 time between different forcings than the forcings are to each other.



### 9.2.2.2 *Uncertainty in the spatial pattern of response.*

Most detection methods identify the magnitude of the space-time pattern of response that is optimally consistent with the observations. The former are obtained by forcing a climate model with a given pattern and amplitude of forcing. However, few studies have examined how uncertainties in the spatial pattern of forcing contribute to uncertainties in the spatial pattern of the response. For short-lived components, uncertainties in the spatial pattern of forcing are related to uncertainties in emissions patterns, transport within the climate model or chemical transport model and, especially for aerosols, uncertainties in the representation of relative humidities or clouds. These uncertainties affect the spatial pattern of the forcing. For example, the ratio of the Southern Hemisphere to Northern Hemisphere indirect aerosol forcing associated with the first aerosol indirect forcing ranges from 0.33 to 0.74 in different studies (Rotstayn and Penner, 2001; Rotstayn and Liu, 2003; Menon et al., 2002; Chuang et al., 2002). The ratio of the ocean and land forcing for the sum of the first and second indirect effects ranges from 0.4 to 1.8 in different studies (Kristjansson, 2002; Menon et al., 2002; Lohmann and Lesins, 2002). It may be possible to exclude some of these forcing patterns using spatially explicit satellite data, for example. But since it is not yet clear that any can be excluded, the contribution of these spatial uncertainties in the pattern of the forcing to the uncertainty of the response patterns needs to be considered.

### 9.2.2.3 *Uncertainty in the temporal pattern of response*

Climate model studies have generally not systematically explored the effect of uncertainties in the time-evolution of each of the forcings used in those studies. These uncertainties depend mainly on the uncertainty in the spatio-temporal expression of emissions, and, for some forcings, fundamental understanding of the possible change over time. For example, there are uncertainties related to the anthropogenic emissions of short-lived compounds and their effects on forcing. For example, estimates of historical emissions from fossil fuel combustion do not account for changes in emission factors of short-lived species associated with concerns over urban air pollution (e.g., van Aardenne et al., 2001). Changes in these emission factors would have slowed the emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> as well as CO after about 1970 and slowed the accompanying increase of tropospheric ozone compared to that represented by a single emission factor for fossil fuel use. Another example relates to the emissions of black carbon associated with the burning of fossil fuels. The spatial and temporal emissions of black carbon by continent reconstructed by Ito and Penner (2005) is significantly different from that reconstructed using the methodology of Novakov et al. (2003). For example, the emissions in Asia grow significantly faster in the inventory based on Novakov et al. (2003) compared to that based on Ito and Penner (2005). Also, before 1988 the growth in emissions in Eastern Europe using the Ito and Penner (2005) inventory is faster than the growth based on the methodology of Novakov et al. (2003). Such spatial/temporal uncertainties will contribute to both spatial/temporal uncertainties in the net forcing and to spatial/temporal uncertainties in the distribution of forcing and response. Fortunately, the time history of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions is better known.

There are also very large uncertainties in the temporal forcing associated with solar radiation changes, particularly on timescales longer than the 11-year cycle. Previous estimates have used sun spot numbers to determine these slow changes in solar irradiance, but are not necessarily supported by current understanding (Lean et al., 2002; Foukal et al., 2004; Gray et al., 2005). In addition, the magnitude of radiative forcing associated with major volcanic eruptions is uncertain and differs between reconstructions (Sato et al., 1993; Andronova et al., 1999; Amman et al., 2003).

### 9.2.3 *Implications for Understanding 20th Century Climate Change*

Any assessment of observed climate change that compares simulated and observed responses will be affected by errors and uncertainties in the forcings prescribed to a climate model and its corresponding responses. Any given model simulation will normally use forcings that have been developed from bottom-up estimates. The best-quantified forcing is perhaps that from the most recent large volcanic eruption (i.e., Pinatubo in 1991), though opinions differ with respect to its usefulness in quantifying responses (Wigley et al., 2005a; Frame et al., 2005).

It has been shown that for most forcings, the global average surface temperature response per unit forcing is similar within a given climate model (to within approximately 40%) (Hansen et al., 1997; Forster et al., 2000; Rotstayn and Penner, 2001; Gregory et al., 2004b). To the extent that the patterns are similar, it is

1 possible to use methods that scale the response patterns to different forcings in detection work to obtain the  
2 best match to observations. Thus errors in the magnitude of the forcing or the magnitude of its response to  
3 anomalous forcing (which is approximately, although not exactly, a function of sensitivity), should not affect  
4 detection results provided that the space-time pattern of the response is correct. For detection studies, if the  
5 space-time pattern of response is incorrect, then the scaling, and with it detection and attribution results, will  
6 be further affected. Attribution studies, on the other hand, evaluate the consistency between the model-  
7 simulated amplitude of response and that which is inferred from observations. However, for a model  
8 simulation to be considered consistent with the observations the scaling should remain consistent with the  
9 uncertainty bounds from bottom-up forcing estimates.

10  
11 Detection and attribution approaches that try to distinguish the response to several external forcings  
12 simultaneously may be affected by similarities in the pattern of response to different forcings and by  
13 uncertainties in forcing and response. Similarities between the responses to different forcings, particularly in  
14 the spatial patterns of response, make it somewhat more difficult to distinguish between responses to  
15 different external forcings, but also imply that the response patterns will be relatively insensitive to modest  
16 errors in the magnitude and distribution of the forcing. Variations in the time history of different kinds of  
17 forcing (e.g., greenhouse gas versus sulphate aerosol) ameliorate the problem of the similarity between the  
18 spatial patterns of response considerably. Distinct features of the vertical structure of the responses in the  
19 atmosphere to different types of forcing further help to distinguish between the different sources of forcing.  
20 Studies that interpret observed climate in subsequent sections use such strategies.

21  
22 Increasingly, different models are used to include some of the uncertainty in the pattern of response (e.g.,  
23 Hegerl et al., 2000; Gillett et al., 2002c; Santer et al., 2005b, Allen et al., 2005; Stott et al., 2005b, Zhang et  
24 al., 2005). This approach accounts for both forcing uncertainty, since usually, different model simulations  
25 apply different combinations of forcings, and model uncertainty. However, the limited sample of forcings  
26 and models used allow only for a limited exploration of these uncertainties. Some recent modelling studies  
27 have explored uncertainties associated with some model parameters (Stainforth et al 2005; Murphy et al  
28 2004).

29  
30 Many detection studies attempt to identify in observations both temporal and spatial aspects of the  
31 temperature response to a given set of forcings because the combined space-time responses tend to be more  
32 distinct than either the space-only or time-only patterns of response. Because the emissions and burdens of  
33 different forcing agents change with time, the net forcing and its rate of change vary with time. An explicit  
34 accounting of how uncertainties in the net forcing as a function of time contribute to uncertainties in the  
35 temporal evolution of temperature is not available. However, since models often employ different  
36 implementations of external forcing, the use of such different simulations for detection and attribution  
37 suggests that results are not very sensitive to small forcing differences. A further problem arises due to  
38 spurious temporal correlations between the responses to different forcings. For example, solar and volcanic  
39 forcings correlate over the 20th century (for example, North and Stevens, 1998).

40  
41 The spatial pattern of the temperature response to aerosol forcing is quite distinct from the spatial response  
42 pattern to CO<sub>2</sub> in some models and diagnostics (Hegerl et al., 1997), but less so in others (Reader and Boer,  
43 1998; Tett et al., 1999; Hegerl et al., 2000; Harvey, 2004). If it is not possible to distinguish the pattern of  
44 greenhouse warming from that of fossil-fuel related aerosol cooling, the observed warming over the last  
45 century could be explained by large greenhouse warming balanced by large aerosol cooling or alternatively  
46 by small greenhouse warming with very little or no aerosol cooling. However, detection results suggest that  
47 estimates of the response of a model to greenhouse gas forcing are not very sensitive to differences in  
48 simulated responses to aerosol forcing (Hegerl and Allen, 2002). In order to understand whether the range of  
49 response patterns used in detection studies adequately captures the range expected from studies of climate  
50 forcing, Stott et al. (2005b) consider the robustness of attribution results to uncertainties in patterns of  
51 aerosol forcing. They conclude that a key constraint is the temporal evolution of the global mean and  
52 hemispheric temperature contrast of the pattern of response to aerosol forcing (see Sections 9.2.4, 9.4.1.5).

#### 53 54 **9.2.4 Summary**

55  
56 The uncertainty in the magnitude and spatial pattern of forcing differs considerably between forcings. For  
57 example, well-mixed greenhouse gas forcing is relatively well constrained and spatially homogeneous. In

1 contrast, the uncertainties are large for many non-greenhouse gas forcings. Bottom up estimates of 20th  
2 century radiative forcing change suggest that it is very likely that the total anomalous forcing is positive but  
3 less than  $2.58 \text{ W/m}^2$ . Top-down studies, which use methods closely related to those used in climate change  
4 detection research, indicate that the magnitude of the net aerosol forcing is very likely less than  $-1.7 \text{ W/m}^2$ .

5  
6 In order of importance based on magnitude of forcing and inherent uncertainty, it is most important to better  
7 constrain those forcing agents that are associated with the indirect effects of aerosols, followed by those  
8 associated with the direct effects of biomass aerosols and fossil-fuel related aerosols. The large uncertainty in  
9 total aerosol forcing and response presently inhibits attempts to accurately infer the climate sensitivity from  
10 observations (Section 9.6). It also increases uncertainties in results that attribute cause to observed climate  
11 change (Section 9.4.1.4), and is in part responsible for differences in projections of future climate change  
12 (Chapter 10). Forcings from black carbon, fossil fuel organic matter, and biomass burning aerosols, which  
13 have not been considered in most detection studies performed to date, are likely small but with large relative  
14 uncertainties. Nonetheless, the distinct spatial pattern of forcing and response from these agents may offer  
15 opportunities to more precisely identify human influences on the climate system provided that it will be  
16 possible to determine their spatial/temporal pattern of emissions and response.

17  
18 Uncertainties also differ between natural forcings. For example, changes in the solar forcing over time need  
19 better quantification. While the 11-year solar forcing cycle is well-documented, lower-frequency forcing  
20 variations have been recognized as highly uncertain. In contrast, the timing and duration of forcing due to  
21 aerosols that are ejected into the stratosphere by large volcanic eruptions is well known during the industrial  
22 period, while the magnitude of that forcing is affected by uncertainty.

23  
24 Differences in the time-evolution and sometimes the spatial pattern of climate response to external forcing  
25 make it possible, with limitations, to separate the response to these forcings in observations. For example, the  
26 time-evolution, and to some extent the spatial pattern, of climate response to natural forcings is quite  
27 different from that of anthropogenic forcing. This makes it possible, with uncertainties, to separate the  
28 climate response to solar and volcanic forcing from that to anthropogenic forcing (despite the uncertainty in  
29 the history of solar forcing noted above). Note that a spurious correlation between the climate responses to  
30 solar and volcanic forcing over parts of the 20th century (North and Stevens, 1998; North et al., 1998) can  
31 lead to misidentification of one versus the other as in the recent study by Douglass and Clader (2002).  
32 Therefore, results based on longer periods provide more reliable attribution of climate variability associated  
33 with natural forcing.

34  
35 We conclude that due to differences in space-time patterns of greenhouse gas forcing from other  
36 anthropogenic forcing, a separation of the latter from other anthropogenic forcing, such as sulphate aerosol  
37 forcing (especially if the latter is taken to include the indirect forcing associated with fossil-fuel related  
38 aerosols), should be relatively robust. In contrast, as discussed above, the climate response and time  
39 evolution of other anthropogenic forcings is more uncertain, making simulated climate response and detected  
40 signals more difficult to interpret.

### 41 42 **9.3 Understanding Pre-Industrial Climate Change**

#### 43 44 **9.3.1 Why do we Consider Pre-Industrial Climate Change?**

45  
46 Understanding past climate variations is important for understanding both present and future climate change.  
47 The Earth system has undergone large-scale climate changes in the past (see Chapter 6). These changes  
48 resulted either from internal feedbacks in the climate system, or from the response of the climate system to  
49 natural external forcings. Our motivation for studying pre-industrial climate change is to better understand  
50 the variability and the major feedbacks of the climate system in the absence of anthropogenic forcing, and  
51 the sensitivity of the climate to external forcing. Past periods offer the potential to increase the information  
52 available from the instrumental record, which is too short to fully understand climate variability on  
53 interdecadal and secular timescales, and is affected by strong anthropogenic as well as natural external  
54 forcings.

55  
56 Here we restrict the discussion mainly to the observations and simulations of the last millennium, because  
57 this period is vital to place the last 140 years in a broader context. We also consider two time periods

1 analyzed in the paleoclimate intercomparison project (PMIP, Joussaume and Taylor, 1995; PMIP2, Harrison  
2 et al., 2002), the mid-Holocene (6000 years ago) and last Glacial Maximum (21000 years ago). Both periods  
3 show relatively strong changes compared to the present, and there is relatively good information from data  
4 synthesis and model simulation experiments (Braconnot et al., 2004; Cane et al., 2005).

### 6 **9.3.2 Records of Past Climate Changes**

7  
8 Prior to the instrumental era, it is necessary to use indirect indicators ("proxy data") to infer past climate  
9 variations (see Chapter 6). These indicators include tree ring width and density, fossil corals, oxygen isotope  
10 ratios in ice core or marine cores pollen counts in sediment layers, and sulphate deposition on ice caps. These  
11 data provide information on past changes in climate, such as in temperature, precipitation, or other indicators  
12 that reflect changes in large-scale patterns of atmospheric and oceanic circulation which may have  
13 contributed to past climate changes. We give a very brief description of the paleo records here. A  
14 corresponding description of the relevant forcing situations can be found in Section 9.2.1.3. More complete  
15 information about these data and their uncertainties, and on the evolution of past climate changes, is  
16 provided in Chapter 6.

17  
18 Compilations of proxy temperature records show that the Earth has warmed rapidly over the past 1000 years  
19 or so (see Chapter 6 and the reviews by Jones et al., 2001 and Jones and Mann, 2004). The Northern  
20 Hemisphere was likely cooler than the late 20th century during the first half of the millennium and cooled a  
21 further 0.5°C to -1°C below the 20th century mean during the period 1500 to 1900. This long term tendency  
22 is punctuated by several climatic events of about 0.25°C when averaged over the Northern Hemisphere  
23 (Figure 6.8). New reconstructions suggest larger variations than contained in the Mann et al. (1999)  
24 reconstruction (see Chapter 6), but large uncertainties remain about the inter-decadal and inter-century  
25 variability recorded by these reconstructions. Uncertainties in the amplitude of the reconstructed temperature  
26 variability arise from different sources depending on the proxy data and methods that are used. New methods  
27 for processing proxy data, such as from tree rings, better preserve low-frequency variability, but some  
28 uncertainty remains as to how to best calibrate proxy data to instrumental temperatures (e.g., von Storch et  
29 al., 2004; Mann et al., 2005; see also Chapter 6), although recently developed techniques that recover low  
30 frequency variability produce reconstructions that appear to be in good agreement (Moberg et al., 2005;  
31 Hegerl et al., 2005). Nonetheless, all reconstructions indicate that the Northern Hemisphere was likely  
32 warmer during the late 20th century than at any other time during the last millennium (see Chapter 6, Figure  
33 6.8).

34  
35 In addition, high resolution records tell us how the interannual variability has evolved. For example, Cobb et  
36 al (2003), using fossil corals, has attempted to extend the record of ENSO back through the last millennium.  
37 They find that ENSO may have been as frequent and intense during the mid-seventeenth century as during  
38 the instrumental period, with events possibly rivalling the strong 1997-1998 event. On the other hand, there  
39 are periods during the 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries when there may have been significantly less ENSO variability,  
40 a period during which there were also cooler conditions in the North East Pacific (Mac Donald and Case,  
41 2005) and evidence of droughts in central North America (Cook et al., 2004). Indications of changes in  
42 ENSO variability during the low solar irradiance period of the 17th to early 18th centuries are more  
43 controversial (e.g., D'Arrigo et al., 2005).

44  
45 The magnitude of natural climate fluctuations is larger further back in time (Chapter 6). Relatively high  
46 quality global reconstructions exist for the mid-Holocene and last glacial maximum (LGM) as part of the  
47 BIOME6000 project (Prentice and Webb, 1998; Prentice and Jolly, 2000). The climate was much colder and  
48 drier during the LGM with a strongly damped hydrological cycle relative to our modern climate as is  
49 indicated by the extensive tundra and steppe vegetation that existed during this period. Most LGM proxy  
50 data also suggest that the tropical oceans were colder by about 2°C than at present, and that the frontal zone  
51 in the southern and northern hemispheres were shifted equator wards (Kucera et al., 2005), even though large  
52 differences are found between temperature estimates from the different proxies in the north Atlantic (De  
53 Vernal et al., 2005). Closer to the present, during the mid-Holocene, one of the most noticeable changes in  
54 climate is the northward extension of northern temperate forest (Bigelow et al., 2003), which reflects warmer  
55 summers than at present. In the tropics the more vegetated conditions found in the now dry sub-Saharan  
56 regions indicate that wetter conditions prevailed there that resulted from enhanced summer monsoons (see  
57 Braconnot et al 2004 for a review). In addition, there is now also a wide range of proxies that extend the

1 record of ENSO back in time for this period (Chapter 6). These data suggest that ENSO variability appears  
2 to have been weaker than it is today prior to approximately 5,000 years before present (Moy et al., 2002 and  
3 references therein; Tudhope and Collins, 2003).

### 4 5 **9.3.3 What can we Learn from the LGM and the Mid-Holocene?**

6  
7 Several simulations with models of intermediate complexity (EMICS), as well as more comprehensive  
8 general circulation models, are available for the LGM and the mid-Holocene as part of PMIP (Joussaume et  
9 al., 1995). This includes an increased number of coupled simulations that have recently become available,  
10 run with the same model version as used for simulation of the climates of the 20th and 21st centuries. These  
11 simulations, and their comparison with proxy data, have improved our understanding of the role of the ocean  
12 and vegetation feedback in the response of the climate system to external forcing. They also provide new  
13 information on changes in short-term climate variability and climate teleconnections.

14  
15 Several new AOGCM simulations of the LGM have been produced since the TAR. These simulations  
16 generally simulate a global cooling of  $-3.1^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $-5.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  in response to greenhouse gas and ice sheet forcing  
17 (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2005), which is within the range ( $-1.8^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $-6.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) of the PMIP results from  
18 simpler models that were discussed in the TAR (IPCC 2001). Only one simulation exhibits a very strong  
19 response with a cooling of  $-10^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Kim et al., 2002). The range of simulated temperature change simulated  
20 by the coupled models reflects differences in their sensitivity to anomalous greenhouse gas forcing and  
21 changes in the specification of ice-covered regions (Taylor et al., 2000). Changes in greenhouse gas  
22 concentrations may account for about half of the tropical cooling (Shin et al., 2003), and for the production  
23 of colder and saltier water found at depth in the southern ocean (Liu et al., 2005). Most LGM simulations  
24 with coupled models shift the deep-water formation in the North Atlantic southward. Some simulations are  
25 in qualitative agreement with the reduction of deepwater ventilation suggested from marine proxy data  
26 (Duplessy et al., 1988) and by a new reconstruction of the north Atlantic ocean (Kageyama et al., 2005).  
27 Inclusion of changes in vegetation appears to improve the realism of LGM simulations. Colder temperatures  
28 are simulated in Eurasia where forests retreat, allowing snow to have a larger impact in reflecting solar  
29 radiation back to space (Crowley and Baum, 1997; Levis et al., 1999; Wyputta and McAvaney, 2001).  
30 Inclusion of the physiological effect of the  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration on vegetation has a non-negligible impact  
31 (Levis et al., 1999) and needs to be included to properly represent changes in global forest (Harrison and  
32 Prentice, 2003).

33  
34 Coupled simulations of the mid-Holocene produce an amplification of the mean seasonal cycle of  
35 temperature of  $0.55^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $0.71^{\circ}\text{C}$ . This range is slightly smaller than that of PMIP1 ( $0.55^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $1.16^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) with  
36 atmosphere only models due to the thermal response of the ocean (Braconnot et al., 2000). Changes in the  
37 ocean circulation have strong seasonal features with an amplification of the SST seasonal cycle of 1 to  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$   
38 in most places within the tropics. This amplification alters land-sea contrasts and influences regional climate  
39 change (Zhao et al., 2005). In particular, the late summer and autumn warming of the surface ocean in  
40 response to the insolation forcing enhances the land-sea contrast and affects both the Indian and African  
41 monsoons, favouring a late monsoon retreat. In Africa, changes in annual mean precipitation simulated by  
42 coupled models over West Africa are about 5 to 10% larger than for atmosphere only simulations and are in  
43 better agreement with data reconstructions (Braconnot et al., 2004). Results for the Indian and Southwest  
44 Asian monsoon are less consistent, as is also the case for future model projections (Chapter 10). As noted in  
45 the TAR, vegetation change during the mid-Holocene is an important feedback in explaining the wet  
46 conditions that prevailed in the Sahel region (IPCC, 2001), as are ocean feedbacks (Braconnot et al., 1999;  
47 Ganopolski et al., 1998). This has been confirmed in recent results (Levis et al., 2004), together with the role  
48 of the soil feedbacks. Changes in the land surface cover, and thus also surface albedo and surface roughness,  
49 introduce an annual mean climate forcing. The signal from this feedback is superimposed on the seasonally  
50 varying mid-Holocene insolation forcing. Wohlfahrt et al. (2004) showed that in mid- and high-latitudes the  
51 vegetation and ocean feedbacks enhance the warming in spring and autumn by about  $0.8^{\circ}\text{C}$ . A comparison  
52 with vegetation reconstructions reveals that coupled models reproduce most observed features, but have a  
53 tendency to overestimate the mid-continental drying in Eurasia (Wohlfahrt et al., 2005). This point needs to be  
54 considered when analysing future climate changes in these regions from model scenarios.

55  
56 Several studies have now attempted to analyse changes in interannual variability for paleo periods relative to  
57 the present. Even though some results are controversial, a consistent picture has emerged for the mid-

1 Holocene (e.g., Liu et al., 2000), for which simulations produce reduced variability in precipitation over  
2 most ocean regions in the tropics (Braconnot et al., 2004). They also show a tendency for less frequent and  
3 intense ENSO events, in qualitative agreement with data, although there are large differences in magnitude  
4 and inconsistent responses of the associated teleconnections (Otto-Bliesner, 1999; Kitoh and Mukarami,  
5 2002; Liu et al., 2000; Otto-Bliesner et al., 2003). A key element of the ENSO response is the Bjerknes  
6 feedback mechanism. Bjerknes (1969) argued, on the basis of observations, that if the East Pacific warms  
7 slightly, the trade winds weaken causing a deepening of the thermocline and consequently further warming.  
8 The increased mid-Holocene solar heating in boreal summer leads to more warming in the western than  
9 eastern Pacific, which sets off the Bjerknes feedback such that there is a cooling in the east. One study also  
10 suggests that a change in the mean sea level pressure in the north Atlantic occurred corresponding to a  
11 negative NAO phase. This is consistent with data, even though it is difficult to determine whether the more  
12 negative NAO phase suggested from data corresponds to a change in the mean state or to changes in decadal  
13 variability (Glastone et al., 2005).

#### 15 **9.3.4 What can we Learn from the Past 1000 Years?**

16  
17 The analysis of the past 1000 years focuses mainly on the climate response to natural forcings (changes in  
18 solar radiation and volcanism) and on the role of the anthropogenic forcing during the most recent part of the  
19 record. These external forcing changes are, in general, small relative to those from the mid-Holocene and  
20 LGM to the present. Nonetheless, the climatic responses to forcing, together with internal variability,  
21 produce several well-defined climatic events, such as the late Maunder Minimum. Increased ability to  
22 understand and simulate the climatic responses to these forcings in the past increases our confidence in our  
23 overall understanding of the impact of external forcing, including anthropogenic forcing, on the climate. In  
24 addition, variability in reconstructions that is not explained by external forcing can provide an estimate of the  
25 magnitude of internal climate variability on interdecadal and secular timescales.

##### 27 **9.3.4.1 Evidence of external influence on the climate over the past 1000 years**

28 Several transient simulations covering the last millennium have been performed using a range of models,  
29 including some runs with CGCMS (e.g., Crowley, 2000; Bertrand et al., 2002; Gerber et al., 2003; Bauer et  
30 al., 2003; Zorita et al., 2004, see also Gonzalez-Ruoco et al., 2003; Jones and Mann, 2004; Goosse et al.,  
31 2004, Tett et al., 2005). All of these simulations use reconstructions of historic solar and volcanic forcing  
32 variations (Figure 6.10). Despite the differences between the various experiments, which result from the use  
33 of different models and uncertainty in the various natural forcing reconstructions (see Section 9.2), they  
34 display some common characteristics in the evolution of the Northern Hemisphere annual mean temperature,  
35 consistent with the broad features shown by data. There is a general cooling from the beginning of the  
36 millennium until the 19<sup>th</sup> century that ranges from approximately 0.5°C to 1°C, depending upon the  
37 simulation considered, which is followed by a rapid warming. All simulations suggest that the time of the  
38 late Maunder Minimum (around 1675 to 1715) was one of the coldest periods of the millennium, which is  
39 qualitatively similar between models and proxy reconstructions, and that the 20th century was warmer than  
40 the last 800 years. The rapid warming at the end of the millennium leads also, with the possible exception of  
41 Zorita et al. (2004), to an absolute maximum during the last decades of the 20th century even compared to  
42 the warm 11th and 12th century. Beyond these broad agreements, both simulations of last millennium and  
43 proxy reconstructions show differences, particularly in the magnitude of past climate variations. The  
44 magnitude of the simulated climate variations varies between models due to differences in forcing and model  
45 formulation, and in reconstructions due to different proxies included and reconstruction techniques (Section  
46 6.5.4). Nevertheless, all of these simulations show that it is not possible to simulate the large warming during  
47 the 20th Century without anthropogenic forcing (Crowley, 2000; Bertrand et al., 2002; Bauer et al., 2003;  
48 Hegerl et al., 2003, 2005a; Tett et al., 2005), stressing the impact of human activity on the recent warming. A  
49 new detection and attribution analysis of the reconstructions indicates that 20–50% of the warming of the  
50 first half of the 20th century can now be attributed to greenhouse gas emissions (Hegerl et al., 2005a).

51  
52 Given the wide range of uncertainties on the magnitude of the Northern Hemispheric temperature trend from  
53 proxy data, it is not yet possible to use the proxy data to fully assess the realism of these simulations. Part of  
54 the variation in the magnitude of the simulated response can be attributed to differences in climate  
55 sensitivity, which varies by a factor of two between different climate models (Chapter 8). By comparing  
56 simulated and observed atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration during the last 1000 years, Gerber et al. (2003)  
57 suggest that the amplitude of the temperature evolution simulated by simple climate models and EMICs is

1 reasonable. Differences in the simulation of internal variability between models could have contributed to  
2 the apparent differences between their simulations of Northern Hemisphere mean temperature, but the role of  
3 internal variability has been found to be smaller than that of the forced variability for hemispheric  
4 temperature means at decadal or longer time scales (Crowley, 2000; Goosse et al., 2004; Hegerl et al., 2003,  
5 2005a). Other sources of uncertainty include the model initial conditions which could explain some of the  
6 warm conditions found in the Zorita et al. (2004) simulation during the first part of the millennium (Goosse  
7 et al., 2005; Osborn, 2005).

#### 9 9.3.4.2 *Role of volcanism and solar irradiance*

10 The role of volcanic forcing has been identified by comparisons between proxy records and model  
11 simulations. Volcanism manifests itself by large and rapid decreases of annual mean temperatures during the  
12 years following a major eruption. In addition, changes in the frequency of large eruptions result in climate  
13 variability on decadal to centennial time-scale (Crowley, 2000; Briffa et al., 2001; Bertrand et al., 2002;  
14 Bauer et al., 2003; Table 9.3.1). Hegerl et al. (2003, 2005a) detect a highly significant response to volcanic  
15 and greenhouse gas forcing in a number of proxy reconstructions, using a multi-regression approach (see  
16 Section 9.4, Appendix 9.A.1) to simultaneously estimate the response to anthropogenic and natural climate  
17 forcings from several paleo-reconstructions of Northern Hemispherically averaged temperature (Figure  
18 9.3.1; Table 9.3.1). Also, modelling studies suggest volcanic activity has a dominant role in explaining the  
19 Maunder Minimum cold conditions (Yoshimori et al., 2005; Andronova et al., 2005). However, Rind et al.  
20 (2004) and Shindell et al. (2003) estimate from model simulations that the dominant forcing for the Maunder  
21 Minimum cold climate state were changes in solar radiation. These uncertainties in interpretation also reflect  
22 substantial uncertainties in our knowledge about the size of past volcanic forcing and of the timing and size  
23 of long-term variations in solar forcing.

24  
25 Tropical variability may also be affected by volcanism. Cobb et al. (2003) found that fluctuations in ENSO  
26 variability do not appear to be correlated in an obvious way with mean state changes in the tropical Pacific or  
27 global mean climate. However, an empirical analysis of proxy-based reconstructions over the past three  
28 centuries (Adams et al., 2003) finds statistical evidence for an El Niño-like anomaly during the first few  
29 years following explosive tropical volcanic eruptions. A study with a simplified model of the tropical Pacific  
30 coupled ocean-atmosphere system supports the possibility of a link with volcanic forcing over the past  
31 millennium (Mann et al., 2005). This study also suggests that, as in earlier periods (Section 9.3.3), the  
32 response of the mean state of the tropical Pacific depends upon differences in surface heating in the eastern  
33 and western Pacific. Other mechanisms could have a role, as has been shown for ENSO variations reported  
34 for the modern climate (see Chapters 2 and 8). However, substantial uncertainties remain as to whether and  
35 how ENSO changes in response to volcanism.

36  
37 [INSERT FIGURE 9.3.1 HERE]

38  
39 [INSERT TABLE 9.3.1 HERE]

40  
41 There is substantially more uncertainty regarding the influence of solar forcing. In addition to substantial  
42 uncertainty in the timing and amplitude of solar variations on timescales of several decades to centuries,  
43 uncertainty also arises because the spatial response of surface temperature to solar forcing resembles that due  
44 to anthropogenic forcing (Nesme-Ribes et al., 1993; Cubasch et al., 1997; Rind et al., 2004; Zorita et al.,  
45 2005). Analyses that make use of differences in the temporal evolution of solar and volcanic forcing are  
46 better able to distinguish between the two (see also Section 9.4.1.4 for the 20th century). In such an analysis,  
47 solar forcing can only be detected and distinguished from the effect of volcanic and greenhouse gas forcing  
48 over some periods in some reconstructions (Hegerl et al., 2003, 2005a), although the effect of solar forcing is  
49 detected over parts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in some time-space analyses (see Section 9.4.1.4). We conclude that  
50 the preindustrial temperatures estimated by proxy data very likely show effects from natural external forcing,  
51 such as changes in solar radiation and explosive volcanism.

52  
53 There is some evidence that the response to external forcing may influence modes of climate variability. In  
54 particular, during the winter following a large volcanic eruption, the zonal circulation may be more intense  
55 (NAM/NAO-like response; Shindell et al., 2004; Yoshimori, 2005). This implies a relative warming over the  
56 continents during the cold season that could partly offset the direct cooling due to the volcanic aerosols (see  
57 Section 8.7.1.3; Robock, 2000; Shindell et al., 2003). Some simulations also indicate a tendency towards the

1 negative NAO state during periods of reduced solar input (Rind et al., 2004), as do reconstructions of this  
2 pattern for the northern hemisphere (Luterbacher et al., 2004). This would imply a solar forcing role in some  
3 long-term regional changes and thus possibly a contribution to cooling over the Northern Hemispheric  
4 continent during some periods such as the late Maunder Minimum (Shindell et al., 2001a; Section 9.2.2).

#### 6 *9.3.4.3 Other forcings and sources of uncertainties*

7 In addition to forcing uncertainties discussed above, there are a number of other uncertainties that affect our  
8 understanding of preindustrial climate change. For example, land cover change may have influenced the  
9 preindustrial climate (Bertrand et al., 2002; Bauer et al., 2003). The largest anthropogenic land cover  
10 changes involve deforestation (Chapter 2), and the greatest proportion of deforestation has occurred in the  
11 temperate regions of the Northern Hemisphere (Ramankutty and Foley, 1999; Goldewijk, 2001). Some  
12 studies suggest that the effect on global mean radiative forcing of land cover change is comparable to that  
13 due to aerosols, ozone, solar variability and minor greenhouse gases (Chapter 2; Section 9.2.1.1). Model  
14 simulations (e.g., Betts, 2001; Matthews et al., 2004) suggest that land use change may have had a cooling  
15 influence on climate, leading to a cooling of 1–2°C in winter and spring over the major agricultural regions  
16 of North America and Eurasia.

18 Oceanic processes and ocean-atmospheric interaction may also have played a role in the climate evolution  
19 during the last millennium (Delworth and Mann, 2000; Weber et al., 2004; van der Schrier and Barkmeijer,  
20 2005). Climate models generally simulate a weak to moderate increase in the intensity of the oceanic  
21 thermohaline circulation in response to a decrease in solar irradiance (Cubasch et al., 1997; Weber et al.,  
22 2004; Goosse and Renssen, 2004). Because of the large oceanic inertia and the long time scales involved in  
23 the renewal of deep-water masses, the climate state at a particular period could be influenced by the previous  
24 climate evolution. A delayed response to forcing due to the storage and transport of heat anomalies by the  
25 deep ocean has been proposed to explain the warm period in the Southern Ocean around the 14–15th  
26 centuries recorded in some proxies (Goosse et al., 2004). If this mechanism is valid, it would imply that the  
27 Southern Ocean has only partly responded to present-day changes in radiative forcing and large temperature  
28 increases could therefore be expected in the future (Weaver et al., 2000; Goosse and Renssen., 2001).

#### 30 *9.3.5 Summary*

31  
32 The discussion above illustrates that climate models are important tools for interpreting past climate changes  
33 that are indicated by paleo records. Considerable progress has been made since the TAR to better understand  
34 the response of the climate system to external forcings. Periods like the mid-Holocene and the Last Glacial  
35 Maximum are now seen as benchmarks for climate models, since it is now possible to use robust features  
36 from proxy data to assess paleo-climate simulations (see Chapter 6). Progress has been made in our  
37 understanding both of changes in the mean climate state and of changes in the short-term variability.

38  
39 We have also substantially increased our understanding of the past thousand years, although uncertainties  
40 remain in the Northern Hemisphere temperature and natural forcing reconstructions. The major climatic  
41 events of the last millennium are quite well established at the scale of the northern hemisphere, but their  
42 magnitude remains somewhat uncertain. Nonetheless, the larger and more closely scrutinized collection of  
43 reconstructions from paleo data than were available for the TAR indicate that it is likely that late 20th  
44 century temperatures were warmer than they have been for the last 1000 years, and possibly for the last 2000  
45 years (see Chapter 6). It has also been shown that the response to natural external forcing has significantly  
46 influenced the evolution of Northern Hemispheric temperature, with pronounced volcanic and possible solar  
47 effects, which contribute substantial interdecadal variability. Climate response to greenhouse gas increases  
48 can be detected in a range of proxy reconstructions by the end of the records.

## 50 **9.4 Understanding of Air Temperature Change During the Industrial Era**

### 52 *9.4.1 Global Scale Surface Temperature Change*

#### 54 *9.4.1.1 Observed changes*

55 There have been five more years of observations since the TAR (see Chapter 3) that show that temperatures  
56 are continuing to warm near the surface of the planet. The annual global mean temperature for every year  
57 since the TAR has been amongst the 10 warmest years since the beginning of the instrumental record. The



1 global mean temperature averaged over land and ocean surfaces during the period 1901–2004 increased by  
2 0.75°C (Chapter 3; approximately 0.6°C per century if approximated by a linear trend) and warming rates  
3 were greater after the mid 1970s with a warming rate of 0.15 to 0.18°C per decade over the 1979–2004  
4 period (Chapter 3). A larger number of proxy reconstructions from paleo data than were available for the  
5 TAR indicate that Northern hemisphere mean temperatures of the late 20th and early 21st centuries are very  
6 unusual and likely unprecedented in the context of the last 2000 years (Chapter 6). Global mean warming  
7 since 1900 has not been a gradual smooth increase as would be expected if global mean temperatures  
8 correlated simply with forcing from increasing greenhouse gas concentrations (i.e., if natural variability and  
9 other forcings did not have a role; see Chapter 2). A rise in near-surface temperatures as rapid as that seen  
10 since the mid 1970s also occurred over several decades during the first half of the 20th century, and in  
11 between there was a period of more than three decades when temperatures showed no pronounced trend  
12 (Figure 3.2.6). Since the mid-1970s, land regions have warmed at a faster rate than oceans in both  
13 hemispheres (Figure 3.2.8) and warming over the southern hemisphere was smaller than that over the  
14 northern hemisphere during this period (Figure 3.2.6), while warming rates during the early 20th century  
15 were similar over land and ocean.

#### 16 9.4.1.2 *Simulations of the 20th century*

17 There are now a greater number of coupled model simulations for the period of the instrumental record than  
18 were available for the TAR, including a greater variety of forcings in a greater variety of combinations.  
19 These simulations used models with different climate sensitivities, rates of ocean heat uptake and  
20 magnitudes and types of forcings. Figure 9.4.1 shows that simulations that include increasing greenhouse  
21 gases, the effects of aerosols and natural external forcings provide a consistent explanation of the observed  
22 temperature record, whereas simulations that include only natural forcings do not simulate the warming  
23 observed over the last three decades.  
24

25  
26 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.1 HERE]

27  
28 Figure 9.4.2 displays the evolution of the spatial distribution of bi-decadal mean observed near surface  
29 temperature over the 20th century relative to the 1945–1974 mean (left hand column) and its simulation by  
30 an ensemble of 10 climate models that include anthropogenic and natural forcing (right hand column). The  
31 similarity between the general evolution of the warming in observations and models that include  
32 anthropogenic and natural forcing is compelling. Larger inter-decadal variations are seen in the observations  
33 than in the ensemble mean model simulation of the 20th century because the ensemble averaging process  
34 filters out much of the natural internal inter-decadal variability that is simulated by models. Figure 9.4.1c  
35 suggests that current models generally simulate large scale natural internal variability quite well. Section  
36 9.4.1.3 will assess the variability of near surface temperature observations and simulations.  
37

38 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.2 HERE]

39  
40 Global mean and hemispheric scale temperatures are controlled by external forcings on multi-decadal time  
41 scales. Stott et al. (2000) analysed an ensemble of integrations of HadCM3 (see Table 8.2.1) including both  
42 anthropogenic and natural forcing that successfully simulates 20th century global mean and large scale land  
43 temperature variations. Calculations of the percentage of total variance explained by the model's response to  
44 external forcings indicate that the climate response on large spatial scales, particularly over land, is strongly  
45 influenced by external factors. This external control is demonstrated by ensembles of model simulations with  
46 identical forcings (whether anthropogenic or natural) whose members have very similar simulations of  
47 global mean temperature on multi-decadal timescales.  
48

49 The global mean warming observed since 1970 is captured by many different climate models when they are  
50 forced with external combinations of forcing that include anthropogenic forcings. These include simulations  
51 by the HadCM3 model including time varying changes in well-mixed greenhouse gases, the direct and first  
52 indirect effects of sulphate aerosols, and changes in tropospheric and stratospheric ozone (Tett et al., 2002),  
53 simulations by the GFDL R30 model including well-mixed greenhouse gases and the direct effect of  
54 sulphate aerosols (Broccoli et al., 2003), simulations by the GFDL CM2.0 and CM2.1 models including  
55 well-mixed greenhouse gases, tropospheric and stratospheric ozone, black and organic carbon, land cover  
56 changes, volcanic aerosols and solar irradiance changes (Knutson et al., 2005), and simulations by the  
57 NCAR PCM model including well-mixed greenhouse gases, the direct effect of sulphate aerosols and

1 changes in tropospheric and stratospheric ozone (Meehl et al., 2004). In all these models, a good simulation  
2 of warming since 1970 is obtained when just anthropogenic forcings are included in the model and in all  
3 cases the response to forcing from well-mixed greenhouse gases dominates the anthropogenic warming in  
4 the model. When the same models include natural forcings only, the observed warming is not reproduced.  
5 Therefore, modelling studies indicate that late 20<sup>th</sup> century warming is much more likely to be anthropogenic  
6 than natural in origin.

7  
8 Modelling studies indicate a greater degree of uncertainty over the causes of early 20th century warming  
9 than the recent warming. Whereas some simulations imply a greater role for solar forcing than other forcings  
10 before 1950 (Meehl et al., 2004), other studies imply that volcanic forcing (Broccoli et al., 2003) or natural  
11 internal variability (Delworth and Knutson, 2000) could be more important. There is also likely to be an  
12 early expression of greenhouse warming in the early 20th century (Tett et al., 2002; Tett et al., 2005; Hegerl  
13 et al., 2003). Nozawa et al. (2005) detect a significant natural contribution to early 20th century warming and  
14 find that natural forcings are probably more important than anthropogenic forcings during this period.  
15 Differences between simulations including increases in greenhouse gases only and runs also including the  
16 cooling effects of sulphate aerosols (e.g., Tett et al., 2002) indicate that the cooling effects of sulphate  
17 aerosols could account for some of the lack of observational warming between 1950 and 1970, despite  
18 increasing greenhouse gas concentrations. Andronova and Schlesinger (2000) proposed that a natural  
19 oscillation over the North Atlantic and its adjacent land areas with a period of 65–70 years (Schlesinger and  
20 Ramankutty, 1994) could account for some of the evolution of global mean temperatures during the  
21 instrumental period, and Knight et al. (2005) estimate that variations in the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation  
22 could account for up to 0.2°C peak-to-trough variability in Northern Hemisphere mean decadal temperatures.  
23 In contrast, Nagashima et al. (2005) find that carbonaceous aerosols are required for the MIROC model to  
24 provide a statistically consistent representation of observed changes in near-surface temperature in the  
25 middle part of the 20th century.

26  
27 The ability of climate models to reproduce observed temperature changes over the 20th century when they  
28 include anthropogenic forcings and their failure to do so when they exclude anthropogenic forcings is  
29 persuasive evidence for the influence of humans on global climate. Nonetheless, given the large uncertainties  
30 in aerosol forcings, agreement could have been obtained fortuitously as a result of, for example, balancing  
31 too much (or too little) greenhouse gas warming by too much (or too little) aerosol cooling, and there is some  
32 evidence for a possible negative correlation between models' sensitivity and their total forcing over the  
33 century. Multi-signal optimal detection and attribution analyses do not rely on such agreement because they  
34 seek to explain the observed temperature changes in terms of the likely responses to individual forcings.  
35 Section 9.4.1.4 assesses studies of the relative contributions of the different forcing factors to global  
36 temperature changes.

37  
38 A common aspect of detection analyses is that they assume the response in models to combinations of  
39 forcings to be additive. This was shown to be the case for the PCM model by Meehl et al. (2004) who  
40 demonstrated that the near-surface global mean temperature response to a combination of forcings is  
41 equivalent to the sum of the responses to the individual forcings. Gillett et al. (2004c) similarly found that  
42 the global mean and large-scale near-surface temperature responses to greenhouse gases and sulphate  
43 aerosols combine linearly in the HadCM2 model. Linear additivity was also found to hold in the PCM model  
44 for changes in tropopause height and synthetic MSU temperatures (Santer et al., 2003a). Additivity is less  
45 likely to hold for regional responses. Meehl et al. (2003) found that the response to solar forcing in the PCM  
46 was enhanced regionally in the presence of greenhouse forcing, in part because altered cloud patterns  
47 affected the heterogeneity of the solar surface heating and altered regional feedbacks that depended on the  
48 climate base state in their model.

#### 49 50 *9.4.1.3 Variability of temperature from observations and models*

51 Year to year variability of global mean temperatures of the most recent models compares reasonably well  
52 with that of observations, as can be seen by comparing observed and modelled variations in Figure 9.4.1c. A  
53 more quantitative evaluation of modelled internal variability can be carried out by comparing the power  
54 spectra of observed and modelled global mean temperatures. Figure 9.4.3 directly compares the power  
55 spectrum of observations with those of transient simulations of the instrumental period (Stone et al., 2005a).  
56 This avoids the need to compare variability estimated from long control runs of models with observed  
57 variability, which is difficult because observations are likely to contain a response to external forcings that

1 will not be entirely removed by a simple linear trend. The simulations considered contain both anthropogenic  
2 and natural forcings, and include the simulations made as part of the IPCC AR4 20C3M project. Figure 9.4.3  
3 shows that most models display similar variance to the observed variance on the decadal to inter-decadal  
4 time-scales important for detection and attribution.

5  
6 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.3 HERE]

7  
8 *9.4.1.4 Detection, attribution, and quantification of the influence of external forcing on global surface*  
9 *temperature.*

10 There are now a greater number of attribution studies than were available for the TAR, and these have used  
11 more recent climate data than previous studies and a greater variety of model simulations. Whereas many  
12 detection studies reported in the TAR considered data only until 1995 or 1996, most detection studies since  
13 the TAR have analysed data at least until the end of the 20th century. However, a common experimental  
14 design for coupled model simulations of past climate change has been to make ensembles of transient  
15 simulations only until 2000, thereby limiting the number of analyses which consider data from the early 21st  
16 century. The greater variety of model simulations includes more sophisticated treatments of a greater number  
17 of forcings of both anthropogenic and natural origins.

18  
19 The longer record, improved models, and strengthening anthropogenic signal has increased confidence in  
20 detection of an anthropogenic signal in the instrumental record (see, for example, the recent review by  
21 IDAG, 2005). Optimal fingerprinting studies that use climate change signals estimated from an array of  
22 climate models indicate that detection of an anthropogenic contribution to the observed warming is a result  
23 that is robust to a wide range of model uncertainty (Gillett et al., 2002c; Tett et al., 2002; Zwiers and Zhang,  
24 2003; IDAG, 2005; Stott et al., 2005a; Stott et al., 2005b; Zhang et al., 2005; Allen et al., 2005). An analysis  
25 of global mean data from the IPCC AR4 20C3M models by Stone et al. (2005a) and an analysis using an  
26 EBM to infer the likely observed global mean responses to natural and anthropogenic forcings (Stone et al.,  
27 2005c) support this conclusion. Recent statistical analyses of the observational record also increase  
28 confidence. For example, Fomby and Vogelsang (2002), using a serial-correlation robust test of trend, find  
29 that the increase in global mean temperature over the 20th century is statistically significant even if it is  
30 assumed that natural climate variability has strong serial correlation. In another study, Kaufmann and Stern  
31 (2002) detected a significant human influence on near-surface temperatures by analysing the lagged  
32 covariance structure of hemispheric mean temperatures.

33  
34 Since the TAR there has been an increased emphasis on quantifying the greenhouse gas contribution to  
35 observed warming, and distinguishing this contribution from other factors, both anthropogenic such as the  
36 cooling effects of aerosols and natural factors such as from volcanic eruptions and changes in solar output.  
37 An example is Tett et al. (2002), who simulated the climatic response to natural and anthropogenic forcings  
38 from 1860 to 1997 using the HadCM3 model. They analysed a variety of simulations in which the model  
39 was forced with changes in natural forcings from changes in solar irradiance and stratospheric aerosol due to  
40 explosive volcanic eruptions, changes in well-mixed greenhouse gases and changes in other anthropogenic  
41 forcings including tropospheric and stratospheric ozone changes and the direct and first indirect effects of  
42 sulphate aerosol. By analysing observed and modelled near-surface temperature changes using an optimal  
43 detection methodology, they found that they could detect the effects of changes in well-mixed greenhouse  
44 gases, other anthropogenic forcings (mainly the effects of sulphate aerosols on cloud albedo) and natural  
45 forcings, showing that all have had a significant impact on 20th century temperature changes. They  
46 estimated the linear trend in global-mean near-surface temperature from well mixed greenhouse gases to be  
47  $0.9 \pm 0.24^{\circ}\text{C}$  per century, offset by cooling from other anthropogenic forcings of  $0.4 \pm 0.26^{\circ}\text{C}$  per century  
48 giving a net anthropogenic warming trend of  $0.5 \pm 0.15^{\circ}\text{C}$  per century. Over the entire century natural  
49 forcings gave a linear trend close to zero, with a cooling trend over the latter part of the century following an  
50 earlier warming trend. Their analysis suggests that the early 20th century warming can best be explained by a  
51 combination of warming due to increases in greenhouse gases and natural forcing, some cooling due to other  
52 anthropogenic forcings, plus a substantial, but not implausible, contribution from internal variability. In the  
53 second half of the century they found that the warming was largely caused by changes in greenhouse gases,  
54 with changes in sulphates and, perhaps, volcanic aerosol cooling offsetting approximately one-third of the  
55 warming.

1 This analysis, in common with most analyses up to that point, did not take account of sampling uncertainty  
2 in the modelled signals of climate change. This uncertainty, which results from the influence of internal  
3 chaotic variability on signal estimates from finite-member ensembles, could lead to a low bias in estimates of  
4 the scaling factors by which the modelled response to a particular forcing must be scaled up or down to best  
5 match the observed change (see Appendix 9.A.1). This low bias is likely to be greater for weak forcings such  
6 as changes in solar output (Allen and Stott, 2003; Stott et al., 2003a). Stott et al. (2003b) showed that the  
7 climate response to solar forcing could be significantly underestimated by HadCM3, a result that was also  
8 found by Crooks (2004) for temperature changes in the free troposphere. However, Gregory et al. (2004b)  
9 showed that HadCM3 has a lower sensitivity to solar forcing than greenhouse forcing. In contrast to the  
10 results from the 20th century, analysis of pre-industrial temperatures (Hegerl et al., 2003) suggests an  
11 overestimate of the response to solar forcings in models and suggests only relatively a small contribution of  
12 solar forcing to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century warming. Therefore, the evidence for the role of solar and volcanic  
13 forcing at present is mixed. Spurious correlations between these forcings during the 20th century (North and  
14 Stevens, 1998) and the uncertain time-evolution of solar forcing (see Section 9.2.1.3) have so far hindered a  
15 reliable estimate of the observed response to solar forcing. However, even with large amplifications of the  
16 HadCM3's response to solar forcing, the conclusion of the TAR still holds that most of the warming over the  
17 last 50 years of the 20th century is attributable to increasing greenhouse gas concentrations. On the whole,  
18 taking account of sampling uncertainty (as developed by Allen and Stott, 2003, and implemented by Stott et  
19 al., 2005a and many other studies) makes relatively little difference to estimates of attributable warming  
20 rates, particularly to greenhouse gases, with the largest differences being to estimates of upper bounds for  
21 small and noisy signals.

22  
23 Stott et al. (2005a) compared HadCM3 results over the 20<sup>th</sup> century with those obtained using the PCM and  
24 GFDL R30 models. They found consistent estimates for the greenhouse gas attributable warming of 0.7 to  
25 1.3°C offset by cooling from other anthropogenic factors (associated mainly with cooling from aerosols) of  
26 0.2 to 1°C and a small net contribution from natural factors over the century of between -0.1 and 0.1°C (first  
27 three sets of bars, Figure 9.4.4 middle panel). Scaling factors for the three forcings are shown in Figure 9.4.4  
28 (top panel). A similar analysis for the MIROC model finds a slightly larger warming contribution from  
29 greenhouse gases of between 0.8 and 1.6°C offset by a cooling of -0.4 to 1.1°C from other anthropogenic  
30 factors and a very small net natural contribution (fourth set of bars in Figure 9.4.4). In all cases, the 5th  
31 percentile of the warming attributable to greenhouse gases is greater than the observed warming over the  
32 20th century as a whole and over the last 50 years of the 20th century (Figure 9.4.4, middle and bottom  
33 panels). These results, obtained from four different climate models, with different sensitivities and forcings,  
34 are consistent with those obtained by Tett et al. (2002) for the HadCM3 model, indicating that observational  
35 constraints reduce the uncertainty on warming rates attributable to greenhouse gas increases.

36  
37 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.4 HERE]

38  
39 Not all models have the full range of simulations required. In these cases the likely pattern of a model's  
40 response to each forcing can be diagnosed, as was done by Crooks et al. (2005) by regressing the all-forcings  
41 model response onto the individual forcing time series to produce a spatial pattern of response for each  
42 forcing. The patterns are modulated in time by the magnitude of the forcing to produce time dependent  
43 response signals. The magnitude of these diagnosed signals can then be inferred from observations using  
44 optimal detection. Crooks et al. (2005) estimate attributable warming rates for HadCM3 that are consistent  
45 with those obtained using the full set of simulations (compare fifth and first sets of bars in middle panel of  
46 Figure 9.4.4) suggesting that this approach, which uses both space and time information, provides potentially  
47 useful estimates of attributable temperature changes from those models for which the full range of  
48 simulations are not available. Applied to the full range of models available as part of the IPCC AR4 20C3M  
49 project, this analysis supports the conclusion from more comprehensive analyses that there has been a  
50 significant contribution to 20th century warming from increased greenhouse gas concentrations with cooling  
51 from aerosols counteracting some of the greenhouse warming (Figure 9.4.4) The results also show a small  
52 warming from increasing solar forcing during the first half of the 20th century. A simpler approach is to fit a  
53 series of energy balance models, one for each forcing, to the mean coupled model response from all the  
54 forcings to diagnose the time-dependent response in the global mean for each individual forcing. The  
55 magnitude of these time-only signals can then, again, be inferred from the observed global mean time series  
56 using optimal detection (Stone et al., 2005a; Stone et al., 2005b; Stone and Allen, 2005b). Applied to the full  
57 range of models available as part of the IPCC AR4 20C3M project, results are generally consistent with

1 space-time analyses (Figure 9.4.4) although uncertainties are greater. However when the same methodology  
2 is applied to a 62 member ensemble of simulations of the CCSM1.4 climate models, Stone et al. (2005b)  
3 found a negligible contribution to warming since 1940 from either solar or volcanic forcing. By tuning an  
4 EBM to the observations, thereby using a climate model solely to estimate internal variability, Stone and  
5 Allen (2005b) detected the effects of greenhouse gases and of tropospheric sulphate aerosols, but not the  
6 effects of volcanic stratospheric aerosols and solar irradiance changes, in the observed record between 1900  
7 and 2004.

8  
9 Gillett et al. (2002c) combined results from five models in a single analysis. They calculated the mean  
10 response patterns from the five models (HadCM2, HadCM3, CGCM1, CGCM2 and ECHAM3) which they  
11 used as fingerprints in a detection of greenhouse gas and sulphate aerosol influence, including an estimate of  
12 model uncertainty. Their results indicate that inter-model differences do not greatly increase detection and  
13 attribution uncertainties as applied to temperature data, and that averaging fingerprints improves detection  
14 results. Gillett et al obtained their estimate of model uncertainty by a simple rescaling of the variability  
15 estimated from a long control run, thereby assuming that intra-model uncertainty has the same covariance  
16 structure as internal variability. Huntingford et al. (2005) developed a more sophisticated methodology for  
17 incorporating modelling uncertainty into detection analyses (by including an estimate of the inter-model  
18 covariance structure in the regression method). Their results (last sets of bars in Figure 9.4.4) support those  
19 results generated by spatio-temporal analyses on single models (first four sets of bars in Figure 9.4.4) in  
20 showing that greenhouse gases have likely caused more warming than has been observed over the 1950–  
21 1999 period.

22  
23 Detection of a greenhouse gas influence on global mean temperature is a robust feature of a wide range of  
24 detection analyses. Optimal detection analyses available to the TAR, which quantified the contributions to  
25 past climate change from greenhouse gases and other external forcing factors, showed that it was likely that  
26 greenhouse gases were responsible for at least half of the warming observed over the last 50 years of the  
27 20th century. The analyses performed since the TAR indicate that greenhouse gases likely caused more than  
28 the observed warming over the last 50 years of the 20th century, with a significant, but possibly small, net  
29 cooling from aerosols. By scaling up models whose transient response to greenhouse gas increases is lower  
30 than observed and scaling down those models whose response is higher than observed, attribution analyses  
31 bring the attributable greenhouse gas component into better agreement than the raw unscaled model results.  
32 A key factor in identifying the aerosol fingerprint, and therefore the amount of aerosol cooling counteracting  
33 greenhouse warming, is the change through time of the hemispheric temperature contrast (Santer et al.,  
34 1996b,c; Stott et al., 2005a), in addition to the trend in hemispheric warming contrast itself, whose strength is  
35 model dependent (Hegerl et al., 2001)

#### 36 37 9.4.1.5 *Bayesian detection and attribution studies.*

38 All studies described in Section 9.4.1.4 employ the standard frequentist approach to assessing hypotheses for  
39 causes of past climate change (see Appendix 9.A.2). However, there is also a developing interest in applying  
40 Bayesian methods which allow the inclusion in the analysis of prior information. As discussed by  
41 Kettleborough et al. (2005), in a Bayesian framework all the above studies assume a non-informative prior  
42 distribution for the scaling factors, equivalent to saying that we have no previous knowledge of the values of  
43 the scaling factors. Some recent studies have also taken prior uncertainty and sources of uncertainty into  
44 account in a Bayesian framework. Most studies use Bayes Factors (ratios of posterior to prior odds) to assess  
45 evidence supporting competing hypotheses. Calibrated descriptors, such as “decisive”, “very strong”,  
46 “strong” or “positive”, are used to describe different ranges of Bayes Factors (Kass and Raftery, 1995,  
47 describes Bayes Factors and the descriptors in detail).

48  
49 Schnur and Hasselman (2005) analysed recent 31-year trends (c.f. Hegerl et al., 1997) of patterns of near-  
50 surface temperature in a Bayesian framework in order to distinguish between three competing hypotheses,  
51 namely that the climate changes observed late in the 20th century can be explained by natural internal  
52 variability alone, by natural internal variability and greenhouse gas forcing (G), or by natural internal  
53 variability and the combined effect of greenhouse gas and sulphate aerosol forcing (GS). Assuming that  
54 these three possibilities were equally likely a priori, Schnur and Hasselman inferred that the odds of  
55 hypotheses G and GS against the natural-variability hypothesis are very large. This is equivalent to saying  
56 that the G and GS signals are clearly detected in the observations. However, they also found that GS is only  
57 twice as likely as G, which does not represent decisive evidence for one hypothesis over the other. In a

1 combined analysis, G and GS are still both detected, with the odds of GS over G being only slightly larger  
2 than one. Compared to conventional analyses, the inclusion of the model error structure in the Bayesian  
3 analysis leads to a downgrading of the information on the impact of sulphate forcing. They postulate that this  
4 occurs because the model uncertainty in the response to aerosols is much larger than that for greenhouse  
5 gases.

6  
7 Min et al. (2004) applied a Bayesian analysis to 1979–1999 surface and 70 hPa NH temperature from  
8 reanalysis and found evidence that simulations with anthropogenic forcings explain observations better than  
9 a control simulation. Min and Hense (2005a) find decisive evidence for an “all forcings” explanation over  
10 the 20th century, as against alternative explanations involving internal variability only, natural forcings only,  
11 and greenhouse gas increases only. They also found strong evidence for both “all forcings” and naturally  
12 forced explanations of temperature changes during the 1900–1949 period. They report that their results are  
13 insensitive to inter-model uncertainties as estimated from the IPCC AR4 20C3M simulations and to prior  
14 probabilities.

15  
16 Differences in separate detection of sulphate aerosol influences in a multi-signal approach can reflect  
17 differences in the diagnostics applied (e.g., the space-time analysis of Tett et al., 1999, vs. the space only  
18 analysis of Hegerl et al., 1997, 2000). Gillett et al., 2002b (see also Hegerl and Allen, 2002) showed that this  
19 could be traced to differences in the response to sulphate aerosol forcing in the different climate models  
20 used. Bayesian studies find that the evidence of a significant aerosol cooling effect on past temperature  
21 changes is relatively weak compared to the very strong evidence for an anthropogenic influence (Schnur and  
22 Hasselman, 2005), although there is some evidence from these studies that the combination of increases in  
23 greenhouse gases with aerosols and natural forcing factors provides a better explanation for past temperature  
24 changes than increases in greenhouse gases alone (Smith et al., 2003).

25  
26 Lee et al. (2005a) applied a variant of the Bayesian technique described by Berliner et al. (2000) to a  
27 conventional optimal fingerprinting in order to evaluate detection and attribution hypotheses about the GS  
28 scaling factor. Lee et al. (2005a) evaluate the evidence for the presence of the GS signal, estimated from two  
29 versions of the CCCma CGCM, in observations for several 5-decade windows, beginning with 1900–1949,  
30 and ending with 1950–1999. Evidence supporting detection was assessed by requiring a high posterior  
31 likelihood that the GS scaling factor was greater than 0.1. Evidence supporting attribution was similarly  
32 assessed by requiring a high posterior likelihood that the scaling factor was within 20% of unity. This study  
33 found very strong evidence in support of detection during the early and latter halves of the 20th century  
34 regardless of the choice of prior distribution. On the other hand, evidence for attribution, as stringently  
35 defined above, is weak. Positive evidence for attribution was obtained when using noncommittal priors and a  
36 less stringent attribution criterion that requires the model response to the GS forcing to be within 50% of the  
37 apparent observed response. Lee et al. (2005a) estimated that strong evidence for attribution may emerge  
38 within the next two decades as the anthropogenic signal strengthens.

39  
40 In a further study using Bayesian techniques, Lee et al. (2005b) have considered predictability of decadal  
41 mean temperature increments relative to the preceding three decade “normal” that arise from anthropogenic  
42 forcing. Using an ensemble of simulations of the 20th century with GS forcing, they use Bayesian tools  
43 similar to those of Lee et al. (2005a) to produce, for each decade beginning with 1930–1939, a forecast of the  
44 probability of above normal temperatures where “normal” is defined as the mean temperature of the  
45 preceding three decades. These hindcasts become skilful during the last two decades of the 20th century as  
46 indicated both by their Brier skill scores, a standard measure of the skill of probabilistic forecasts, and the  
47 confidence bounds on hindcast global mean temperature anomalies (Figure 9.4.5).

48  
49 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.5 HERE]

#### 50 51 9.4.1.6 *Implications for future warming rates*

52 Knowledge of how the observations constrain the likely contributions of greenhouse gases and other forcing  
53 factors to past temperature change (Section 9.4.1.4) also provides observational constraints on likely future  
54 rates of warming. Scaling factors derived from detection analyses determine how much simulations from  
55 comprehensive coupled atmosphere-ocean global climate models should be scaled up or down to remain  
56 consistent with past temperature change. Assuming that fractional error in model predictions of global mean  
57 temperature change is constant, these same scaling factors can be applied to predictions of future change, in

1 a manner analogous to the Model Output Statistics (MOS) technique which has a long history of application  
2 in weather forecasting. This linear relationship between past and future fractional error in temperature  
3 change is sufficiently robust over a number of realistic forcing scenarios to introduce little additional  
4 uncertainty (Kettleborough et al., 2005). Diagnostics obtained from these approaches can be used to project  
5 uncertainty in past climate change into the future (Allen et al., 2002; Allen and Stainforth, 2002; Allen and  
6 Ingram, 2002; Stott and Kettleborough, 2002; see Section 10.5.4.5). Uncertainties calculated this way are  
7 likely to be more reliable than ranges of forecast uncertainty based on ensembles of opportunity of coupled  
8 ocean-atmosphere general circulation models, which could provide a misleading estimate of forecast  
9 uncertainty (Allen et al., 2002; Allen and Stainforth, 2002).

10  
11 Several authors have used such an approach. Allen et al. (2000) obtained uncertainties in 21st century  
12 warming rates under the IS92A scenario using this approach for a range of coupled climate models. Stott and  
13 Kettleborough (2002) derived separate scaling factors on the response patterns to greenhouse gas, aerosol  
14 and natural forcings for the HadCM3 model and used them to determine probabilistic forecasts of global  
15 mean temperatures for four representative SRES emissions scenarios. Global mean temperature rise was  
16 found to be insensitive to differences in emission scenarios over the first few decades of the 21st century but  
17 large differences between emission scenarios emerge by the end of the 21st century. Stott et al. (2005a)  
18 compared observationally constrained predictions from three coupled climate models with a range of  
19 sensitivities. Results showed that predictions from more and less sensitive models are brought into better  
20 agreement, demonstrating that predictions produced in this way are relatively insensitive to the model used  
21 to produce them. The transient climate response following a 1% per year increase in carbon dioxide is likely  
22 to be greater than 2°C per century (see Section 9.6.1, Figure 9.6.1) and warming rates less than 1.5°C per  
23 century are unlikely under the SRES A2 scenario.

#### 24 25 *9.4.1.7 Remaining uncertainties*

26 A larger range of forcing combinations has been analysed in detection studies than were available for the  
27 TAR. Nevertheless studies have concentrated on what are believed to be the most important forcings with  
28 most analyses excluding some forcings that could potentially have significant effects, particularly on  
29 regional scales but possibly on global scales also. Observational campaigns have demonstrated the  
30 importance of black carbon in the South Asia region (e.g., see Ramanathan et al., 2005) and modelling  
31 studies have shown that the global forcing from black carbon could be greater than 0.5 W m<sup>-2</sup> (Hansen and  
32 Nazarenko, 2004; Jacobson, 2001), yet few detection studies have explicitly included the temperature  
33 response to black carbon aerosols because there are few transient coupled model simulations including this  
34 forcing and because the modelling uncertainty is large (see Section 9.2, Roberts and Jones, 2004). Land use  
35 changes are another forcing that could be potentially important, particularly on regional scales (Tett et al.,  
36 2005), and could explain discrepancies during the late 19th and early 20th centuries between observations  
37 and model simulations that do not account for such changes (see Section 9.3). Forcing from land use changes  
38 is expected to be negative globally (see Section 9.2.1.1) implying that the net global mean attributable  
39 warming could be slightly greater than estimated from calculations that neglect this forcing. Attribution  
40 analyses that use recent model simulations which include carbonaceous aerosols and land use changes, such  
41 as the MIROC model (fourth set of bars in Figure 9.4.4) and the HadGEM1 model (Stott et al., 2005b),  
42 continue to detect a significant anthropogenic influence on 20<sup>th</sup> century temperature changes. Other forcings  
43 discussed in Chapter 2 but not yet included in attribution analyses include stratospheric water vapour  
44 changes.

45  
46 A sensitivity study incorporating a near-surface temperature pattern of response to black carbon estimated  
47 from a climate model with a slab ocean (Jones et al., 2005) indicated that the patterns of near-surface  
48 temperature response to sulphate aerosol and black carbon were so similar on large spatial scales (but of  
49 opposite signs) that a detection analysis was unable to distinguish them (see also Section 9.2). The  
50 implication of this study is that attribution of the net aerosol contribution to past global-mean temperature  
51 change is likely to be fairly robust to inclusion of black carbon in future analyses but that separating sulphate  
52 cooling from warming due to black carbon will require a careful choice of suitable diagnostics. However  
53 there are likely to be greater differences in the patterns of response in some regions such as India  
54 (Ramanathan et al., 2005) and in the vertical structure of the temperature response (see Section 9.2.2).

55  
56 For each forcing considered, there are uncertainties associated with the temporal and spatial nature of the  
57 forcing and the modelled response. Progress has been made since the TAR in relaxing some of the previous

1 assumptions that have been taken, including sampling uncertainty associated with estimating the climate's  
2 forced response from a limited number of simulations (Allen and Stott, 2003), and there has been some  
3 recent work on incorporation of modelling uncertainty of response to a particular forcing (Huntingford et al.,  
4 2005). However estimation of this modelling uncertainty is dependent on the model simulations available  
5 and large multi-model ensembles (Murphy et al., 2004; Stainforth et al., 2005) using different models. There  
6 remains considerable uncertainty in the forcings that are used in climate models. Since the TAR, the  
7 estimated uncertainties in reconstructions of past solar forcing have increased (see Chapter 2 and Gray et al.,  
8 2005) and many climate models used in detection studies do not include dynamical and chemical processes  
9 in the stratosphere associated with the atmosphere's response to changes in solar irradiance (Gray et al.  
10 2005). Similarly, a number of different volcanic reconstructions are included in the modelling studies  
11 described in Section 9.4.1.2 (e.g., Sato et al., 1993; Amman et al., 2003; Andronova et al., 1999). Some  
12 models include the indirect effects of sulphate aerosols on clouds (e.g., Tett et al., 2002), whereas others  
13 consider only the direct radiative effect (e.g., Meehl et al., 2004). In models that include indirect effects,  
14 different treatments of the indirect effect are used including changing the albedo of clouds according to an  
15 off-line calculation (e.g., Tett et al., 2002) and a fully interactive treatment of the effects of aerosols on  
16 clouds (e.g., Stott et al., 2005b).

17  
18 Systematic biases resulting from missing physics in model simulations or imperfect understanding of the  
19 physical and chemical processes involved in climate change are not explicitly included in the uncertainties  
20 derived using detection analyses and could lead to errors in detection results. Although this type of  
21 uncertainty has not been included in detection results to date, the ability of climate models to simulate large-  
22 scale temperature changes during the 20th century (e.g., see Figure 9.4.1) and the ability of detection results  
23 to provide a consistent explanation for 20th century temperature change (e.g., Figure 9.4.4) indicate that such  
24 errors are likely to have a relatively small impact on attribution results of large scale temperature change at  
25 the surface.

26  
27 A further source of uncertainty originates with the estimates of internal variability that are required for all  
28 detection analyses. These estimates are generally model-based because the observational record is too short  
29 to provide reliable natural variability estimates on the space and time scales considered in detection studies.  
30 However, models would need to underestimate variability by large factors (over 2 for HadCM3 which has  
31 larger variability than many models, Tett et al., 2002) to nullify detection of greenhouse gases in near surface  
32 temperature data. The detection of the effects of other forcings, including aerosols, is likely to be more  
33 sensitive (an increase of 40% in the estimate of internal variability is enough to nullify detection of aerosol  
34 and natural forcings in HadCM3, Tett et al., 2002).

35  
36 Few detection studies have explicitly considered the influence of observational uncertainty on near-surface  
37 temperature changes. Hegerl et al. (2001) showed that inclusion of observational sampling uncertainty had  
38 relatively little effect on detection results and that random instrumental error had even less effect. Systematic  
39 instrumental errors, such as changes in measurement practices or urbanization, could be more important (see  
40 Chapter 3), although these errors are estimated to be relatively small and more important for the first half of  
41 the 20th century than the latter half. Urbanization effects appear to have negligible effects on continental and  
42 hemispheric average temperatures (Chapter 3). Observational uncertainties are likely to be more important  
43 for analyses of free atmosphere temperature changes and these are discussed in Section 9.4.4.

## 44 45 **9.4.2 Regional Surface Temperature Change**

### 46 47 *9.4.2.1 Observed changes*

48 In regions such as Europe that have centuries-long instrumental records, late 20th century temperatures are  
49 the warmest observed (Chapter 6). Over the 1901–2003 period there has been warming over most of the  
50 Earth's surface with the exception of an area south of Greenland and parts of North and South America  
51 (Figure 3.2.8, Section 3.2.2.7). Warming has been strongest over the continental interiors of Asia and Canada  
52 and some mid-latitude ocean regions of the southern hemisphere. Since 1979, all land areas show warming  
53 except for a small region at the tip of South America (Figure 3.2.9). Warming is smaller in the southern  
54 hemisphere than the northern hemisphere with cooling over parts of the mid-latitude oceans. There have  
55 been widespread decreases in continental diurnal temperature range since the 1950s which coincide with  
56 increases in cloud amounts (Section 3.4.3.1).



#### 9.4.2.2 *Studies based on space time patterns*

The sensitivity of detection results to the space and time scale considered was discussed in the TAR.

Idealised studies (e.g., Stott and Tett, 1998) showed that surface temperature changes are detectable on large spatial scales of the order of several thousand kilometres. The large-scale coherence of surface temperature changes means that significant warming trends are also detectable in observations at a much larger fraction of individual climate model grid boxes than can be explained by chance, calculated by a field significance test (Karoly and Wu, 2005). Furthermore, models typically do not underestimate natural internal variability at grid box scale (Karoly and Wu, 2005), although the processes that generate variability on small spatial scales may not be well represented in models. Thus, detection at an individual grid box does not necessarily imply that temperatures are controlled largely by external forcings and therefore predictable at that grid box, as can be the case for larger area averages (Stott et al., 2000).

Previous global-scale analyses using space-time detection techniques (Section 9.4.1.4) have robustly identified the influence of anthropogenic forcing on the 20th century global climate. Given this success, a number of studies have now extended these analyses to consider sub-global scales. Two approaches have been used; one to assess the extent to which global studies can provide information on sub-global scales, the other to assess the influence of external forcing on the climate in specific regions.

One method for assessing climate change on sub-global scales was carried out by IDAG (2005). By comparing analyses of full space-time fields with results obtained after removing the linear trend in the global mean and after removing the annual global mean from each year in the analysis, they found that the detection of anthropogenic climate change is driven by the pattern of the observed warming in space and time, not just by consistent global mean temperature trends between models and observations. These results suggest that greenhouse warming should also be detectable on sub-global scales (see also Barnett et al., 1999). However, their results also show that uncertainties on the scaling factors, or equivalently the estimated contribution to 20th century warming, increases, as expected, when global mean information, which has a high signal-to-noise ratio, is disregarded.

Another approach for assessing the regional influence of external forcing is to apply detection and attribution analyses to observations in specific regions. Zwiers and Zhang (2003) assess the detectability of the GS signal as estimated by the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis (CCCma) CGCMs in a series of nested regions, beginning with the full global domain and descending to separate continental domains for North America and Eurasia. They find evidence that climates in both domains have been influenced by anthropogenic emissions during the latter half of the 20th century. This finding is robust to the exclusion of North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO/AO) related variability (Thompson and Wallace, 1998), which may itself be related to anthropogenic forcing (see Gillett et al., 2000, 2003b; Fyfe et al., 1999; Shindell et al., 1999). As the spatial scales considered become smaller, the uncertainty in estimated signal amplitudes (as demonstrated by the size of the vertical bars in Figure 9.4.6) becomes larger, reducing the signal to noise ratio in detection and attribution results (see also Stott and Tett, 1998). The signal-to-noise ratio, however, also depends on the strength of the climate change and the local level of natural variability. Therefore, signal to noise ratios vary between regions. Most of the results noted above hold even if the amount of estimate of internal climate variability from the control simulation is doubled.

[INSERT FIGURE 9.4.6 HERE]

Stott (2003) analysed HadCM3 simulations to estimate the influence of natural and anthropogenic forcings on 20th century near-surface temperature in six continental scale regions, each composed of a small number of sub regions. The warming effects of increasing greenhouse gas concentrations are detected in all the regions examined. In most regions, cooling from sulphate aerosols counteracts some of the greenhouse warming. However, the separate detection of sulphate aerosol signal in regional analyses remains difficult because of weaker signal to noise ratios (Zhang et al., 2005). Figure 9.4.7, from IDAG (2005), shows that HadCM3 reproduces many features of the observed temperature changes and variability in the different regions. The GFDL CM2 model is also able to reproduce many features of the evolution of temperature change in a number of regions of the globe (Knutson et al., 2005). Other studies show success at simulating regional temperatures when models include anthropogenic and natural forcings. Wang et al. (2005) showed that all the IPCC AR4 20C3M simulations replicated the late 20th century Arctic warming to various degrees, while both forced simulations and control simulations reproduce multi-year Arctic warm anomalies

1 similar in magnitude to the observed mid-century warming event. The recent warming observed over the  
2 Tibetan Plateau is reproduced by 20C3M simulations of the MIROC and GFDL CM2.1 models but not by  
3 their control simulations, suggesting an anthropogenic influence on increasing temperatures there (Duan et  
4 al., 2005).

5  
6 These results, taken together with the sub-global detection analysis described above, provide compelling  
7 evidence of human influence on regional climates. Nevertheless, difficulties remain in simulating  
8 temperature changes in some regions of the World. Parts of North America are not particularly well  
9 simulated by either HadCM3 or GFDL CM2, and GFDL CM2 underestimates warming in Northern Asia  
10 (Knutson et al., 2005) while HadCM3 fails to capture features of the observed warming in mid Asia (IDAG,  
11 2005; Figure 9.4.7). An analysis of the IPCC AR4 20C3M experiments indicates that there is a large spread  
12 in simulations of 20th century temperatures in the central United States, a region that has cooled over the last  
13 100 years, suggesting that multi-decadal internal variability could be responsible (Kunkel et al., 2005). Zhou  
14 and Yu (2005) find that most IPCC AR4 20C3M simulations fail to simulate the warming observed in China  
15 in the first half of the 20th century and many have difficulty reproducing differential warming trends in  
16 North and South China in the second half of the 20th century. Ramanathan et al. (2005) found that observed  
17 temperature trends in South Asia and the Northern Indian Ocean can be simulated with the PCM if  
18 atmospheric brown clouds are included in the model.

19  
20 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.7 HERE]

21  
22 Optimal detection analyses can now also be applied to smaller, sub continental areas. An analysis of France  
23 (Spagnoli et al., 2002) indicated the potential for detecting changes at the country level, for some specific  
24 indices; for France detection of anthropogenic influence was seen for 30 year trends of summer daily  
25 minimum temperatures but not for summer daily maximum temperatures or winter temperatures. Stott et al.  
26 (2004) detect an anthropogenic influence on European summer mean temperature changes of the past 50  
27 years, and Gillett et al. (2004a) detect an anthropogenic contribution to summer season warming for regions  
28 of Canada prone to forest fires. Zhang et al. (2005) demonstrate the detectability of the G and GS signals in  
29 annual mean, and some seasonal mean temperatures, in Europe, Canada and China using a multi-model  
30 approach. Further evidence for an anthropogenic influence on regional climate comes from Min et al. (2005),  
31 who analyzed East Asian temperature changes in a Bayesian framework and showed strong evidence for  
32 detection with high Bayes factors (see discussion in Section 9.4.1.5) in this region.

33  
34 A very different approach to the studies described above is to compare observed temperature changes with  
35 atmosphere-only general circulation model simulations forced with observed sea surface temperatures.  
36 Sexton et al. (2003) proposed a methodology for extracting estimated signals of land surface air temperature  
37 for anthropogenic and natural effects from SST forced simulations and their interactions. The smaller  
38 variability of atmosphere-only models compared to coupled models enables the detection of weaker signals  
39 and potentially the detection of anthropogenic effects on smaller spatial and temporal scales, although the  
40 causes of changes in SSTs remain unexplained using this methodology. In agreement with previous studies  
41 using coupled models (Gillett et al., 2004c; Meehl et al., 2004; see Section 9.4.1.2); Sexton et al. (2003)  
42 found that the greenhouse gas and direct sulphate aerosol effect responses add linearly. However, Sexton et  
43 al (2003) also detected a non-linear interaction between the effects of greenhouse gases and the indirect  
44 effect of sulphate aerosols that was similar in magnitude to the individual effects of changing tropospheric  
45 and stratospheric ozone concentrations and the direct sulphate aerosols effect, although interpretation of this  
46 result is complicated by potential inconsistencies between the imposed SSTs and the model's atmospheric  
47 response to the imposed forcings.

#### 48 49 9.4.2.3 *Studies based on indices for temperature change*

50 Another method for identifying fingerprints of climate change in the observational record is to use simple  
51 indices of surface air temperature patterns that reflect features of the anticipated response to anthropogenic  
52 forcing (Karoly and Braganza, 2001; Braganza et al., 2003). By comparing modelled and observed changes  
53 in such indices, which included the global-mean surface temperature the land-ocean temperature contrast,  
54 and the temperature contrast between Northern and Southern hemispheres, Braganza et al. (2004) found that  
55 anthropogenic forcing accounts for almost all of the warming observed between 1946 and 1995 whereas  
56 warming between 1896 and 1945 was explained by a combination of anthropogenic and natural forcing and

1 internal variability. These results are consistent with the results from studies using space-time optimal  
2 detection techniques (see Section 9.4.1.4).

3  
4 Diurnal temperature range (DTR) has decreased over land by about 0.4°C over the last 50 years. This  
5 decreasing trend has been shown to be outside the range of natural internal variability estimated from  
6 models. Hansen et al. (1995) demonstrated that tropospheric aerosols plus increases in continental cloud  
7 cover, possibly associated with aerosols, could account for the observed decrease in DTR. However,  
8 although models simulate a decrease in DTR when they include anthropogenic changes in greenhouse gases  
9 and aerosols, the observed decrease is underestimated (Stone and Weaver, 2002; Stone and Weaver, 2003;  
10 Braganza et al., 2004). This underestimate is associated with an overestimate by models of the observed  
11 increase in daily maximum temperature. Braganza et al. (2004) showed evidence that this overestimate could  
12 be associated with models failing to capture observed increases in cloud cover (since the middle of the last  
13 century over many continental regions and over the last 30 years over the oceans, see Section 3.4.3.1), a  
14 result supported by other analyses (Stone and Weaver, 2002, 2003; Dai et al., 1999).

15  
16 Indices of North American continental scale temperature change were analysed by Karoly et al. (2003).  
17 Observed trends in the indices, which included the regional mean, the mean land-ocean temperature contrast,  
18 and the annual cycle, were found to be generally consistent with simulated trends under historical forcing  
19 from greenhouse gases and sulphate aerosols during the second half of the 20th century. In contrast they  
20 found only a small likelihood of agreement with trends driven by natural forcing only during this period.  
21 Changes in Australian mean, daily maximum and daily minimum temperatures and diurnal temperature  
22 range were analysed by Karoly and Braganza (2005a) using 6 coupled climate models. They showed that it is  
23 likely that there has been a significant contribution to observed warming in Australia from increasing  
24 greenhouse gases and sulphate aerosols. Nicholls (2003) showed that there has been an anomalous warming  
25 over Australia over the last few decades associated with a changed relationship between annual mean  
26 maximum temperature and rainfall since the early 1970s. Whereas interannual rainfall and temperature  
27 variations are strongly inversely correlated, in recent decades temperatures have tended to be higher for a  
28 given rainfall than in previous decades. A recent warming trend not associated with rainfall variations that  
29 could therefore be associated with the enhanced greenhouse effect, has also been identified in New South  
30 Wales (Nicholls et al., 2005b). By removing the rainfall related component of Australian temperature  
31 variations, thereby enhancing the signal-to-noise ratio, Karoly and Braganza (2005b) detected an  
32 anthropogenic warming signal in south eastern Australia, although their results are affected by some  
33 uncertainty associated with their removal of rainfall related temperature variability.

### 34 35 **9.4.3 Surface Temperature Extremes**

#### 36 37 *9.4.3.1 Observed changes*

38 Observed changes in extremes are consistent with the observed warming of the climate (Alexander et al.,  
39 2005). There has been a gradual reduction in the number of frost days over most of the mid-latitudes in  
40 recent decades, an increase in the number of warm extremes, particularly warm nights, and less so, hot days;  
41 and a reduction in the number of cold extremes at the daily timescale. Heat waves have increased in  
42 frequency during the latter part of the 20th century. A number of regional studies all show patterns of  
43 changes in extremes consistent with a general warming, although the observed changes in the tails of the  
44 temperature distributions are generally not consistent with a simple shift of the entire distribution. (Section  
45 3.8.2.1).

#### 46 47 *9.4.3.2 Global assessments*

48 Evidence for observed changes in short duration extremes generally depends on the region considered and  
49 the analysis method (IPCC, 2001). Global analyses have been restricted by the limited availability of quality  
50 controlled and homogenized daily station data. In the absence of detection results for extreme events, studies  
51 based on model output alone can be used to develop suitable approaches for early detection. Hegerl et al.  
52 (2004) investigated anthropogenic changes in daily minimum and maximum temperature over land in two  
53 atmosphere-ocean general circulation models, using indices scanning the transition from mean to extreme  
54 climate events within a year. They found a subtle but significant difference between changes in extremes and  
55 seasonal means over large areas of the globe, and estimated the signal-to-noise for changes in extreme  
56 temperature to be nearly as large as for changes in mean temperature.

1 Indices of temperature extremes have been calculated from station data, including some indices from regions  
2 where daily station data are not released (Frich et al., 2002; Klein-Tank and Können, 2003; Alexander et al.,  
3 2005). Kiktev et al. (2003) analysed a subset of such indices, by using fingerprints from atmospheric model  
4 simulations driven by prescribed sea surface temperatures and a bootstrap method for significance testing.  
5 They find significant decreases in the number of frost days and increases in the number of very warm nights  
6 over much of the Northern Hemisphere. Comparisons of observed and modelled trend estimates indicate that  
7 inclusion of anthropogenic effects in the model integrations significantly improves the simulation of these  
8 changing temperature extremes.

9  
10 Christidis et al. (2005) analysed a new gridded dataset of daily temperature data (Caesar et al., 2005) using  
11 the indices shown by Hegerl et al. (2004) to have a potential for attribution. Robust anthropogenic changes  
12 were detected in indices of extremely warm nights. Human influence on cold days and nights was also  
13 detected, although less robustly, and with some indication that simulated changes were underestimated.  
14 Christidis et al. (2005) found no detection of a significant human influence on extremely warm days, which  
15 had the smallest signal-to-noise ratios of the four types of indices they examined.

#### 16 17 *9.4.3.3 Assessment of regional temperature extremes*

18 Many important impacts of climate change are likely to manifest themselves through a change in the  
19 frequency or likelihood of occurrence of events that, taken individually, could be explained as naturally  
20 occurring (e.g., Palmer, 1999). Palmer and Raissanen (2002) assess how future increases in greenhouse gas  
21 forcing may change such risks in the case of extreme seasonal precipitation.

22  
23 It is important to be clear about the difference between the actual observed change in the variable of interest  
24 and the expected underlying change (Allen, 2005). Most of the variability of global mean temperature on  
25 multi-decadal timescales is externally driven (Stott et al., 2000) but nevertheless global mean temperatures  
26 vary from year to year around the underlying forced changes due to internal variability. For regional changes  
27 in mean temperature and for temperature extremes, the chaotic component from variability becomes more  
28 important relative to the predictable changes from external forcings.

29  
30 Most attribution studies have considered underlying deterministic changes rather than the actual events  
31 themselves. Allen (2003) and Stone and Allen (2005a) proposed a methodology for making quantitative  
32 attribution statements about individual climatic events, by expressing the contribution of external forcing to  
33 the risk of an event exceeding the observed magnitude. These studies proposed that the concept of the  
34 fraction of attributable risk (FAR), an established concept in epidemiological studies, should be applied to  
35 the problem of attributing a single event in a chaotic system to external forcing. If  $P_1$  is the probability of a  
36 climatic event (such as a flood or heat wave) occurring in the presence of anthropogenic forcing of the  
37 climate system, and  $P_0$  is the probability of it occurring if such anthropogenic forcing had not been present,  
38 then the fraction of the current risk that is attributable to past greenhouse gas emissions is given by  
39  $1 - P_0/P_1$  (Allen, 2003). Analyses of attributable risk provide the basis for such statements as “half the  
40 deaths due to X are attributable to environmental risk factor Y” and are subject to well-documented hazards  
41 of interpretation (Greenland and Robins, 1988) which need to be borne in mind as they are extended to the  
42 climate problem. The “frequency of occurrence” interpretation becomes more problematic when dealing  
43 with the most extreme events that, by definition, occur very infrequently in both present-day and pre-  
44 industrial climate where the probability of events is much more difficult to assess. Changes in the probability  
45 and recurrence time of extreme rainfall, temperature and storminess events are expected under climate  
46 change conditions (e.g., Kharin and Zwiers, 2000, 2005), suggesting that this kind of quantitative risk  
47 analysis will become more important in the future.

48  
49 Stott et al. (2004) investigated to what extent climate change could be responsible for the high summer  
50 temperatures in Europe during the summer of 2003 (described in detail in Chapter 3, Box 3.5) by applying  
51 the FAR concept to mean summer temperatures throughout a large region of continental Europe and the  
52 Mediterranean. Luterbacher et al. (2004) showed that the summer of 2003 in central Europe was likely the  
53 warmest in 500 years. Schär et al. (2004) showed that the central European heat wave of 2003 was consistent  
54 with model predicted increases in temperature variability due to soil moisture and vegetation feedbacks, and  
55 hence greater likelihood of extremes. Overlain on an overall warming trend affecting extreme summer  
56 temperatures could be an influence of basin-scale changes in the Atlantic Ocean, related to the Thermohaline

1 Circulation, which could drive multi-decadal variations in western European summer climate (Sutton and  
2 Hodson, 2005). Klein Tank et al. (2005) show evidence that there have been distinctive patterns of change in  
3 European temperature variance in spring and summer that are not consistent with patterns of change in  
4 temperature variance expected from natural variability. Meteorological aspects of the summer 2003 heat  
5 wave are discussed briefly in Chapter 3, Box 3.5, and in more detail by Fink et al. (2004) and Black et al.  
6 (2004).

7  
8 There could be an increase in extreme events (with impact-related thresholds being exceeded) both as a  
9 result of changes in mean temperatures without any increase in variability, or as a result of increases in  
10 variability alone, or a combination of both. Contrary to analyses of smaller continental regions (Schär et al.,  
11 2004 and Hegerl et al., 2004), Stott et al. (2004) found no evidence for a change of variability in the future  
12 under the much larger region and for the seasonal mean change they considered. They were therefore able to  
13 consider the problem as a two stage problem. By carrying out an optimal detection analysis and comparing  
14 observed and modelled European temperature changes, they first estimated the change in 1990s temperatures  
15 in their large European region that were attributable to both anthropogenic and natural factors, and compared  
16 this with the temperature change attributable to natural factors alone. They then further used the model to  
17 estimate the probability of exceeding a particular extreme threshold in the presence and absence of the model  
18 simulated anthropogenic climate change after carefully evaluating the model's ability to simulate  
19 temperature variability in the region of interest. The FAR was then calculated from the ratio of these two  
20 probabilities. In this way they estimate, using a threshold that was exceeded in 2003, but in no other year  
21 since 1851, that it is very likely (a better than 9 in 10 chance) that past human influence has more than  
22 doubled the risk of a regional scale heat wave of at least this magnitude. Figure 9.4.7 shows the estimated  
23 likelihood of the risk (probability) of exceedance of a 1.6°C threshold in the presence (red line) and absence  
24 (green line) of anthropogenic change, expressed both as a frequency (number of occurrences per thousand  
25 years, top axis) and as a return period (bottom axis). The clear shift from the green to the red distribution  
26 (Figure 9.4.8a) implies an FAR distribution whose mean is 0.75, corresponding to an increase in risk of a  
27 factor 4 (Figure 9.4.8b).

28  
29 Although Stott et al estimated that the summer heat wave was still a relatively rare occurrence (the current  
30 probability of exceeding their chosen threshold in their model simulations was 1 in 250 years) the HadCM3  
31 simulations showed a rapidly increasing risk such that by the 2040s half of all summers (averaged over their  
32 large region of continental Europe and the Mediterranean) would be warmer than 2003 under the SRES A2  
33 emissions scenario. This was due in their model largely to a change in mean temperature with little change in  
34 variability over the very large region they considered. Over smaller land areas of the continent, drying of soil  
35 and vegetation feedbacks leads to an increase in variability in addition to an overall warming trend in model  
36 predictions. Every second summer in Switzerland can be expected to be hotter than 2003 by the 2071–2100  
37 period under the same SRES A2 scenario (Schar et al., 2004; Beniston et al., 2004), and heat waves are  
38 expected to become more intense, more frequent and longer lasting both in Europe and North America  
39 according to simulations of the PCM model (Meehl and Tebaldi, 2004), although some models may over-  
40 estimate soil moisture feedbacks and so exaggerate increases in extreme temperatures (Rowell and Jones,  
41 2005). Hegerl et al. (2004) showed that two climate models simulate a stronger change in European hot  
42 summer days in future than in summer means, widening the future temperature distribution and therefore  
43 leading to stronger warm extremes. This study also found a stronger increase in the temperature of cold  
44 winter days in future than in winter means, narrowing the future winter temperature distribution, and  
45 therefore producing less extreme cold winter temperatures.

46  
47 Tebaldi et al. (2005) found that eight CGMs run for the IPCC AR4 agreed well with the observations that  
48 there has already been a trend in temperature-related extremes in the positive direction for heat waves and  
49 warm nights, and in the negative direction for frost days, over the last four decades.

50  
51 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.8 HERE]

#### 52 53 **9.4.4 Free Atmosphere Temperature**

##### 54 55 *9.4.4.1 Observed changes*

56 Radiosonde and satellite temperature measurements show that the troposphere has warmed and the  
57 stratosphere has cooled since the 1960s (Section 3.4.1). Over the shorter period for which there have been

1 both satellite and radiosonde data, there remains considerable uncertainty as to the differential warming rates  
2 seen at the surface and in the free atmosphere. Some analyses indicate a significant difference, with relative  
3 cooling aloft compared to warming at the surface. However, other analyses indicate that there have been  
4 warming rates that are consistent with or larger than those at the surface, as expected from models.  
5

6 Record lengths of 25 years are now possible from satellites. At the time of the TAR only one group  
7 (University of Alabama – Huntsville UAH) had produced a 20-year climate data record from operational  
8 Microwave Sounding Unit (MSU) data. Since then other analyses of the MSU data have been produced  
9 (Mears et al., 2003; Mears and Wentz, 2005 (Remote Sensing Systems – RSS); Grody et al., 2004). Global-  
10 mean trends in the mid-troposphere (channel T2) retrieval differ greatly between the three analyses (see  
11 Section 3.4.1). If these differences are real then uncertainties due to different retrieval methods are very large  
12 (Thorne et al., 2005b). Fu et al. (2004) demonstrated that T2 temperature trends are contaminated by  
13 stratospheric cooling, and that when retrieved stratospheric temperatures (T4) are used to remove this  
14 influence, T2 temperature trends are in closer agreement with surface trends. Both UAH and RSS have also  
15 produced a lower-tropospheric retrieval (T2LT) and these differ by a similar magnitude to their T2 retrievals.  
16 Both T2LT retrievals are now internally consistent following the identification of a flaw in the diurnal  
17 correction applied by UAH (Mears and Wentz, 2005) and its subsequent removal. This flaw had led to a  
18 spurious cooling in the tropics in the UAH lower-tropospheric retrieval.  
19

20 Concurrently, there have been two major efforts to create new homogenised records from radiosondes since  
21 1958. LKS (Lanzante et al., 2003a, b) produced a dataset based on 87 globally distributed radiosonde  
22 stations, which is updated in real-time (RATPAC; Free et al., 2005). HadAT is based on a much larger  
23 network of radiosonde stations (Thorne et al., 2005a). There is evidence that pervasive cooling trends due to  
24 reducing warm biases in instruments may contaminate radiosonde records and this and other effects tend to  
25 be magnified with height, reducing confidence in the radiosonde datasets as height increases (Sherwood et  
26 al., 2005; see Section 3.4.1).  
27

#### 28 9.4.4.2 *Changes in tropopause height*

29 The height of the lapse rate tropopause (the boundary between the stratosphere and the troposphere) is  
30 sensitive to bulk changes in the thermal structure of the stratosphere and the troposphere. Analyses of  
31 radiosonde data have documented increases in tropopause height over the past 3–4 decades (Highwood et al.,  
32 2000; Seidel et al., 2001). Similar increases have been inferred from three different reanalysis products  
33 (ERA-15, ERA-40 and NCAR-NCEP) and from model simulations with combined anthropogenic and  
34 natural forcing (Santer et al., 2003a, c; Santer et al., 2004; see Figure 9.4.9). In both models and reanalyses,  
35 changes in tropopause height over the satellite and radiosonde eras are smallest in the tropics and largest  
36 over Antarctica (Santer et al., 2004). Model simulations with individual forcings indicate that the major  
37 drivers of the model tropopause height increases are ozone-induced stratospheric cooling and the  
38 tropospheric warming caused by greenhouse gas increases (Santer et al., 2003a). However, earlier model  
39 studies have found that it is difficult to alter tropopause height through stratospheric ozone changes alone  
40 (Thuburn and Craig, 2000). Santer et al. (2003a) found that the model-predicted fingerprint in response to  
41 combined anthropogenic and natural forcing is robustly detectable in different reanalysis products, even  
42 when global mean tropopause height increases are removed. Solar and volcanic forcing alone could not  
43 explain the tropopause height increases (Figure 9.4.9).  
44

45 [INSERT FIGURE 9.4.9 HERE]  
46

#### 47 9.4.4.3 *Overall atmospheric temperature change*

48 Tett et al. (2002) compared radiosonde observations of zonal-mean changes in temperature for the 1961 to  
49 1995 period with those simulated by HadCM3. They detected an anthropogenic response, but found that its  
50 magnitude was overestimated by the model. Their results also suggested that stratospheric variability was  
51 underestimated by the model. This study was extended by Jones et al. (2003) and by Thorne et al. (2002,  
52 2003). Jones et al carried out a space-time analysis of temperature changes in both free-atmosphere and  
53 surface observations. They concluded that the effect of greenhouses gases and sulphate aerosols was robustly  
54 detected. In addition they could detect the influence of volcanic aerosol, and less robustly, solar irradiance  
55 changes on the temperature of the free-atmosphere/near-surface. Santer et al. (2003b) also demonstrated that  
56 PCM-simulated tropospheric temperature changes agree well with observations.  
57

1 Thorne et al. (2002) carried out a sensitivity study of the processing methods used in Tett et al. (2002) and  
2 Allen and Tett (1999). They used results from both HadCM2 and HadCM3 over the same 1961–1995 period  
3 and found that the combined influence of greenhouse gases and sulphate aerosols was robustly detected,  
4 even without the inclusion of stratospheric temperature changes. When stratospheric values were more  
5 heavily weighted, best-fit simulated values were inconsistent with the radiosonde observations, due to  
6 shortcomings in the models' simulations of stratospheric variability. Thorne et al. (2003) subsequently  
7 carried out a space-time analysis. This analysis differed from that of Jones et al. (2003) in that they  
8 considered 5–10 large-area average regions rather than zonal-averages and used both HadCM2 and  
9 HadCM3. Like other studies they found robust detection of an anthropogenic impact on climate. With much  
10 less confidence they found evidence of a solar and volcanic impact on the upper-troposphere but little  
11 confidence of a detectable natural influence on other diagnostics. Both models, especially HadCM3, tended  
12 to over estimate free-atmospheric warming and they therefore were not able to unambiguously attribute  
13 recent observed tropospheric temperatures changes to any combination of external forcing influences,  
14 although they did conclude that by far the most plausible causes are anthropogenic.

15  
16 Crooks (2004) detected a solar signal in atmospheric temperature changes as seen in the HadRT radiosonde  
17 dataset when a diagnostic chosen to extract the solar signal from other signals was used. They showed that  
18 the HadCM3 model appears to underestimate the observed free-atmosphere response to solar forcing in the  
19 free atmosphere, which was also seen by Stott et al. (2003b) for near-surface temperatures, although  
20 HadCM3 has a lower sensitivity to solar forcing than greenhouse forcing (Gregory et al., 2004b; see Section  
21 9.4.1.4).

22  
23 A different approach is to compare observed temperature changes through the depth of the atmosphere with  
24 atmosphere-only general circulation model simulations forced with observed sea surface temperatures. The  
25 vertical profile of the atmosphere temperature change signal estimated in this way can be quite different from  
26 the same signal estimated by coupled models with the same external forcings (Hansen et al., 2002; Sun and  
27 Hansen, 2003; Santer et al., 2005b). Sexton et al. (2001) showed that it is highly unlikely that the observed  
28 changes could be accounted for by sea surface temperature variations and internal variability alone. They  
29 found that inclusion of anthropogenic effects improved the simulation of zonally averaged upper air  
30 temperature changes such that an anthropogenic signal was detected at the 5% significance level on both 8-  
31 year and inter-annual timescales.

#### 32 33 9.4.4.4 *Differential temperature trends*

34 Radiosonde observations indicate less overall warming in the troposphere compared to the surface since  
35 1979 (Section 3.4.1.5), in contrast to coupled model simulations, and this discrepancy is largest in the tropics  
36 (Santer et al., 2005a). However, the discrepancy between simulated and observed differential warming in the  
37 tropics is smaller based on satellite measurements of tropospheric temperature change (Santer et al., 2005b),  
38 particularly when the effect of the cooling stratosphere on tropospheric retrievals is accounted for (Section  
39 3.4.1.5). External forcing other than greenhouse gas changes also helps to reconcile some of the differential  
40 warming, since both volcanic eruptions and stratospheric ozone depletion may have cooled the troposphere  
41 by more than the surface over the last several decades (IPCC, 2001; Santer et al., 2000; Santer et al., 2001;  
42 Free and Angell, 2002; CCSP, 2005). There are, however, uncertainties in quantifying the differential  
43 cooling caused by these forcings, both in models and observations arising from uncertainties in the forcings  
44 and model response to the forcings. Differential effects of natural modes of variability, such as ENSO and  
45 the AO/NAO, on observed surface and tropospheric temperatures, which arise from differences in the  
46 amplitudes and spatial expression of these modes at the surface and in the troposphere, make only minor  
47 contributions to the overall differences in observed surface and tropospheric warming rates (Santer et al.,  
48 2001; Hegerl and Wallace, 2002; CCSP, 2005).

49  
50 Concerns have mainly centred around the deep tropics where models exhibit a pronounced warming  
51 maximum aloft, whereas until recently the available observations suggested little if any trend. Santer et al.  
52 (2005b) undertook an intercomparison between RSS, UAH, HadAT, and RATPAC and simulations from 19  
53 IPCC AR4 models. On monthly and annual timescales variations of temperature at the surface are amplified  
54 aloft in both models and observations by consistent amounts. It is only on longer timescales that  
55 disagreement arises. Only RSS is consistent with the models on both short and long timescales. While this  
56 does not prove that RSS is correct it does demonstrate the importance of multiple observational records,  
57 preferably from independent observational platforms.

### 9.4.5 Summary

Since the TAR, the evidence has strengthened that global temperatures have increased near the surface of the Earth as a result of human influence. Every year since the publication of the TAR has been in the top ten warmest years in the instrumental record. A large number of climate models are now available which simulate global mean temperature changes that are consistent with those observed over the last century when they include the most important forcings of the climate system. However, none of these models is able to simulate the warming observed over the last 50 years when they include just natural factors. These studies demonstrate that anthropogenic forcings dominate recent global warming. This conclusion is robust to details of model formulation and to uncertainties in forcings; as far as they have been explored in the large multi-model ensembles available (see Figure 9.4.1).

Many studies have detected a human influence on near-surface temperature changes, applying a variety of statistical techniques and using many different climate model simulations. Comparison with observations shows that these models appear to have an adequate representation of internal variability on the decadal to inter-decadal time-scales important for detection (Figure 9.4.3). When framed in a Bayesian framework, evidence for a human influence on global temperature change is found to be “very strong”, regardless of the choice of prior distribution.

Since the TAR there has been an increased emphasis on partitioning the observed warming into contributions from greenhouse gas increases and other anthropogenic and natural factors. Estimates obtained from optimal detection analyses applied to spatial and temporal changes in temperature over the 20th century indicate that greenhouse gases were responsible for more than the observed warming over the last fifty years. They show that there has been a significant cooling from aerosols counter-acting some of the greenhouse warming (Figure 9.4.4). Spatial information is evidently necessary to reliably detect the influence of aerosols. In particular aerosols are expected to cause differential warming and cooling rates between the northern and southern hemisphere, and this fingerprint helps to constrain the possible range of cooling from aerosols over the century. Analyses based solely on temporal changes in global mean temperatures do not consistently detect the cooling effects of aerosols. Bayesian studies, which find very strong evidence for an anthropogenic influence on climate, find weaker evidence for a significant effect of aerosols. However, clear evidence from optimal detection studies of a significant aerosol cooling over the last five decades indicates that, even in the light of continuing uncertainties in aerosol forcing and the climate’s response, it is likely that greenhouse gases were responsible for more than the observed warming over the last fifty years.

An important development since the TAR has been the identification of an emerging anthropogenic signal in surface temperature changes on continental and sub continental scale land areas. The ability of models to simulate many aspects of the temperature evolution on these scales (Figure 9.4.7) and the detection of significant anthropogenic effects on individual continents (Figure 9.4.6) provide compelling evidence for human influence on regional climates. Although it is generally more difficult to attribute temperature changes to individual forcings in continental and sub continental regions, and in individual seasons than to attribute global scale changes, human influence has been clearly identified in a variety of different studies in a number of disparate regions.

Evidence for changes in extreme temperatures is beginning to emerge. There has been a significant decrease in the frequency of frost days and an increase in the incidence of warm nights. An optimal detection analysis has shown a significant human influence on patterns of changes in extremely warm nights with a less robust detection of a human-induced warming of the coldest nights and days of the year. Many important impacts of climate are likely to manifest themselves through an increase in the frequency of heat-waves in some regions and a decrease in the frequency of extremely cold events in others. A calculation of the change of risk attributable to anthropogenic factors (fraction of attributable risk, FAR) has been made for the European heat wave of 2003. It was estimated that, using a threshold that was exceeded in 2003, but no other year since 1851, that it is very likely (a better than 9 in 10 chance) that past human influence has more than doubled the risk of a regional scale heat wave of at least this magnitude (Figure 9.4.8). Changes in the probability and recurrence time of extreme temperatures, as well as extreme rainfall and storminess, are expected under climate change conditions, suggesting that this kind of quantitative risk analysis will become more important in the future.



1  
2 Since the TAR further evidence has accumulated that there has been a significant anthropogenic influence on  
3 free atmosphere temperature since measurement became available from radiosondes in the late 1950s. The  
4 influence of greenhouse gases on tropospheric temperatures has been detected as has the influence of  
5 stratospheric ozone depletion on stratospheric temperatures. The combination of a warming troposphere and  
6 a cooling stratosphere has led to an increase in the height of the tropopause and model data comparisons  
7 show that greenhouse gases and stratospheric ozone changes are likely largely responsible (Figure 9.4.9).  
8

9 Simulations of differential warming rates between the surface and the free atmosphere are inconsistent with  
10 some observational records. These possible discrepancies between modelled and observed lapse rates are  
11 largest in the tropics, where interpretation is critically dependent upon the observational dataset used in the  
12 comparison. The IPCC AR4 simulations are remarkably consistent in their predictions of tropical  
13 tropospheric changes, but only one observational estimate follows this behaviour. Both models and  
14 observations do show slow decadal changes in lapse rate (both positive and negative) particularly over the  
15 longer period of the radiosonde era. Further understanding of lapse rate changes will require a more  
16 systematic treatment of the full range of both modelling and observational uncertainty.  
17

## 18 **9.5 Understanding of Change in Other Variables during the Industrial Era**

19

20 Our objective in this section is to assess large-scale climate change in variables other than air temperature,  
21 including ocean climate changes, atmospheric circulation changes, precipitation changes, cryosphere  
22 changes and sea-level change. This section draws heavily on Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 8. Where possible, it  
23 attempts to identify links between changes in different variables, such as those that associate some aspects of  
24 sea-surface temperature change with precipitation change. It also discusses the role of external forcing,  
25 drawing where possible on formal detection studies.  
26

### 27 **9.5.1 Ocean Climate Change**

#### 28 *9.5.1.1 Ocean state changes*

29 Warming of the surface should lead, in time, to warming of the sub-surface ocean, and hence, due to thermal  
30 expansion, an increase in sea level. Since the TAR there has been an accumulation of evidence for climate  
31 change within the ocean, both at regional and global scales (Chapter 5). The overall heat content in the world  
32 ocean is estimated to have increased by  $14.5 \times 10^{22}$  J during the period 1955–1998 (Section 5.2.2; Fig. 5.2.1).  
33 This overall increase has been superimposed on estimated decadal variations of  $\pm 5 \times 10^{22}$  J. The fact that the  
34 ocean gained heat during the latter half of the 20th century is in itself, a strong argument for a net positive  
35 radiative forcing of the climate system. If the observed warming of the atmosphere (Chapter 3, Section 9.4)  
36 originated from natural internal sources of variability, then the source of the heat would have likely been the  
37 ocean given that it is by far the system's largest heat reservoir (Levitus et al., 2001; Figure 5.2.1). However,  
38 observations indicate that the ocean has been gaining, rather than losing, heat, suggesting an external rather  
39 than internal heat source. For a consistent explanation of observed changes, models should be able to  
40 simulate both the overall increase and capture the observed variability.  
41  
42

#### 43 *9.5.1.2 Heat content in ocean basins*

44 Levitus et al. (2000) presented evidence that there had been a warming of the world ocean in the second half  
45 of the 20th century (with evidence from geologic sources or earlier increases in ocean heat content; Section  
46 9.3; Crowley et al 2003). These estimates were subsequently updated to include additional data both for  
47 earlier and more recent years (Levitus et al, 2005) which resulted in a small revision downwards of the  
48 observed increase in ocean heat content (Section 5.2.2; Fig. 5.2.1).  
49

50 A number of studies have sought to understand the late 20th century changes, which Levitus et al. (2001)  
51 demonstrated were at least one order of magnitude larger than the increase in heat content of any other  
52 component of the earth's ocean-atmosphere-cryosphere system. Levitus et al. (2001) and Gregory et al  
53 (2004a) analysed simulations of the GFDL R30 and HadCM3 models respectively and showed that model  
54 simulations agree best with observed changes when the models include anthropogenic forcings from  
55 increasing greenhouse gas concentrations and sulphate aerosols. Gent and Danabasoglu (2004) showed that  
56 the observed trend could not be explained by natural internal variability as simulated by a long control run of  
57 the CCSM2 climate model. Barnett et al. (2001) and Reichert et al. (2002) used optimal detection analyses,

1 similar to those described in Section 9.4, to detect model simulated ocean climate change signals in the  
2 observed spatio-temporal patterns of ocean heat content across the ocean basins. All these analyses indicate a  
3 large anthropogenic component to the increasing trend in global ocean heat content. In contrast, changes in  
4 solar forcing can potentially explain only a small fraction of the observed increase in ocean heat content  
5 (Crowley et al., 2003). It is likely that cooling from natural (volcanic) and anthropogenic aerosols has slowed  
6 ocean warming; Delworth et al. (2005) find a delay of several decades and a reduction in magnitude of  
7 warming of approximately two thirds in simulations of the GFDL CM2 model including these forcings when  
8 compared to the response to increasing greenhouse gases alone, consistent with results based on an  
9 upwelling diffusion energy balance model (Crowley et al., 2003). Barnett et al. (2005) considered the  
10 detection implications of the revisions to the Levitus et al. (2000) ocean heat content data (Levitus et al.,  
11 2005) and found that the earlier conclusions of Barnett et al. (2001) were not affected.

12  
13 Barnett et al (2005) extended previous analyses of ocean heat content changes to a basin by basin analysis of  
14 the temporal evolution of temperature changes in the upper 700m of the ocean (see also Pierce et al., 2005).  
15 They report that whereas natural internal variability and naturally externally forced variability as simulated  
16 by the PCM are not capable of replicating the observed signal, ocean warming due to anthropogenic factors  
17 (including well mixed greenhouse gases and sulphate aerosols) are consistent with the observed changes and  
18 reproduce many of the different responses seen in the individual ocean basins (Figure 9.5.1). Repeating the  
19 analysis using the HadCM3 model supported their conclusions of a human induced warming of the world's  
20 oceans with a complex vertical and geographical structure that is simulated quite well by two AOGCMs.  
21 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.1 HERE]

22  
23 Although the overall increasing trend in ocean heat content is well explained by models, the decadal  
24 variability seen in Levitus et al. (2000) is not well reproduced by models. Gregory et al. (2004a) show that  
25 agreement between models and observations is better in the well-observed upper ocean (above 300m) in the  
26 Northern Hemisphere and that there is large sensitivity to the method of in-filling the observational dataset  
27 outside this well-observed region. They find a strong maximum in variability in the Levitus dataset at around  
28 500m depth that is not seen in HadCM3, a possible indication of model deficiency or alternatively an artefact  
29 in the Levitus data. AchutaRao et al. (2005) also find that the effects of sparse observational coverage and  
30 the method of infilling have significant impacts on the representativeness of the observed variability over  
31 much of the oceans.

### 32 33 9.5.1.3 *Sea level*

34 We present here a brief synthesis of sea level findings that are assessed in Section 5.5.7. Model simulations  
35 with anthropogenic forcings show a significant sea-level rise of between 0.2–0.6 mm/yr from thermal  
36 expansion and 0.2–0.3 mm/yr from glacier melt on average for the 20th century, roughly consistent with  
37 observational estimates of these terms. However, models systematically underestimate the observed sea-level  
38 rise of 1.5 to 2 mm/yr. After including estimates of smaller contributions, some of the observed rise still  
39 remains unexplained. Coupled model results indicate that natural forcings and warming before the mid-19th  
40 century are significant factors in explaining the overall evolution of sea-level rise during the 20th century.  
41 Simulations including these forcings show a fairly steady rate of rise during the 20th century, rather than the  
42 acceleration implied by anthropogenic forcings alone, for which there is no observational evidence.  
43 Anthropogenic forcings are estimated to be the largest contributor to the overall sea level rise during the 20th  
44 century.

### 45 46 9.5.1.4 *Water mass properties*

47 The ocean heat content analyses cited above are based on basin-integrated values for the different ocean  
48 basins, in part because observational coverage, particularly at lower levels in the ocean, remains thin.  
49 However some studies have attempted to investigate changes in three dimensional water mass properties  
50 (Section 5.3). Sub Antarctic mode water and the sub-tropical gyres have warmed in the Indian and Pacific  
51 basins since the 1960s and there has been a freshening of the salinity minimum layer in the Atlantic, Indian  
52 and Pacific oceans as well as a freshening of surface waters in the Atlantic (Curry et al., 2003). These  
53 changes in Antarctic Intermediate Water and North Pacific Intermediate Water are consistent with a global  
54 increase in the hydrological cycle with increased precipitation at high latitudes (Wong et al., 1999). This  
55 would suggest that the ocean might integrate rainfall changes to produce detectable salinity changes. Boyer  
56 et al. (2005) provided linear trend estimates of salinity for the World ocean from 1955 to 1998, indicating

1 salinification in the Antarctic Polar Frontal Zone around 40S and in the subtropical North Atlantic, and  
2 freshening in the sub-polar Atlantic (Figure 5.3.1; Figure 5.3.9; Figure 5.2.6).

3  
4 Care should be taken in interpreting sparse hydrographic data, since apparent trends could be aliased natural  
5 variability or the aliased effect of changing observational coverage. One such example concerns recent  
6 measurements of the southern Indian Ocean gyre along the WOCE 15 section. Sub Antarctic Mode Water  
7 (SAMW) in the South Indian Ocean was fresher on isopycnals in 1987 than in the 1960s, but in 2002 the  
8 salinity was again near to the 1960s values (Bindoff and McDougall, 2000; Bryden et al., 2003). Based on  
9 20th Century simulations with the HadCM3 model, it is not possible to reject the null hypothesis that the  
10 observed differences are due to internal variability (Stark et al., 2005). However the model suggests a long-  
11 term freshening trend in the 21st Century due to the large scale response to surface heating and hydrological  
12 changes (Banks et al., 2002). Banks and Bindoff (2003) show that Indo-Pacific water mass changes could  
13 provide a 'fingerprint' of anthropogenic climate change.

14  
15 One possible oceanic consequence of climate change is a slowing down or even halting of the thermohaline  
16 circulation. Freshening of North East Atlantic Deep Water has been observed (Curry et al., 2003; Dickson et  
17 al., 2002; Figure 5.3.15) and has been interpreted as being consistent with an enhanced hydrological cycle  
18 and a possible slowing down of the THC. Wu et al. (2004) show that the observed freshening trend is well  
19 reproduced by an ensemble of HadCM3 simulations that includes both anthropogenic and natural forcings  
20 but this freshening coincides with an upward rather than downward trend in the THC. Therefore this analysis  
21 is not consistent with an interpretation of the observed freshening trends in the North Atlantic as an early  
22 signal of a slow down of the thermohaline circulation. The North Atlantic freshening trend in the HadCM3  
23 simulations originates from the Arctic Ocean where there is a decrease in sea ice and an increase in river  
24 runoff. Wu et al. (2005a) show that observed increases in Arctic river flow (Peterson et al., 2002) are well  
25 simulated by HadCM3 and propose that this upward trend could be an early indicator of an anthropogenic  
26 intensification of the hydrological cycle, since this upward trend is not seen in HadCM3 simulations  
27 including just natural forcing factors. Therefore anthropogenic factors may be driving increases in river  
28 runoff into the Arctic but the relationship between this increased source of fresh water and freshening in the  
29 Labrador Sea and the link with the overturning circulation is not yet clear. Wu et al. (2005b) propose that  
30 recent freshening in the Labrador Sea could be driven by natural rather than anthropogenic forcings.  
31 Variability in the strength of the THC could also be associated with the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, a  
32 multi-decadal mode of variability (Knight et al., 2005).

### 33 34 **9.5.2 Atmospheric Circulation Changes**

35  
36 Natural low frequency variability of the climate system is dominated by a small number of large scale  
37 circulation patterns such as the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO), the Pacific Decadal Oscillation  
38 (PDO), and the Northern and Southern Annular Modes (NAM; SAM) (see Section 3.6). The extent to which  
39 these modes can be excited or altered by external forcing remains uncertain, but their impact on terrestrial  
40 climate on annual to decadal time scales can be profound. While at least some of these modes can be  
41 expected to change as a result of anthropogenic effects such as the enhanced greenhouse effect, there is little  
42 a priori theory indicating the direction or magnitude of such changes. Risbey et al. (2002) used models and  
43 synoptic-dynamical reasoning to assess likely changes in atmospheric circulation under enhanced  
44 greenhouse conditions. They determined that it was difficult, at this time, to confidently predict the likely  
45 change in features such as jet position or strength, or in the strength and extent of the Hadley Cell. This  
46 reduces the likelihood of successful detection and attribution of changes in circulation patterns.

#### 47 48 **9.5.2.1 El Niño Southern Oscillation/Pacific Decadal Oscillation**

49 El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is the leading mode of variability in the tropical Pacific, and it has  
50 impacts on climate around the globe (Section 3.6.2). There have been multidecadal oscillations in the ENSO  
51 index throughout the 20th century, with more intense El Niño events since the late 1970s, partly  
52 corresponding to a mean warming of the western equatorial Pacific (Mendelssohn et al., 2005). The 1998 El  
53 Niño was the strongest on record. Tett et al. (2005) found no significant response in the related Southern  
54 Oscillation Index to either anthropogenic or natural forcing in multi-century integrations of HadCM3. While  
55 some simulations of the response to anthropogenic influence have shown an increase in ENSO variability in  
56 response to greenhouse gas increases (Timmermann, 1999; Timmermann et al., 1999; Collins, 2000a), others  
57 have shown no change (e.g., Collins, 2000b). A recent survey of the simulated response to CO<sub>2</sub> doubling in

15 fifteen IPCC AR4 coupled climate models (Merryfield, 2005) found that three of the models exhibited significant increases in ENSO variability, five exhibited significant decreases and seven exhibited no significant change. Using a model which simulated an increase in variability, Timmerman (1999a) found no detectable change in ENSO variability in the observations. Thus as yet there is no detectable change in ENSO variability in the observations, and no consistent picture of how it might be expected to change in response to anthropogenic forcing.

Decadal variability in the North Pacific is characterised by variations in the strength of the Aleutian Low coupled to changes in North Pacific SST (Section 3.6.3.1). The leading mode of decadal variability in the North Pacific is usually referred to as the PDO, and has a spatial structure in the atmosphere and upper North Pacific Ocean similar to the pattern that is associated with ENSO (Latif and Barnett, 1994; Mantua et al., 1997; Zhang et al., 1997; Deser et al., 2004). However, the time-series corresponding to the PDO is more heavily influenced by variability at decadal and longer time-scales than are traditional ENSO indices (Mantua et al., 1997; Newman et al., 2003). Recent work suggests that the PDO is the North Pacific expression of an ENSO-like pattern of variability called the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation or IPO (Folland et al., 2002; Deser et al., 2004). It is presently not clear to what extent the PDO or IPO is physically different from tropical Pacific variability in El Niño, and also to what extent extratropical influences play a role (e.g., Newman et al., 2003; Liu et al., 2002; Wu et al., 2003).

The PDO/IPO is an internally generated mode of climate variability associated with variability that shows large-scale influences in both models and observations (e.g., Salinger et al., 2001; Deser et al., 2004; Vimont et al., 2002; Arblaster et al., 2002; Reason and Roualt, 2002; Yukimoto et al., 2000; Pierce et al., 2000; Shiogama et al., 2005). Like ENSO, the PDO/IPO influences hemispheric and global average surface temperature (Pan and Oort, 1983; Meehl et al., 1998; Bratcher and Giese, 2002), as well as many aspects of regional climate, such as Amazonian rainfall (Marengo, 2004) and Northern Hemisphere terrestrial rainfall (Deser et al., 2004). One recent study identified an anthropogenic influence on the PDO based on simulations of the MIROC model (Shiogama et al., 2005).

#### 9.5.2.2 *North Atlantic Oscillation / Northern Annular Mode*

The Northern Annular Mode (NAM) is an approximately zonally symmetric mode of variability in the Northern Hemisphere (Thompson and Wallace, 1998), and the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) (Hurrell, 1996) may be viewed as its Atlantic counterpart (Section 3.6.4). The NAM index exhibited a pronounced trend towards its positive phase between the 1960s and the 1990s, corresponding to a decrease in surface pressure over the Arctic and an increase over the subtropical North Atlantic (Hurrell, 1996; Thompson et al., 2000; Gillett et al., 2003a). Several studies have shown this trend to be inconsistent with simulated internal variability (Osborn et al., 1999; Gillett et al., 2000; Gillett et al., 2002a; Osborn, 2004; Gillett, 2005). Although the NAM index has decreased somewhat since its peak in the mid-1990s, the trend calculated over recent decades remains significant at the 5% significance level compared to simulated internal variability in most models (Osborn, 2004; Gillett, 2005), although one study found that the NAO index trend was marginally consistent with internal variability in one model (Selten et al., 2004).

Most climate models simulate some increase in the NAM in response to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases (Fyfe et al., 1999; Paeth et al., 1999; Shindell et al., 1999; Gillett et al., 2003a, b; Osborn, 2004; Rauthe et al., 2004), although the simulated trend is generally smaller than that observed (Gillett et al., 2002a; Gillett et al., 2003b; Osborn, 2004; Gillett, 2005; and see Figure 9.5.2). Simulated sea level pressure changes are generally found to project more strongly onto the hemispheric NAM index than onto a two-station NAO index (Gillett et al., 2002a; Osborn, 2004; Rauthe et al., 2004). Some studies have postulated an influence of ozone depletion (Volodin and Galin, 1999; Shindell et al., 2001b), changes in solar irradiance (Shindell et al., 2001b), and volcanic eruptions (Kirchner et al., 1999; Shindell et al., 2001b; Stenchikov et al., 2005), and on the Northern Annular Mode. Stenchikov et al. (2005) examined changes in sea level pressure following nine volcanic eruptions in 20C3M simulations of the IPCC AR4 ensemble, and found that the models simulated a positive NAM response to the volcanoes, albeit one that was smaller than that observed. However, ozone, solar and volcanic forcing changes are generally not found to have made a large contribution to the observed NAM trend over recent decades (Shindell et al., 2001b; Gillett et al., 2003b). Simulations incorporating all the major anthropogenic and natural forcings from the IPCC AR4 20C3M ensemble generally showed some increase in the NAM over the latter part of the 20th century (Miller et al., 2005; Gillett, 2005; and see Figure 9.5.2), though the simulated trend is in all cases smaller than that

1 observed, indicating inconsistency between simulated and observed trends at the 5% significance level  
2 (Gillett, 2005).

3  
4 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.2 HERE]

5  
6 The mechanisms underlying Northern Hemisphere circulation changes remain open to debate. Simulations in  
7 which observed SST changes were prescribed either globally or in the tropics alone were able to capture  
8 around half of the recent trend towards the positive phase of the NAO (Hurrell et al., 2005; Hoerling et al.,  
9 2001), suggesting that the trend may in part relate to SST changes, particularly over the Indian Ocean  
10 (Hoerling et al., 2005b). Another simulation in which a realistic trend in stratospheric winds was prescribed  
11 was able to reproduce the observed trend in the NAO (Scaife et al., 2005). Rind et al. (2005a, 2005b) find  
12 that both stratospheric changes and changes in SST can force changes in the NAM and NAO, with changes  
13 in tropical SSTs being the dominant forcing mechanism.

14  
15 Over the period 1968–1997, the trend in the NAM was associated with approximately 50% of the winter  
16 surface warming in Eurasia, due to increased advection of maritime air onto the continent, but only a small  
17 fraction (16%) of the NH extratropical annual mean warming trend (Thompson et al., 2000). It was also  
18 associated with a decrease in winter precipitation over Southern Europe and an increase over Northern  
19 Europe, due the northward displacement of the storm track (Thompson et al., 2000).

#### 20 21 9.5.2.3 *Southern Annular Mode*

22 The Southern Annular Mode (SAM) is more zonally-symmetric than its Northern Hemisphere counterpart  
23 (Thompson and Wallace, 2000) (Section 3.6.5). It too has exhibited a pronounced upward trend over the past  
24 thirty years, corresponding to a decrease in surface pressure over the Antarctic and an increase over the  
25 Southern midlatitudes (Figure 9.5.2). An upward trend in the SAM has occurred in all seasons, but the  
26 largest trend has been observed during the southern summer (Thompson et al., 2000; Marshall, 2003).  
27 Marshall et al. (2004) show that observed trends in the SAM are not consistent with simulated internal  
28 variability in HadCM3, suggesting an external cause. By contrast, Jones and Widmann (2004) develop a 95-  
29 year reconstruction of the SAM index based largely on mid-latitude pressure measurements, and find that the  
30 recent upward trend in the SAM is not unprecedented, suggesting it may have a natural cause. However,  
31 reconstructions from 1958 using additional data indicate that the recent peak is unprecedented (Marshall et  
32 al., 2004).

33  
34 Based on an analysis of the structure and seasonality of the observed trends in Southern Hemisphere  
35 circulation, Thompson and Solomon (2002) suggest that they have been induced by stratospheric ozone  
36 depletion. Several modelling studies simulate an upward trend in the SAM in response to stratospheric ozone  
37 depletion (Sexton, 2001; Gillett and Thompson, 2003; Marshall et al., 2004; Shindell and Schmidt, 2004;  
38 Arblaster and Meehl, 2005; Miller et al., 2005), particularly in the southern summer. Stratospheric ozone  
39 depletion cools and strengthens the Antarctic stratospheric vortex in spring, and observations and models  
40 indicate that this strengthening of the stratospheric westerlies can be communicated downwards into the  
41 troposphere (Thompson and Solomon, 2002; Gillett and Thompson, 2003), probably by changes to the  
42 propagation of planetary waves, although radiative effects may also play a role (Solomon et al., 2005). While  
43 ozone depletion may be the dominant cause of the trends, other studies have indicated that greenhouse gas  
44 increases have also likely contributed (Fyfe et al., 1999; Stone et al., 2001; Kushner et al., 2001; Cai et al.,  
45 2003; Marshall et al., 2004; Shindell and Schmidt, 2004; Arblaster and Meehl, 2005; Stone and Fyfe, 2005).  
46 During the Southern summer, the trend in the SAM has been associated with the observed increase in the  
47 circumpolar westerly winds over the Southern Ocean by  $\sim 3 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ , cooling of the Antarctic interior, and part  
48 of the warming of the Antarctic Peninsula (Thompson and Solomon, 2002; Carril et al., 2005), though other  
49 factors are also likely to have contributed to this warming (Vaughan et al., 2001).

#### 50 51 9.5.2.4 *Sea level pressure detection and attribution*

52 Trends in sea level pressure changes may be assessed globally by applying optimal fingerprinting techniques  
53 similar to those which have been applied to temperature. Global December–February sea level pressure  
54 changes observed over the past fifty years have been shown to be inconsistent with simulated internal  
55 variability (Gillett et al., 2003b; Gillett et al., 2005), but are consistent with the simulated response to  
56 greenhouse gas, stratospheric ozone, sulphate aerosol, volcanic aerosol and solar irradiance changes based on  
57 a detection and attribution analysis using 20C3M simulations of eight IPCC AR4 coupled models (Gillett et

1 al., 2005) (Figure 9.5.2). However, this result is dominated by the Southern Hemisphere, where the inclusion  
2 of stratospheric ozone depletion leads to consistency between simulated and observed sea level pressure  
3 changes. By contrast in the Northern Hemisphere simulated sea level pressure trends are much smaller than  
4 those observed (Gillett, 2005).

5  
6 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.2 HERE]

#### 7 8 9.5.2.5 *Monsoon circulation*

9 The current understanding of climate change in the monsoon regions remains one of considerable uncertainty  
10 with respect to circulation and precipitation (Sections 3.7.1 and 9.5.3.2). The Asian monsoon circulation in  
11 the IPCC AR4 models was found to decrease by 15% by the late 21st century, according to the ensemble  
12 mean of the IPCC model simulations (Tanaka et al., 2005; Ueda et al., 2005), but trends during the 20th  
13 century were not examined. Ramanathan et al. (2005) simulated a pronounced weakening of the Asian  
14 monsoon circulation between 1985 and 2000 in response to black carbon aerosol increases. Chase et al.  
15 (2003) examined changes in several indices of four major tropical monsoonal circulations (South-eastern  
16 Asia, western Africa, eastern Africa, and the Australia/Maritime Continent) for the period 1950–1998. In  
17 each region they found a consistent picture of significantly diminished monsoonal circulation, although this  
18 result is uncertain due to changes in the observing system affecting the NCEP reanalysis (Section 3.7.1). So  
19 the results of Chase et al are not inconsistent with the expectation (Tanaka et al., 2005; Ramanathan et al.,  
20 2005) of weakening monsoons due to anthropogenic factors, but further model and empirical studies are  
21 required to confirm this.

#### 22 23 9.5.2.6 *Tropical cyclones*

24 The active North Atlantic hurricane season of 2004, and the unusual development of a large cyclonic system  
25 in the subtropical South Atlantic that hit the coast of southern Brazil in March 2004 (e.g., Pezza and  
26 Simmonds, 2005), led to raised public and media interest in the possible effects of climate change on tropical  
27 cyclone activity. The TAR concluded that there was “no compelling evidence to indicate that the  
28 characteristics of tropical and extratropical storms have changed”, but that an increase in tropical peak wind  
29 intensities was likely to occur in some areas with an enhanced greenhouse effect (see also Box 3.4, which  
30 discusses processes affecting tropical cyclone formation, frequency, and intensity, and Trenberth, 2005).  
31 Recent modelling studies continue to support this conclusion. Knutson et al. (2001) suggest that maximum  
32 surface wind speeds may increase by about 5% under CO<sub>2</sub> doubling, although Michaels et al. (2005) suggest  
33 that this may be an over-estimate. Knutson and Tuleya (2004) demonstrate that this result is robust across a  
34 range of choices for the CGCM that is used to set the environment for hurricane simulations and the  
35 convection parameterization used in those simulations. However, Sugi et al. (2002), in a time slice  
36 experiment with a T106 atmospheric model, suggest that tropical cyclone frequency may decrease in  
37 response to future greenhouse gas forcing. McDonald et al. (2005) and Oouchi et al. (2005) obtain similar  
38 results in time slice experiments with high resolution atmospheric models with prescribed SST and  
39 anthropogenic forcing changes. Wu and Wang (2004) examine the likely changes in large-scale  
40 environmental flows and suggest that western North Pacific tropical cyclone tracks may shift slightly south-  
41 westward over the next three decades. A fine-resolution model study by Walsh et al. (2004) suggested that  
42 the numbers of tropical cyclones near Australia would not change greatly under enhanced greenhouse  
43 conditions, but that the number of intense systems may increase, particularly at higher latitudes.

44  
45 There continues to be little evidence of any trend in the observed total frequency of global tropical cyclones,  
46 at least up until the late 1990s (e.g., Solow and Moore, 2002; Elsener et al., 2004; Pielke et al., 2005;  
47 Webster et al., 2005). Bister and Emanuel (2002) found generally positive trends in tropical cyclone potential  
48 intensity (a measure of the maximum intensity expected of tropical systems) based on reanalysis data, but  
49 Free et al. (2004), using radiosonde data from tropical islands, found no consistent trend from 1975 to 1995  
50 in either the Pacific nor the Caribbean. Trenberth (2005) suggests that there has been some increase in heavy  
51 rainfall associated with hurricanes affecting the southeast United States, due to changes in the environmental  
52 conditions in which hurricanes are embedded. Emanuel (2005) reports a marked increase since the mid-  
53 1970s of an index of the destructiveness of tropical cyclones (essentially an integral, over the lifetime of the  
54 cyclone, of the cube of the maximum wind speed) in the western North Pacific and North Atlantic. This  
55 index is closely related to tropical sea surface temperatures, including oscillations such as ENSO and the  
56 NAO as well as the strong warming since the mid-1970s, suggesting that the increased destructiveness may  
57 be partly the result of warming. The changes appear to have been the result of increases in both the duration

1 of cyclones and their peak intensity. Webster et al. (2005) found a strong increase in the number and  
2 proportion of the most intense tropical cyclones over the past 35 years. Nonetheless, detection and attribution  
3 of observed changes in hurricane intensity or frequency to external influences remains difficult given the  
4 small relative increase in intensity expected from a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> (Pielke et al., 2005), and the lack of a  
5 strong consistent signal in the changes in cyclone numbers in model experiments under enhanced greenhouse  
6 conditions, (Knutson and Tuleya, 2004; Walsh, 2004).

#### 8 9.5.2.7 *Extra-tropical cyclones*

9 Simulations of the 20th century in the IPCC coupled model ensemble generally show a decrease in the total  
10 number of extratropical cyclones in both hemispheres, but an increase in the number of the most intense  
11 events when compared to pre-industrial control simulations (Lambert and Fyfe, 2005). Similar changes were  
12 seen in earlier model studies (Fyfe, 2003; Geng and Sugi, 2003), and in the ERA-40 reanalysis, though these  
13 are not statistically significant.

14  
15 Recent observational studies of winter Northern Hemisphere storms have found a poleward shift in storm  
16 tracks and increased storm intensity, but a decrease in total storm numbers, in the second half of the 20th  
17 century (Section 3.5.3). Analysis of observed wind and significant wave height suggests an increase in storm  
18 activity in the Northern Hemisphere. In the Southern Hemisphere, the storm track has also shifted poleward,  
19 with increases in the radius and depth of storms, but decreases in their frequency. These features appear to be  
20 associated with the observed trends in the Southern and Northern Annular Modes. However, the reanalyses  
21 from which the observed changes have been deduced have problems due to changes in observing systems,  
22 thus we cannot yet conclude that an anthropogenic effect on mid-latitude storm tracks has been detected.

### 24 9.5.3 *Precipitation*

#### 26 9.5.3.1 *Changes in atmospheric water vapour*

27 As climate warms, the amount of moisture in the atmosphere is expected to rise (Trenberth et al., 2005),  
28 since saturation vapour pressure increases with temperature according to the Clausius-Clapeyron equation.  
29 Radiosonde observations of water vapour over Northern Hemisphere land generally indicate increasing  
30 trends in specific humidity (Section 3.4.2.1). Satellite (SSM/I) measurements of water vapour since 1988 are  
31 of higher quality than either radiosonde or reanalysis data (Trenberth et al., 2005) and show a statistically  
32 significant upward trend in precipitable (column-integrated) water of  $0.40 \pm 0.09$  mm per decade averaged  
33 over global oceans (Section 3.4.2.2). Soden et al. (2005) demonstrated that these observed changes are well  
34 simulated in the GFDL atmosphere model with prescribed SSTs (Figure 9.5.3), including the upward trend.  
35 The simulation and observations both show common low frequency variability, which is largely associated  
36 with ENSO. Soden et al. (2005) also demonstrated that upper-tropospheric changes in water vapour are  
37 realistically simulated by their model, indicating that the water vapour feedback is realistically simulated.

38  
39 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.3 HERE]

#### 41 9.5.3.2 *Global precipitation changes*

42 The increased atmospheric moisture content associated with warming might be expected to lead to increased  
43 global mean precipitation. However, precipitation is also strongly influenced by changes in the tropospheric  
44 energy budget and the atmospheric circulation, so spatio-temporal patterns of precipitation change are likely  
45 to be complex. Global terrestrial annual mean precipitation showed a small upward trend over the 20th  
46 century of approximately 2.1 mm/decade based on GHCN data (Section 3.3.2.1). However, the record is  
47 characterised by large interdecadal variability, and global terrestrial annual mean precipitation based on the  
48 New et al. (2000) record shows almost no trend since 1940 (Figure 9.5.4).

##### 50 9.5.3.2.1 *Detection of external influence on precipitation*

51 Several studies have demonstrated that simulated terrestrial precipitation in climate model integrations  
52 including both natural and anthropogenic forcings is significantly correlated with that observed (Allen and  
53 Ingram, 2002; Lambert et al., 2004; Gillett et al., 2004b), thereby detecting external influence in  
54 observations of precipitation. Lambert et al. (2005) examine simulated precipitation changes in simulations  
55 of nine IPCC AR4 coupled models including anthropogenic and natural forcing (Figure 9.5.4). Using five of  
56 the models they find a detectable response to external forcing in the observations, although in two cases the  
57 residual variance is unrealistically large. Lambert et al. (2004) further demonstrate using HadCM3 that the

1 response to shortwave, but not longwave forcing is detectable in observations. Gillett et al. (2004b) similarly  
2 demonstrate that the terrestrial precipitation response to volcanic forcing simulated by the PCM is detectable  
3 in observations. These results therefore suggest that natural forcings such as volcanic aerosol are likely to  
4 have had a larger influence on precipitation than have greenhouse gas changes thus far, and this is consistent  
5 with simulations of the response to volcanic forcing (Robock and Liu, 1994; Broccoli et al., 2003).  
6 Simulations and observations indicate that global precipitation decreases by approximately 1 to 3%  
7 following large volcanic eruptions (Robock and Liu, 1994; Broccoli et al., 2003). Lambert et al. (2005)  
8 report that all nine models they examine underestimate the variance of terrestrial precipitation compared to  
9 that observed, consistent with earlier findings (Gillett et al., 2004b; Lambert et al., 2004). It is unclear  
10 whether this discrepancy results principally from an underestimated response to shortwave forcing (Gillett et  
11 al., 2004b), underestimated internal variability, or errors in the observations.

12  
13 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.4 HERE]

14  
15 Mitchell et al. (1987) argue that precipitation changes are controlled primarily by the energy budget of the  
16 troposphere where the latent heat of condensation is balanced by radiative cooling. Warming the troposphere  
17 enhances the cooling rate, thereby increasing precipitation, but this may be partly offset by a decrease in the  
18 efficiency of the cooling due to greenhouse gas increases (Allen and Ingram, 2002; Yang et al., 2003;  
19 Lambert et al., 2004; Sugi and Yoshimura, 2004). Yang et al. (2003) and Sugi and Yoshimura (2004)  
20 demonstrated that in a climate model with doubled CO<sub>2</sub> but fixed sea surface temperatures, the rate of  
21 radiative cooling is decreased by the increased CO<sub>2</sub>, while the temperature of the atmosphere remains  
22 constrained by the fixed lower boundary, leading to a reduction in precipitation. This mechanism therefore  
23 explains why precipitation responds more to changes in shortwave forcing than longwave forcing, since  
24 shortwave forcings, such as volcanic aerosol, alter the temperature of the troposphere without affecting the  
25 efficiency of radiative cooling. It also explains why anthropogenic influence is not yet detectable in  
26 measurements of global mean precipitation (Gillett et al., 2004b; Ziegler et al., 2003). However, Lambert et  
27 al. (2004) urge caution in applying the energy budget argument to land-only data, where they argue that the  
28 availability of moisture is in many cases more important than the energy budget of the troposphere for  
29 controlling precipitation.

30  
31 Gedney et al. (2005) attributed increased continental runoff in the latter decades of the 20th century to  
32 suppression of transpiration due to CO<sub>2</sub>-induced stomatal closure. They found that observed climate changes  
33 (including precipitation changes) were insufficient to explain the increased run-off.

34  
35 Burke and Brown (2005), using the HadCM3 model with all natural and anthropogenic external forcings and  
36 a global Palmer Drought Severity Index dataset compiled from observations by Dai et al. (2004), were able  
37 to simulate the observed increases in the global frequency of droughts in the second half of the 20th century,  
38 although the model trend was weaker than that observed. The model also simulated some aspects of the  
39 regional pattern of drought trends, such as the observed strong trends across much of Africa and southern  
40 Asia, but not others (such as the trend to wetter conditions in Brasil and northwest Australia). While this was  
41 not a formal detection study, it does suggest that the observed global trend towards increased droughtiness in  
42 the second half of the 20th century is at least partly due to external forcings, although the relative  
43 contributions of natural external forcings and anthropogenic forcings has not been assessed.

#### 44 45 9.5.3.2.2 *Changes in extreme precipitation*

46 Climatological data show that the most intense precipitation occurs in warm regions (Easterling et al., 2000).  
47 Also, diagnostic analyses have shown that even without any change in total precipitation, higher  
48 temperatures lead to a greater proportion of total precipitation in heavy and very heavy events (Karl and  
49 Trenberth, 2003). In addition, Groisman et al. (1999) have demonstrated empirically, and Katz (1999)  
50 theoretically, that as precipitation increases a greater proportion falls in heavy and very heavy events if the  
51 frequency remains constant. Similar characteristics are anticipated under global warming (IPCC, 2001;  
52 Semenov and Bengtsson, 2002; Trenberth et al., 2003). Trenberth et al. (2005) point out that since the  
53 amount of moisture in the atmosphere is likely to rise much faster (as a consequence of rising temperatures)  
54 than the total precipitation, this should lead to an increase in the intensity of storms, offset by decreases in  
55 duration or frequency of events.



1 Model results also suggest that future changes in precipitation extremes will likely be greater than changes in  
2 mean precipitation (see, for example, Meehl et al., 2000; Kharin and Zwiers, 2000, 2005; Kharin et al., 2005;  
3 Semenov and Bengtsson, 2002; Groisman et al., 2005; Pall et al., 2005; Emori and Brown, 2005). Simulated  
4 changes in globally averaged annual mean and extreme precipitation appear to be quite consistent between  
5 models. Allen and Ingram (2002) suggest that while mean precipitation is constrained by the energy budget  
6 of the troposphere, extreme precipitation is constrained by its moisture content, as predicted by the Clausius-  
7 Clapeyron equation: For a given change in temperature they therefore predict a larger change in extreme  
8 precipitation than in mean precipitation. This Clausius-Clapeyron constraint was found to apply well in  
9 HadCM3 (Pall et al., 2005). Consistent with these findings, Emori and Brown (2005) discuss physical  
10 mechanisms governing changes in the dynamic and thermodynamic components of mean and extreme  
11 precipitation and conclude that changes related to the dynamic component (i.e., that due to circulation  
12 change) are secondary in explaining the general increase in extreme precipitation that is seen in models.  
13 Meehl et al. (2005), while not specifically concerned with extreme precipitation, demonstrate that tropical  
14 precipitation intensity increases due to increases in water vapour, while mid-latitude intensity increases are  
15 related to circulation changes that affect the distribution of increased water vapour. A model-model detection  
16 study, in which fingerprints from one model were used to detect precipitation change in simulations from  
17 another model, suggests that changes in heavy precipitation (i.e., the magnitude of events that occur a few  
18 times per year) may be more robustly detectable using signals from different models than changes in annual  
19 total rainfall (Hegerl et al., 2004). This is mainly because precipitation extremes increase over a large  
20 fraction of the globe in both models, whereas total precipitation exhibits a more model-dependent spatial  
21 pattern of increases and decreases.

22  
23 Evidence for changes in observations of short-duration precipitation extremes vary with the region  
24 considered (Alexander et al., 2005) and the analysis method that is employed (IPCC, 2001; Section 3.8.2.2).  
25 Significant increases in observed extreme precipitation have been reported over some parts of the world, for  
26 example over the United States, where the increase is similar to changes expected under greenhouse  
27 warming (e.g., Karl and Knight, 1998; Semenov and Bengtsson, 2002; Groisman et al., 2005). However, a  
28 quantitative comparison between area-based extreme events simulated in models and station data remains  
29 difficult because of the different scales involved (Osborn and Hulme, 1997). A first attempt was made based  
30 on Frich et al. (2002) indices, using fingerprints from atmospheric model simulations with prescribed sea  
31 surface temperature and a bootstrap method for significance testing (Kiktev et al., 2003). This study  
32 indicated that patterns of simulated and observed rainfall extremes bear little similarity. This is in contrast to  
33 the qualitative similarity found in other studies (Semenov and Bengtsson, 2002; Groisman et al., 2005).  
34 Tebaldi et al. (2005) reported that eight GCMs run for the IPCC AR4 showed general agreement of a trend  
35 towards greater frequency of heavy-precipitation events over the past four decades, most coherently in the  
36 high latitudes of the Northern hemisphere.

### 37 38 9.5.3.3 *Regional precipitation changes*

39 Regional trends in precipitation are likely to exhibit strong spatial variations, even if global precipitation  
40 increases somewhat as a result of warming, because of the dependence of precipitation on atmospheric  
41 circulation. Trends in observed annual precipitation during the period 1901 to 2003 are shown in Figure  
42 3.3.2 for regions in which data is available. Annual mean precipitation increased over most of North and  
43 South America, although negative trends were observed in some regions such as the south-western United  
44 States and parts of the western coast of the South America (Marengo et al., 2004). Over Europe, precipitation  
45 has increased in the north and decreased in the south, and over Australia it has increased over much of the  
46 continent but decreased in the southwest. Very large negative trends in regional annual precipitation  
47 occurred over Africa, particularly over the Sahel region. Although anthropogenic influence has not been  
48 detected in spatial patterns of precipitation change, Milly et al. (2005) demonstrated that observed 20th  
49 century changes in runoff are significantly correlated with those simulated in a subset of nine of the IPCC  
50 20th century simulations. However, runoff also depends on evaporation, thus this result does not reflect  
51 changes in precipitation alone but also may reflect changes in transpiration by plants in response to changes  
52 in CO<sub>2</sub> (Gedney et al., 2005).

#### 53 54 9.5.3.3.1 *Sahel drought*

55 Rainfall decreased substantially across the Sahel from the 1950s until at least the late 1980s (Dai et al., 2004;  
56 Figure 9.5.5). There has been a partial recovery since about 1990, although rainfall has not returned to levels  
57 typical of the period 1920–1965. Three main hypotheses have been proposed as a cause of the extended

1 drought (Zeng, 2003): overgrazing and conversion of woodland to agriculture increasing surface albedo and  
2 reducing moisture supply to the atmosphere, large-scale atmospheric circulation changes related to global sea  
3 surface temperature changes, and internal variability (Nicholson, 2001). Taylor et al. (2002) examined the  
4 impact of land use change with a GCM forced only by estimates of land use change since 1961. They  
5 simulated a small decrease in Sahel rainfall (around 5% by 1996) and concluded that the impacts of recent  
6 land use changes are not large enough to have been the principal cause of the Sahel drought. Several recent  
7 studies have demonstrated that simulations with a range of atmospheric models using prescribed observed  
8 SSTs are able to reproduce observed decadal variations in Sahel rainfall (Giannini, 2003; Rowell, 2003;  
9 Bader and Latif, 2003; Held et al., 2005; Haarsma et al., 2005; Hoerling et al., 2005a; see also Figure 9.5.5) ,  
10 consistent with earlier findings (Folland et al., 1986). These studies differ somewhat in terms of which ocean  
11 SSTs they find to be most important: Gianni et al (2003) and Bader and Latif (2003) emphasize the role of  
12 tropical Indian Ocean warming, Hoerling et al. (2005a) attribute the drying trend to a progressive warming of  
13 the South Atlantic relative to the North Atlantic, and Rowell et al. (2003) ascribe decadal variations in Sahel  
14 rainfall largely to variations in Mediterranean SST. Based on a multi-model ensemble of coupled model  
15 simulations Hoerling et al. (2005a) concluded that the observed drying trend in the Sahel is not consistent  
16 with simulated internal variability alone or with the simulated response to greenhouse gas forcing alone.

17  
18 [INSERT FIGURE 9.5.5 HERE]

19  
20 Thus recent research indicates that sea surface temperatures are likely to have been the dominant influence  
21 on rainfall in the Sahel, rather than land use changes (Taylor et al., 2002). But what has caused the changes  
22 in sea surface temperatures? Rotstayn and Lohmann (2002) proposed that spatially-varying, anthropogenic  
23 sulphate aerosol forcing (both direct and indirect) can alter low-latitude atmospheric circulation leading to a  
24 decline in Sahel rainfall. They found a southward shift of tropical rainfall due to a hemispheric asymmetry in  
25 the sea surface temperature response to changes in cloud albedo and lifetime in a model experiment forced  
26 with recent anthropogenic changes in sulphate aerosol. Williams et al. (2001) also found a southward shift of  
27 tropical rainfall as a response to the indirect effect of sulphate aerosol. The results to date therefore suggest  
28 that sulphate aerosol changes may have led to reduced warming of the northern tropical oceans which in turn  
29 led to the decrease in Sahel rainfall, possibly enhanced through land-atmosphere interaction, though a full  
30 attribution analysis has yet to be applied. Held et al. (2005) showed that historical coupled simulations with  
31 the GFDL-CM2.0 and CM2.1 models both exhibit drying trends over the Sahel in the second half of the 20th  
32 century, which they ascribe to a combination of greenhouse gas and sulphate aerosol changes. The ensemble  
33 mean does not reproduce the magnitude of the observed drought in the 1980s, but one of the ensemble  
34 members does approximately do so. The spatial pattern of the trends in rainfall also shows some agreement  
35 with observations. However, their results are in contrast to most of the IPCC AR4 20C3M simulations,  
36 which generally show little change or a small increase in future Sahel rainfall in response to anthropogenic  
37 forcing (Haarsma et al., 2005).

#### 38 39 9.5.3.3.2 *Southwest Australian drought*

40 Early winter (May–July) rainfall in the far southwest of Australia declined by about 15% in the mid-1970s  
41 (IOCI, 2002). Rainfall has remained low subsequently. The rainfall decrease was accompanied by a change  
42 in large-scale atmospheric circulation in the surrounding region (Timbal, 2004). The circulation and  
43 precipitation changes are somewhat consistent with, but larger than, those simulated by climate models in  
44 response to increases in greenhouse gas concentration. IOCI (2005) conclude that land cover change could  
45 not be the primary cause of the rainfall decrease, and re-affirm the conclusion of IOCI (2002) that both  
46 natural variability and the enhanced greenhouse effect probably contributed to the rainfall decrease.

47  
48 Some authors have suggested that the decrease in rainfall is related to changes in the Southern Annular Mode  
49 (SAM), with a decrease in SW Australian rainfall associated with a southward shift in the storm track, and  
50 anomalously high mid-latitude atmospheric pressure (e.g., Karoly, 2003). Several modelling studies have  
51 shown that this change in the SAM may be a response to stratospheric ozone depletion, greenhouse gas  
52 increases, or a combination of both (see Section 9.5.2.3). However, the largest SAM trend has occurred  
53 during the southern hemisphere summer (December–March; Thompson et al., 2000; Marshall et al., 2004),  
54 while the largest rainfall decrease has occurred in early winter (May–July). Thus it remains unclear how  
55 important this circulation trend has been for the Southwest Australian drought. Timbal et al. (2005) detect an  
56 anthropogenic influence in SW Australian precipitation, using climate change signals that were downscaled  
57 from the PCM. However, such local detection results should be treated with caution in the absence of

1 evidence of an anthropogenic influence on precipitation on global scales where, presumably, signal to noise  
2 ratios would be larger.

#### 3 4 *9.5.3.3.3 Monsoon precipitation*

5 Observations show that overall South Asian, North African and North American monsoon precipitation  
6 decreased somewhat in the mid-1970s (Section 3.7.1). The TAR (IPCC, 2001, pp 568) concluded that an  
7 increase in SE Asian summer monsoon precipitation is simulated in response to greenhouse gas increases in  
8 climate models, but that this effect is reduced by an increase in sulphate aerosols, which tend to decrease  
9 monsoon precipitation. Since then, additional modelling studies have come to conflicting conclusions  
10 regarding changes in monsoon precipitation (Lal and Singh, 2001; Douville et al., 2002; Maynard et al.,  
11 2002; Wang and Lau, 2003; May, 2004, Wardle and Smith, 2004; see also Section 9.5.2.5). However, by  
12 simulating the effects of black carbon aerosol, Ramanathan et al. (2005) were able to simulate realistic  
13 changes in Indian monsoon rainfall, particularly a decrease which occurred between 1950 and 1970. In both  
14 the observations and model, these changes were associated with a decreased SST gradient over the Indian  
15 Ocean, and an increase in tropospheric stability. These changes in the monsoon were not simulated in  
16 simulations with greenhouse gas and sulphate aerosol changes only.

### 17 18 *9.5.4 Cryosphere Changes*

19  
20 Widespread warming would, in the absence of other countervailing effects, be expected to lead to declines in  
21 sea ice, snow, and glacier and ice-sheet extent and thickness.

#### 22 23 *9.5.4.1 Sea ice*

24 The annual mean area of Arctic sea ice has decreased by about 2.4% per decade over the past quarter  
25 century, with stronger declines in summertime than winter (Johannessen et al., 2004; Chapter 4). There has  
26 also been some thinning of the ice, although the amount of thinning is still in dispute (Johannessen et al.,  
27 2004). Gregory et al. (2002b) in a four-member ensemble of integrations of HadCM3 with forcings due to all  
28 major anthropogenic and natural climate factors, simulated a decline in Arctic sea ice extent of about 2.5%  
29 per decade over the period 1970–1999, which is close to the decline observed. Gregory et al. (2002b)  
30 concluded that internal variability and natural forcings (solar and volcanic) are “very unlikely by themselves  
31 to have caused a trend of this size”. Johannessen et al. (2004) conducted similar integrations with the  
32 ECHAM4 model and concluded “there are strong indications that neither the Arctic warming trend nor the  
33 decrease in ice extent and volume over the last two decades can be explained by natural processes alone”.

34  
35 Gregory et al. (2002b) also found a decline in Antarctic sea ice extent in their model, whereas there is no  
36 record of such a decline in the observations since at least 1973. They suggested that the lack of consistency  
37 between the observed and modelled decline might reflect an unrealistic simulation of regional warming  
38 around Antarctica, rather than a deficiency in the ice model. Shindell and Schmidt (2004), using the GISS  
39 model forced by ozone and greenhouse gas changes, simulated a December-May cooling of Antarctica over  
40 the period 1979-2000, more consistent with the observations of temperature and the lack of a decline in sea  
41 ice extent.

#### 42 43 *9.5.4.2 Snow*

44 Snow cover in the Northern Hemisphere, as measured from satellites, has declined substantially in the past  
45 30 years, particularly from early spring through summer (Diaz et al., 2003; Figure 4.2.1). The same period  
46 and season has exhibited a large decline in the area above the freezing level, and all major mountain chains  
47 exhibit upward shifts in the height of the freezing level surface. The most likely explanation for the decline  
48 in snow cover is that warming has increased snow melt, or reduced the proportion of precipitation falling as  
49 snow.

50  
51 Mote (2003) demonstrated that snow mass in the Pacific Northwest region of North America had declined  
52 substantially at most locations, especially below the 1800m elevation level, and that these declines coincided  
53 with significant increases in temperature and occurred irrespective of whether precipitation declined or  
54 increased. Mote concluded that positive snow-albedo feedback was likely to be contributing to springtime  
55 warming and decline in snow cover, both at low elevations and in the mountains. Stewart et al. (2004)  
56 demonstrated that spring snowmelt in western North America had shifted earlier in the year by typically 10-  
57 20 days since the mid-20th century, and that this was due to warmer spring air temperatures. Mote et al.

1 (2005) extended the Mote (2003) study and demonstrated that the decline in snow mass since the mid-20th  
2 century had occurred over nearly all of western North America, especially at moderate elevations. At cold,  
3 high elevations where there has been an increase in precipitation, snow cover increased.  
4

5 Nicholls (2005) demonstrated that springtime (first observation in October) snow depth in the Snowy  
6 Mountains of south-eastern Australia had declined by about 40% since 1962, while winter maximum snow  
7 depth had declined only weakly. The stronger decrease in spring snow depth is largely attributable to  
8 warming during July-September. Only a weak decline in total precipitation has occurred in this region, far  
9 too small to account for the decline in snow depth, whereas mean maximum temperature (which is strongly  
10 correlated with October snow depth,  $r = -0.81$ ,  $n = 41$ ) has increased about 1°C, sufficient to account for the  
11 decline in springtime snow depth.  
12

13 Scherrer et al. (2004) show that decreases in late 20<sup>th</sup> century low altitude Swiss Alpine snow days are  
14 associated with increases in temperature, associated partly with NAO variability.  
15

#### 16 9.5.4.3 *Alpine and polar glaciers*

17 Meier et al. (2003) synthesised data on changes in alpine glaciers and concluded that glacier wastage has  
18 been pervasive during the last century, with small glaciers and those in marginal environments disappearing  
19 and large mid-latitude glaciers shrinking slightly. The average global mass balance has been continuously  
20 negative since 1961 with an estimated mass loss of 90 km<sup>3</sup>/yr in water equivalent. There is evidence that  
21 glacier retreat is stronger than has been assumed previously (Paul et al., 2004) and it has been suggested that  
22 positive feedbacks associated with a decrease in glacier albedo may be accelerating glacier melt. The global  
23 shrinkage appears to imply general warming, and since glacier retreat on the century time scale is rather  
24 uniform across the globe, this suggests that the warming is a pervasive cause (Oerlemans, 2005; Chapter 4)  
25 although in the tropics changes in atmospheric moisture might be contributing (Chapter 4). Mass balances  
26 for glaciers in western North America are strongly correlated with global mean winter (October-April)  
27 temperatures and the decline in glacier mass balance has paralleled the increase in temperature since 1968  
28 (Meier et al., 2003). Balances for glaciers in north and central Europe are only weakly related to global  
29 temperatures but are strongly correlated with the Arctic Oscillation. Reichert et al. (2002) forced a glacier  
30 mass balance model for Nigardsbreen and Rhone glacier with downscaled data from an OAGCM control  
31 simulation and concluded that the rate of glacier advance during the little ice age can be explained by  
32 internal climate variability for both glaciers, but that the recent retreat cannot. This suggests that the recent  
33 retreat of both glaciers is a sign of externally forced climate change. As well, at least some polar glaciers  
34 appear to be thinning and accelerating, apparently as a result of ocean warming (Thomas et al., 2004). The  
35 mean rate of glacier retreat in the Antarctic Peninsula has been increasing since 1945 (Cook et al., 2005).  
36 The pattern of retreat is broadly compatible with retreat driven by warming, but the speed of the retreat  
37 suggests that other factors may be contributing.  
38

#### 39 9.5.4.4 *Polar ice sheets*

40 Abdalati and Steffen (2001) found that the melt extent of the Greenland ice sheet had increased nearly 1%/yr  
41 over the period 1979–1999. The correlation between melt extent and temperature was estimated to be 0.82,  
42 suggesting that the warming is a likely explanation for the increased melt extent. Melt extent in 2002 set a  
43 new record since observations first became available in 1979 (ACIA, 2004). The Greenland ice sheet is  
44 losing mass by near-coastal thinning and the West Antarctic ice sheet is probably thinning overall, despite  
45 thickening in parts (Rignot and Thomas, 2002). Increased snowfall (which would lead to thickening of the  
46 ice sheets) appears to have been more than offset by increased ice-surface melt water loss (Greenland), and  
47 increased ice flow from melt water lubrication (Greenland) (Chapter 4). Domack et al. (2005) inferred from  
48 paleo data that the 2002 collapse of the Larsen ice shelf off the Antarctic Peninsula was unprecedented in the  
49 past 11,000 years and suggest that recent warming contributed to the collapse.  
50

#### 51 9.5.5 *Summary*

52  
53 In the TAR, quantitative evidence for human influence on climate was based almost exclusively on  
54 atmospheric and surface temperature. Since then, anthropogenic influence has also been identified in a range  
55 of other climate variables, such as ocean heat content, atmospheric pressure and sea ice extent, thereby  
56 further strengthening the case for an anthropogenic influence on climate, and improving our confidence in  
57 climate models.

1  
2 Observed changes in ocean heat content have now been shown to be inconsistent with natural climate  
3 variability, but consistent with a combination of natural and anthropogenic influence both on a global scale,  
4 and in individual ocean basins. Models suggest a significant anthropogenic contribution to sea level rise, but  
5 underestimate the actual rise observed. While some studies suggest that an anthropogenic increase in high  
6 latitude rainfall may have contributed to a freshening of the Arctic Ocean and North Atlantic deep water,  
7 these results are still uncertain.

8  
9 ENSO has not shown any behaviour which is clearly distinguishable from natural variability, but both the  
10 Northern and Southern Annular Modes have shown significant trends. While models reproduce the sign of  
11 the Northern Annular Mode trend, the simulated response is too small. By contrast, models including both  
12 greenhouse gas and ozone simulate a realistic trend in the Southern Annular Mode, leading to a detectable  
13 human influence on global sea level pressure. As yet there is no compelling evidence for a detectable  
14 anthropogenic influence on either tropical or extra-tropical cyclones, although the apparent increased  
15 frequency of intense tropical cyclones, and its relationship to ocean warming, is suggestive of an  
16 anthropogenic influence.

17  
18 Simulations and observations of total atmospheric water vapour averaged over oceans agree closely when the  
19 simulations are constrained by observed sea surface temperatures, suggesting that anthropogenic influence  
20 has possibly led to an increase in total atmospheric water vapour. However, global mean precipitation is  
21 controlled not by the availability of water vapour, but by a balance between the latent heat of condensation  
22 and radiative cooling in the troposphere. This explains why human influence is not yet detectable in global  
23 precipitation, but the influence of volcanic aerosols is. However, model simulations indicate that the rainfall  
24 in the heaviest events is likely to increase in line with atmospheric water vapour concentration, and there is  
25 some observational evidence that the intensity of the heaviest rainfall events has increased, although  
26 uncertainties remain. Many models capture the observed decrease in Sahel rainfall when constrained by  
27 observed sea surface temperatures, although these sea surface temperature changes have not been clearly  
28 attributed to human influence. One study found that an observed decrease in Asian monsoon rainfall could  
29 only be simulated in response to black carbon aerosol, although conclusions regarding the monsoon response  
30 to anthropogenic forcing differ.

31  
32 Observed decreases in Arctic sea ice extent have been shown to be inconsistent with natural variability, but  
33 consistent with the simulated response to human influence, although Southern Hemisphere sea ice extent has  
34 not declined as predicted. There is evidence of a decreasing trend in global snow cover, and widespread  
35 melting of glaciers, consistent with a widespread warming.

## 36 37 **9.6 Observational Constraints on Climate Sensitivity**

38  
39 In this section we briefly review recent research to infer climate sensitivity (defined as the equilibrium global  
40 mean temperature response to a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> from preindustrial levels) from observed climate changes.  
41 Such inferences, which can be made in a number of ways using instrumental or paleo data, complement  
42 other approaches to the assessment of climate sensitivity based on modelling and other types of studies. An  
43 overall summary assessment of equilibrium sensitivity and transient climate response, taking all of these  
44 approaches into account, is given in Chapter 10, Box 10.2 Precise definitions of climate sensitivity are given  
45 in the Glossary and Section 8.6.2.1. That section also cautions that climate sensitivity will depend to some  
46 extent on the mean climate state and the nature of the forcing. For example, climate sensitivity to the large  
47 negative forcing in the Last Glacial Maximum relative to the preindustrial climate (Section 9.2.1.3) may not  
48 be exactly the same as that for a positive CO<sub>2</sub> forcing of the same magnitude (Chapter 6). Moreover, global  
49 sensitivities do not provide information about regional climate responses and how they might vary in  
50 response to different forcings (Chapter 6) Here, we focus on what inferences can be made about climate  
51 sensitivity to increases in CO<sub>2</sub> based on the ability of models to simulate past climate changes, and do not  
52 attempt to specify regional sensitivity and sensitivity to forcings other than greenhouse gases.

53  
54 Three basic approaches are used to infer information about climate sensitivity from observed climate  
55 changes. One approach, shortly to be introduced, identifies probabilistic ranges of combinations of climate  
56 parameters in simplified climate models for which simulations of historical climate change are consistent  
57 with changes observed during the historical period considered (Section 9.6.1). Several studies of this type

1 have used observed surface temperature changes over the last 150 years (see Chapter 3), the estimated ocean  
2 heat uptake since 1955 based on Levitus et al. (2000, 2005), and changes in atmospheric temperatures  
3 (Forest et al., 2002, 2005, Lindzen and Giannitsis, 2002). Note that studies using radiosonde data may be  
4 affected to some extent by recently discovered inhomogeneities in radiosonde data (see Section 3.4.1.1;  
5 Forest et al., 2002, 2005 use radiosonde data in addition to surface and ocean data). One recent study also  
6 uses ERBE Earth radiation budget data (Forster and Gregory, 2005). Such studies have used either spatial  
7 patterns of temperature change, or simple temperature indices such as the global mean surface temperature or  
8 the differential warming between the SH and the NH. In addition, studies using this approach have also been  
9 conducted with paleo reconstructions of NH temperature variations of the past millennium. Note that a  
10 further variant of this approach, which derives such distributions by varying uncertain parameters in coupled  
11 climate models, is discussed in Section 10.5.4.5.

12  
13 A summary of key results obtained from studies that systematically vary parameters in simplified models is  
14 given in Table 9.2.1. The table also details the methods used and uncertainties that are taken into account.  
15 Methods that incorporate a more comprehensive treatment of uncertainty generally produce wider  
16 uncertainty ranges on the inferred climate parameters. Methods that treat uncertain parameters, such as ocean  
17 diffusivity, as fixed will yield probability distributions for climate sensitivity that are conditional on these  
18 values, and therefore are likely to underestimate the true uncertainty of the climate sensitivity.

19  
20 The two other approaches that will be discussed in this section further augment the information on climate  
21 sensitivity that is available. The first of these is to infer information on the climate sensitivity from specific,  
22 well observed events in recent climate history, such as the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo in 1992 (Section  
23 9.6.1.2). The second is to deduce information on climate sensitivity, with the aid of models, from more  
24 extended, earlier, events in climate history such as the Maunder Minimum (Section 9.6.2.2) or the Last  
25 Glacial Maximum (Section 9.6.2.3).

### 26 27 **9.6.1 Estimates of Climate Sensitivity Based on Instrumental Observations**

28  
29 Detection and attribution studies rigorously compare observations with model-simulated climate change in  
30 response to external forcing. Similar methods can be employed to identify which of a large number of  
31 models with varying uncertain parameters or different external forcing, best simulate the observed change.  
32 Results from such comparisons can be used to learn about important, but unknown, parameters of the climate  
33 system. Three key parameters are (i) the equilibrium climate sensitivity  $\alpha$ , which is the global mean  
34 equilibrium near surface temperature change in response to CO<sub>2</sub> doubling relative to preindustrial levels, (ii)  
35 the transient climate response, which is the global mean temperature change at the time of CO<sub>2</sub> doubling in a  
36 scenario where CO<sub>2</sub> increases by 1%/yr, and (iii) the rate of ocean heat uptake. These studies can also be  
37 used to make inferences about the magnitude of total external forcing or its individual components,  
38 particularly aerosol forcing, as discussed in Section 9.2.

39  
40 The basic approach that is used is to vary the parameters of interest within plausible ranges, and then to  
41 quantify the similarity between model simulations and observations for each choice of parameter settings.  
42 The idea that underlies this approach is that the plausibility of a given combination of parameter settings can  
43 be determined from the agreement between the resulting simulation of historical climate and observations.  
44 This is typically evaluated by means of Bayesian methods (see Appendix 9.B for methods). Such studies  
45 require very large ensembles of simulations of historical climate change (ranging from several hundreds to  
46 thousands members). Parameters such as the climate sensitivity can only be varied directly in simple climate  
47 models or earth system models of intermediate complexity (the so-called EMICS; see Chapter 8) and thus  
48 most studies to date have been performed with such models.

49  
50 The approach is essentially Bayesian because the sampling that is performed on the parameters of interest in  
51 effect specifies a prior distribution on those parameters. Frame et al. (2005) point out that the results of such  
52 studies are sensitive to the choice of prior distribution. Prior assumptions that assume that different  
53 equilibrium climate sensitivities are equally likely (“uninformed” or “flat” prior) will use a different strategy  
54 to sample the parameter space than studies in which different feedback values (i.e. the inverse of climate  
55 sensitivity) are assumed to be equally likely, or in which different transient climate responses are assumed to  
56 be equally likely. Since the observational constraints are still weak (as will be shown below), these prior  
57 assumptions matter and it is therefore important to define a sampling strategy that is suitable to the problem

1 to be considered, for example, sample a flat (“uninformative”) prior in equilibrium sensitivity if this is the  
2 target of the estimate, or in transient climate response if the future temperature trends are to be constrained.  
3

#### 4 *9.6.1.1 Estimates of climate sensitivity based on 20th century warming*

5 Several studies have used the approach described above to infer probability distributions for the equilibrium  
6 climate sensitivity or for the transient climate response from the observed warming of the last 150 years.  
7 Results and assumptions are listed in Table 9.2.1, a comparison of some probability density functions for  
8 equilibrium climate sensitivity is shown in Figure 9.6.1, and some estimates of transient climate response are  
9 displayed in Figure 9.6.2.

10  
11 Wigley et al. (1997) laid the groundwork by simulating global mean temperature change over the  
12 instrumental period using a range of climate sensitivities in a simple climate model. They concluded that  
13 uncertainties made it impossible to use observed global temperature changes to constrain climate sensitivity  
14 beyond the range explored by climate models (1.5 to 4.5°C), and that the upper end of the range was  
15 particularly difficult to constrain, a conclusion confirmed by subsequent studies. Similarly, Tol and De Vos  
16 (1998) find poorly constrained upper limits for the equilibrium climate sensitivity in a Bayesian approach,  
17 testing a variety of prior assumptions using a simple statistical climate model.

18  
19 Andronova and Schlesinger (2001) used a simple climate model consisting of a hemispheric Energy-  
20 Balance-Model (EBM) coupled to a simple ocean model to simulate the change in NH and SH annual-mean  
21 temperatures from 1765 to 1997. Radiative forcing was varied, including the effects of five forcing factors  
22 (greenhouse gases, tropospheric ozone, anthropogenic sulphate aerosols, solar and volcanic) in sixteen  
23 combinations. The climate sensitivity and unknown sulphate forcing were varied systematically for each  
24 combination of forcing factors. Considering the resulting collection of likelihood functions, they estimated  
25 that there was a greater than 50% likelihood that climate sensitivity lays outside the 1.5 to 4.5°C range.

26  
27 Knutti et al. (2002) systematically varied the climate sensitivity, ocean heat uptake and ocean mixing  
28 parameters in an EMIC over plausible ranges. External forcing uncertainty was represented by interpreting  
29 the IPCC (2001) forcing uncertainty ranges as four standard deviation confidence intervals. Their  
30 simulations were evaluated against observed 20th century ocean and surface air temperatures. Using the time  
31 evolution of global surface warming and ocean heat uptake as constraints, and taking uncertainties into  
32 account, Knutti et al. (2002) found no reliable upper limit on climate sensitivity. They also found that the  
33 available data on ocean heat uptake does not constrain their ocean mixing parameter. However, they  
34 determined that the indirect aerosol forcing and total aerosol forcing are both very likely (95%) negative, but  
35 that strongly negative aerosol forcing, as has been suggested by several observational studies (see Anderson  
36 et al., 2003) is incompatible with the observed warming trend over the last century (Section 9.2.1.2, Table  
37 9.2.1).

38  
39 Gregory et al. (2002a) constrain the climate sensitivity by considering the change in the Earth’s energy  
40 balance between 1861–1900 and 1957–1994. Their calculation uses the definition of effective climate  
41 sensitivity (Murphy, 1995) in assuming that the climate system responds to warming by increasing its  
42 radiation to space proportionately to the temperature change. Energy balance requires this heat  
43 flux to equal the difference between the radiative forcing and the rate of ocean heat uptake. Best estimates of  
44 temperature change, forcing change and ocean heat content change between the two periods and their  
45 uncertainties (which are assumed to be Gaussian) are used to estimate the climate feedback parameter and its  
46 uncertainty. Since uncertainties in forcing dominate, the inverse of climate sensitivity has approximately a  
47 Gaussian distribution. Consequently, consistent with other studies, the derived likelihood function for the  
48 climate sensitivity is skewed, with the lower 5% boundary at 1.6°C and a very long upper tail (Figure 9.6.1).

49  
50 Forest et al. (2002) use spatio-temporal patterns of climate change rather than using large scale indices, and  
51 assessed the similarity between simulations and observations by means of optimal detection (Allen and Tett,  
52 1999). They repeatedly calculated the time-space response to anomalous greenhouse gas, sulphate aerosol,  
53 and stratospheric ozone forcing using the MIT EMIC (Table 8.8.2) and compared against upper-air, surface  
54 and deep-ocean temperature observations. The climate sensitivity, net aerosol forcing and ocean heat uptake  
55 used in their simulations were selected from uniform prior distributions (i.e., all parameter combinations  
56 within pre-specified ranges were considered to be equally likely within the range explored, such as up to a

1 sensitivity of 10°C). They estimated a 5–95% confidence interval of 1.4–7.7°C for the climate sensitivity,  
2 and a 30% probability that sensitivity was outside the 1.5 to 4.5°C range.  
3

4 Forest et al. (2005) updated this study to include solar irradiance, volcanic aerosols, and land-surface  
5 vegetation forcing. They also used a larger range of AOGCM control simulations to estimate the internal  
6 climate variability. This resulted in wider uncertainty ranges on the climate parameters of interest, with 5–  
7 95% range of 2.4 to 9.2°C for climate sensitivity (Table 9.2.1). They obtained generally narrower uncertainty  
8 ranges when using expert prior distributions rather than uniform, uninformative, priors (see discussion in  
9 Appendix 9.B). The increased upper bound on their sensitivity estimate compared to the result explaining the  
10 late 20th century by anthropogenic forcing alone is due to a net cooling from volcanic aerosols, which  
11 reduces the total forcing and favours a combination of slightly higher climate sensitivity and weaker  
12 tropospheric aerosol cooling (Figure 9.6.1).  
13

14 Frame et al. (2005) point out that inferences on the climate sensitivity are strongly affected by prior  
15 assumptions and the way in which uncertainty on unknown parameters is sampled. They point out that the  
16 decision as to whether to sample an unobservable parameter such as the climate sensitivity (or its inverse, the  
17 climate feedback) from a subjectively chosen prior distribution, or to sample a parameter that can be  
18 constrained by observations such as the transient climate sensitivity, depends in part upon the objective of  
19 the analysis. Sampling uniformly in climate sensitivity, they infer a 5–95% uncertainty range for the  
20 sensitivity of 1.2 to 11.8°C, which is consistent with others who take this approach (Table 9.2.1). On the  
21 other hand, sampling uniformly in transient climate response, an approach that would be appropriate if the  
22 goal is to constrain projections of future change, results in an estimated climate sensitivity of 1.2 to 5.2°C  
23 with a median value of 2.3°C. Note that this is based on an energy balance model and a multi-fingerprint  
24 separation of the observed response into greenhouse gas, aerosol and natural forcings. The latter avoids  
25 sulphate aerosol forcing uncertainty that affects parameter estimates, but adds uncertainty associated with  
26 separating the model's responses the various forcings (see discussion in Section 9.2.3).  
27

28 Forster and Gregory (2005) estimate climate sensitivity based on radiation budget data from the Earth  
29 Radiation Budget Experiment (ERBE). They find a climate feedback parameter of  $2.3 \pm 1.4 \text{ W m}^2 \text{ K}^{-1}$ , which  
30 corresponds to a 5–95% equilibrium climate sensitivity range of 1.0 to 4.1°C, assuming a flat prior  
31 probability in feedback parameters (note that the results would be wider with a flat prior in sensitivity or  
32 transient climate response, see Frame et al., 2005).  
33

34 [INSERT FIGURE 9.6.1 HERE]  
35

36 Lindzen and Giannitsis (2002) consider the difference in warming rates between tropospheric (850–300 hPa)  
37 temperatures estimated from radiosondes and surface temperatures. They note that tropospheric temperatures  
38 increased rapidly around 1976, while the surface temperature increased more slowly. Using a simple climate  
39 model, they find that if the observed surface temperature increase is interpreted as a delayed response to the  
40 tropospheric temperature increase, it is best modelled with a climate sensitivity of less than 1°C. The  
41 plausibility of this finding is limited by the lack of an explanation for the tropospheric temperature increase  
42 particularly, and neglect of the effects of external forcing. The finding in Lindzen and Giannitsis is in  
43 contrast to that of Forest et al. (2002, 2005) who also considered the joint evolution of surface and upper air  
44 temperatures.  
45

46 In summary, the climate sensitivity that is inferred from constraints provided by historical instrumental data  
47 yields best estimates (mode of the estimated probability density functions) that range between 1.2 and 4°C,  
48 in agreement with other estimates derived from comprehensive climate models, and suggests a lower 5%  
49 limit on climate sensitivity of 1°C or above. The upper 95% limit is not well constrained, particularly in  
50 studies that account conservatively for uncertainty in, for example, 20<sup>th</sup> century radiative forcing and ocean  
51 heat uptake. Such studies cannot rule out with reasonable likelihood the possibility that the climate  
52 sensitivity exceeds 4.5°C.  
53

#### 54 9.6.1.2 *Estimates based on individual volcanic eruptions*

55 Some recent analyses have attempted to constrain the equilibrium climate sensitivity from the well observed  
56 forcing and response to the eruption of Mount Pinatubo, or other major eruptions during the 20th century.  
57 Such events allow the study of physical mechanisms and feedbacks as was done by Soden et al. (2002; see,



1 Figure 8.6.2) who demonstrated good agreement between simulated and observed responses, unless the  
2 (positive) water vapour feedback in their model, which had a climate sensitivity of 3.0°C, is switched off.  
3 Yokohata et al. (2005) find that a version of the MIROC climate model with a sensitivity of 4.0°C yields a  
4 much better simulation of that eruption than a model version with sensitivity 6.3°C, and determine that the  
5 cloud feedback in the latter model appears inconsistent with data. Wigley et al. (2005a) find that the lower  
6 boundary and best estimate obtained by comparing observed and simulated responses to major eruptions in  
7 the 20th century are consistent with the IPCC range of 1.5 to 4.5°C and find that the response to the eruption  
8 of Mount Pinatubo suggests a best fit sensitivity of 3.0°C. In contrast, an analysis by Douglass and Knox  
9 (2005) based on a box-model suggests a very low climate sensitivity (under 1°C) and negative climate  
10 feedbacks based on the eruption of Mount Pinatubo. However, Wigley et al. (2005b) demonstrate that the  
11 analysis method of Douglass and Knox (2005) severely underestimates climate sensitivity (by a factor of 3)  
12 if applied to the volcanic response in a climate model with known climate sensitivity. Both Robock et al.  
13 (2005) and Wigley et al. (2005b) question the analysis method of Douglass and Knox.

14  
15 In studies based on the temperature response to single volcanic eruptions it is generally found (Wigley et al.,  
16 2005a, Frame et al., 2005) that a reliable upper limit on sensitivity cannot be established, particularly if  
17 forcing uncertainty is considered. The reason is that the response to short-term volcanic forcing is strongly  
18 nonlinear in equilibrium climate sensitivity, yielding only slightly enhanced peak responses and substantially  
19 extended response times for very high sensitivities. Such differences in response are small compared to  
20 internal climate variability and the uncertainty in the rate of heat taken up by the ocean in response to a short,  
21 strong forcing.

### 22 23 *9.6.1.3 Transient vs. equilibrium climate sensitivity.*

24 While the equilibrium climate sensitivity determines the equilibrium global mean temperature change that  
25 eventually results from CO<sub>2</sub> doubling, the smaller *transient climate response* refers to the global mean  
26 temperature change that is realized at the time of CO<sub>2</sub> doubling under an idealized scenario in which CO<sub>2</sub>  
27 concentrations increase at 1%/yr (Cubasch et al., 2001; see also Section 8.6.2.1). The transient climate  
28 response is indicative of the temperature trend associated with external forcing, and as such it is well  
29 constrained by an observable quantity, the observed warming trend. However, the transient climate response  
30 does not scale linearly with sensitivity, particularly given uncertainty in ocean heat uptake (see discussion in  
31 Frame et al 2005), which makes it difficult to rule out high values of equilibrium sensitivity on the basis of a  
32 well constrained transient response. This is exacerbated by uncertainty in aerosol forcing (Boucher and  
33 Haywood, 2001; Chapter 2, Section 9.2), with the result that high values of climate sensitivity combined  
34 with small positive forcing can remain reasonably consistent with 20<sup>th</sup> century observations.

35  
36 Frame and Allen (2005) point out that transient climate response may be more relevant to determining the  
37 maximum temperature change that might result under greenhouse gas forcing scenarios where concentrations  
38 first peak and then reduce rather than equilibrate. Stott et al. (2005c) estimate the transient climate response  
39 based on scaling factors for the response to greenhouse gases only (separated from aerosol and natural  
40 forcing in a 3-pattern optimal detection analysis) using fingerprints from three different model simulations  
41 (Figure 9.6.2) and find a relatively tight constraint. Using three model simulations together, their estimated  
42 median transient climate response is 3°C, with a 5–95% range of 2.2 to 4°C. We conclude that transient  
43 climate response is very unlikely to be more than 4.5°C/century in response to a 1%/yr increase in CO<sub>2</sub>. Note  
44 that since transient climate response scales linearly with the errors in the estimated scaling factors, estimates  
45 do not show a tendency for a long upper tail, as is the case for the equilibrium climate sensitivity.

46  
47 [INSERT FIGURE 9.6.2 HERE]

### 48 49 **9.6.2 Estimates of Climate Sensitivity Based on Paleoclimatic Data**

50  
51 The paleoclimate record offers a range of opportunities to try to assess the ability of climate models to  
52 realistically respond to changes in external forcing. Climate feedbacks may be different for different climatic  
53 background states, and for different seasonal characteristics of forcing. The sensitivity to past climatic  
54 forcing may be substantially different from that to a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> for past climate states with a strong  
55 seasonal change in insolation (see, for example, Montoya et al., 2000), and in these cases, sensitivity to  
56 forcing cannot be directly compared to that to a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>. For climate at the Last Glacial Maximum,  
57 the sensitivity to forcing may be more comparable. In both cases, if climate models attempt to simulate past

1 climatic conditions, model physics and the realism of the feedbacks can be validated. In some cases, the  
2 agreement between past climate and simulations with model versions with varying sensitivity to CO<sub>2</sub>  
3 doubling has been quantified in order to derive a probability density function for equilibrium climate  
4 sensitivity.

5  
6 We discuss estimates obtained from both the paleoclimatic record of the last millennium, and from the near-  
7 equilibrium climate state of the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM). The latter give a perspective on feedbacks  
8 for a very different climate than that expected to be associated with greenhouse warming, and provides a test  
9 bed for the physics of feedbacks in climate models.

#### 10 9.6.2.1 *Estimates of climate sensitivity based on proxy data for the last millennium*

11 More than one approach can be used to estimate climate sensitivity from reconstructions of the last  
12 millennium. The approach discussed here uses results on the attribution of interdecadal climate changes to  
13 external forcing (see Section 9.3.3). Another option, which will be discussed in Section 9.6.2.2, is to consider  
14 differences between different climate states that occurred during the last millennium, for example, the late  
15 Maunder Minimum relative to the present.

16  
17 Hegerl et al. (2005b) use several decadal or decadal smoothed proxy data reconstructions of Northern  
18 Hemispheric extratropical temperature for the past millennium (Briffa et al., 2001; Esper et al., 2002; Mann  
19 and Jones, 2003 and Hegerl et al., 2005b) to constrain the climate sensitivity during the pre-industrial period  
20 up to 1850. As with the studies discussed in Section 9.6.1, a very large ensemble of simulations of the last  
21 millennium is performed with an energy balance model. The EBM is forced with volcanic (Crowley, 2000,  
22 updated) and solar forcing (Lean et al., 2002) reconstructions, and with changes in CO<sub>2</sub> forcing (see Section  
23 9.3.3 for results on the detection of these external influences). The calculation of the probability distribution  
24 for equilibrium climate sensitivity incorporates uncertainty in the amplitude of volcanic and solar forcing.  
25 Reconstruction uncertainty is accounted for by fully incorporating uncertainty in the amplitude of one  
26 particular reconstruction, and by using several different reconstructions as possible realizations of observed  
27 climate change. Probability density functions for climate sensitivity from all reconstructions combined yield  
28 a median sensitivity of 3.4°C and a 5–95% range of 1.1 to 8.6°C, while those for the reconstruction judged to  
29 allow for the most complete assessment of uncertainty, yields a range of 1.4 to 6.1°C (see Figure 9.6.1).  
30 Probability density functions from the other reconstructions, individually, yield peak probabilities (modes)  
31 from 1.3 to 3.6°C. Generally, reconstructions with a higher amplitude of past climate variations (such as  
32 Esper et al., 2002 or Hegerl et al., 2005b) support higher climate sensitivity estimates than reconstructions  
33 with lower amplitude (such as Mann and Jones, 2003). Note that the constraint on climate sensitivity  
34 originates mainly from low-frequency temperature variations associated with changes in the statistics of  
35 volcanism that lead to a highly significant detection of volcanic response (see Section 9.3.3) in all records  
36 used in the study.

37  
38  
39 Constraints on the climate sensitivity can be further tightened by combining information from the  
40 instrumental and paleo records of the last millennium. In particular, instrumental temperature change during  
41 the second half of the 20th century is independent of the paleo record and of the instrumental data from the  
42 first half of the 20th century that is typically used to calibrate the paleo record. Thus, detection analyses on  
43 late 20th century temperature change information can be used to develop a prior probability distribution for  
44 the climate sensitivity, which when applied to an analysis of a paleo reconstruction, reduces the 5–95% range  
45 of climate sensitivity from the combined analysis of all proxy reconstructions used to 1.5 to 6.2°C (Hegerl et  
46 al., 2005b). Thus independent estimates, when properly combined in a Bayesian analysis, can provide a  
47 tighter constraint. Nonetheless, these results must be interpreted with caution since the exact upper limit still  
48 is still somewhat dependent on the details of the analysis, and paleoclimatic reconstructions are still being  
49 assessed for the realism of their variance (see Chapter 6).

#### 50 9.6.2.2 *Inferences about climate sensitivity based on the Late Maunder Minimum*

51 Another approach to estimating the climate sensitivity is to compare different climate states. The Late  
52 Maunder Minimum (approximately 1675–1715) provides one such opportunity. During this period, sunspots  
53 were generally missing and net radiative forcing relative to present is estimated to have been close to  $-1.8 \text{ W}$   
54  $\text{m}^{-2}$  (Section 9.2.1.3).

1 Different NH temperature reconstructions (Figure 6.8) yield estimates of cooling relative to the late 20<sup>th</sup>  
2 century ranging from  $-0.45^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Mann et al., 1999, annual value for the Northern Hemisphere) to  
3 approximately  $-1.0^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Moberg et al., 2005). Model studies (Figure 6.8) for this time period are discussed in  
4 Chapter 6, and generally yield a total cooling of  $-1^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $-1.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  or greater. The radiative forcing at this  
5 period is discussed in 9.2.1.3, and is approximately  $-1.63\text{ W/m}^2$  (relative to the present) with large  
6 uncertainties. For the approximately 50 year time period associated with the late Maunder Minimum, which  
7 was without large forcing trends, the model results may be close to radiative balance (Rind et al., 2004).  
8 However, some of the forcing during the present period is not yet realized in the system ( $\sim 0.85\text{ W m}^{-2}$ ,  
9 Hansen et al., 2005) yielding only about  $0.78\text{ W m}^{-2}$  radiative forcing that should have been expressed in the  
10 system by the present time relative to the late Maunder Minimum. The climate sensitivity of the GCMs used  
11 for these simulations is on the order of  $2.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  (or higher, depending on the model used). Were this to have  
12 resulted in a temperature change of about  $-0.45^{\circ}\text{C}$  (as in the Mann et al., 1999 reconstruction), it would  
13 imply a best-guess climate sensitivity of about  $2.1^{\circ}\text{C}$ . On the other hand, using the higher estimated cooling  
14 of  $1.0^{\circ}\text{C}$  results in an estimate of climate sensitivity up to  $4.7^{\circ}\text{C}$  (updated from Rind et al., 2004), which is  
15 broadly consistent with estimates obtained from the full millennial record (Section 9.6.2.1) and previous  
16 IPCC estimates. However, the substantial uncertainties in the total rate of forcing, past temperatures and the  
17 amount of unrealized warming makes it difficult to formally infer a probability density function for climate  
18 sensitivity from this time period.

### 19 9.6.2.3 Inferences about climate sensitivity based on the Last Glacial Maximum

20 The Last Glacial Maximum featured reduced greenhouse gases relative to pre-industrial levels, increased  
21 land ice as well as altered vegetation and increased atmospheric aerosols (dust primarily), while solar  
22 insolation change was negligible. Overall, the radiative forcing during the LGM is estimated to be  
23 approximately  $-6.1$  to  $-10.6\text{ W m}^{-2}$  relative to pre-industrial (see [Section 9.2.x.x](#)).

24  
25  
26 Coupled atmosphere-ocean models run for the climate of the Last Glacial Maximum, and forced with  
27 changes in greenhouse gases and ice sheets produced global cooling estimates from  $3.1^{\circ}\text{C}$ – $5.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  when  
28 forced with changed greenhouse gases and ice sheets (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2005; see Section 9.3.3).  
29 (Note that this change may not reflect the full uncertainty in LGM temperature change, since not all forcings  
30 may be represented and uncertainties are large, see chapter 6). The radiative forcing change for the forcings  
31 and boundary conditions incorporated in the PMIP-2 LGM experiment is  $4.1$ – $7.2\text{ W m}^{-2}$ , resulting in a  
32 climate sensitivity estimate of  $1.5$  to  $4.4^{\circ}\text{C}$  for  $\text{CO}_2$  doubling. The model responses are in broad agreement  
33 with the data, suggesting that they adequately represent the feedback mechanisms that determine the climate  
34 sensitivity that corresponds to the LGM climate state.

35  
36 As with estimates of climate sensitivity based on the instrumental period, the consistency between  
37 simulations and paleo observations can be used to determine a probability density function for climate  
38 sensitivity. The sensitivity to  $\text{CO}_2$  doubling of each model with each parameter setting is calculated by  
39 simulating the double  $\text{CO}_2$  equilibrium climate change. Then, the probability of the different parameter  
40 settings (and with it, the different equilibrium sensitivities associated with these parameter settings) is  
41 determined from the model's ability to simulate LGM climate. Annan et al. (2005b) used a low-resolution  
42 version of the CCSR/NIES/FRCGC atmospheric GCM coupled to a mixed layer ocean. An ensemble  
43 Kalman filter method was used to obtain ranges for 25 uncertain parameters when tuned to reproduce  
44 observed seasonal climatological fields of 15 variables, and 40 member ensemble simulations were made of  
45 the response to both doubled  $\text{CO}_2$  and Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) forcings. The authors found a strong  
46 relationship between climate sensitivity and cooling in LGM tropical sea surface temperatures. Their results  
47 suggest that sensitivities in excess of  $5.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  are unlikely given observed estimates of LGM cooling and the  
48 relationship between tropical SST and sensitivity in their model.

49  
50 The link between LGM cooling and climate sensitivity is further examined in another perturbed physics  
51 ensemble, by Schneider von Deimling et al. (2005). The authors vary 11 ocean and atmospheric parameters  
52 in 1,000 member ensemble simulations of the CLIMBER-2 EMIC (see Table 8.8.2). As with Annan et al.  
53 (2005), these authors also find a pronounced relationship between climate sensitivity and tropical SST  
54 changes in the LGM. However their relationship is different from that of Annan et al (2005b) implying a low  
55 probability for sensitivities exceeding  $3.8^{\circ}\text{C}$ , while Annan et al. (2005) find higher sensitivities consistent  
56 with data. The discrepancy between the inferred upper limits arises from structural differences between the  
57 models used, illustrating the importance of sampling uncertainties within different model frameworks to

1 establish the robustness of simulated relationships between observables and future changes. Therefore, we  
2 conclude that these results generally support the estimates of climate sensitivity from the instrumental period  
3 and climate models, but are presently unable to constrain them further.

### 4 **9.6.3 Summary of Observational Constraints for Climate Sensitivity**

#### 5 *9.6.3.1 Caveats and uncertainties*

6  
7 Any constraint of climate sensitivity obtained from observations must be interpreted in light of the  
8 underlying assumptions, namely the choice of prior distribution for each of the model parameters (see  
9 Appendix 9.B) and the uncertainties that are accounted for in the approach. For example, since ocean heat  
10 uptake parameters are poorly constrained from the observations and the meaning of “effective diffusivity” is  
11 different between models (Knutti et al., 2002, 2003; Forest et al., 2002; Sokolov et al., 2003), the choice of  
12 the parameter range explored will influence the results. Neglecting sources of uncertainty in these estimates  
13 will generally result in unrealistically small uncertainties and overly narrow ranges on climate sensitivity that  
14 do not reflect the true uncertainties in our knowledge of this parameter. Errors in assumptions about forcing  
15 or model response will also result in unrealistic features of model simulations, which can result in erroneous  
16 modes (peak probabilities) and shapes of the probability density function which also affect the 5–95% range.  
17 Furthermore, structural uncertainties in the models that simulate changes with different climate sensitivities  
18 (such as problems in ocean mixing, or uncertainties in the connection between tropical SST changes and  
19 sensitivity in models) will affect results and are very difficult to quantify.

20  
21  
22 The dominant uncertainties (climate sensitivity, radiative forcing, mixing of heat into the ocean) have been  
23 taken into account in most studies (Table 9.2.1), but the following caveats must still be kept in mind. First,  
24 some processes and feedbacks might be poorly represented or missing in simple or intermediate complexity  
25 models. The use of ‘effective’ climate sensitivity (the equilibrium climate sensitivity a model would have  
26 assuming that feedbacks remained constant at the value found at any given point of the transient response)  
27 assumes that the climate sensitivity is truly constant in time. However some authors (e.g., Senior and  
28 Mitchell, 2000; Boer and Yu, 2003) have shown that the effective climate sensitivity varies substantially in  
29 time in the climates simulated by their models. Since results from instrumental data and the last millennium  
30 are dominated primarily by decadal to century scale changes, they will therefore only represent climate  
31 sensitivity at an equilibrium that is not too far from the present climate. A tight constraint on the sensitivity  
32 of the LGM climate is difficult to obtain because of the present uncertainty regarding tropical temperature  
33 changes.

#### 34 *9.6.3.2 Summary of observational constraints on climate sensitivity*

35  
36 Despite these uncertainties, which are accounted for to differing degrees in the various studies, estimates of  
37 equilibrium climate sensitivity show some encouraging similarities (Figure 9.6.1). This increases confidence  
38 in individual findings. Additionally, results that assess the realism of models with different sensitivity by  
39 each model’s ability to simulate ice age conditions and studies using comprehensive climate models are  
40 similar, further increasing confidence. Most studies find a lower 5% limit of 1°C or greater. We conclude  
41 that it is very likely that climate sensitivity exceeds 1°C. This lower bound is consistent with the view that  
42 the sum of all atmospheric feedbacks affecting climate sensitivity is very likely positive. In most studies, the  
43 most likely value of climate sensitivity is between 1 and 4°C, averaging around on the order of 2–3°C, and  
44 rarely outside the range of 1.2 to 4°C, leading credibility to mainstream climate models used to simulate  
45 future climate change.

46  
47 However, for probabilistic forecasts of future climate with constant radiative forcing, the upper tail of  
48 estimates of climate sensitivity is important. The upper 95% limit for equilibrium climate change ranges  
49 from 5°C to 10°C, or greater depending upon the approach taken, the number of uncertainties included, and  
50 specific details of the prior distribution that was used. This is, in part, caused by uncertainties and  
51 nonlinearities in forcings and response. For example, a high sensitivity cannot be ruled out because it is  
52 possible that a high aerosol forcing could nearly cancel greenhouse gas forcing. For the last millennium,  
53 uncertainties in proxy records and forcing and the nonlinear connection between sensitivity and the response  
54 to volcanism prohibit tighter constraints. For the Last Glacial Maximum, the present uncertainty about the  
55 connection between tropical SST changes and climate sensitivity in a model also makes a tight constraint  
56 difficult to obtain. Thus most studies that use a simple uniform prior on the sensitivity are not able to exclude  
57 sensitivities beyond the traditional 1.5 to 4.5°C range. However, the transient climate response, which may

1 be more relevant for climate change in the near-term future, is easier to constrain since it relates more  
2 linearly to observables. This magnitude determines future climate change under CO2 concentrations that  
3 peak and then decline.  
4

1 [START OF QUESTION 9.1]  
2

3 **Question 9.1: Can Individual Extreme Events be Explained by Climate Change?**  
4

5 Almost any weather event might occur by chance, in a climate unmodified by human activities as well as in a  
6 changed climate. However, it is possible that human influences on climate might have changed the risk of  
7 occurrence of specific extreme events (e.g., a heat wave, a widespread flooding event or a hurricane).

8 Because extreme events are, by definition, rare it is difficult to quantify their risk and attribute the causes of  
9 changes in risk. Nevertheless, there is growing evidence of human-induced warming on continental and sub-  
10 continental scales, suggesting a possible increase in the risk of heat waves. An analysis of European mean  
11 summer temperatures indicates that human influences could have more than doubled the risk of a summer of  
12 the intensity of 2003. Quantifying the possible influence of climate change on other types of individual  
13 extreme events, including hydrological events, such as floods, is likely to prove even more difficult than is  
14 the case with temperature extremes, because of greater natural variability, lower spatial coherence and  
15 greater uncertainties in simulated climate change in rainfall.

16  
17 People affected by an extreme weather event often ask whether human influences on the climate could be  
18 held to some extent responsible. Recent years have seen many examples of extreme weather that some  
19 commentators have linked to climate change. These include the prolonged drought in Australia, the  
20 extremely hot summer in Europe in 2003 (very likely the hottest in Europe for at least 500 years), the  
21 hurricanes that made landfall during the intense North Atlantic hurricane season of 2004, and the extreme  
22 daily rainfall in Mumbai, India, in July 2005. Could a human influence such as increased atmospheric  
23 greenhouse gas concentrations have “caused” any of these events?  
24

25 Such a question is ill-posed. We might not be able to say that a particular weather event, given the right  
26 combination of meteorological factors, would not have happened in the absence of human-induced climate  
27 change. For example, factors that contributed to the very warm European summer of 2003 included dry soil  
28 (which leaves more solar energy available to heat the land because less energy is consumed by evaporating  
29 moisture from the soil), a persistent blocking high pressure system associated with anticyclonic subsidence  
30 that restricted vertical mixing of strongly heated surface air, and very clear skies. Such factors could arise in  
31 a climate unmodified by human influences.  
32

33 Our question can, however, be re-posed as “How has anthropogenic forcing changed the probability of  
34 occurrence of extreme weather events such as heat waves?” This question can be addressed, for example for  
35 the 2003 European heat wave, by studying the characteristics of European summers in a climate model,  
36 either forced solely with natural factors such as volcanic activity and changes in solar radiation, or by both  
37 anthropogenic and natural factors. Experiments of this type indicate that it is very likely that anthropogenic  
38 forcing is responsible for a substantial fraction of the summer warming trend observed over Europe in recent  
39 decades, and thus an increase in the likelihood of extremely warm summers. These experiments indicate that  
40 human influences may have more than doubled the risk of European mean summer temperatures as hot as  
41 those in 2003. More detailed modelling work will be required to estimate the change in risk for specific  
42 impacts, such as a successive number of very warm nights in an urban area such as Paris, the type of  
43 meteorological indicator most closely related to increased mortality in the summer of 2003.  
44

45 The value of a risk-based approach (“is there an increase in the probability of an event that is attributable to  
46 human influence?”) is that it can be used to estimate the influence of external factors, such as increases in  
47 greenhouse gas concentrations, on the frequency of specific types of weather events. Some care must be  
48 taken in assessing changes in risks of extreme events. Careful statistical analyses are required, since the risk  
49 of individual extremes, such as very hot days exceeding some threshold, could change due to changes in  
50 variability as well as changes in the mean climate. Such analyses rely on model-based estimates of  
51 variability, and thus an important additional requirement is that climate models adequately represent climate  
52 variability.  
53

54 The same risk based approach could be adopted to examine possible changes in the frequency of extreme  
55 hydrological events such as heavy rainfalls or floods. However rainfall is much more variable from one  
56 location to the next than temperature, increasing the difficulty of ascribing causes. High resolution modelling  
57 is likely to be required to capture details of the climate change signal which may be difficult to identify

1 above a high level of natural variability noise. Also, rainfall is less reliably simulated than temperature. As  
2 the signal of climate change becomes stronger in future, climate models predict that there will be changes in  
3 the incidence of many types of extreme weather events, including an increase in extreme rainfall events.  
4 There is already some evidence of increases in extreme rainfall events in at least some regions. However  
5 there is no convincing evidence as yet that there is a clear link between these increases and increasing  
6 greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.

7  
8 [END OF QUESTION 9.1]

9  
10 [START QUESTION 9.2]

11  
12 **Question 9.2: Can the Warming of the 20th Century be Explained by Natural Variability?**

13  
14 Unlikely. There has been a rapid warming over the last century that is very unusual relative to other periods  
15 in the last millennium according to estimates deduced from proxy records of temperature such as tree rings  
16 and ice cores. This rapid warming is consistent with our physical understanding of how the climate would  
17 respond to a rapid increase in greenhouse gas concentrations. Observed patterns of recent temperature  
18 change are similar to those expected from increased greenhouse gas concentrations and differ in many  
19 respects from the most important patterns of natural climate variability such as the El Niño southern  
20 Oscillation. Climate models provide good simulations of the last 100 years when they include the dominant  
21 external forcings that were experienced by the climate system during this period. Moreover, models fail to  
22 reproduce the warming observed in recent decades when anthropogenic forcings are not included. Climate  
23 models almost never simulate warming rates of the magnitude observed over the 20th century when external  
24 forcings of the climate system are held constant, even in very long multi-millennium simulations.

25  
26 The warming seen over the 20th century is consistent with scientific understanding, based on simple energy  
27 balance considerations, of how the climate is expected to respond to perturbations from forcings of the  
28 climate system, both man-made and natural. Over the last 100 years, there has been a rapid increase in the  
29 atmospheric content of carbon dioxide and other well mixed greenhouse gases that had previously remained  
30 at stable concentrations in the atmosphere for thousands of years. Human activities also led to increased  
31 concentrations of aerosols of sulphur and other chemicals in the atmosphere, particularly in the 1950s and  
32 1960s. Explosive volcanic eruptions periodically ejected large amounts of dust and sulphate aerosol high up  
33 in the atmosphere temporarily shielding the earth and reflecting solar radiation back to space. Solar output  
34 varied on an 11 year cycle and could also have had longer term variations.

35  
36 Although internal variations in the climate system can cause changes in global temperature from decade to  
37 decade, much of the multi-decadal changes in global mean temperature over the 20th century are likely to  
38 have been caused by external forcings. Short-lived decreases in global temperature followed volcanic  
39 eruptions such as Pinatubo in 1991. The levelling off of global mean temperatures in the 1950s and 1960s  
40 accompanied increases in sulphate aerosols, which have the potential to cool the planet by reflecting  
41 radiation directly to space and by making clouds more reflective and longer lasting. There was global mean  
42 warming in the early part of the 20th century, a period during which greenhouse gas concentrations had  
43 started to rise, volcanic activity was reduced, and when solar output was likely increasing. The warming  
44 observed since the 1970s has occurred in a period when greenhouse gas forcing has dominated over all other  
45 forcings.

46  
47 The patterns of warming observed in the most recent four decades are consistent with physical understanding  
48 of greenhouse gas forcing. There has been a warming of the lower atmosphere (the troposphere) and cooling  
49 higher up in the stratosphere. Also, at the surface there has been a greater warming over land than ocean with  
50 the largest warming at high northern latitudes. Such patterns of change are not only consistent with those  
51 expected from anthropogenic forcing but also differ in many respects from patterns of temperature change  
52 associated with the most important modes of internal variability, such as the El Niño Southern Oscillation.

53  
54 Numerous experiments have been conducted with coupled ocean-atmosphere climate models, forced with  
55 natural and/or anthropogenic factors, to determine the likely causes of the 20th century climate change.  
56 These experiments, conducted with a variety of models, indicate that the warming of global surface  
57 temperature cannot be reproduced by the models when they are forced only with natural variations in

1 external forcing (i.e., variations in solar radiation and volcanic aerosols). However, models are able to  
2 simulate the observed warming when they include all of the most important forcings, including forcings from  
3 anthropogenic sources (changes in greenhouse gases, stratospheric ozone, and industrial aerosols) as well as  
4 natural forcings. Long multi-century climate simulations have also been used to estimate the variability of  
5 the climate system in the absence of natural and anthropogenic external forcing changes. Century scale  
6 temperature changes that result from internal climate variability, as simulated by models, are quite small  
7 relative to the strong 20th century warming, suggesting that internal climate system mechanisms are very  
8 unlikely to have produced the observed warming.

9  
10 An important source of uncertainty arises from the incomplete knowledge about the temporal and spatial  
11 variations in forcings, such as those associated with anthropogenic aerosols, used in model experiments. In  
12 addition, the climate models themselves are also imperfect. However models exhibit a common pattern of  
13 response to anthropogenic greenhouse forcing including greater warming over land than ocean, warming in  
14 the troposphere and cooling in the stratosphere. Such characteristic patterns help to distinguish the response  
15 to greenhouse gases from that to natural forcings, for example from increasing solar output which has a  
16 different vertical pattern of response. In addition, the different time histories of anthropogenic and natural  
17 forcings help to distinguish between the responses. Such considerations increase confidence that warming  
18 observed over the last 50 years was dominated by anthropogenic rather than natural factors.

19  
20 Reconstructions of Northern Hemispheric temperature of the last 1000 years that are based on “proxy” data  
21 (e.g., tree rings that vary in width or density from one year to the next in step with temperature changes)  
22 provide a second line of evidence that natural variability cannot explain the 20th century warming. While  
23 recent work has shown that there is some uncertainty in the level of past temperature variability, all  
24 reconstructions, including the most variable, strongly suggest that the warming observed during the 20th  
25 century is stronger than any other century-scale global temperature change estimated to have occurred over  
26 the last 1000 years. Much of the variation in the reconstructed record of Northern Hemisphere mean  
27 temperature prior to the industrial era can be explained by variations in natural (volcanic and solar) forcing.  
28 Temperature variations during the last 150 years of these records can also be explained if anthropogenic  
29 forcing is also taken into account. Thus, despite some uncertainty in these records, they provide a picture of  
30 the role of external influences on the climate system and the unusual nature of the 20th century that is  
31 consistent with the results of the analysis of the 20th century instrumental record.

32  
33 [END OF QUESTION 9.2]  
34  
35



1 **References**

- 2
- 3 Abdalati, W., and K. Steffen, 2001: Greenland ice sheet melt extent: 1979-1999. *Journal of Geophysical*
- 4 *Research*, 106(D24), 33,983-33,989.
- 5 ACIA, 2004: *The Arctic Climate Impacts Assessment -The impacts of climate warming*. Cambridge
- 6 University Press, The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, C2B 2RU, UK.
- 7 Ackerman, A.S., O.B. Toon, D.E. Stevens, A.J. Heymsfield, V. Ramanathan, and E.J. Welton, 2000:
- 8 Reduction of tropical cloudiness by soot. *Science*, 288, 1042-1047.
- 9 AchutaRao, K.M., P.J. Gleckler, B.D. Santer, K.E. Taylor, D. Pierce, and T.P. Barnett, 2005: Variability of
- 10 ocean heat uptake: Reconciling observations and models. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
- 11 (submitted).
- 12 Adams, J.B., M.E. Mann, and C.M. Ammann, 2003: Proxy evidence for an El Niño-like response to
- 13 volcanic forcing. *Nature*, 426, 274-278.
- 14 Alexander, L.V., X. Zhang, T.C. Peterson, J. Caesar, B. Gleason, A. Klein-Tank, M. Haylock, D. Collins,
- 15 B. Trewin, F. Rahimzadeh, A. Tagipour, P. Ambenje, K. Rupa Kumar, J. Revadekar, G. Griffiths, L.
- 16 Vincent, D. Stephenson, J. Burn, E. Aguilar, M. Brunet, M. Taylor, M. New, P. Zhai, M. Rusticucci,
- 17 J.L. Vazquez-Aguirre, 2005: Global observed changes in daily climate extremes of temperature and
- 18 precipitation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, submitted.
- 19 Allen, M.R., 2003: Liability for climate change. *Nature*, 421, 891-892.
- 20 Allen, M.R., 2005: The spectre of liability: Part I – Attribution. In: *The Finance of Climate Change: A guide*
- 21 *for governments, corporations, and investors* [Tang, K. (ed.)]. Risk Books, Haymarket House, 28-29
- 22 Haymarket, London, SW1Y 4RX UK, chap. 29.
- 23 Allen, M.R., and S.F.B. Tett, 1999: Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting. *Climate*
- 24 *Dynamics*, 15, 419-434.
- 25 Allen, M.R. and W.J. Ingram, 2002: Constraints on future changes in climate and the hydrologic cycle.
- 26 *Nature*, 419, 224-232.
- 27 Allen, M.R. and D.A. Stainforth, 2002: Towards objective probabilistic climate forecasting. *Nature*, 419,
- 28 228-228.
- 29 Allen, M.R. and P.A. Stott, 2003: Estimating signal amplitudes in optimal fingerprinting, Part I: Theory.
- 30 *Climate Dynamics*, 21, 477-491.
- 31 Allen, M.R., P.A. Stott, J.F.B. Mitchell, R. Schnur, and T. Delworth, 2000: Quantifying the uncertainty in
- 32 forecasts of anthropogenic climate change. *Nature*, 407, 617-620.
- 33 Allen, M.R., J.A. Kettleborough, and D.A. Stainforth, 2002: Model error in weather and climate forecasting.
- 34 In: *Predictability of weather and climate* [Palmer, T.N. (ed.)], Proceedings of the seminar at ECMWF,
- 35 September 9-13 2002, ECMWF, Reading, UK, (available from
- 36 <http://www.ecmwf.int/publications/library/do/references/list/161>).
- 37 Allen, M.R. and Coauthors, 2005: Quantifying anthropogenic influence on recent near-surface temperature.
- 38 *Surveys in Geophysics* (in press).
- 39 Ammann, C.M., G.A. Meehl, W.M. Washington, and C. Zender, 2003: A monthly and latitudinally varying
- 40 volcanic forcing dataset in simulations of 20<sup>th</sup> century climate. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(12),
- 41 1657, doi:10.1029/2003GL016875.
- 42 Anderson, D.M., J.T. Overpeck, and A.K. Gupta, 2002: Increase in the Asian southwest monsoon during the
- 43 past four centuries. *Science*, 297, 596-599.
- 44 Anderson, T. L., R. J. Charlson, S.E. Schwartz, R. Knutti, O. Boucher, H. Rodhe and J. Heintzenberg 2003:
- 45 Climate Forcing by Aerosols: A Hazy Picture. *Science*, 300, 1103-1104.
- 46 Andreae, M.O., C.D. Jones, and P.M. Cox, 2005: Strong present-day aerosol cooling implies a hot future.
- 47 *Nature*, 435, 1187-1190.
- 48 Andronova, N.G., E.V. Rozanov, F. Yang, M.E. Schlesinger, and G.L. Stenchikov, 1999: Radiative forcing
- 49 by volcanic aerosols from 1850 to 1994. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 104, 16,807-16,826.
- 50 Andronova, N.G. and M.E. Schlesinger, 2000: Causes of global temperature changes during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>
- 51 centuries. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 27 (14), 2137-2140.
- 52 Andronova, N.G. and M.E. Schlesinger, 2001: Objective estimation of the probability density function for
- 53 climate sensitivity. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106(D19), 22,605-22,611.
- 54 Andronova, N. G., M. E. Schlesinger, S. Dessai, M. Hulme, and B. Li 2005: The Concept of Climate
- 55 Sensitivity: History and Development. In: *Human-Induced Climate Change: An Interdisciplinary*
- 56 *Assessment*. M. E Schlesinger et al. (Eds), Cambridge University Press, accepted.

- 1 Arblaster, J.M., and G.A. Meehl, 2005: Contributions of external forcing to Southern Annular Mode trends.  
2 *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 3 Arblaster, J.M., G.A. Meehl, and A.M. Moore, 2002: Interdecadal modulation of Australian rainfall. *Climate*  
4 *Dynamics*, 18, 519-531.
- 5 Bader, J., and M. Latif, 2003: The impact of decadal-scale Indian Ocean sea surface temperature anomalies  
6 on Sahelian rainfall and the North Atlantic Oscillation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 2169,  
7 doi:10.1029/2003GL018426.
- 8 Banks, H.T. and N.L. Bindoff, 2003: Comparison of observed temperature and salinity changes in the Indo-  
9 Pacific with results from the coupled climate model HadCM: Processes and mechanisms. *Journal of*  
10 *Climate*, 16, 156-166.
- 11 Banks, H.T., R.A. Wood, J.M. Gregory, T.C. Johns, and G.S. Jones, 2002: Are observed decadal changes in  
12 intermediate water masses a signature of anthropogenic climate changes? *Geophysical Research*  
13 *Letters*, 27, 2961-2964.
- 14 Barnett, T. P. and coauthors, 1999: Detection and attribution of recent climate change. *Bulletin of the*  
15 *American Meteorological Society*, 80, 2631-2659.
- 16 Barnett, T.P., D.W. Pierce, and R. Schnur, 2001: Detection of anthropogenic climate change in the world's  
17 oceans. *Science*, 292, 270-274.
- 18 Barnett, T. P., D. Pierce, K. AchutaRao, P. Gleckler, B. Santer, J. Gregory, and W. Washington, 2005:  
19 Penetration of a warming signal in the World's oceans: human impacts. *Science*,  
20 doi:10.1126/science.1112418.
- 21 Bauer, E., M. Claussen, V. Brovkin, and A. Huenerbein, 2003: Assessing climate forcings of the Earth  
22 system for the past millennium. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 1276, doi:10.1029/2002GL016639.
- 23 Beniston, M., 2004: The 2003 heat wave in Europe: A shape of things to come? An analysis based on Swiss  
24 climatological data and model simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L02202,  
25 doi:10.1029/2003GL018857.
- 26 Berger, A., 1978: Long-term variations of caloric solar radiation resulting from the earth's orbital elements.  
27 *Quaternary Research*, 9, 139-167.
- 28 Berger, A., 1988: Milankovitch theory and climate. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 26, 624-657.
- 29 Berliner, L.M., R.A. Levine, and D.J. Shea, 2000: Bayesian climate change assessment. *Journal of Climate*,  
30 13, 3805-3820.
- 31 Bertrand, C., M.F. Loutre, M. Crucifix, and A. Berger, 2002: Climate of the last millennium: a sensitivity  
32 study. *Tellus*, 54, 221-244.
- 33 Betts, R.A., 2000: Offset of the potential carbon sink from boreal forestation by decreases  
34 in surface albedo. *Nature*, 408, 187-190.
- 35 Betts, R., P.M. Cox, M. Collins, P.P. Arris, C. Huntingford, and C.D. Jones, 2004: The role of ecosystem-  
36 atmosphere interactions in simulated Amazonian precipitation decrease and forest die back under global  
37 climate warming. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 78, 157-166.
- 38 Bigelow, N.H., L.B. Brubaker, M.E. Edwards, S. P. Harrison, I.C. Prentice, P.M. Anderson, A.A. Andreev,  
39 P.J. Bartlein, T.R. Christensen, W. Cramer, J.O. Kaplan, A.V. Lozhkin, N.V. Matveyeva, D.F. Murray,  
40 A.D. McGuire, V.Y. Razzhivin, J.C. Ritchie, B. Smith, D.A. Walker, K. Gajewski, V. Wolf, B.H.  
41 Holmqvist, Y. Igarashi, K. Kremenetskii, A. Paus, M. F. J. Pisaric, and V. S. Volkova, 2003: Climate  
42 change and Arctic ecosystems: 1. Vegetation changes north of 55 degrees N between the last glacial  
43 maximum, mid-Holocene, and present. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 108(D19),  
44 8170, doi:10.1029/2002JD002558.
- 45 Bindoff, N.L. and T.J. McDougall, 2000: Decadal changes along an Indian Ocean section at 32S and their  
46 interpretation. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 30 (6), 1207-1222.
- 47 Bister, M. and K.A. Emanuel, 2002: Low frequency variability of tropical cyclone potential intensity 1.  
48 Interannual to interdecadal variability. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107(D24), 4801,  
49 doi:10.1029/2001JD000776.
- 50 Bjerknes, J., 1969: Atmospheric teleconnections from the equatorial Pacific. *Monthly Weather Review*, 97,  
51 163-172.
- 52 Black, E., M. Blackburn, G. Harrison, B. Hoskins, and J. Methven, 2004: Factors contributing to the summer  
53 2003 European heatwave. *Weather*, 59, 217-223.
- 54 Boer, G.J. and B. Yu, 2003: Climate Sensitivity and climate state. *Climate Dynamics*, 21, 167-176.
- 55 Boucher, O., and J. Haywood, 2001: On summing the components of radiative forcing of climate change  
56 *Climate Dynamics*, 18, 297-302.

- 1 Boyer, T.P., S. Levitus, J.I. Antonov, R.A. Locarnini, and H.E. Garcia, 2005: Linear trends in salinity for the  
2 World Ocean, 1955-1998. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32, L01604, doi:10.1029/2004GL021791.
- 3 Braconnot, P., S. Joussaume, O. Marti, and N. de Noblet, 1999: Synergistic feedbacks from ocean and  
4 vegetation on the African monsoon response to mid-Holocene insolation. *Geophysical Research Letters*,  
5 26, 2481-2484.
- 6 Braconnot, P., O. Marti, S. Joussaume, and Y. Leclainche, 2000: Ocean feedback in response to 6 kyr BP  
7 insolation. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 1537-1553.
- 8 Braconnot, P., S. Harrison, S. Joussaume, C. Hewitt, A. Kitoh, J. Kutzbach, Z. Liu, B.L. Otto-Bleisner, J.  
9 Syktus, and S.L. Weber, 2004: Evaluation of PMIP coupled ocean-atmosphere simulations of the Mid-  
10 Holocene. In: *Past Climate Variability through Europe and Africa* [Battarbee, R.W., F. Gasse, C.E.  
11 Stickley, (eds.)], Springer, London, UK, chap. 24.
- 12 Braganza, K., D.J. Karoly, A.C. Hirst, M.E. Mann, P.A. Stott, R.J. Stouffer, and S.F.B. Tett, 2003: Simple  
13 indices of global climate variability and change: Part I - Variability and correlation structure. *Climate*  
14 *Dynamics*, 20, 491-502.
- 15 Braganza, K., D.J. Karoly, A.C. Hirst, P.A. Stott, R.J. Stouffer, and S.F.B. Tett, 2004: Simple indices of  
16 global climate variability and change: Part II - Attribution of climate change during the 20th century.  
17 *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 823-838.
- 18 Bratcher, A.J. and B.S. Giese, 2002: Tropical Pacific decadal variability and global warming. *Geophysical*  
19 *Research Letters*, 29, 1918, doi:10.1029/2002GL015191.
- 20 Briffa, K.R., T.J. Osborn, F.H. Schweingruber, I.C. Harris, P.D. Jones, S.G. Shiyatov, and E.A. Vaganov,  
21 2001: Low-frequency temperature variations from a northern tree ring density network. *Journal of*  
22 *Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 106, 2929-2941.
- 23 Broccoli, A.J., K.W. Dixon, T.L. Delworth, T.R. Knutson, and R.J. Stouffer, 2003: Twentieth century  
24 temperature and precipitation trends in ensemble climate simulations including natural and  
25 anthropogenic forcing. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108(D24), 4798, doi:10.1029/2003JD003812.
- 26 Bryden, H.L., E. McDonagh, and B.A. King, 2003: Changes in ocean water mass properties: Oscillations of  
27 trends? *Science*, 300, 2086-2088.
- 28 Cai, W., P.H. Whetton, and D.J. Karoly, 2003: The response of the Antarctic Oscillation to increasing and  
29 stabilized atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 1525-1538.
- 30 Cai, W., M.J. McPhaden, and M.A. Collier, 2004: Multidecadal fluctuations in the relationship between  
31 equatorial Pacific heat content anomalies and ENSO amplitude. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31,  
32 L01201, doi:10.1029/2003GL018714.
- 33 Cane, M., P. Braconnot, A. Clement, H. Gildor, J. Joussaume, M. Khodri, D. Paillard, S. Tett, and E. Zorita,  
34 2005: Progress in Paleoclimate modeling. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 35 Carril, A.F., C.G. Menéndez, and A. Navarra, 2005: Climate response associated with the Southern Annular  
36 Mode in the surroundings of Antarctic Peninsula: A multimodel ensemble analysis. *Geophysical*  
37 *Research Letters* (submitted).
- 38 CCSP, 2005: *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling*  
39 *Differences*. Karl, T.R., S.J. Hassol, C.D. Miller, and W.L. Murray, editors. A Report by the U.S/  
40 Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research, Washington, DC.  
41 (in preparation).
- 42 Chase, T.N., J.A. Knaff, R.A. Pielke, and E. Kalnay, 2003: Changes in global monsoon circulations since  
43 1950. *Natural Hazards*, 29, 229-254.
- 44 Christidis, N., P.A. Stott, S. Brown, G. Hegerl, and J. Caesar, 2005a: Detection of changes in temperature  
45 extremes during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 46 Chuang, C.C., J.E. Penner, K.E. Grant, J.M. Prospero, G.H. Rau, and K. Kawamoto, 2002: Cloud  
47 susceptibility and the first aerosol indirect forcing: Sensitivity to black carbon and aerosol  
48 concentrations. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107(D21), Art. No. 4564.
- 49 Collins, M., 2000a: Understanding Uncertainties in the response of ENSO to Greenhouse Warming,  
50 *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, 27, 3509-3513.
- 51 Collins, M., 2000b: The El-Niño Southern Oscillation in the second Hadley Centre coupled model and its  
52 response to greenhouse warming. *J. Climate*, 13, 1299-1312.
- 53 Cobb, K. M., C. D. Charles, H. Cheng, and R. L. Edwards, 2003: El Niño/Southern Oscillation and tropical  
54 Pacific climate during the last millennium. *Nature*, 424, 271-276.
- 55 Cook, A.J., A.J. Fox, D.G. Vaughan, and J.G. Ferrigno, 2005: Retreating glacier fronts over the Antarctic  
56 Peninsula over the past half-century. *Science*, 308, 541-544.

- 1 Cook, E.R., C.A. Woodhouse, C.M. Eakin, D.M. Meko, and D.W. Stahle, 2004: Long-term aridity changes  
2 in the western United States. *Science*, 306, 1015-1018.
- 3 Crooks, S., 2004: *Solar influence on climate*. D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford, ??pp.
- 4 Crooks, S., M. R. Allen and P. A. Stott, 2005: An update on the detection and attribution of observed  
5 temperature change – a space-time separable approach. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 6 Crowley, T.J., 2000: Causes of climate change over the past 1000 years. *Science*, 289, 270-277.
- 7 Crowley, T. J. and S. K. Baum, 1997: Effect of vegetation on an ice-age climate model simulation. *Journal*  
8 *of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 102, 16463-16480.
- 9 Crowley, T.J., S.K. Baum, K.-Y. Kim, G.C. Hegerl, and W.T. Hyde, 2003: Modeling ocean heat content  
10 changes during the last millennium. *Geophysical Research Letters* 30, 1932,  
11 doi:10.1029/2003GL017801.
- 12 Cubasch, U., R. Voss, G. C. Hegerl, J. Waszkewitz, and T. J. Crowley, 1997: Simulation of the influence of  
13 solar radiation variations on the global climate with an ocean-atmosphere general circulation model.  
14 *Climate Dynamics*, 13, 757-767.
- 15 Cubasch et al., 2001, 2001: Projections of future climate change. In: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific*  
16 *Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel*  
17 *on Climate Change* [Houghton, J.T., Y. Ding, D.J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P.J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K.  
18 Maskell, and C.A. Johnson (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, pp.99-181.
- 19 Curry, R., B. Dickson, and I. Yashayaev, 2003: A change in the freshwater balance of the Atlantic ocean  
20 over the past four decades. *Nature*, 426, 826-829.
- 21 Dai, A., K.E. Trenberth, and T.R. Karl, 1999: Effects of clouds, soil, moisture, precipitation and water  
22 vapour on diurnal temperature range. *Journal of Climate*, 12, 2451-2473.
- 23 Dai, A., P.J. Lamb, K.E. Trenberth, M. Hulme, P.D. Jones, and P. Xie, 2004: The recent Sahel drought is  
24 real. *International Journal of Climatology*, 24, 1323-1331.
- 25 D'Arrigo, R., E. R. Cook, R. J. Wilson, R. Allan, and M. E. Mann, 2005: On the variability of ENSO over  
26 the past six centuries. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32.
- 27 Delworth, T.L. and T.R. Knutson, 2000: Simulation of early 20th century global warming. *Science*, 287,  
28 2246-2250.
- 29 Delworth, T. L. and M. E. Mann, 2000: Observed and simulated multidecadal variability in the Northern  
30 Hemisphere. *Climate Dynamics*, 16, 661-676.
- 31 Delworth, T. L., V. Ramaswamy, and G. L. Stenchikov, 2005: The impact of aerosols on simulated global  
32 ocean temperature and sea level. *Nature* (submitted).
- 33 Deser, C., A.S. Phillips, and J.W. Hurrell, 2004: Pacific Interdecadal Climate Variability: Linkages between  
34 the Tropics and North Pacific during boreal winter since 1900. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 3109-3124.
- 35 de Vernal, A., A. Rosell-Mele, M. Kucera, C. Hillaire-Marcel, F. Eynaud, M. Weinelt, T. Dokken, and M.  
36 Kageyama, 2005: Multiproxy reconstruction of LGM sea-surface conditions in the northern North  
37 Atlantic.
- 38 Diaz, H.F., J.K. Eischeid, C. Duncan, and R. Bradley, 2003: Variability of freezing levels, melting season  
39 indicators, and snow cover for selected high-elevation and continental regions in the last 50 years.  
40 *Climatic Change*, 59, 33-52.
- 41 Dickson, R.R., I. Yashayaev, J. Meineke, B. Turrel, S. Dye, and J. Holfort, 2002: Rapid freshening of the  
42 deep North Atlantic Ocean over the past four decades. *Nature*, 416, 832-837.
- 43 Douglass, D. H. and B.D. Clader, 2002: Climate sensitivity of the Earth to solar irradiance. *Geophysical*  
44 *Research Letters*, 29(16), 1786, doi:10.1029/2002GL015345.
- 45 Douglas, D.H. and R.S. Knox, 2005: Climate forcing by volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo. *Geophys. Res.*  
46 *Lett.*, 32, L05710, doi:10.1029/2004GL022119.
- 47 Douglass, D.H., B.D. Pearson, and S.F. Singer, 2004: Altitude dependence of atmospheric temperature  
48 trends: Climate models versus observation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31.
- 49 Douville, H., F. Chauvin, S. Planton, J.-F. Royer, D. Sala-Méla, and S. Tyteca, 2002: Sensitivity of the  
50 hydrological cycle to increasing amounts of greenhouse gases and aerosols. *Climate Dynamics*, 20, 45-  
51 68.
- 52 Duan, A, G. Wu, Q. Zhang and Y. Liu, 2005: Recent climate warming over the Tibetan plateau and the  
53 increasing greenhouse gas emissions. ??? (submitted).
- 54 Duplessy, J. C., N. J. Shackleton, R. Fairbanks, L. Labeyrie, D. Oppo, and N. Kallel, 1988: Deep water  
55 source variation during the last climatic cycle and their impact on the global deep water circulation.  
56 *Paleoceanography*, 3, 343-360.

- 1 Easterling, D.R., G.A. Meehl, C. Parmesan, S. Changnon, T.R. Karl, and L.O. Mearns, 2000: Climate  
2 extremes: Observations, modeling and impacts. *Science*, 289, 2068-2074.
- 3 Elsner, J.B. X. Niu and T. H. Jagger. 2004: Detecting Shifts in Hurricane Rates Using a Markov Chain  
4 Monte Carlo Approach. *Journal of Climate*: 17, 2652-2666.
- 5 Emanuel, K., 2005: Increasing destructiveness of tropical cyclones over the past 30 years. *Nature*, 436, 686-  
6 688, doi:10.1038/nature03906.
- 7 Emori, S. and S.J. Brown, 2005: Dynamic and thermodynamic changes in mean and extreme precipitation  
8 under changed climate. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* Submitted.
- 9 Esper, J., E.R. Cook and F.H. Schweingruber, 2002: Low frequency signals in long tree line chronologies for  
10 reconstructing past temperature variability. *Science*, 295, 2250-2253.
- 11 Fink, A. H., T. Brucher, A. Kruger, G. C. Leckebusch, J. G. Pinto and U. Ulbrich, 2004: The 2003 European  
12 summer heatwaves and drought – synoptic diagnosis and impacts. *Weather*, 59, 209-216.
- 13 Folland, C. K., T. N. Palmer, and D. E. Parker, 1986: Sahel rainfall and worldwide sea temperatures, 1901–  
14 85, *Nature*, 320, 602-607.
- 15 Folland, C.K., J.A. Renwick, M.J. Salinger, and A.B. Mullan, 2002: Relative influences of the IPO and  
16 ENSO on the South Pacific Convergence Zone. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(13).
- 17 Fomby, T.B., and T.J. Vogelsang, 2002: The application of size-robust trend statistics to global-warming  
18 temperature series. *Journal of Climate*, 15, 117-123.
- 19 Forest, C.E., M.R. Allen, P.H. Stone, and A.P. Sokolov, 2000: Constraining uncertainties in climate models  
20 using climate change detection techniques. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 27, 569-572.
- 21 Forest, C.E., M.R. Allen, A.P. Sokolov, and P.H. Stone, 2001: Constraining Climate Model Properties Using  
22 Optimal Fingerprint Detection Methods. *Climate Dynamics*, 18, 277-295.
- 23 Forest, C.E., P.H. Stone, A.P. Sokolov, M.R. Allen, and M.D. Webster, 2002: Quantifying uncertainties in  
24 climate system properties with the use of recent observations. *Science*, 295.
- 25 Forest, D.J., P. H. Stone and A. P. Sokolov, 2005: Estimated PDFs of climate system properties including  
26 natural and anthropogenic forcing. Submitted to *Geophysical Research Letters*.
- 27 Forster, P.M.D.F., M. Blackburn, and K.P. Shine, 2000: an examination of climate sensitivity for idealized  
28 climate change experiments in an intermediate general circulation model, *Clim. Dyn.* 16, 833-849.
- 29 Forster, P. and J.M. Gregory, 2005: The climate sensitivity and its components diagnosed from Earth  
30 Radiation Budget data. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 31 Foukal, P., G. North, and T. Wigley, 2004: A stellar view on solar variations and climate. *Science*, 306, 68-  
32 69.
- 33 Frame, D.J. and M.R. Allen, 2005: Challenging climate sensitivity. Submitted.
- 34 Frame, D.J., B.B.B. Booth, J.A. Kettleborough, D.A. Stainforth, J.M. Gregory, M. Collins, And M.R. Allen,  
35 2005: Constraining climate forecasts: the role of prior assumptions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32,  
36 L09702, doi:10.1029/2004GL022241.
- 37 Free, M. and J.K. Angell, 2002: Effect of volcanoes on the vertical temperature profile in radiosonde data.  
38 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107, doi:10.1029/2001JD001128.
- 39 Free, M., M. Bister, and K.A. Emanuel, 2004: Potential intensity of tropical cyclones: Comparison of results  
40 from radiosonde and reanalysis data. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 1722-1727.
- 41 Free M., D. J. Seidel, J. K. Angell, J. Lanzante, I. Durre, and T. C. Peterson, 2005: Radiosonde atmospheric  
42 temperature products for assessing climate (RATPAC): A new dataset of large-area anomaly time  
43 series. *Journal of Geophysical Research* (accepted).
- 44 Frich, P., L.V. Alexander, P. Della-Marta, B. Gleason, M. Haylock, A.M.G. Klein-Tank, and T. Peterson,  
45 2002: Observed coherent changes in climatic extremes during the second half of the twentieth century.  
46 *Climate Research*, 19, 193-212.
- 47 Fu, Q., C.M. Johanson, S.G. Warren, and D.J. Seidel, 2004: Contribution of stratospheric cooling to satellite-  
48 inferred tropospheric temperature trends. *Nature*, 429, 55-58.
- 49 Fyfe, J.C., 2003: Extratropical Southern Hemisphere cyclones: harbingers of climate change? *Journal of*  
50 *Climate*, 16, 2802-2805.
- 51 Fyfe, J.C., G.J. Boer, and G.M. Flato, 1999: The Arctic and Antarctic Oscillations and their projected  
52 changes under global warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 26, 1601-1604.
- 53 Ganopolski, A., C. Kubatzki, M. Claussen, V. Brovkin, and V. Petoukhov, 1998: The influence of  
54 Vegetation-atmosphere-Ocean Interaction on Climate During the Mid-Holocene. *Science*, 280, 1916-  
55 1919.
- 56 Gedney, N, P. M. Cox, R. Betts, O. Boucher, C. Huntingford, P. A. Stott, 2005: Detection and attribution  
57 changes in 20<sup>th</sup> century continental runoff. *Nature*, submitted.

- 1 Geng, Q. and M. Sugi, 2003: Possible change of extratropical cyclone activity due to enhanced greenhouse  
2 gases and sulfate aerosols – study with a high-resolution AGCM. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 2262-2274.
- 3 Gent, P. R. and G. Danabasoglu, 2004: Heat uptake and the thermohaline circulation in the Community  
4 Climate System Model, Version 2. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 4058-4069.
- 5 Gerber, S., F. Joos, P. Brugger, T. F. Stocker, M. E. Mann, S. Sitch, and M. Scholze, 2003: Constraining  
6 temperature variations over the last millennium by comparing simulated and observed atmospheric  
7 CO<sub>2</sub>. *Climate Dynamics*, 20, 281-299.
- 8 Giannini, A., R. Saravanan, and P. Chang, 2003: Oceanic forcing of Sahel rainfall on interannual to  
9 interdecadal time scales. *Science*, 302, 1027-1030.
- 10 Gilgen, H., M. Wild, and A. Ohmura, 1998: Means and trends of shortwave irradiance at the surface  
11 estimated from global energy balance archive data. *Journal of Climate*, 11, 2042-2061.
- 12 Gillett, N.P., 2005: Inconsistency between simulated and observed Northern Hemisphere circulation  
13 changes. *Nature* (submitted).
- 14 Gillett, N.P. and D.W.J. Thompson, 2003: Simulation of recent Southern Hemisphere climate change.  
15 *Science*, 302, 273-275.
- 16 Gillett, N.P., G.C. Hegerl, M.R. Allen, and P.A. Stott, 2000: Implications of changes in the Northern  
17 Hemispheric circulation for the detection of anthropogenic climate change. *Geophysical Research  
18 Letters*, 27, 993-996.
- 19 Gillett, N.P., M.R. Allen, R.E. McDonald, C.A. Senior, D.T. Shindell, and G.A. Schmidt, 2002a: How linear  
20 is the Arctic Oscillation response to greenhouse gases? *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **107(D3)**,  
21 doi:10.1029/2001JD000589.
- 22 Gillett, N.P., G.C. Hegerl, M.R. Allen, P.A. Stott, and R. Schnur, 2002b: Reconciling two approaches to the  
23 detection of anthropogenic influence on climate. *Journal of Climate*, 15, 326-329.
- 24 Gillett, N.P., F.W. Zwiers, A.J. Weaver, G.C. Hegerl, M.R. Allen, and P.A. Stott, 2002c: Detecting  
25 anthropogenic influence with a multi-model ensemble. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29.
- 26 Gillett, N.P., H.F. Graf, and T.J. Osborn, 2003a: *Climate change and the North Atlantic Oscillation*. [Y.K. J.  
27 Hurrell, G. Ottersen and M. Visbeck (ed). American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC.
- 28 Gillett, N.P., F.W. Zwiers, A.J. Weaver, and P.A. Stott, 2003b: Detection of human influence on sea level  
29 pressure. *Nature*, 422, 292-294.
- 30 Gillett, N.P., A.J. Weaver, F.W. Zwiers, and M.D. Flannigan, 2004a: Detecting the effect of climate change  
31 on Canadian forest fires. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31(18), L18211.
- 32 Gillett, N.P., A.J. Weaver, F.W. Zwiers, and M.F. Wehner, 2004b: Detection of volcanic influence on global  
33 precipitation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31(12), L12217.
- 34 Gillett, N.P., M.F. Wehner, S.F.B. Tett, and A.J. Weaver, 2004c: Testing the linearity of the response to  
35 combined greenhouse gas and sulfate aerosol forcing. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31.
- 36 Gillett, N. P., R. J. Allan, and T. J. Ansell, 2005: Attribution of 20<sup>th</sup> century sea level pressure changes to  
37 external influence. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 38 Gladstone, R. M., I. Ross, P. Valdes, A. Abe-Ouchi, P. Braconnot, S. Brewer, M. Kageyama, A. Kitoh, A.  
39 Legrande, O. Marti, R. Ohgaito, B. L. Otto-Bleisner, and G. Vettoretti, 2005: Mid-Holocene NOA : a  
40 PMIP2 model intercomparison. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, submitted.
- 41 Goddard, L., A.G. Barnston, and S.J. Mason, 2003: Evaluation of the IRI'S "Net Assessment" Seasonal  
42 Climate Forecasts: 1997-2001. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 84, 1761-1781.
- 43 Goldewijk, K. K., 2001: Estimating global land use change over the past 300 years: The HYDE Database.  
44 *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15, 417-433.
- 45 Gonzalez-Rouco, F., H. von Storch, and E. Zorita, 2003: Deep soil temperature as proxy for surface air-  
46 temperature in a coupled model simulation of the last thousand years. *Geophysical Research Letters*,  
47 30(21), 2116, doi:10.1029/2003GL018264.
- 48 Goosse, H. and H. Renssen, 2001: A two-phase response of the Southern Ocean to an increase in greenhouse  
49 gas concentrations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28, 3469-3472.
- 50 Goosse, H. and H. Renssen, 2004: Exciting natural modes of variability by solar and volcanic forcing:  
51 idealized and realistic experiments. *Climate Dynamics*, 23, 153-163.
- 52 Goosse, H., V. Masson-Delmotte, H. Renssen, M. Delmotte, T. Fichefet, V. Morgan, T. van Ommen, B. K.  
53 Khim, and B. Stenni, 2004: A late medieval warm period in the Southern Ocean as a delayed response  
54 to external forcing? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L06203, doi:10.1029/2003GL019140.
- 55 Goosse, H., T. J. Crowley, E. Zorita, C. M. Ammann, H. Renssen, and E. Driesschaert, 2005: Modelling the  
56 climate of the last millennium: What causes the differences between simulations? *Geophysical  
57 Research Letters*, 32, L06710, doi:10.1029/2005GL022368.

- 1 Gray, L. J., J. D. Haigh, and R. G. Harrison, 2005: *The Influence of Solar Changes on the Earth's Climate*.  
2 Hadley Centre Technical Note 62, The Met Office (available from  
3 <http://www.metoffice.com/research/hadleycentre/pubs/HCTN/>).
- 4 Greenland, S. and J.M. Robins, 1988: Conceptual problems in the definition and interpretation of attributable  
5 fractions. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 128(6), 1185-1197.
- 6 Gregory, J.M., R.J. Stouffer, S.C.B. Raper, P.A. Stott, and N.A. Rayner, 2002a: An Observationally Based  
7 Estimate of the Climate Sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 15(22), 3117--3121.
- 8 Gregory, J.M., P.A. Stott, D.J. Cresswell, N.A. Rayner, C. Gordon, and D.M.H. Sexton, 2002b: Recent and  
9 future changes in Arctic sea ice simulated by the HadCM3 AOGCM. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29,  
10 2175.
- 11 Gregory, J.M., H.T. Banks, P.A. Stott, J.A. Lowe, and M.D. Palmer, 2004a: Simulated and observed decadal  
12 variability in ocean heat content. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, doi:10.1029/2004GL020258.
- 13 Gregory, J.M., W.J. Ingram, M.A. Palmer, G.S. Jones, P.A. Stott, R.B. Thorpe, J.A. Lowe, T.C. Johns, and  
14 K.D. Williams, 2004b: A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and climate sensitivity.  
15 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L03205.
- 16 Grody, N. C. and coauthors, 2004: Calibration of multisatellite observations for climatic studies: Microwave  
17 Sounding Unit (MSU). *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109(D24), doi:10.1029/2004JD005079.
- 18 Groisman, P.Y., and Coauthors, 1999: Changes in the probability of heavy precipitation: Important  
19 indicators of climatic change. *Climatic Change*, 42, 243-283.
- 20 Groisman, P., R. Knight, D.R. Easterling, T.R. Karl, and G.C. Hegerl, 2005a: Trends in Precipitation  
21 Intensity in the Climate Record. *Journal of Climate*, 18, 1326-1349.
- 22 Groisman, P. Y., R. W. Knight, D. R. Easterling, T. R. Karl, G. C. Hegerl, and V. N. Razuvaev, 2005b:  
23 Trends in intense precipitation in the climate record. *Journal of Climate*, 18, 1326-1349.
- 24 Haarsma, R. J., F. Selten, N. Weber, and M. Klijn, 2005: Sahel Rainfall variability and response to  
25 greenhouse warming. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 26 Hansen, J. and L. Nazarenko, 2004: Soot climate forcing via snow and ice albedos. *Proceedings of the*  
27 *National Academy of Sciences*, 101, 423-428, doi:10.1073/pnas.2237157100.
- 28 Hansen, J.E., M. Sato, and R. Ruedy, 1995: Long-term changes of the diurnal temperature cycle:  
29 implications about mechanisms of global climate change. *Atmospheric Research*, 37, 175-209.
- 30 Hansen, J.E., M. Sato, and R. Ruedy, 1997: Radiative forcing and climate response. *Journal of Geophysical*  
31 *Research*, 102, 6831-6864.
- 32 Hansen, J. M. and coauthors, 2002: Climate forcings in Goddard Institute for Space Studies SI2000  
33 simulations. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, doi:10.1029/2001JD001143.
- 34 Hansen, J. M. and coauthors, 2005: Earth's Energy Imbalance: Confirmation and Implications..*Science*, 308,  
35 1431-1435, DOI: 10.1126/science.1110252
- 36 Harvey, L.D.D., 2004: Characterizing the Annual-Mean Climatic Effect of Anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> and Aerosol  
37 Emissions In Eight Coupled Atmosphere-Ocean GCMs. *Climate Dynamics*, 23, 569-599.
- 38 Harvey, L.D.D. and R.K. Kaufmann, 2002: Simultaneously constraining climate sensitivity and aerosol  
39 radiative forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 15 (20), 2837-2861.
- 40 Harrison, S. and C. Prentice, 2003: Climate and CO<sub>2</sub> controls on global vegetation distribution at the last  
41 glacial maximum: analysis based on palaeovegetation data, biome modelling and palaeoclimate  
42 simulations. *Global Change Biology*, 9, 983-1004.
- 43 Harrison, S., P. Braconnot, C. Hewitt, and R. J. Stouffer, 2002 : Fourth international workshop of the  
44 Paleoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project (PMIP): launching PMIP Phase II. *Eos*, 83, 447-447.
- 45 Hasselmann, K., 1976: Stochastic climate models. Part 1. Theory. *Tellus*, 28, 473-485.
- 46 Hasselmann, K., 1979: On the signal-to-noise problem in atmospheric response studies. *Meteorology of*  
47 *Tropical Oceans*, D. B. Shaw, Ed., Royal Meteorological Society, 251-259.
- 48 Hasselmann, K., 1997: Multi-pattern fingerprint method for detection and attribution of climate change.  
49 *Climate Dyn.*, 13, 601-612.
- 50 Hasselmann, K., 1998: Conventional and Bayesian approach to climate-change detection and attribution.  
51 *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 124, 2541-2565.
- 52 Hegerl, G.C. and M.R. Allen, 2002: Origins of model-data discrepancies in optimal fingerprinting. *Journal*  
53 *of Climate*, 15, 1348-1356.
- 54 Hegerl, G.C. and J.M. Wallace, 2002: Influence of patterns of climate variability on the difference between  
55 satellite and surface temperature trends. *Journal of Climate*, 15, 2412-2428.

- 1 Hegerl, G.C., K. Hasselmann, U. Cubasch, J.F.B. Mitchell, E. Roeckner, R. Voss, and J. Waszkewitz, 1997:  
2 Multi-fingerprint detection and attribution of greenhouse-gas and aerosol-forced climate change.  
3 *Climate Dynamics*, 13, 613-634.
- 4 Hegerl, G.C., P.A. Stott, M.R. Allen, J.F.B. Mitchell, S.F.B. Tett, and U. Cubasch, 2000: Detection and  
5 attribution of climate change: Sensitivity of results to climate model differences. *Climate Dynamics*, 16,  
6 737-754.
- 7 Hegerl, G.C., P.D.Jones, and T.P.Barnett, 2001: Effect of observational sampling error on the detection and  
8 attribution of anthropogenic climate change. *Journal of Climate*, 198-207.
- 9 Hegerl, G. C., T. J. Crowley, S. K. Baum, K. Y. Kim, and W. T. Hyde, 2003: Detection of volcanic, solar  
10 and greenhouse gas signals in paleo-reconstructions of Northern Hemispheric temperature. *Geophysical  
11 Research Letters*, 30, 1242, doi:10.1029/2002GL016635.
- 12 Hegerl, G.C., F.W. Zwiers, V.V. Kharin, and P.A. Stott, 2004: Detectability of anthropogenic changes in  
13 temperature and precipitation extremes. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 3683-3700.
- 14 Hegerl, G. C., T. Crowley, M. Allen, W. T. Hyde, H. Pollack, J. Smerdon, E. Zorita, 2005a:A new 1500 yr  
15 climate reconstruction: enhanced low-frequency variability and the fingerprint of anthropogenic  
16 warming. Submitted for publication.
- 17 Hegerl, G. C., T. Crowley, W. T. Hyde and D. Frame, 2005b: Using paleoclimatic records of the last  
18 millennium to constrain climate sensitivity. *Nature*, submitted.
- 19 Hegerl, G.C., T.R. Karl, M.R. Allen, N.L.Bindoff, N.P. Gillett, X.Zhang, and F.W. Zwiers, 2005c: Climate  
20 change detection and attribution: beyond mean temperature signals. *Journal of Climate* (accepted).
- 21 Held, I. M., T. L. Delworth, J. Lu, K. Findell, and T. R. Knutson, 2005: Simulation of Sahel drought in the  
22 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. *Nature* (submitted).
- 23 Highwood, E.J., B.J. Hoskins and P. Berrisford, 2000: Properties of the Arctic tropopause. *Quarterly Journal  
24 of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 126, 1515-1532.
- 25 Hoerling, M.P., A. Kumar and T. Xu. 2001: Robustness of the Nonlinear Climate Response to ENSO's  
26 Extreme Phases. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 1277-1293.
- 27 Hoerling, M.P., J.W. Hurrell, and J. Eischeid, 2005a: Detection and attribution of 20<sup>th</sup> century Northern and  
28 Southern African monsoon change. *Journal of Climate* (prov. accepted).
- 29 Hoerling, M.P., J.W. Hurrell, T. Xu, G.T. Bates, and A.S. Phillips, 2005b: Twentieth century North Atlantic  
30 climate change. Part II: Understanding the effect of Indian Ocean warming, *Climate Dynamics*, 23, 391-  
31 405.
- 32 Huntingford, C., P.A. Stott, M. R. Allen and F. H. Lambert, 2005: Incorporating model uncertainty into  
33 attribution of observed temperature change. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, submitted..
- 34 Hurrell, J.W., 1996: Influence of variations in extratropical wintertime teleconnections on Northern  
35 Hemisphere temperature. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 23, 665-668.
- 36 Hurrell, J. W., M. P. Hoerling, A. S. Phillips, and T. Xu, 2005: Twentieth century North Atlantic climate  
37 change. Part I: Assessing determinism. *Climate Dynamics*, 23, 371-389.
- 38 IDAG, 2005: Detecting and Attributing External Influences on the Climate System: A Review of Recent  
39 Advances. *Journal of Climate*, 18, 1291-1314.
- 40 Initiative, I.O.C., 2002: *Climate variability and change in south west Western Australia*. Perth, Australia, 34  
41 pp. available at [http://www.ioci.org.au/publications/pdf/IOCI\\_TechnicalReport02.pdf](http://www.ioci.org.au/publications/pdf/IOCI_TechnicalReport02.pdf).
- 42 Initiative, I.O.C., 2005: *Report on Stage 1 of IOCI Phase 2.*, Perth, Australia, (in press). pp.
- 43 IPCC, 1990: *Climate change: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Scientific Assessment* [J.T.  
44 Houghton, G. J. Jenkins and J. J. Ephraums (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 365pp.
- 45 IPCC, 1996: *Climate change 1995: The Science of Climate Change. Contribution of the Working Group I to  
46 the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [J.T. Houghton,  
47 L.G.M. Filho, B.A. Callander, N. Harris, A. Kattenberg, and K. Maskell (eds.)]. Cambridge University  
48 Press, Cambridge, 572 pp.
- 49 IPCC, 2001: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Third  
50 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. [J.T. Houghton, Y. Ding, D.J.  
51 Griggs, M. Noguer, P.J.v.d. Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell, and C.A. Johnson (eds.)]. Cambridge  
52 University Press, Cambridge, 881 pp.
- 53 Ito, A. and J.E. Penner, 2005: Historical emissions of carbonaceous aerosols from biomass and fossil fuel  
54 burning for the period 1870-2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19(2), GB2028,  
55 doi:10.1029/2004GB002374.
- 56 Jacobson, M.Z., 2001: Strong radiative heating due to the mixing state of black carbon in atmospheric  
57 aerosols. *Nature*, 409, 695-697.



- 1 Johannssen, O.M., L. Bengtsson, M.W. Miles, S.I. Kuzmina, V.A. Semenov, G.V. Alekseev, A.P. Nagurnyi,  
2 V.F. Zakharov, L.P. Bobylev, L.H. Pettersson, K. Hasselmann, and H.P. Cattle, 2004: Arctic climate  
3 change: observed and modeled temperature and sea-ice variability. *Tellus*, 56A, 328-341.
- 4 Jones, G.S., S.F.B. Tett, and P.A. Stott, 2003: Causes of atmospheric temperature change 1960-2000: A  
5 combined attribution analysis. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 1228, doi:10.1029/2002GL016377.
- 6 Jones, G., A. Jones, D. L. Roberts, P. A. Stott and K. D. Williams, 2005: Sensitivity of global scale  
7 attribution results to inclusion of climatic response to black carbon. *Geophysical Research Letters*, (in  
8 press).
- 9 Jones, J.M. and M. Widmann, 2004: Early peak in Antarctic oscillation index. *Nature*, 432, 290-291.
- 10 Jones, P. D. and M. E. Mann, 2004: Climate over past millennia. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 42, RG2002,  
11 doi:10.1029/2003RG000143.
- 12 Jones, P. D., T. J. Osborn, and K. R. Briffa, 2001: The evolution of climate over the last millennium.  
13 *Science*, 292, 662-667.
- 14 Joussaume, S. and K. E. Taylor, 1995: Status of the Paleoclimate Modeling Intercomparison Project. in  
15 *Proceedings of the first international AMIP scientific conference, WCRP-92, Monterey, USA*, 425-430.
- 16 Kageyama, M., A. Laîné, A. Abe-Ouchi, P. Braconnot, E. Cortijo, M. Crucifix, A. de Vernal, J. Guiot, C.  
17 Hewitt, A. Kitoh, M. Kucera, O. Marti, R. Ohgaito, B. L. Otto-Bleisner, W. R. Peltier, A. Rosell- Mele,  
18 G. Vettoretti, S. L. Weber, and M. P. Member, 2005: Last Glacial Maximum temperatures over the  
19 North Atlantic, Europe and western Siberia: a comparison between PMIP models, MARGO sea-surface  
20 temperatures and pollen-based reconstructions. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, (submitted).
- 21 Karl, T.R., and R.W. Knight, 1998: Secular trends of precipitation amount, frequency, and intensity in the  
22 USA. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 79, 231-241.
- 23 Karl, T.R., and K.E. Trenberth, 2003: Modern Global Climate Change. *Science*, 302, 1719-1723.
- 24 Karoly, D. J., 2003: Ozone and climate change, *Science*, 302, 236-237.
- 25 Karoly, D.J. and K. Braganza, 2001: Identifying global climate change using simple indices. *Geophysical  
26 Research Letters*, 28, 2205-2208.
- 27 Karoly, D.J. and K. Braganza, 2005a: Attribution of recent temperature changes in the Australian region.  
28 *Journal of Climate*, 18, 457-464.
- 29 Karoly, D. J. and K. Braganza, 2005b: A new approach to detection of anthropogenic temperature changes in  
30 the Austrlian region. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, 89, 57-67.
- 31 Karoly, D. J. and Q. Wu, 2005: Detection of regional surface temperature trends. *J. Climate*, In press.
- 32 Karoly, D.J., K. Braganza, P.A. Stott, J.M. Arblaster, G.A. Meehl, A.J. Broccoli, and D.W. Dixon, 2003:  
33 Detection of a human influence on North American climate. *Science*, 302, 1200-1203.
- 34 Kass, R.E. and A.E. Raftery, 1995: Bayes Factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90,  
35 773-795.
- 36 Katz, R.W., 1999: Extreme value theory for precipitation: Sensitivity analysis for climate change. *Advances  
37 in Water Resources*, 23, 133-139.
- 38 Kaufmann, R. K. and D. L. Stern, 2002: Cointegration analysis of hemispheric temperature relations. *J.  
39 Geophys. Res.*, 107, doi:10.1029/2000JD000174.
- 40 Kettleborough, J.A., B.B.B. Booth, P.A. Stott, and M.R. Allen, 2005: Estimates of uncertainty in predictions  
41 of global mean surface temperature. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 42 Kharin, V.V. and F.W. Zwiers, 2000: Changes in the extremes in an ensemble of transient climate  
43 simulations with a coupled atmosphere-ocean GCM. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 3760-3788.
- 44 Kharin, V.V. and F.W. Zwiers, 2005: Estimating extremes in transient climate change simulations. *Journal  
45 of Climate*, 18, 1156-1173.
- 46 Kharin, V.V., F.W. Zwiers, X. Zhang, G.C. Hegerl, 2005: Changes in temperature and precipitation extremes  
47 in the IPCC ensemble of global coupled model simulations, *J. Climate*, submitted.
- 48 Kiktev, D., D. Sexton, L. Alexander, and C. Folland, 2003: Comparison of modelled and observed trends in  
49 indices of daily climate extremes. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 3560-3571.
- 50 Kim, S. J., G. M. Flato, G. J. Boer, and N. A. McFarlane, 2002: A coupled climate model simulation of the  
51 Last Glacial Maximum, part 1: transient multi-decadal response. *Climate Dynamics*, 19, 515-537.
- 52 Kirchner, I., G.L. Stenchikov, H.-F. Graf, A. Robock, and J.C. Antuna, 1999: Climate model simulation of  
53 winter warming and summer cooling following the 1991 Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption. *Journal of  
54 Geophysical Research*, 104, 19,039-19,055.
- 55 Kitoh, A. and S. Murakami, 2002: Tropical Pacific climate at the mid-Holocene and the Last Glacial  
56 Maximum simulated by a coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation model. *Paleoceanography*, 17,  
57 1047, doi:10.1029/2001PA000724.

- 1 Kleeman, R., Jr. and B.A. Klinger, 1999: A mechanism for generating ENSO decadal variability.  
2 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 26, 1743-1746.
- 3 Klein-Tank, A.M.G., and G.P. Können, 2003: Trends in Indices of Daily Temperature and Precipitation  
4 Extremes in Europe, 1946-99. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 3665-3680.
- 5 Knight, J.R., R. J. Allan, C.K. Folland, M. Vellinga and M.E. Mann, 2005: A signature of persistent natural  
6 thermohaline circulation cycles in observed climate. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 7 Knutson, T.R., and R. E. Tuleya, 2004: Impact of CO<sub>2</sub>-Induced Warming on Simulated Hurricane Intensity  
8 and Precipitation: Sensitivity to the Choice of Climate Model and Convective Parameterization, *J.*  
9 *Clim.*, 17, 3477-3495.
- 10 Knutson, T.R., R.E. Tuleva, S. W., and I. Ginis, 2001: Impact of CO<sub>2</sub>-induced warming on hurricane  
11 intensities as simulated in a hurricane model with ocean coupling. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 2458-2468.
- 12 Knutson, T. R., T. L. Delworth, K. W. Dixon, I. M. Held, J. Lu, V. Ramaswamy, D. Shwarzkopf, G.  
13 Stenchikov and R. J. Stouffer, 2005: Assessment of twentieth-century regional surface temperature  
14 trends using the GFDL CM2 coupled models. *Journal of Climate*. (submitted).
- 15 Knutti, R., T.F. Stocker, F. Joos, and G.-K. Plattner, 2002: Constraints on radiative forcing and future  
16 climate change from observations and climate model ensembles. *Nature*, 416, 719-723.
- 17 Knutti, R., T.F. Stocker, F. Joos, and G.-K. Plattner, 2003: Probabilistic climate change projections using  
18 neural networks. *Climate Dynamics*, 21, 257-272.
- 19 Knutti, R. and G.A. Meehl, 2005: Constraining climate sensitivity from the seasonal cycle in surface  
20 temperature. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 21 Kristjansson, J.E., 2002: Studies of the aerosol indirect effect from sulfate and black carbon aerosols.  
22 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107.
- 23 Kucera, M., M. Weinelt, T. Kiefer, U. Pflaumann, A. Hayes, M. T. Chen, A. C. Mix, T. T. Barrows, E.  
24 Cortijo, J. Duprat, S. Juggins, and C. Waelbroeck, 2005: Reconstruction of sea-surface temperatures  
25 from assemblages of planktonic foraminifera: Multi-technique approach based on geographically  
26 constrained calibration data sets and its application to glacial Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. *Quaternary*  
27 *Science Reviews*, 24, 951-998.
- 28 Kunkel, K. E., X-Z. Liang, J. Zhu and Y. Lin, 2005: Can CGCMS simulate the twentieth century “warming  
29 hole” in the central United States? *Journal of Climate*, (submitted).
- 30 Kushner, P.J., I.M. Held, and T.L. Delworth, 2001: Southern Hemisphere atmospheric circulation response  
31 to global warming. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 2238-3349.
- 32 Lal, M., and S.K. Singh, 2001: Global warming and monsoon climate. *Mausam*, 52, 245-262.
- 33 Lambert, S. J. and Fyfe, J. C., 2005: Changes in winter cyclone frequencies and strengths simulated in  
34 enhanced greenhouse warming experiments: results from the models participating in the IPCC  
35 diagnostic exercise.
- 36 Lambert, F.H., P.A. Stott, M.R. Allen, and M.A. Palmer, 2004: Detection and attribution of changes in 20<sup>th</sup>  
37 century land precipitation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31(10), L10203.
- 38 Lambert, F. H., N. P. Gillett, D. A. Stone, and C. Huntingford, 2005: Attribution of changes in observed land  
39 precipitation with nine coupled models, *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 40 Lanzante, J.R., S.A. Klein, and D.J. Seidel, 2003a: Temporal homogenization of monthly radiosonde  
41 temperature data. Part I: Methodology. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 224-240.
- 42 Lanzante, J.R., S.A. Klein, and D.J. Seidel, 2003b: Temporal homogenization of monthly radiosonde  
43 temperature data. Part II: Trends, sensitivity, and MSU comparison. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 241-262.
- 44 Latif, M., and T.P. Barnett, 1994: Causes of decadal climate variability over the North Pacific and North  
45 America. *Science*, 266, 634-637.
- 46 Lean, J.L., Y.-M. Wang, and N.R. Sheeley, 2002: The effect of increasing solar activity on the sun’s total  
47 and open magnetic flux during multiple cycles: Implications for solar forcing on climate. *Geophysical*  
48 *Research Letters*, 29, 2224.
- 49 Lee, T.C.K., F.W. Zwiers, X. Zhang, G.C. Hegerl, and M. Tsao, 2005a: A Bayesian approach to climate  
50 change detection and attribution. *Journal of Climate*, **18**, 2429-2440.
- 51 Lee, T.C.K., F.W. Zwiers, X. Zhang, and M. Tsao, 2005b: Evidence of decadal climate prediction skill  
52 resulting from changes in anthropogenic forcing. *Journal of Climate*, submitted.
- 53 Leroy, S.S., 1998: Detecting climate signals: Some Bayesian aspects. *Journal of Climate*, 11, 640-651.
- 54 Levis, S., J. A. Foley, and D. Pollard, 1999: CO<sub>2</sub>, climate, and vegetation feedbacks at the Last Glacial  
55 Maximum. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 104, 31191-31198.

- 1 Levis, S., G. B. Bonan, and C. Bonfils, 2004: Soil feedback drives the mid-Holocene North African monsoon  
2 northward in fully coupled CCSM2 simulations with a dynamic vegetation model. *Climate Dynamics*,  
3 23, 791-802.
- 4 Levitus, S., J. Antonov, T.P. Boyer, and C. Stephens, 2000: Warming of the World Ocean. *Science*, 287,  
5 2225-2229.
- 6 Levitus, S., J. Antonov, J. Wang, T.L. Delworth, K.W. Dixon, and A.J. Broccoli, 2001: Anthropogenic  
7 warming of the Earth's climate system. *Science*, 292, 267-270.
- 8 Levitus, S, J. Antonov, and T. Boyer, 2005: Warming of the world ocean, 1955-2003. *Geophysical Research*  
9 *Letters*, 32, doi:10.1029/2004GL021592.
- 10 Liepert, B., 2002: Observed reductions of surface solar radiation at sites in the United States and worldwide  
11 from 1961 to 1990. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29, 1421, doi:10.1029/2002/GL014910.
- 12 Lindzen, R.S. and C. Giannitsis, 2002. Reconciling observations of global temperature change. *Geophys.*  
13 *Res. Letts.* 29, doi:10.1029/2001GL014074
- 14 Liu, Z. Y., J. Kutzbach, and L. X. Wu, 2000: Modeling climate shift of El Niño variability in the Holocene.  
15 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 27, 2265-2268.
- 16 Liu, Z., L. Wu, R. Gallimore, and R. Jacob, 2002: Search for the origins of Pacific decadal climate  
17 variability. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(10), 1404, doi:10.1029/2001GL013735.
- 18 Liu, Z. Y., S. I. Shin, R. S. Webb, W. Lewis, and B. L. Otto-Bliesner, 2005: Atmospheric CO2 forcing on  
19 glacial thermohaline circulation and climate. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32 (in press).
- 20 Lohmann, U. and G. Lesins, 2002: Stronger constraints on the anthropogenic indirect aerosol effect. *Science*,  
21 298, 1012-1016.
- 22 Luterbacher, J., D. Dietrich, E. Xoplaki, M. Grosjean, and H. Wanner, 2004: European seasonal and annual  
23 temperature variability, trends, and extremes since 1500. *Science*, 303, 1499-1503.
- 24 MacDonald, G. M. and R. A. Case, 2005: Variations in the Pacific Decadal Oscillation over the past  
25 millennium. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32 (in press).
- 26 Mann, M. E., R. S. Bradley, and M. K. Hughes, 1999: Northern Hemisphere temperatures during the past  
27 millennium: Inferences, uncertainties and limitations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 26, 759-762.
- 28 Mann, M.E. and P.D. Jones, 2003: Global surface temperature over the past two millennia. *Geophysical*  
29 *Research Letters*, 30(15), 1820, doi: 10.1029/2003GL017814,.
- 30 Mann, M. E., M. A. Cane, S. E. Zebiak, and A. Clement, 2005: Volcanic and solar forcing of the tropical  
31 Pacific over the past 1000 years. *Journal of Climate*, 18, 447-456.
- 32 Mantua, N.J., S.R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J.M. Wallace, and R.C. Francis, 1997: A Pacific interdecadal climate  
33 oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 78,  
34 1069-1079.
- 35 Marengo, J.A., 2004: Interdecadal and long term rainfall variability in the Amazon basin. *Theoretical and*  
36 *Applied Climatology*, 78, 79-96.
- 37 Marengo, J., W. Soares, C. Saulo, and M. Nicolini, 2004: Climatology of the LLJ east of the Andes as  
38 derived from the NCEP reanalyses. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 2261-2280.
- 39 Marshall, G.J., 2003: Trends in the Southern Annular Mode from observations and reanalyses. *Journal of*  
40 *Climate*, 16, 4134-4143.
- 41 Marshall, G.J., P.A. Stott, J. Turner, W.M. Connolley, J.C. King, and T.A. Lachlan-Cope, 2004: Causes of  
42 exceptional atmospheric circulation changes in the Southern Hemisphere. *Geophysical Research*  
43 *Letters*, 31, L14205.
- 44 Masson-Delmotte, V. et al., 2005: Past and future amplification of climate  
45 change: climate model intercomparisons and ice-core constraints. *Climate*  
46 *Dynamics*, (submitted).
- 47 Matthews, H. D., A. J. Weaver, K. J. Meissner, N. P. Gillett, and M. Eby, 2004: Natural and anthropogenic  
48 climate change: incorporating historical land cover change, vegetation dynamics and the global carbon  
49 cycle. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 461-479.
- 50 May, W., 2004: Potential future changes in the Indian summer monsoon due to greenhouse warming:  
51 analysis of mechanisms in a global time-slice experiment. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 389-414.
- 52 Maynard, K., J.F. Royer, and F. Chauvin, 2002: Impact of greenhouse warming on the West African summer  
53 monsoon. *Climate Dynamics*, 19, 499-514.
- 54 McDonald, R. E., D. G. Bleaken, D. R. Cresswell, V.D. Pope, and C.A. Senior, 2005. Tropical storms:  
55 representation and diagnosis in climate models and the impacts of climate change. *Climate Dynamics*,  
56 (submitted).

- 1 Mears, and e. al., 2003: A reanalysis of the MSU channel 2 tropospheric temperature record. *Journal of*  
2 *Climate*, 16, 3650-3664.
- 3 Mears, C. A. and Wentz, F. J., 2005. The effect of drifting measurement time on satellite-derived lower  
4 tropospheric temperature. *Scienceexpress*, 11 August 2005; 10.1126/science.1114772..
- 5 Mears, C. A. and F. J. Wentz, The Effect of Diurnal Correction on Satellite-Derived Lower Tropospheric  
6 Temperature, 2005: *Scienceexpress*, August 11 2005; 10.1126/science.1114772
- 7 Meehl, G.A. and C. Tebaldi, 2004: More intense, more frequent, and longer lasting heat waves in the 21<sup>st</sup>  
8 century. *Science*, 305, 994-997.
- 9 Meehl, G.A., J.M. Arblaster, and W.G.S. Jr., 1998: Global scale decadal climate variability. *Geophysical*  
10 *Research Letters*, 25, 3983-3986.
- 11 Meehl, G.A., F.W. Zwiers, J. Evans, T. Knutson, L.O. Mearns, and P. Whetton, 2000: Trends in extreme  
12 weather and climate events: Issues related to modeling extremes in projections of future climate change.  
13 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 81, 427-436.
- 14 Meehl, G. A., W. M. Washington, T. M. L. Wigley, J. M. Arblaster, and A. Dai, 2003: Solar and greenhouse  
15 gas forcing and climate response in the 20th century. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 426-444.
- 16 Meehl, G.A., W.M. Washington, C.M. Ammann, J.M. Arblaster, T.M.L. Wigley, and C. Tebaldi, 2004:  
17 Combinations of natural and anthropogenic forcings in 20th century climate. *Journal of Climate*, 17,  
18 3721-3727.
- 19 Meehl, G.A., J.M. Arblaster, C. Tebaldi, 2005: Understanding future patterns of precipitation extremes in  
20 climate model simulations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, submitted.
- 21 Meier, M.F., M.B. Dyurgerov, and G.J. McCabe, 2003: The health of glaciers: Recent changes in glacier  
22 regime. *Climatic Change*, 59, 123-135.
- 23 Mendelssohn, R., S. J. Bograd, F. B. Schwing, and D. M. Palacios, 2005: Teaching old indices new tricks: A  
24 state-space analysis of El Niño related climate indices. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32, L07709,  
25 doi:10.1029/2005GL022350.
- 26 Menon, S., A.D. DelGenio, D. Koch, and G. Tselioudis, 2002: GCM Simulations of the aerosol indirect  
27 effect: Sensitivity to cloud parameterization and aerosol burden. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*,  
28 59, 692-713.
- 29 Merryfield, W. J., 2005: Changes to ENSO under CO<sub>2</sub> doubling in the IPCC AR4 coupled climate models.  
30 *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 31 Michaels, P. J., Knappenberger, P. C., and Landsea, C. W., 2005: Comments on impacts of CO<sub>2</sub>-induced  
32 warming on simulated hurricane intensity and precipitation: Sensitivity to the choice of climate model  
33 and convective scheme. *Journal of Climate* (in press).
- 34 Miller, R.L., Schmidt, G.A., and D.T. Shindell, 2005: Forced variations in the annular modes in the 20<sup>th</sup>  
35 century IPCC AR4 simulations. (in preparation).
- 36 Milly, P.C.D., K.A. Dunne, and A.V. Vecchia, 2005: The global fingerprint of externally forced  
37 hydroclimatic change on land during the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. (in preparation).
- 38 Min, S.-K. and A. Hense, 2005a: A Bayesian climate change detection using multi-model ensembles. Part I:  
39 Global mean surface temperature. *Journal of Climate*, (submitted).
- 40 Min, S.-K., A. Hense, H. Paeth and W-T. Kwon, 2004: A Bayesian decision method for climate change  
41 signal analysis. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 13, 421-436.
- 42 Min, S.-K., A.Hense, and W.-T. Kwon, 2005: Regional-scale climate change detection using a Bayesian  
43 decision method. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32, L03706, doi:10.1029/GL021028.
- 44 Mitchell, J.F.B., C.A. Wilson, and W.M. Cunningham, 1987: On CO<sub>2</sub> climate sensitivity and model  
45 dependence of results. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 113, 293-322.
- 46 Mitchell, J.F.B., D.J. Karoly, G.C. Hegerl, F.W. Zwiers, and J. Marengo, 2001: Detection of climate change  
47 and attribution of causes. In: *Climate Change 2001. The Scientific Basis. The Contribution of Working*  
48 *Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.  
49 [Houghton, J.T., Y. Ding, D.J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P.J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell, and C.A.  
50 Johnson (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, pp.695-738.
- 51 Moberg, A., D. M. Sonechkin, K. Holmgren, N. M. Datsenko, and W. Karlen, 2005. Highly variable  
52 Northern Hemisphere temperatures reconstructed from low- and high-resolution proxy data. *Nature*  
53 433, 613-617.
- 54 Monnin, E., A. Indermuhle, A. Dallenbach, J. Fluckiger, B. Stauffer, T.F. Stocker, D. Raynaud, and J.M.  
55 Barnola, 2001: Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations over the last glacial termination. *Science*, 291, 112-  
56 114.

- 1 Montoya, M., Crowley, TC, Storch, H Temperatures of the last interglacial simulated by a coupled  
2 ocean-atmosphere climate model. *Paleoceanography* 13, 170-177, 1998
- 3 Montoya, M. M., T. J. Crowley and H. von Storch, 1998: Temperatures of the last interglacial simulated by a  
4 coupled ocean-atmosphere climate model. *Paleoceanography*, 13, 170-177.
- 5 Mote, P.W., 2003: Trends in snow water equivalent in the Pacific Northwest and their climatic causes.  
6 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(12), 1601.
- 7 Mote, P.W., Alan F. Hamlet, Martyn P. Clark and Dennis P. Lettenmaier. 2005: Declining mountain  
8 snowpack in western North America. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 86, 39–49.
- 9 Moy, C. M., G. O. Seltzer, D. T. Rodbell, and D. M. Anderson, 2002: Variability of El Niño/Southern  
10 Oscillation activity at millennial timescales during the Holocene epoch. *Nature*, 420, 162-165.
- 11 Murphy, J. M., D. M. H. Sexton, D. N. Barnett, G. S. Jones, M. J. Webb, M. Collins and D. A. Stainforth,  
12 2004. Quantification of modelling uncertainties in a large ensemble of climate change simulations.  
13 *Nature*, 430, 768-772.
- 14 Nagashima, T., H. Shiogama, T. Yokohata, S. A. Crooks and T. Nozawa, 2005: The effect of carbonaceous  
15 aerosols on surface temperature in the mid twentieth century. *Nature*, (submitted).
- 16 Nesme-Ribes, E., E. N. Ferreira, R. Sadourny, H. Le Treut, and Z.-X. Li, 1993: Solar dynamics and its  
17 impact on solar irradiance and the terrestrial climate. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 98, 18,923-  
18 18,935.
- 19 New, M.G., M. Hylme and P.D. Jones, 2000: Representing twentieth-century space-time climate variability.  
20 Part II: development of 1901-96 monthly grids of terrestrial surface climate. *J. Climate*, 13, 2217-2238.
- 21 Newman, M., G.P. Compo, and M.A. Alexander, 2003: ENSO-forced variability of the PDO. *Journal of*  
22 *Climate*, 16, 3853-3857.
- 23 Nicholls, N., 2003: Continued anomalous warming in Australia. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 1370.
- 24 Nicholls, N., 2005: Climate variability, climate change, and the Australian snow season. *Australian*  
25 *Meteorological Magazine*, (submitted).
- 26 Nicholls, N., P. Della-Marta, and D. Collins, 2005b: 20<sup>th</sup> century changes in temperature and rainfall in New  
27 South Wales. *Australian Meteorological Magazine*, In Press.
- 28 Nicholson, S. E. 2001: Climatic and environmental change in Africa during the last two centuries. *Climate*  
29 *Research*, 17, 123-144.
- 30 North, G. R. and M. Stevens, 1998: Detecting climate signals in the surface temperature record. *Journal of*  
31 *Climate*, 11, 563-577
- 32 Novakov, T., V. Ramanathan, J.E. Hansen, T.W. Kirchstetter, M. Sato, J.E. Sinton, and J.A. Sathaye, 2003:  
33 Large historical changes of fossil-fuel black carbon aerosols. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(6),  
34 1324.
- 35 Nozawa, T., T. Nagashima, H. Shiogama and S. Crooks, 2005: Detecting natural influence on surface air  
36 temperature in the early twentieth century, *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 37 Oerlemans, J.H., 2005. Extracting a signal from 169 glacier records. *Science*, doi:10.1126/science.1107046.
- 38 Osborn, T.J., 2004: Simulating the winter North Atlantic Oscillation: the roles of internal variability and  
39 greenhouse gas forcing. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 605-623.
- 40 Osborn, T.J. and M. Hulme, 1997: Development of a Relationship between Station and Grid-Box Rainday  
41 Frequencies for Climate Model Evaluation. *Journal of Climate*, 10, 1885-1908.
- 42 Osborn, T.J., K.R. Briffa, S.F.B. Tett, P.D. Jones, and R.M. Trigo, 1999: Evaluation of the North Atlantic  
43 Oscillation as simulated by a coupled climate model. *Climate Dynamics*, 15, 685-702.
- 44 Otto-Bliesner, B. L., 1999: El Niño La Nina and Sahel precipitation during the middle Holocene.  
45 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 26, 87-90.
- 46 Otto-Bliesner, B. L., E. C. Brady, S.-I. Shin, Z. Y. Liu, and C. Shields, 2003: Modeling El Niño and its  
47 tropical teleconnections during the last glacial-interglacial cycle. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(23),  
48 2198, doi:10.1029/2003GL018553.
- 49 Paeth, H., A. Hense, R. Glowienka-Hense, and R. Voss, 1999: The North Atlantic Oscillation as an indicator  
50 for greenhouse-gas induced regional climate change. *Climate Dynamics*, 15, 953-960.
- 51 Pall, P., M.R. Allen, and J.M. Gregory, 2005: A possible emergent constraint on changes in extreme  
52 precipitation under CO<sub>2</sub> warming. *Climate Dynamics* (submitted).
- 53 Palmer, T.N., 1999: Predicting uncertainty in forecasts of weather and climate. *Reports on Progress in*  
54 *Physics*, 63, 71-116.
- 55 Palmer, T.N. and J. Raisanen, 2002: Quantifying the risk of extreme seasonal precipitation events in a  
56 changing climate. *Nature*, 415, 512-514.

- 1 Pan, Y.H. and A. Oort, 1983: Global climate variations with SST anomalies in the eastern equatorial Pacific  
2 Ocean for the 1958-73 period. *Monthly Weather Review*, 111, 1244-1258.
- 3 Paul, F., A. Kaab, M. Maisch, T. Kellenberger, and W. Haerberli, 2004. Rapid disintegration of Alpine  
4 glaciers observed with satellite data. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, 31, doi:10.1029/2004GL020816.
- 5 Peltier, W. R., 1994: Ice age paleotopography. *Science*, 265, 195-201.
- 6 Peltier, W. R., 2004: Global Glacial isostasy and the surface of the ice-age Earth: the ICE-5G(VM2) model  
7 and GRACE. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 32, 111-149.
- 8 Penner, J.E., S.Y. Zhang, and C.C. Chuang, 2003: Soot and smoke aerosol may not warm climate. *Journal of*  
9 *Geophysical Research*, 108 (D21), Art. No. 4657, doi:10.1029/2003JD003409.
- 10 Penner, J.E., M. Wang, A. Kumar, L. Rotstajn, and B. Santer, 2005: Effect of black carbon on mid-  
11 troposphere and surface temperature trends. In: *Human-Induced Climate change: An Interdisciplinary*  
12 *Assessment* [Schlesinger, M., H. Keshgi, J. Smith, F. de la Chesnaye, J. Reilly, C. Kolstad, and T.  
13 Wilson (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, UK (submitted).
- 14 Peterson, B.J., R.M.Holmes, J.W.McClelland, C.J. Vorosmarty, R.B. Lammers, A.I. Shiklomanov, I.A.  
15 Shiklomanov, and S. Rahmstorf, 2002: Increasing river discharge to the Arctic ocean. *Science*, 298,  
16 2171-2173.
- 17 Pezza, A. B. and I. Simmonds, 2005: The first South Atlantic Hurricane: Unprecedented blocking, low shear  
18 and climate change. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, accepted.
- 19 Pielke, R., Landsea, C., Emanuel, K., Mayfield, M., Laver, J., and Pasch, R., 2005: Hurricanes and global  
20 warming. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* (in press).
- 21 Pierce, D.W., T.P. Barnett, and M. Latif, 2000: Connections between the Pacific Ocean tropics and  
22 midlatitudes on decadal time scales. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 1173-1194.
- 23 Pierce, D.W., T.P. Barnett, K. AchutaRao, P. J. Gleckler, J. M. Gregory, and W. M. Washington, 2005:  
24 Anthropogenic warming of the oceans: observations and model results. *Journal of Climate*, (submitted).
- 25 Pinker, R.T., B. Zhang, and E.G. Dutton, 2005: Do satellites detect trends in surface solar radiation? *Science*,  
26 308, 850 – 854.
- 27 Prentice, I. C. and T. Webb, 1998: BIOME 6000: Reconstructing global mid-Holocene vegetation patterns  
28 from palaeoecological records. *Journal of Biogeography*, 25, 997-1005.
- 29 Prentice, I. C. and D. Jolly, 2000: Mid-Holocene and glacial-maximum vegetation geography of the northern  
30 continents and Africa. *Journal of Biogeography*, 27, 507-519.
- 31 Ramanathan, V., C. Chung, D. Kim, T. Bettge, L. Buja, J. T. Kiehl, W. M. Washington, Q. Fu, D. R. Sikka  
32 and M. Wild, 2005: Atmospheric brown clouds: Impacts on South Asian climate and hydrological  
33 cycle, *PNAS*, 102, 5326-5333, doi:10.1073/pnas.0500656102.
- 34 Ramankutty, N. and J. A. Foley, 1999: Estimating historical changes in global land cover: Croplands from  
35 1700 to 1992. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 13, 997-1027.
- 36 Rauthe, M., A. Hense, and H. Paeth, 2004: A model intercomparison study of climate change-signals in  
37 extratropical circulation. *International Journal of Climatology*, 24, 643-662.
- 38 Reader, M., and G. Boer, 1998: The modification of greenhouse gas warming by the direct effect of sulphate  
39 aerosols. *Climate Dynamics*, 14, 593-607.
- 40 Reason, C.J.C., and M. Roualt, 2002: ENSO-like decadal variability and South African rainfall. *Geophysical*  
41 *Research Letters*, 29(13).
- 42 Reichert, K.B., R. Schnur, and L. Bengtsson, 2002: Global ocean warming tied to anthropogenic forcing.  
43 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(11), 1525.
- 44 Rignot, E. and R.H.Thomas, 2002. Mass balance of polar ice sheets. *Science*, 297, 1502-1506.
- 45 Rind, D., D. Shindell, J. Perlwitz, J. Lerner, P. Lonergan, J. Lean, and C. McLinden, 2004: The relative  
46 importance of solar and anthropogenic forcing of climate change between the Maunder Minimum and  
47 the present. *Journal of Climate*, 17, 906-929.
- 48 Rind, D., J. Perlwitz, and P. Lonergan, 2005a: AO/NAO response to climate change. Part I: The respective  
49 influences of stratospheric and tropospheric climate changes. (submitted).
- 50 Rind, D., J. Perlwitz, and P. Lonergan, 2005b: AO/NAO response to climate change. Part II: The relative  
51 importance of low and high latitude temperature changes. (submitted).
- 52 Risbey, J.S. and M. Kandlikar. 2002: Expert Assessment of Uncertainties in Detection and Attribution of  
53 Climate *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 83, 1317-1326.
- 54 Roberts, D.L. and A. Jones, 2004: Climate sensitivity to black carbon from fossil fuel combustion. *Journal of*  
55 *Geophysical Research*, 109.
- 56 Robertson, A., C.R. Mechoso, and Y.-J. Kim, 2000: The influence of Atlantic SST anomalies on the North  
57 Atlantic Oscillation. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 122-138.

- 1 Robertson, A., J. Overpeck, D. Rind, E. Mosley-Thompson, G. Zielinski, J. Lean, D. Koch, J. Penner, I.  
2 Tegen, and R. Healy, 2001: Hypothesized climate forcing time series for the last 500 years. *Journal of*  
3 *Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 106, 14783-14803.
- 4 Robock, A., 2000: Volcanic eruptions and climate. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 38, 191-219.
- 5 Robock, A. and Y. Liu, 1994: The volcanic signal in Goddard Institute for Space Studies three-dimensional  
6 model simulations. *Journal of Climate*, 7, 44-55.
- 7 Robock, A. and M. P. Free, 1995: Ice Cores as an index of global volcanism from 1850 to the present.  
8 *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 100, 11549-11567.
- 9 Robock, A., 2005: Using the Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption to determine climate sensitivity: Comments  
10 on "Climate forcing by the volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo" by David H. Douglass and Robert S.  
11 Knox. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* Submitted.
- 12 Roderick, M.L. and G.D. Farquhar, 2002: The cause of decreased pan evaporation over the past 50 years.  
13 *Science*, 298, 1410-1411.
- 14 Romanou, A., B. Liepert, G. Schmidt, W. Rossow and Y. Zhang, 2005: 20th Century reduction in surface  
15 solar irradiance in simulations and observations. Submitted for publication
- 16 Rotstayn, L.D. and J.E. Penner, 2001: Forcing, quasi-forcing and climate response. *Journal of Climate*, 14,  
17 2960-2975.
- 18 Rotstayn, L.D., and U. Lohmann, 2002: Tropical rainfall trends and the indirect aerosol effect. *Journal of*  
19 *Climate*, 15, 2103-2116.
- 20 Rotstayn, L.D. and Y. Liu, 2003: Sensitivity of the first indirect aerosol effect to an increase of cloud droplet  
21 spectral dispersion with droplet number concentration. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 3476-3481.
- 22 Rowell, D. P., 2003: The Impact of Mediterranean SSTs on the Sahelian rainfall season. *Journal of Climate*  
23 16, 849-862.
- 24 Rowell, D. and R. Jones, 2005: The causes and uncertainty of future summer drying over Europe. *Climate*  
25 *Dynamics* (submitted).
- 26 Salinger, M.J., J.A. Renwick, and A.B. Mullan, 2001: Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation and South Pacific  
27 climate. *International Journal of Climatology*, 21, 1705-1721.
- 28 Santer, B.D., T.M.L. Wigley, T. Barnett, and E. Anyamba, 1996a: Detection of Climate Change and  
29 Attribution of Causes. In: J. T. Houghton *et al.* (eds.) *Climate Change 1995. The IPCC Second*  
30 *Scientific Assessment*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 407-444
- 31 Santer, B.D., K.E. Taylor, T.M.L. Wigley, T.C. Johns, P.D. Jones, D.J. Karoly, J.F.B. Mitchell, A.H. Oort,  
32 J.E. Penner, V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, R.J. Stouffer, and S.F.B. Tett, 1996b: A search for  
33 Human Influences on the thermal structure of the atmosphere" *Nature*, 382, 39-46.
- 34 Santer, B.D., K.E. Taylor, T.M.L. Wigley, T.C. Johns, P.D. Jones, D.J. Karoly, J.F.B. Mitchell, A.H. Oort,  
35 J.E. Penner, V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, R.J. Stouffer, and S.F.B. Tett, 1996c: Reply to  
36 "Human effect on global climate?" *Nature*, 384, 522-525.
- 37 Santer, B.D., and Coauthors, 2000: Interpreting differential temperature trends at the surface and in the lower  
38 troposphere. *Science*, 287, 1227-1231.
- 39 Santer, B.D., and Coauthors, 2001: Accounting for the effects of volcanoes and ENSO in comparisons of  
40 modeled and observed temperature trends. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 28,033-28,059.
- 41 Santer, B.D., and Coauthors, 2003a: Behavior of tropopause height and atmospheric temperature in models,  
42 reanalyses, and observations: Decadal changes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108(D1), 4002.
- 43 Santer, B.D., and Coauthors, 2003b: Contributions of anthropogenic and natural forcing to recent tropopause  
44 height changes. *Science*, 301, 479-483.
- 45 Santer, B.D., and Coauthors, 2003c: Influence of satellite data uncertainties on the detection of externally-  
46 forced climate change. *Science*, 300, 1280-1284.
- 47 Santer, B.D., T.M.L. Wigley, A.J. Simmons, P. K<sup>o</sup>llberg, G.A. Kelly, S.M. Uppala, C. Ammann, J.S.  
48 Boyle, W. Br<sup>u</sup>ggemann, C. Doutriaux, M. Fiorino, C. Mears, G. A. Meehl, R. Sausen, K.E. Taylor,  
49 W.M. Washington, M.F. Wehner, and F.J. Wentz, 2004: Identification of Anthropogenic Climate  
50 Change Using a Second-Generation Reanalysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres*, 109,  
51 doi:10.1029/2004JD005075.
- 52 Santer, B.D., J.E. Penner, and P.W. Thorne, 2005: How well can the observed vertical temperature changes  
53 be reconciled with our understanding of the causes of these changes? In: *Temperature Trends in the*  
54 *Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences* [Karl, T.R., S. Hassol, C.D.  
55 Miller, and W.L. Murray (eds.)] A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the  
56 Subcommittee on Global Change Research, Washington, DC. (in draft).

- 1 Santer, B. D. and coauthors, 2005b: Amplification of surface temperature trends and variability in the  
2 tropical atmosphere. *Science*, (submitted).
- 3 Sato, M., J.E. Hansen, M.P. McCormick, and J.B. Pollack, 1993: Stratospheric aerosol optical depths (1850-  
4 1990). *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 98, 22987-22994.
- 5 Scaife, A. A., J. R. Knight, G. K. Vallis, and C. K. Folland, 2005: A stratospheric influence on winter  
6 climate in the North Atlantic region. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- 7 Schar, C., P.L. Vidale, D. Luthi, C. Frei, C. Haberli, M.A. Liniger, and C. Appenzeller, 2004: The role of  
8 increasing temperature variability in European summer heatwave. *Nature*, 427, 332-336.
- 9 Scherrer, S.C., C. Appenzeller, and M. Laternser, 2004: Trends in Swiss alpine snow days – the role of local  
10 and large scale climate variability. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, 31, doi:10.1029/2004GL020255.
- 11 Schlesinger, M.E. and N. Ramankutty, 1992: Implications for global warming of intercycle solar irradiance  
12 variations. *Nature*, 360, 330-333.
- 13 Schlesinger, M.E. and N. Ramankutty, 1994: An oscillation in the global climate system of period 65-70  
14 years. *Nature*, 367, 723-726.
- 15 Schnur, R. and K. Hasselmann, 2005: Optimal filtering for Bayesian detection of climate change. *Climate  
16 Dynamics*, 24, 45-55.
- 17 Seidel, D.J., R.J. Ross, J.K. Angell, and G.C. Reid, 2001: Climatological characteristics of the tropical  
18 tropopause as revealed by radiosondes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 7857-7878.
- 19 Selten, F. M., Branstator, G. W., Dijkstra, and M. Klinkhuis, 2004: Tropical origins for recent and future  
20 Northern Hemisphere climate change, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L21205,  
21 doi:10.1029/2004GL020739.
- 22 Semenov, V.A., and L. Bengtsson, 2002: Secular trends in daily precipitation characteristics: Greenhouse  
23 gas simulation with a coupled AOGCM. *Climate Dynamics*, 19, 123-140.
- 24 Senior, C.A., and J.F.B. Mitchell, 2000: The time dependence of climate sensitivity. *Geophysical Research  
25 Letters*, 27, 2685-2689.
- 26 Sexton, D.M.H., 2001: The effect of stratospheric ozone depletion on the phase of the Antarctic Oscillation.  
27 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28, 3697-3700.
- 28 Sexton, D.M.H., D.P. Rowell, C.K. Folland, and D.J. Karoly, 2001: Detection of anthropogenic climate  
29 change using an atmospheric GCM. *Climate Dynamics*, 17, 669-685.
- 30 Sexton, D.M.H., H. Grubb, K.P.Shine, and C.K. Folland, 2003: Design and analysis of climate model  
31 experiments for the efficient estimation of anthropogenic signals. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 1320-1336.
- 32 Sherwood, S., J. Lanzante and C. Meyer, 2005: Radiosonde daytime biases and late 20<sup>th</sup> century warming.  
33 Submitted.
- 34 Shin, S. I., Z. Liu, B. Otto-Bliesner, E. C. Brady, J. E. Kutzbach, and S. P. Harrison, 2003: A simulation of  
35 the last glacial maximum climate using the NCAR-CCSM. *Climate Dynamics*, 20, 127-151.
- 36 Shindell, D.T. and G.A. Schmidt, 2004: Southern Hemisphere climate response to ozone changes and  
37 greenhouse gas increases. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L18209, doi:10.1029/2004GL020724.
- 38 Shindell, D.T., R.L. Miller, G.A. Schmidt, and L. Pandolfo, 1999: Simulation of recent northern winter  
39 climate trends by greenhouse-gas forcing. *Nature*, 399, 452-455.
- 40 Shindell, D.T., G.A. Schmidt, M.E. Mann, D. Rind, and A. Waple, 2001a: Solar forcing of regional climate  
41 change during the Maunder Minimum. *Science*, 294, 2149-2152.
- 42 Shindell, D.T., G.A. Schmidt, R.L. Miller, and D. Rind, 2001b: Northern Hemispheric climate response to  
43 greenhouse gas, ozone, solar and volcanic forcing. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 7193-7210.
- 44 Shindell, D.T., G.A. Schmidt, R.L. Miller, and M.E. Mann, 2003: Volcanic and solar forcing of climate  
45 change during the preindustrial era. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 4094-4107.
- 46 Shindell, D.T., G.A. Schmidt, M.E. Mann, and G. Faluvegi, 2004: Dynamic winter climate response to large  
47 tropical volcanic eruptions since 1600. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 109, D05104,  
48 doi:10.1029/2003JD004151.
- 49 Shiogama, H, M. Watanabe, M. Kimoto, T. Nozawa, 2005: Anthropogenic and Natural Forcing Impacts on  
50 the Pacific Decadal Oscillation during the Second Half of the 20th Century. *Geophysical Research  
51 Letter* (submitted).
- 52 Smith, R.L., T.M.L. Wigley, and B.D. Santer, 2003: A bivariate time series approach to anthropogenic trend  
53 detection in hemispheric mean temperatures. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 1228-1240.
- 54 Soden, B.J., R.T. Wetherald, G.L. Stenchikov and A. Robock, 2002: Global cooling after the eruption of  
55 Mount Pinatubo: a test of climate feedback by water vapor, *Science*, 296, 727-730
- 56 Soden, B. J., D. L. Jackson, V. Ramaswamy, M. D. Schwarzkopf, and X. Huang, 2005: The radiative  
57 signature of upper tropospheric moistening. *Science* (submitted).



- 1 Sokolov, A., C.E. Forest, and P.H.Stone, 2003: Comparing oceanic heat uptake in AOGCM transient climate  
2 change experiments. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 1573-1582.
- 3 Solanki, S. K. and M. Fligge, 1999: A reconstruction of total solar irradiance since 1700. *Geophysical*  
4 *Research Letters*, 26, 2465-2468.
- 5 Solomon, S., R. W. Portmann, T. Sasuki, D. J. Hofmann, and D. W. J. Thompson, 2005: Four decades of  
6 ozonesonde measurements over Antarctica. *Journal of Geophysical Research* (submitted).
- 7 Solow, A., R., and L.J. Moore, 2002: Testing for trend in North Atlantic hurricane activity, 1900-98. *Journal*  
8 *of Climate*, 15, 3111-3114.
- 9 Spagnoli, B., S. Planton, M. Deque, O. Mestre, and J.-M. Moisselin, 2002: Detecting climate change at a  
10 regional scale: the case of France. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **29** (10), 1450,  
11 doi:10.1029/2001GL014619.
- 12 Stainforth, D. A., T. Aina, C. Christensen, M. Collins, N. Faull, D. J. Frame, J. A. Kettleborough, S. Knight,  
13 A. Martin, J. M. Murphy, C. Piani, D. Sexton, L. A. Smith, R. A. Spicer, A. J. Thorpe and M. R. Allen,  
14 2005: Uncertainty in predictions of the climate response to rising levels of greenhouse gases. *Nature*,  
15 433, 403-406.
- 16 Stanhill, G. and S. Cohen, 2001: Global dimming, a review of the evidence for a widespread and significant  
17 reduction in global radiation with a discussion of its probable causes and possible agricultural  
18 consequences. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 107, 255-278.
- 19 Stark, S., R. A. Wood, H. T. Banks, 2005: Can anthropogenic climate change be detected in Indian Ocean  
20 water masses ?. *J. Climate*, (submitted).
- 21 Stenchikov, G., K. Hamilton, R. J. Stouffer, A. Robock, V. Ramaswamy, B. Santer, and H.-F. Graf, 2005:  
22 Climate Impacts of Volcanic Eruptions in the IPCC AR4 Climate Models, *Journal of Geophysical*  
23 *Research* (submitted).
- 24 Stewart, I.T., D.R. Cayan, and M.D. Dettinger, 2004: Changes in snowmelt runoff timing in western North  
25 America under a Business As Usual 6? climate change scenario. *Climatic Change*, 62, 217-232.
- 26 Stone, D.A. and A.J. Weaver, 2002: Daily minimum and maximum temperature trends in a climate model.  
27 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29, doi:10.1029/2001GL014556.
- 28 Stone, D.A. and A.J. Weaver, 2003: Factors contributing to diurnal temperature trends in twentieth and  
29 twenty-first century simulations of the CCCma coupled model. *Climate Dynamics*, 20, 435-445.
- 30 Stone, D.A. and M.R. Allen, 2005a: The end-to-end attribution problem: From emissions to impacts.  
31 *Climatic Change*, (submitted).
- 32 Stone, D.A., and J.C. Ffye, 2005: The effect of ocean mixing parameterisation on the enhanced CO<sub>2</sub>  
33 response of the Southern Hemisphere mid-latitude jet. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* Accepted.
- 34 Stone, D. A. and M. R. Allen, 2005b: Detection and attribution of global surface warming without using the  
35 response of dynamical models. *J. Climate*. (submitted).
- 36 Stone, D.A., A.J. Weaver, and R.J. Stouffer, 2001: Projection of climate change onto modes of atmospheric  
37 variability. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 3551-3565.
- 38 Stone, D.A., M.R. Allen, F. Selten, M. Kilphuis, 2005a: The detection and attribution of climate change  
39 using an ensemble of opportunity. To be submitted to . *Journal of Climate*
- 40 Stone, D.A., M.R. Allen and P.A. Stott, 2005b: A multi-model update on the detection and attribution of  
41 global surface warming, *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 42 Stott, P.A., 2003: Attribution of regional-scale temperature changes to anthropogenic and natural causes.  
43 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30.
- 44 Stott, P.A. and S.F.B. Tett, 1998: Scale-dependent detection of climate change. *Journal of Climate*, 11,  
45 3282-3294.
- 46 Stott, P.A. and J.A. Kettleborough, 2002: Origins and estimates of uncertainty in predictions of 21<sup>st</sup> century  
47 temperature rise. *Nature*, 416, 723-726.
- 48 Stott, P.A., S.F.B. Tett, G.S. Jones, M.R. Allen, J.F.B. Mitchell, and G.J. Jenkins, 2000: External control of  
49 20th century temperature by natural and anthropogenic forcings. *Science*, 290, 2133-2137.
- 50 Stott, P.A., M.R. Allen, and G.S. Jones, 2003a: Estimating signal amplitudes in optimal fingerprinting, Part  
51 II: Application to general circulation models. *Climate Dynamics*, **21**, 493-500.
- 52 Stott, P.A., G.S. Jones, and J.F.B. Mitchell, 2003b: Do models underestimate the solar contribution to recent  
53 climate change? *Journal of Climate*, 16, 4079-4093.
- 54 Stott, P.A., D.A. Stone, and M.R. Allen, 2004: Human contribution to the European heatwave of 2003.  
55 *Nature*, 432, 610-614.

- 1 Stott, P. A., G. S. Jones, J. A. Lowe, P. Thorne, C. Durman, T. C. Johns, and J-C. Thelen, 2005a: Transient  
2 climate simulations with the HadGEM1 model: causes of past warming and future climate change.,  
3 *Journal of Climate*, (submitted).
- 4 Stott, P.A., J.F.B. Mitchell, J.M. Gregory, B. Santer, G. Meehl, T. Delworth, M. Allen, 2005b: Observational  
5 constraints on past attributable warming and predictions of future global warming. *Journal of Climate*  
6 (submitted)..
- 7 Stott, P.A., J.F.B. Mitchell, J.M. Gregory, B.D. Santer, G.A. Meehl, and T. L. Delworth, 2005c: Robustness  
8 of estimates of greenhouse attribution and observationally constrained predictions of global warming.  
9 Submitted.
- 10 Sugi, M. and J. Yoshimura, 2004: A Mechanism of tropical precipitation change due to CO<sub>2</sub> increase.  
11 *Journal of Climate*, 17, 238-243.
- 12 Sugi, M., A. Noda, and N. Sato, 2002: Influence of global warming on tropical cyclone climatology: An  
13 experiment with the JMA Global Model. *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, 80, 249-272.
- 14 Sun, S., and J. Hansen, 2003: Climate simulations for 1951-2050 with a coupled atmosphere-ocean model.  
15 *Journal of Climate*, 16, 2807-2826.
- 16 Sutton, R. T. and L. R. Hodson, 2005: Atlantic ocean forcing of North American and European summer  
17 climate. *Science*, **309**, 115-118.
- 18 Tanaka, H. L., N. Ishizaki, and N. Nohara, 2005: Intercomparison of the intensities and trends of Hadley,  
19 Walker and Monsoon Circulations in the global warming predictions. Submitted, SOLA.
- 20 Taylor, C.M., E.F. Lambin, N. Stephenne, R.J. Harding, and R.L. Essery, 2002: The influence of land use  
21 change on climate in the Sahel. *Journal of Climate*, 15, 3615-3629.
- 22 Taylor, K. E., C. Hewitt, P. Braconnot, A. J. Broccoli, C. Doutriaux, J. F. B. Mitchell, and P. p. groups,  
23 2000: Analysis of forcing, response, and feedbacks in a paleoclimate modeling experiment.  
24 *Paleoclimate Modeling Intercomparison Project (PMIP), Proceedings of the thrid PMIP Workshop*, La  
25 Huardière, Canada, 271.
- 26 Tett, S.F.B., P.A. Stott, M.R. Allen, W. Ingram, and J. Mitchell, 1999: Causes of twentieth century  
27 temperature change. *Nature*, 399, 569-572.
- 28 Tett, S.F.B., Jones, G. S., P.A. Stott, D. Hill, J. F. B. Mitchell, M.R. Allen, W. Ingram, T. Johns, C. Johnson,  
29 A. Jones, D. Roberts, D. Sexton, and M. Woodage, 2002: Estimation of natural and anthropogenic  
30 contributions to twentieth century temperature change. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107(D16),  
31 doi:10.1029/2000JD000028.
- 32 Tett, S., R. A. Betts, T. Crowley, J. M. Gregory, T. C. Johns, J. M. Jones, T. J. Osborn, E. Öström, D. L.  
33 Roberts, and M. J. Woodage, 2005: The impact of Natural and Anthropogenic Forcings on Climate and  
34 Hydrology since 1550. *Climate Dynamics*, (submitted).
- 35 Thomas, R., E. Rignot, G. Casassa, P. Kanagaratnam, C. Acuña, T. Atkins, H. Brecher, E. Frederick, P.  
36 Gogineni, W. Krabill, S. Manizade, H. Ramamoorthy, A. Rivera, R. R., J. Sonntag, R. Swift, J. Yungel,  
37 and J. Zwally, 2004: Accelerated sea level rise from West Antarctica. *Science*, **306**, 255-258.
- 38 Thompson, D.W.J. and J.M. Wallace, 1998: The Arctic Oscillation signature in the wintertime geopotential  
39 height and temperature fields. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 25, 1297-1300.
- 40 Thompson, D.W.J. and J.M. Wallace, 2000: Annular modes in the extratropical circulation. Part I: Month-to-  
41 month variability. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 1000-1016.
- 42 Thompson, D.W.J., and S. Solomon, 2002: Interpretation of recent Southern Hemisphere climate change.  
43 *Science*, 296, 895-899.
- 44 Thompson, D.W.J., J.M. Wallace, and G.C. Hegerl, 2000: Annular modes in the extratropical circulation.  
45 Part II: Trends. *Journal of Climate*, 13, 1018-1036.
- 46 Thorne, P.W., P.D. Jones, T.J. Osborn, T.D. Davies, S.F.B. Tett, D.E. Parker, P.A. Stott, G.S. Jones, and  
47 M.R. Allen, 2002: Assessing the robustness of zonal mean climate change detection. *Geophysical*  
48 *Research Letters*, 29, doi:10.1029/2002GL015717.
- 49 Thorne, P.W., P.D. Jones, S.F.B. Tett, M.R. Allen, D.E. Parker, P.A. Stott, G.S. Jones, T.J. Osborn, and T.D.  
50 Davies, 2003: Probable causes of late twentieth century tropospheric temperature trends. *Climate*  
51 *Dynamics*, 21, 573-591.
- 52 Thorne, P.W., D.E. Parker, S.F.B. Tett, P.D. Jones, M. McCarthy, H. Coleman, P. Brohan and J.R. Knight,  
53 2005a: Revisiting radiosonde upper-air temperatures from 1958 to 2002. *Journal of Geophysical*  
54 *Research* (revised submission - May05).
- 55 Thorne, P.W., D.E. Parker, J.R. Christy, and C.A. Mears, 2005b: Causes of differences in observed climate  
56 trends. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, (submitted).

- 1 Thuburn, J. and G.C Craig, 2000: Stratospheric influence on tropopause height: The radiative constraint,  
2 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 57, 17-28,
- 3 Timbal, B., 2004: Southwest Australia past and future rainfall trends. *Climate Research*, 26, 233-249.
- 4 Timbal, B., Arblaster, J.M., and Power, S., 2005. Attribution of late 20th century rainfall decline in South-  
5 West Australia. *J. Climate* (submitted).
- 6 Timmermann, A., 1999: Detecting the nonstationary response of ENSO to greenhouse warming. *Journal of*  
7 *the Atmospheric Sciences*, 56, 2313-2325.
- 8 Timmermann, A., M. Latif, A. Bacher, J. Oberhuber, and E. Roeckner, 1999: Increased El Niño frequency in  
9 a climate model forced by future greenhouse warming. *Nature*, 398, 694-696.
- 10 Tol, R.S.J. and A.F. de Vos, 1998: A Bayesian statistical analysis of the enhanced greenhouse effect.  
11 *Climatic Change*, 38, 87-112.
- 12 Trenberth, K., 2005: Uncertainty in hurricanes and global warming. *Science*, 308, 1753-1754.
- 13 Trenberth, K.E., A. Dai, R.M. Rasmussen, and D.B. Parsons, 2003: The changing character of precipitation.  
14 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 84, 1205-1217.
- 15 Trenberth, K.E., J. Fasullo, and L. Smith, 2005: Trends and variability in column-integrated water vapour.  
16 *Climate Dynamics*, 24, 741-758.
- 17 Tudhope, S. and M. Collins, 2003: Global change - The past and future of El Niño. *Nature*, 424, 261-262.
- 18 van Aardenne, J.A., F.J. Dentener, J.G.J. Olivier, C.G.M.K. Goldewijk, and J. Lelieveld, 2001: A 1° x 1°  
19 resolution data set of historical anthropogenic trace gas emissions for the period 1890-1990. *Global*  
20 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15, 909-928.
- 21 Ueda, H., A. Iwai, K. Kuwako and M. E. Hori, 2005: Impact of anthropogenic forcing on the Asian summer  
22 monsoon as revealed by simulated 8 GCMs, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, submitted.
- 23 van der Schrier, G. and J. Barkmeijer, 2005: Bjerknes' hypothesis on the coldness during AD 1790-1820  
24 revisited. *Climate Dynamics*, 24, 355-371.
- 25 Vaughan, D.G., G.J. Marshall, W.M. Connolley, J.C. King, and R. Mulvaney, 2001: Devil in the detail.  
26 *Science*, 293, 1777-1779.
- 27 Vimont, D.J., D.S. Battisti, and A.C. Hirst, 2002: Pacific Interannual and Interdecadal equatorial variability  
28 in a 1000-Yr simulation of the CSIRO coupled GCM. *Journal of Climate*, 15, 160-178.
- 29 Volodin, E.M., and V.Y. Galin, 1999: Interpretation of winter warming on Northern Hemisphere continents  
30 in 1977-1994. *Journal of Climate*, 12, 2947-2955.
- 31 von Storch, H. and F.W. Zwiers, 1999: *Statistical Analysis in Climate Research*. Cambridge University  
32 Press, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK, 484 pp.
- 33 von Storch, H., E. Zorita, J. M. Jones, Y. Dimitriev, F. Gonzalez-Rouco, and S. F. B. Tett, 2004:  
34 Reconstructing past climate from noisy data. *Science*, 306, 679-682.
- 35 Walsh, K., 2004: Tropical cyclones and climate change: unresolved issues. *Climate Research*, 27, 77-83.
- 36 Walsh, K.J.E., K.-C. Nguyen, and J.L. McGregor, 2004: Fine-resolution model simulations of the impact of  
37 climate change on tropical cyclones near Australia. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 47-56.
- 38 Wang, H. and N.-C. Lau, 2003 February: *Response of South Asian monsoon climate to global warming in*  
39 *GFDL ensemble climate simulations*. In AMS Symposium on Global Change and Climate Variations,  
40 Long Beach, California.
- 41 Wang, M, J. E. Overland, V. Kattsov, J. E. Walsh, X. Zhang and T. Pavlova, 2005: Intrinsic versus forced  
42 variation in coupled climate model simulations over the Arctic during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Journal of*  
43 *Climate* (submitted).
- 44 Wardle, R., and I. Smith, 2004: Modeled response of the Australian monsoon to changes in land surface  
45 temperatures. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L16205.
- 46 Weaver, A.J., P.B. Duffy, M. Eby, and E.C. Wiebe, 2000: Evaluation of ocean and climate models using  
47 present-day observations and forcing. *Atmosphere-Ocean*, 38, 271-301.
- 48 Weber, S. L., T. J. Crowley, and G. van der Schrier, 2004: Solar irradiance forcing of centennial climate  
49 variability during the Holocene. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 539-553.
- 50 Wielicki, B.A., T. Wong, N. Loeb, P. Minnis, K. Priestley, and R. Kandel, 2005: Changes in Earth's albedo  
51 measured by satellite. *Science*, 308, 825.
- 52 Wigley, T.M.L., 1989: Climate variability on the 10-100-year time scale: Observations and possible causes.  
53 In: *Global Changes of the Past: Papers arising from the 1989 OIES Global Change Institute* [R.S.  
54 Bradley (ed.). UCAR, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 83-101.
- 55 Wigley, T.M.L., P.D. Jones, and S.C.B. Raper, 1997: The observed global warming record: What does it tell  
56 us? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*, 94, 8314-8320.

- 1 Wigley, T.M., C.M. Ammann, B.D. Santer, and K.E. Taylor, 2005b: Using the Mount Pinatubo volcanic  
2 eruption to determine climate sensitivity: Comments on “Climate forcing by the volcanic eruption of  
3 Mount Pinatubo” by David H. Douglass and Robert S. Knox. *Geophysical Research Letters*  
4 (submitted).
- 5 Wigley, T.M.L., C.M. Ammann, B.D. Santer, and S.C.B. Raper, 2005: Effect of climate sensitivity on the  
6 response to volcanic forcing. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110, D09107,  
7 doi:10.1029/2004JD005557.
- 8 Wild, M., H. Gilgen, A. Roesch, A. Ohmura, C.N. Long, E.G. Dutton, B. Forgan, A. Kallis, V. Russak, and  
9 A. Tsvetkov, 2005: From dimming to brightening: Decadal changes in solar radiation at Earth’s surface.  
10 *Science*, 308, 847-850.
- 11 Williams, K.D., A. Jones, D.L. Roberts, C.A. Senior, and M.J. Woodage, 2001: The response of the climate  
12 system to the indirect effects of anthropogenic aerosol. *Climate Dynamics*, 17, 845-856.
- 13 Wohlfahrt, J., S.P. Harrison, and P. Braconnot, 2004: Synergistic feedbacks between ocean and vegetation  
14 on mid- and high-latitude climates during the mid-Holocene. *Climate Dynamics*, 22, 223-238.
- 15 Wohlfahrt, J., S. Harrison, P. Braconnot, C. Hewitt, A. Kitoh, U. Mikolajewicz, B. L. Otto-Bleisner, and S.  
16 L. Weber, 2005: Evaluation of coupled ocean-atmosphere simulations of northern hemisphere  
17 extratropical climates in the mid-Holocene. *Climate Dynamics* (submitted).
- 18 Wong, A.P.S., N. L. Bindoff, and J. Church, 1999: Large-scale freshening of intermediate waters in the  
19 Pacific and Indian Oceans. *Nature*, 400, 440-443.
- 20 Wong, T., B.A. Wielicki, R.B. Lee III, G.L. Smith, and K.A. Bush, 2005: Re-examination of the observed  
21 decadal variability of the Earth Radiation Budget using altitude-corrected ERBE/ERBS nonscanner data.  
22 *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 23 Wu, L. and B. Wang, 2004: Assessing impacts of global warming on tropical cyclone tracks. *Journal of*  
24 *Climate*, 17, 1686-1698.
- 25 Wu, L., Z. Liu, R. Gallimore, R. Jacob, D. Lee, and Y. Zhong, 2003: Pacific Decadal Variability: The  
26 Tropical Pacific Mode and the North Pacific Mode. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 3111-3131.
- 27 Wu, P., R. Wood, and P.A. Stott, 2004: Does the recent freshening trend in the North Atlantic indicate a  
28 weakening thermohaline circulation? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, doi:10.1029/2003GL018584.
- 29 Wu, P., R. Wood, and P.A. Stott, 2005a: Recent Arctic river flow changes simulated in HadCM3.  
30 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32, doi:10.1029/2004GL021570.
- 31 Wu, P., R. Wood, P. A. Stott, and G. S. Jones, 2005b: Deep North Atlantic freshening simulated in a coupled  
32 model. *Progress in Oceanogr.*, (submitted).
- 33 Wyputta, U. and B. J. McAvaney, 2001: Influence of vegetation changes during the Last Glacial Maximum  
34 using the BMRC atmospheric general circulation model. *Climate Dynamics*, 17, 923-932.
- 35 Yang, F., A. Kumar, M.E. Schlesinger, and W. Wang, 2003: Intensity of hydrological cycles in warmer  
36 climates. *Journal of Climate*, 16, 2419-2423.
- 37 Yokohata, T., S. Emori, T. Nozawa, Y. Tsushima, T. Ogura, and M. Kimoto, 2005. Climate response to  
38 volcanic forcing: Validation of climate sensitivity of a coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation  
39 model. Submitted to *Science*
- 40 Yoshimori, M., T. Stocker, C. C. Raible, and M. Renold, 2005: Externally-forced and internal variability in  
41 ensemble climate simulations of the Maunder Minimum. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 42 Yukimoto, S., M. Endoh, Y. Kitamura, A. Kitoh, T. Motoi, and A. Noda, 2000: ENSO-like interdecadal  
43 variability in the Pacific Ocean as simulated in a coupled general circulation model. *Journal of*  
44 *Geophysical Research*, 105(C6), 13945-13963.
- 45 Zeng, N., Drought in the Sahel. *Science*, 302, 999-1000.
- 46 Zhang, X., F. W. Zwiers, and P. A. Stott, 2005: Multi-model multi-signal climate change detection at  
47 regional scale. *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 48 Zhang, Y., J.M. Wallace, and D.S. Battisti, 1997: ENSO-like interdecadal variability: 1900-93. *Journal of*  
49 *Climate*, 10, 1004-1020.
- 50 Zhang, Y.-C., W.B. Rossow, A.A. Lacis, V. Oinas, and M.I. Mishchenko, 2004: Calculation of radiative flux  
51 profiles from the surface to top-of-atmosphere based on ISCCP and other global data sets: Refinements  
52 of the radiative transfer model and the input data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, D19105,  
53 doi:10.1029/2003JD004457.
- 54 Zhao, Y., P. Braconnot, O. Marti, S. Harrison, C. Hewitt, A. Kitoh, J. Liu, U. Mikolajewicz, B. L. Otto-  
55 Bleisner, and S. L. Weber: A multi-model analysis of the role of the ocean on the African and Indian  
56 monsoon during the mid-Holocene, *Climate Dynamics*, accepted.

- 1 Zhou, J. and W.K.-M. Lau, 1998: Does a monsoon climate exist over South America. *Journal of Climate*, 11,  
2 1020-1040.
- 3 Zhou, T and R Yu, 2005: 20<sup>th</sup> century Chinese temperature in coupled model simulations of IPCC AR4.  
4 *Journal of Climate* (submitted).
- 5 Ziegler, A.D., J. Sheffield, E.P. Maurer, B. Nijssen, E.F. Wood, and D.P. Lettenmaier, 2003: Detection of  
6 intensification in global- and continental-scale hydrological cycles: Temporal scale of evaluation.  
7 *Journal of Climate*, 16, 535-547.
- 8 Zorita, E., H. Von Storch, F. J. Gonzalez-Rouco, U. Cubasch, J. Luterbacher, S. Legutke, I. Fischer-Bruns,  
9 and U. Schlese, 2004: Climate evolution in the last five centuries simulated by an atmosphere-ocean  
10 model: global temperatures, the North Atlantic Oscillation and the Late Maunder Minimum.  
11 *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 13, 271-289.
- 12 Zorita, E., J. F. Gonzalez-Rouco, H. von Storch, J. P. Montavez, and F. Valero, 2005: Natural and  
13 anthropogenic modes of surface temperature variations in the last thousand years. *Geophysical*  
14 *Research Letters*, 32 (in press).
- 15 Zwiers, F.W. and X. Zhang, 2003: Toward regional scale climate change detection. *Journal of Climate*, 16,  
16 793-797.  
17  
18

## Appendix 9.A: Methods Used to Detect Externally Forced Signals

We very briefly review the statistical methods that have been used in most recent detection and attribution work. Standard ‘frequentist’ methods (methods based on the relative frequency concept of probability) are most frequently used, but there is also increasing use of Bayesian methods of statistical inference. We will briefly describe the optimal fingerprinting technique in the following subsection. This will be followed by a short discussion on the differences between the standard and Bayesian approaches to statistical inference that are relevant to detection and attribution.

### 9.A.1 Optimal Fingerprinting

Optimal fingerprinting is generalized multivariate regression adapted to the detection of climate change and the attribution of change to externally-forced climate change signals (Hasselmann, 1979, 1997; Allen and Tett, 1999). The regression model has the form  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{u}$  where vector  $\mathbf{y}$  is a filtered version of the observed record, matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  contains the estimated response patterns to the external forcings (signals) that are under investigation,  $\mathbf{a}$  is a vector of scaling factors that adjusts the amplitudes of those patterns, and  $\mathbf{u}$  is a realization of internal climate variability. Vector  $\mathbf{u}$  is a Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ . Vector  $\mathbf{a}$  is estimated with  $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{y} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$  where matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  and vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$  represent the signal patterns and observations after normalization by the climate’s internal variability. The normalization transform is performed to maximize the signal-to-noise ratio (see e.g., Mitchell et al., 2001).

The matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  typically contains signals that are estimated with either a CGCM, an atmospheric general circulation model (AGCM; see Sexton et al., 2001, 2003) or a simplified climate model such as an energy balance model (EBM). Because CGCMs simulate natural internal variability as well as the response to specified anomalous external forcing, the GCM simulated climate signals are typically estimated by averaging across an ensemble of simulations (for a discussion of optimal ensemble size and composition, see Sexton et al., 2003). The vector  $\mathbf{a}$  accounts for possible errors in the amplitude of the external forcing and the amplitude of the climate model’s response by scaling the signal patterns to best match the observations.

Fitting the regression model requires an estimate of the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  (i.e., the internal variability) which is usually obtained from long control simulations with CGCMs (i.e., without external forcing) because the instrumental record is too short to provide a reliable estimate and may be affected by external forcing. CGCMs may not simulate natural internal climate variability accurately, particularly on small spatial scales, and thus a residual consistency test (Allen and Tett 1999) is typically used to assess the model simulated variability on the scales that are retained in the analysis. To avoid bias, uncertainty of the estimate of the vector of scaling factors  $\mathbf{a}$  is usually assessed with a second, statistically independent estimate of the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  which is ordinarily obtained from an additional, independent control simulation.

Signal estimates are obtained by averaging across an ensemble of forced climate change simulations, but contain remnants of the climate’s natural internal variability because the ensembles are finite. When ensembles are small or signals weak, these remnants may bias ordinary least squares estimates of  $\mathbf{a}$  downward. This is avoided by estimating  $\mathbf{a}$  with the total least squares algorithm (Allen and Stott 2003).

### 9.A.2 Methods of Inference

Detection and attribution questions are assessed through a combination of deductive reasoning (to determine whether there is evidence that other mechanisms of change not included in the climate model could plausibly explain the observed change) and by evaluating specific hypotheses on the scaling factors  $\mathbf{a}$ . Most studies evaluate these hypotheses using standard frequentist methods (Hasselmann, 1979, 1997; Hegerl et al., 1997; Allen and Tett, 1999; Allen et al., 2005). Several recent studies have also used Bayesian methods (Hasselmann, 1998; Leroy, 1998; Berliner et al., 2000; Min et al., 2004; Min and Hense, 2005a; Schnur and Hasselmann, 2005; Lee et al., 2005a; see also Kettleborough, 2005).

In the standard approach, detection of a postulated climate change signal occurs when its amplitude in observations is shown to be significantly different from zero (i.e., when the null hypothesis  $H_D : \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$

1 where  $\mathbf{0}$  is a vector of zeros, is rejected). Subsequently, second attribution requirement (consistency with a  
2 combination of external forcings and natural internal variability) is assessed with the *attribution consistency*  
3 *test* (Hasselmann, 1997; see also Allen and Tett, 1999) that evaluates the null hypothesis  $H_A : \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{1}$  where  
4  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes a vector of units. This test does not constitute a complete attribution assessment, but contributes  
5 important evidence to such assessments, see Mitchell et al. (2001).  
6

7 Bayesian approaches are of interest because they can be used to integrate information from multiple lines of  
8 evidence, and can incorporate independent prior information into the analysis. Essentially two approaches  
9 (described below) have been taken to date. In both cases inferences are based on a posterior distribution that  
10 blends evidence from the observations with the independent prior information, which may include  
11 information on the uncertainty of external forcing estimates, climate models, and their responses to forcing..  
12 In this way, all information that enters into the analysis is declared explicitly. Also, Bayesian inferences are  
13 probabilistic (i.e., based on the posterior likelihoods of detection and attribution), which means that they can  
14 better feed into decision making processes that balance risks and benefits.  
15

16 Schnur and Hasselmann (2005) approach the problem by developing a filtering technique that optimizes the  
17 impact of the data on the prior in a manner similar to the way in which optimal fingerprints maximize the  
18 ratio of the anthropogenic signal to natural variability noise in the conventional approach. The optimal filter  
19 in the Bayesian approach depends on the properties of both the natural climate variability and model errors.  
20 Inferences are made by comparing evidence, as measured by Bayes Factors (Kass and Raftery, 1995), for  
21 competing hypotheses. Other studies using similar approaches include Min et al. (2004) and Min and Hense  
22 (2005a). In contrast, Berliner et al. (2000) and Lee et al. (2005a) use Bayesian methods only to make  
23 inferences about the estimate of  $\mathbf{a}$  that is obtained from conventional optimal fingerprinting, although their  
24 approach could be extended to also include the latter within the Bayesian framework.  
25  
26

## Appendix 9.B: Methods Used to Estimate Climate Sensitivity and Aerosol Forcing

Two different approaches have been used recently to estimate climate sensitivity, and other parameters such as aerosol forcing and ocean diffusivity, from observations. Gregory et al. (2002a) use a direct estimate of sensitivity based on uncertainties in components that determine climate response. That approach is explained in Section 9.6. Here, we focus on an approach that is closely related to climate change detection methods.

In this approach, observed climate change  $T_{obs}(x, t)$ , where  $x$  and  $t$  indicate space and time coordinates, is repeatedly compared to each of a series of climate change simulations  $T(x, t, \theta)$  obtained from a climate model by varying the elements of a small vector  $\theta$  of model parameters. A relatively simple climate model is typically used in this approach because of the large number of simulations that are required and because such models often explicitly include parameters such as the equilibrium climate sensitivity. The parameters that are varied from one climate simulation to the next typically include the equilibrium climate sensitivity  $\alpha$  and other important determinants of the climate response to greenhouse gas forcing. The latter may include the effective vertical diffusivity of the ocean  $\kappa$  (which controls the rate at which heat anomalies penetrate into the deep ocean) or a parameter representing a range of possible aerosol forcings  $\mathcal{E}_{aer}$ .

Depending upon the study, the comparison between observations and model is performed either only in time (i.e., after integrating  $T(x, t, \theta)$  and  $T_{obs}(x, t)$  over the space coordinate  $x$ ) or in both space and time. Also, depending upon the study,  $T$  and  $T_{obs}$  can represent either a scalar variable such as surface temperature, or a vector composed of several variables such as surface temperature, upper-air temperature and deep-ocean temperature.

A variety of statistics have been used to evaluate the agreement between model and observations for a given setting of the parameters  $\theta$ . Knutti et al. (2002) assess the probability of a mean quantity being consistent with observations by calculating the probability of the observed change given the model simulation, its uncertainty and observational uncertainty. Forest et al. (2001, 2002) first calculate the residual mean square  $r^2(\theta, T_{obs}) = (T(\theta) - T_{obs})^T C^{-1} (T(\theta) - T_{obs})$  where  $C^{-1}$  is the inverse covariance matrix of internal climate variability estimated from control simulations with OAGCMs. As in optimal detection methods, this statistic measures residual variability after transforming the model response and observations so that the former is optimally detectable in the latter (Allen and Tett, 1999; see Appendix 9.A). The same square residual, but using a simple Euclidean measure, was used by Hegerl et al. (2005b). The residual mean square is subsequently used to evaluate the likelihood of the given parameter choice. For example, assuming that noise is Gaussian, the likelihood can be evaluated by using the fact that the relative distance of any residual to the minimum residual  $\Delta r^2 / (r_{min}^2)$  will be distributed according to the F-distribution with  $m$  and  $\nu$  degrees of freedom (Forest et al., 2002; 2004; Hegerl et al., 2005b) where  $m$  is the number of free parameters in the model simulation, and  $\nu$  is the number of degrees of freedom of the residual climate variability.

In either case, the end result is a function  $p(T_{obs} | \theta)$ , known as the likelihood function, which describes how the likelihood of the observations changes as the parameters  $\theta$  vary. This function, together with a prior distribution on the parameters, can be combined by means of Bayes theorem to obtain a posterior distribution  $p(\theta | T_{obs})$  on the parameters. That is, one calculates  $p(\theta | T_{obs}) \propto p(T_{obs} | \theta) \cdot p(\theta)$  where the product on the right is normalized so that the integral of  $p(\theta | T_{obs})$  with respect to  $\theta$  is equal to one. Finally, if one is interested in making inferences only about one of the parameters contained in  $\theta$ , say the climate sensitivity, the posterior density function  $p(\theta | T_{obs})$  is integrated over the range of free parameters other than climate sensitivity to yield a marginal posterior probability density function for climate sensitivity. Similar integrations must be performed to obtain marginal probability density functions on the other parameters.

The prior distribution  $p(\theta)$  that is used in this calculation is chosen to reflect prior knowledge (either subjective or objective) about plausible parameter values, and in fact, is often simply a wide uniform distribution. Such a prior indicates that little is known, a priori, about the parameters of interest except that they are bounded below and above. Even so, choice of prior bounds can be somewhat subjective. In the case



1 of climate sensitivity, some studies (e.g., Forest et al., 2002, 2004), have used 0°C and 10°C as lower and  
2 upper bounds respectively.

3  
4 An important consideration is the representation of the expected discrepancy between observed and  
5 simulated temperatures due to, for example, observational uncertainty or internal climate variability.. This  
6 “noise” affects the width of the likelihood function, and thus the width of the posterior distribution. Noise  
7 properties must be estimated from either models or residual variability. Care is required because  
8 underestimates of noise will result in narrow posterior distributions that do not adequately portray the real  
9 uncertainty of parameters of interest.

10  
11 Another important consideration is the choice of prior. The assessment presented in Section 9.6 concludes  
12 that inferences on climate sensitivity, for example, remain sensitive to the choice of prior, indicating that  
13 observations do not yet contain sufficient information to constrain this parameter. The approach used in most  
14 studies is to place uniform priors on the parameters of interest, such as the climate sensitivity. However,  
15 observable properties of the climate system appear to scale with the strength of atmospheric feedbacks rather  
16 than sensitivity (Frame et al., 2005). Imposing a flat prior on an observable property, such as the climate  
17 feedback or transient climate response, is equivalent to imposing a highly skewed prior on the climate  
18 sensitivity, and therefore results in narrower posterior likelihood ranges on the climate sensitivity that  
19 exclude very high sensitivities. The decision as to how to sample a given climate parameter (e.g., whether to  
20 place a prior on the climate feedback as opposed to the climate sensitivity) ultimately depends upon the  
21 application (e.g., whether the objective is to constrain projections of future climate change, or the  
22 equilibrium climate sensitivity).

23  
24 Alternatively, expert opinion can also be used to construct priors, as done by Forest et al. (2002; 2005). Note,  
25 however, that expert opinion may be overconfident (Risbey and Kandlikar, 2002) and if this is the case, the  
26 posterior distribution may again be too narrow. Also, the information used to derive the expert prior needs to  
27 be independent from the information that is used to estimate the posterior distribution. Given the limited data  
28 available, it is impossible to separate prior beliefs about climate system properties from knowledge of  
29 relevant climate observations.

1 **Tables**

2  
3 **Table 9.1.1.** A synthesis of climate change detection results. **a)** Surface and atmospheric temperature evidence. Note that while individual global and regional  
4 detection studies identify an anthropogenic signal in observations relative to estimates of internal variability, our likelihood assessments are necessarily conservative  
5 because the number of studies assessing the impact of forcing and model uncertainty remains limited. **b)** Evidence from other variables.

6  
7 **a)**

Result	Region	Likelihood	Main Sources of Uncertainty and Certainty
<i>Surface temperature</i>			
Warming during the past half century is not solely due to known sources of internal climate variability	Global	Virtually Certain (>99%)	Anthropogenic change detected with very high significance levels in surface temperature (much less than 1%) and the upper ocean. Observed change is very large relative to climate model simulated internal variability. Variability simulated by models consistent with variability estimated from instrumental and paleo records. (Sections 9.4.1.2, 9.4.1.4, 9.5.1.2, 9.3.4.2),
Warming during the past half century is not solely due to known natural causes	Global	Very Likely (90–99%)	This warming took place at a time when non-anthropogenic factors would likely have produced cooling. The combined effect of known sources of anthropogenic forcing would have been very likely to produce a warming. Main uncertainty from forcing and internal variability estimates (Sections 9.4.1.2, 9.4.1.4)
Early 20th century warming due in part to anthropogenic and natural external forcing.	Global	Likely (66–90%)	Natural forcing and response uncertain, some observational uncertainty in early 20th century trend. (Sections 9.3.4.1, 9.4.1.4).
Greenhouse gas warming greater than observed during latter half of 20th century.	Global	Likely (66–90%), bordering on Very Likely (90–99%)	Separation of response to non-greenhouse gas (particularly aerosol) forcing from greenhouse gas forcing varies between models (although greenhouse gas response estimates consistent between models). (Section 9.4.1.4)
Greenhouse warming detected on all continents except Antarctica (latter half 20th century).	Continental to sub-continental	Likely (66–90%)	Sampling (lower signal to noise ratio on subcontinental scale – multi-signal results less consistent as a result). (Section 9.4.2)
Late 20th century warmer than at any other time in past 1000 years.	NH (mostly extra-tropics)	Likely (66–90%)	Uncertainty in reconstructions, particularly in the magnitude of past variations. (Chapter 6)
Preindustrial temperatures significantly affected by natural external forcing (~1000–1850)	NH (mostly extra-tropics)	Very Likely (90–99%)	Uncertainty in reconstructions and past forcings; however, both uncertainties would tend to decrease similarity between simulation and reconstruction and hence reduce consistency between reconstructions and simulated response to past forcings. (Section 9.3.4)
Temperature extremes have changed due to anthropogenic forcing	NH land areas, Australia	Likely (66–90%).	Model uncertainties and limited observational coverage. A range of observational evidence indicates that temperature extremes are changing. An anthropogenic influence on increased temperature of warmest night, coldest day and coldest night annually has been formally detected in one study. Anthropogenic influence in temperature of warmest day was not detected. (Section 9.4.3)

<i>Free atmosphere changes</i>			
Tropopause height changes detectable and attributable to anthropogenic forcing (latter half 20th century)	Global	Likely (66-90%)	Observations rely on reanalysis data, although mostly during the better constrained satellite period. Modelled changes result mainly from tropospheric warming from greenhouse gas increases and ozone-induced stratospheric cooling, although uncertainties remain concerning influence of stratospheric ozone changes on tropopause height (Section 9.4.4.2).
Tropospheric warming detectable and attributable to anthropogenic forcing (latter half 20th century)	Global	Likely (66-90%)	Model and observational. Some models may respond too strongly to anthropogenic forcing, although simulated response of other models now consistent with the recently reconciled satellite records. The radiosonde record continues to be uncertain. (Section 9.4.4)

1  
2

1  
2

b)

Result	Region	Likelihood	Main Sources of Uncertainty and Certainty
<i>Ocean changes</i>			
Detectable anthropogenic warming of upper ocean (latter half 20th century)	Global (but with limited sampling in some regions)	Very Likely (90–99%)	Observations and models. Limited sampling of ocean interior makes it difficult to assess model performance. Greater confidence in results for well-sampled, upper 300m layer of ocean. (Section 9.5.1.2)
<i>Circulation</i>			
Sea level pressure shows detectable anthropogenic signature (latter half 20th century)	Global	Likely (66–90%)	Models and observations. Models underestimate the observed NH changes for reasons that are not understood, and few studies. Simulated responses in the SH to ozone concentration changes are consistent with observations (Section 9.5.2.4).
Increase in tropical cyclone intensity and duration since the 1970s due to anthropogenic forcing	Tropical regions	Inconclusive at this stage.	Models (insufficient resolution) and sampling (signal to noise ratio likely low). Process studies anticipate only modest changes in intensity by end of 21st century. Observational evidence indicates that increases cyclone intensity and duration since the 1970s are consistent with SST and atmospheric water vapour increases. (Box 3.4 and Section 9.5.2.6)
<i>Precipitation, Drought, Runoff</i>			
Rainfall changes show detectable volcanic signal (latter half 20th century)	Global land areas	Likely (66–90%), bordering on as Likely as Not (33–66%)	Models, forcings and observations. Model and observed response different in amplitude. Model response not detectable in observations for all models. However, result supported by theoretical understanding. (Section 9.5.3.2)
Increases in heavy rainfall consistent with anthropogenic forcing (latter half 20th century)	Global land areas (limited sampling)	About as Likely as Not (33–66%)	Results vary between regions and studies. Changes in some regions consistent with expectations. Models may not represent heavy rainfall well, observations suffer from sampling uncertainty. (Section 9.5.3.2)
Increased risk of drought due to anthropogenic forcing (latter half 20th century)	Global land areas	About as Likely as Not (33–66%), bordering on Likely (66–90%)	Not formally detected..Observed trends inconsistent with simulated natural internal variability and consistent with simulated response to external forcing in one modelling study. Studies suggest that regional droughts are linked either to SST changes that, in some instances, may be linked to anthropogenic aerosol forcing (e.g., Sahel) or a circulation response to anthropogenic forcing (e.g., SW Australia). Models, observations and forcing all contribute uncertainty. (Section 9.5.3.2)
Increase in continental runoff due to anthropogenic forcing (latter half 20th century)	Global land areas	About as Likely as Not (33–66%), probably >50%	Response to suppression of transpiration due to CO <sub>2</sub> -induced stomatal closure detected in one study. Large model and forcing uncertainties. (Section 9.5.3.2).
<i>Cryosphere</i>			
Reductions in NH sea-ice extent due to anthropogenic forcing (latter half of 20th century)	Arctic	Likely (66–90%)	Sea-ice extent change detected in one study. The model used has some deficiencies in Arctic sea-ice annual cycle and extent. The conclusion is supported by simulations with another climate model. (Section 9.5.4.1)
Glacier retreat due to anthropogenic forcing (20th century)	Global	Very Likely (90–99%)	Formally detected (relative to internal variability) for only two glaciers, but observed changes qualitatively consistent with theoretical expectations and temperature detection. Volume change difficult to estimate. Retreat in vast majority of glaciers. (Section 9.5.4.3)

1 **Table 9.2.1.** Results from key studies on observational estimates of the equilibrium climate sensitivity parameter  $\alpha$  (in °C/CO<sub>2</sub> doubling) and the total or net fossil  
 2 fuel-related aerosol forcing “aer” (in W m<sup>-2</sup>). All assume non-negative sensitivity to avoid unstable climate. The following uncertainties are incorporated in some  
 3 studies:  $\kappa$  refers to ocean diffusivity,  $\varepsilon_{aer}$  to aerosol uncertainty,  $\varepsilon_{nat}$  to natural forcing uncertainty,  $\varepsilon_{obs}$  observational uncertainty. “Noise” refers to internal climate  
 4 variability. Note that the aerosol range refers to the net fossil-fuel related aerosol range, which tends to be all forcings not accounted for by greenhouse gases, ozone  
 5 or natural forcing that project onto the pattern associated with fossil fuel aerosols, and it includes all unknown or not explicitly considered forcings. “Mode” refers to  
 6 the most likely value (peak of the probability PDF). Values are taken from publications and depend on ranges considered, priors etc.  
 7 Key to forcings: G: greenhouse gases; Sul: direct sulphate aerosol effect; Suli: indirect sulphate; OzT: tropospheric ozone; OzS: stratospheric ozone; Vol: volcanism;  
 8 Sol: solar, BC+OM: black carbon and organic matter  
 9

Study	Data	Model	Forcing	Free Parameters	$\alpha$ Range 5–95% [°C]	Mode	Aer 5–95% Range [W/m <sup>2</sup> ]	Incorporated Uncertainties
Forest et al., 2002	Upper air, surface and deep ocean space-time 20th C Temp. (diag 2nd half)	2-D OAGCM	G, Sul, OzS,	$\alpha$ (0–10), $\kappa$ , aer (0 to –1.5)	1.4 to 7.7 1.3–4.2 with expert prior	2.0	–0.3 to –0.95* –0.25 to –0.9 with expert prior	$\varepsilon_{obs}$ , noise (OAGCM)
Forest et al., 2005	“	“	G, Sul, Sol, Vol, OzS, land surface changes	“	2.4–9.2 2.2–5.2 with expert prior	3.0	–0.16 to –0.7 –0.05 to –0.62 with expert prior	$\varepsilon_{obs}$ , noise (OAGCMs), tests for effect of nat. forcing unc.
Andronova and Schlesinger, 2001	Global mean and hemispheric difference in SAT 1856–1997	EBM with ocean	G (detailed), OzT, Sul, Suli	$\alpha$ , choice of radiative forcing factors	1.0 to 9.3 p>54% % that outside 1.5–4.5	1.2	–0.54 to –1.3	Noise (bootstrap residual)
Knutti et al., 2002, 2003	Global mean ocean heat uptake 1955–1995, mean SAT inc. 1900–2000	EMIC, (+ neural net)	G, OzT, OzS, fossil fuel and biomass burning BC+OM, strat water vapour, Vol, Sol	$\alpha$ (1–10), $\kappa$ , scaling for all forcings including aer	2.2 to 9.2 p>50% that outside 1.5–4.5	Median 4.9	0 to –1.2 ind. aerosol, –0.6 to –1.7 total aer	$\varepsilon_{obs}$ , $\varepsilon_{forc}$ from IPCC 2001, different ocean mixing schemes
Gregory et al., 2002a	Global mean change in SAT and ocean heat change between (1861–1900) and (1957–1994)	1-box	G, Sul and Suli (top down via Stott et al., 2001), Sol, Vol	Directly estimated	1.1 to inf with BC, 1.6 to inf. Without	2.1	Derived from Stott et al., 2000: –0.4 to –1.6	$\varepsilon_{obs}$ , $\varepsilon_{forc}$
Frame et al., 2005	Global change in surface temperature	EBM	G, Sul, Nat?	Range of $\kappa$ consistent with ocean warming	1.2 to 11.8 (sampled to 20) (0.4 to 4.0 if unif. feedbacks)	2.0	Aerosol response separated out	Noise, forcing uncertainties

Forster and Gregory, 2005	1985–1996 ERBE data 60N–60S, global surface T	1-Box	Ghg, Vol, Sol, Sul	Directly estimated	1.0 to 4.1 sampled unif. in feedbacks!	NA	Changes not important in period chosen	$\mathcal{E}_{obs}$ , forcing uncertainty discussed
Hegerl et al., 2005b	NH mean SAT preindustrial (1270/1505 to 1850) from multiple reconstructions	EBM	G, Sul, Sol, Vol	$\alpha$ (0–10), $\kappa$ , aer (–0.3 to 2.5)	1.1 to 8.6 for rec. combined, 1.4–6.1 for CH rec.,	2.0 all com., 2.3 CH-b	Not constrained to 1850, not well to 1960	$\mathcal{E}_{obs}$ , $\mathcal{E}_{nat}$ , $\mathcal{E}_{aer}$ , noise (from residual)

- 1 Notes:
- 2 \*Implicitly include OZT and fossil fuel BC+OM since these were excluded from the study.

1 **Table 9.3.1.** Detection and attribution results for a range of paleoclimatic records of the last millennium. “Y”  
 2 or “N” indicates that the response to external forcing is, or is not, detectable; “small” or “large” indicates that  
 3 signals are significantly under- or overestimated. The bottom row gives the standard deviation of the  
 4 (decadally smoothed for annual data) residual and, in parentheses, the amount of decadal variance explained  
 5 by external forcing. From Hegerl et al. (2003).  
 6  
 7

Record	Briffa et al., (2001)	Crowley -Lowery, 2000	Mann et al., 1999	Esper et al., 2002	Crowley-Lowery, 2000
Period	1400–1940	1400–1960	1400–1960	1400–1960	1000–1960
Volcanic	Y	Y	Y small	Y	Y
Solar	N, small	N, small	N (Y for periods)	N, small	N (Y from 1100 on)
Ghg + aer	Y	Y	N small (Y to 1980)	Y, large	Y
Residual std	0.09 (57%)	0.08 (77%)	0.07 (49%)	0.13 (67%)	0.10 (57%)

8  
 9