# **Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing Supplementary Material**

#### **Coordinating Lead Authors:**

Gunnar Myhre (Norway), Drew Shindell (USA)

#### **Lead Authors:**

François-Marie Bréon (France), William Collins (UK), Jan Fuglestvedt (Norway), Jianping Huang (China), Dorothy Koch (USA), Jean-François Lamarque (USA), David Lee (UK), Blanca Mendoza (Mexico), Teruyuki Nakajima (Japan), Alan Robock (USA), Graeme Stephens (USA), Toshihiko Takemura (Japan), Hua Zhang (China)

#### **Contributing Authors:**

Borgar Aamaas (Norway), Olivier Boucher (France), Stig B. Dalsøren (Norway), John S. Daniel (USA), Piers Forster (UK), Claire Granier (France), Joanna Haigh (UK), Øivind Hodnebrog (Norway), Jed O. Kaplan (Switzerland/Belgium/USA), George Marston (UK), Claus J. Nielsen (Norway), Brian C. O'Neill (USA), Glen P. Peters (Norway), Julia Pongratz (Germany), Michael Prather (USA), Venkatachalam Ramaswamy (USA), Raphael Roth (Switzerland), Leon Rotstayn (Australia), Steven J. Smith (USA), David Stevenson (UK), Jean-Paul Vernier (USA), Oliver Wild (UK), Paul Young (UK)

#### **Review Editors:**

Daniel Jacob (USA), A.R. Ravishankara (USA), Keith Shine (UK)

#### **This chapter supplementary material should be cited as:**

Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestvedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura and H. Zhang, 2013: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing Supplementary Material. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Available from www. climatechange2013.org and www.ipcc.ch.

# **Table of Contents**





8SM

# **8.SM.1 Figures on Regional Emissions to Support Section 8.2.2**



**Figure 8.SM.1 |** Time evolution of regional anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions 1850–2100 used in Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5)/Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP) following each Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP). Historical (1850–2000) values are from (Lamarque et al., 2010). RCP values are from (van Vuuren et al., 2011).





**Figure 8.SM.2 |** Time evolution of anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions 1850–2100 used in CMIP5/ACCMIP following each RCP. Historical (1850–2000) values are from Lamarque et al. (2010). RCP values are from van Vuuren et al. (2011).



**Figure 8.SM.2 |** (continued)





 $\big|$  (g[C] m<sup>-2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) 0.01 0.02 0.05 0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2

**Figure 8.SM.2 |** (continued)

# **8.SM.2 Description of Hydroxyl Radical Feedback and Perturbation Lifetime for Methane to Support Section 8.2.3**

The methane lifetime with respect to tropospheric hydroxyl radical (OH) is estimated at 11.2  $\pm$  1.3 years, while the lifetime of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) with respect to additional sinks is estimated at  $120 \pm 24$  years (bacterial uptake in soils), 150  $\pm$  50 years (stratospheric loss) and 200  $\pm$ 100 years (chlorine loss), respectively. This leads to a total  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  lifetime estimate of 9.25  $\pm$  0.6 years, calculated by computing the total lifetime using the full range of each separate lifetime listed above. Note that adding the inverse values of the best estimates of the lifetimes gives 9.15 years, but the value based on full ranges is chosen here. Combining this information with the OH-lifetime sensitivity (s) for CH<sub>4</sub>, s\_OH  $(0.31 \pm 0.04)$  by scaling s\_OH with the ratio between total lifetime and OH-lifetime (9.25/11.2) leads to an overall estimate of s of  $0.25 \pm 0.03$ 

and therefore gives a feedback factor  $f = 1/(1 - s) = 1.34 \pm 0.06$  (for 1- $\sigma$  range). The error estimate on f is estimated from the error estimate on s using error(f) = error(s)  $*$  df/ds.

The perturbation lifetime is therefore calculated by combining the range of values for the CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime with the range of values for the feedback factor, leading to a perturbation lifetime of  $12.4 \pm 1.4$  years (for one sigma range) which is adopted for the metric calculations. Note that this value is slightly larger than the value obtained using the mean estimates from all parameters (12.3 years).

# **8.SM.3 Well-Mixed Greenhouse Gas Radiative Forcing Formulae and Uncertainties to Support Table 8.3**

The formulae used to calculate the radiative forcings (RFs) from carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), CH<sub>4</sub> and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) are taken from Myhre et al. (1998) Table 3 as in Third Assessment Report (TAR) and Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). They are listed here for convenience.

In calculating the uncertainties in the WMGHG RF we assume a  $\pm 10\%$ (5 to 95% confidence interval) uncertainty in the radiative transfer modeling that is correlated across all species. We assume the uncertainties in the measurements of the 1750 and 2011 abundance levels of the gases are uncorrelated.

**Table 8.SM.2 |** Supplementary for Table 8.3: Uncertainties in WMGHG RF.

8SM

**Table 8.SM.1** | Supplementary for Table 8.3: RF formulae for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O.



Notes:

f (M, N) = 0.47 ln [1+2.01×10<sup>-5</sup> (MN)0.75 + 5.31×10<sup>-15</sup> M (MN)<sup>1.52</sup>]

C is  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in ppm.

M is  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  in ppb.

N is  $N_2O$  in ppb.

The subscript 0 denotes the unperturbed molar fraction for the species being evaluated. However, note that for the CH<sub>4</sub> forcing N<sub>0</sub> should refer to present-day N<sub>2</sub>O, and for the N<sub>2</sub>O forcing  $M_0$  should refer to present-day CH<sub>4</sub>.





# **8.SM.4 Total Solar Irradiance Reconstructions from 1750 to 2012 to Support Section 8.4.1**

Table 8.SM.3 | Total Solar Irradiance (TSI, W m<sup>-2</sup>) reconstruction since 1750 based on Ball et al. (2012) and Krivova et al.(2010) (annual resolution series). The series are standardized to the Physikalisch-Meteorologisches Observatorium Davos (PMOD) measurements of solar cycle 23 (1996–2008) (PMOD is already standardized to Total Irradiance Monitor (TIM)).







# **8.SM.5 Table with Estimates of Radiative Forcing due to Solar Changes over the Industrial Era to Support Section 8.4.1**

**Table 8.SM.4 |** Comparison of RF estimates between 1745 and 2008 minima.



Notes:

8SM

rm = running means. For the reconstructions based on solar surface magnetic structures, with annual resolution, the year of the minimum is 1745. However, for the Steinhilber et al. (2009) reconstruction, based on cosmogenic isotopes, the minimum is in 1765, because the resolution of the series is 5 years.

# **8.SM.6 Further Information on Total Solar Irradiance, Uncertainties and Change Since the Maunder Minimum to Support Section 8.4.1**

The absolute measurements of TSI are extremely difficult with an absolute accuracy better than 0.1%. All TSI instruments since 1979 have been calibrated, relatively or absolutely. In order to maintain a reasonable accuracy in the annual to multi-decadal timeframe it is essential to have at least three independent sensors operating in space simultaneously. The fundamental difficulties of the absolute measurements are described in Butler et al. (2008). Fox et al. (2011) quantified how the uncertainty in satellite TSI measurements could be improved by an order of magnitude by adding primary SI traceability on board. For instance, to reduce from 3.60% for Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MODIS)/Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) to 0.30% for Traceable Radiometry Underpinning Terrestrial- and Helio-Studies (TRUTHS). This would reduce by 67 to 75% the time required to achieve trend accuracy.

The Spectral Irradiance Monitor (SIM) on board of the Solar Radiation and Climate Experiment (SORCE) measurements (Harder et al., 2009) suggest that over solar cycle (SC) 23 declining phase, the 200 to 400 nm ultraviolet (UV) flux decreased by two to six times more than expected from prior observations and model calculations and in phase with the TSI trend, whereas surprisingly the visible presents an opposite trend. However, SIM's solar spectral irradiance measurements from April 2004 to December 2008 and inferences of their climatic implications are incompatible with the historical solar UV irradiance database, coincident solar proxy data, current understanding of the sources of solar irradiance changes and empirical climate change attribution results, but are consistent with known effects of instrument sensitivity drifts. Thus what seems to be needed is improved characterization of the SIM/SORCE observations and extreme caution in studies of climate and atmospheric change (Haigh et al., 2010) until additional validation and uncertainty estimates are available (DeLand and Cebula, 2012; Lean and Deland, 2012).

# **8.SM.6.1 Uncertainties**

1. PMOD RF and uncertainty between 1986 and 2008: According to PMOD, 2009 is the year of the TSI minimum, but according to TIM it is 2008. We take the year 2008 as the year of the minimum.

The PMOD TSI mean for September 2008 was 1365.26  $\pm$  0.16 W m<sup>-2</sup>, whereas in the 1986 minimum it was 1365.57  $\pm$  0.01 W m<sup>-2</sup> (Frohlich, 2009).

Difference between 2008 and 1986 minima:  $1365.26 \pm 0.16 - 1365.57 \pm 0.01$ 

Applying the error propagation formula:  $(a \pm x) - (b \pm y) = (a - b) \pm [x^2 + y^2]^{1/2}$ 

That for our case is:  $(1365.26 - 1365.57) \pm [(0.16)^2 + (0.01)^2]^{1/2} = -0.31 \pm 0.16$ 

**The RF is:**

 $[-0.31 \pm 0.16]$  \* 0.175 \* 0.78 = -0.042  $\pm$  0.022  $\sim$  -0.04  $\pm$  0.02 W m<sup>-2</sup>

#### **8.SM.6.2 Standardization**

We use the following expression to standardize the time series:  $[S_i - ~~]+~~$ 

Where  $S_i$  is the annual TSI of the series that will be standardized.

 $<$  S  $>$  is the TSI average of the whole time span of series that will be standardized.

 $\langle S^* \rangle$  is the TSI average of the series we are using as the standard. In our case the TIM TSI between 2003 and 2012 or the PMOD TSI for SC 23 (1996–2008).

For the RF estimates the years with minimum solar activity based on modern or historical observations are used as provided in the referenced literature. These years may in some cases be slightly different from the years with minimum annual mean TSI (see Table 8.SM.3), but these differences have a negligible impact on the RF estimates provided in Section 8.4.1.

### **8.SM.6.3 Total Solar Irradiance Variations Since the Maunder Minimum**

For the Maunder minimum (MM)-to-present AR4 gives a RF positive range of 0.1 to 0.28 W m<sup>-2</sup>, equivalent to 0.08 to 0.22 W m<sup>-2</sup> used here. The estimates based on irradiance changes in Sun-like stars were included in this range but are not included in the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) range because they are now considered incorrect: Baliunas and Jastrow (1990) found a bimodal separation between noncycling MM-like state stars with the lowest Ca II brightness, and the higher emission Ca II cycling stars. More recent surveys have not reproduced their results and suggest that the selection of the original set was flawed (Wright (2004); also, stars in a MM-like state do not always exhibit Ca II emission brightness below that of solar minimum (Hall and Lockwood (2004).

The reconstructions in Schmidt et al. (2011) indicate a MM-to-present RF range of 0.08 to 0.18 W  $m<sup>-2</sup>$ , which is within the AR4 range although narrower. Gray et al. (2010) point out that choosing the solar activity minima years of 1700 (Maunder) or 1800 (Dalton) would substantially increase the solar RF with respect to 1750-to-present while leaving the anthropogenic forcings essentially unchanged, and that these solar minima forcings would represent better the solar RF of the pre-industrial era.

Other recent estimates give various MM-to-present RF values: The analysis of Shapiro et al. (2011) falls outside the range 0.08 to 0.18 W  $m<sup>-2</sup>$  reported above: 0.78 W  $m<sup>-2</sup>$ . These authors used the semi-empirical photosphere model A (supergranule cell interior) of Fontenla et al. (1999). But Judge et al. (2012) indicate that by using such model Shapiro et al. (2011) overestimated the quiet-Sun irradiance variations by a factor of about two, then the RF would be 0.36 W  $m^{-2}$ , which is still outside the range of Schmidt et al. (2011). Studies of magnetic field indicators suggest that changes over the 19th and 20th centuries were more modest than those assumed in the Shapiro et al. (2011) reconstruction (Svalgaard and Cliver, 2010; Lockwood and Owens, 2011). Also, analysis by Feulner (2011) indicates that temperature simulations driven by such a large solar forcing are inconsistent with reconstructed and observed historical temperatures, although when a forcing in line with the range presented here is used they are consistent. Hence we do not include this larger forcing within our assessed range. Schrijver et al. (2011) and Foukal et al. (2011) find a RF which is consistent with the RF range given above (0.08 to 0.18 W  $m^{-2}$ ).

Almost all the TSI reconstructions since pre-industrial times are based on the Sunspot Group Number (SGN; Hoyt and Schatten (1998). The SGN is preferred by researchers respect to the International Sunspot Number (Clette et al., 2007) because SGN starts at 1610 and it is the longest time series based on direct solar observations.

As these two sunspot number versions are quite different in the historical period, using one or the other results in different trends since the MM (Hathaway et al., 2002) and therefore different RF estimates. Moreover, Svalgaard et al. (2012) have published some preliminary corrections to SGN that could imply a reduction in the RF since the MM.

# **8.SM.7 Method Description to Support Figure 8.16**

In Figure 8.16, probability distributions are shown for the main climate drivers as well as for the total anthropogenic forcing. This paragraph describes how it was built.

For each of the major forcing agents, a best estimate and a 90% uncertainty range [P05; P95] was provided. The best estimate is the median of the probability distribution. The values are available in Table 8.6 and repeated below. For some forcing agents, the best estimate and the uncertainty range are provided for RF, and not for effective radiative forcing (ERF). In such a case, we assume that  $ERF_{\text{Best}}=RF_{\text{Best}}$  and we assumed a quadratic 17% increase of the uncertainty range  $\sigma$ , that is:

$$
\sigma_{_{ERF}}^2 = \sigma_{_{RF}}^2 + (0.17 \, R_{_{Best}}^2)^2 \tag{8.5M.1}
$$

Most forcing agents considered here (WMGHG, ozone, stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O, land use change) have symmetrical uncertainty ranges (i.e., Best  $= (P05 + P95)/2$ ). For these forcing agents, the probability distribution is assumed to be Gaussian, with a standard deviation as

$$
\sigma = \frac{P95 - P05}{2f}
$$
 (8.5M.2)

where *f* ≈ 1.645 is the factor to convert one standard deviation to the 5-95% probability range.

The other forcing agents (black carbon on snow, contrails, aerosols) have non-symmetrical uncertainty ranges. For black carbon and snow, we assume a log-normal distribution as

$$
P(x) = \frac{1}{x \sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2(x/x_0)}{2\sigma^2}\right)
$$
 (8.5M.3)

with  $x_0$  as the best estimate and  $\sigma$  adjusted to fit P05 and P50 ( $\sigma_{BC}$  = 0.5 ;  $\sigma_{\text{Contrails}} = 0.65$ ).

For the aerosols, which have a non-symmetrical uncertainty range, we build a probability distribution as

$$
P(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{2}{\sigma_+ + \sigma_-} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - x_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)
$$
  

$$
x \le x_0 \quad \sigma = \sigma_-
$$
  

$$
x \ge x_0 \quad \sigma = \sigma_+
$$
 (8.5M.4)

 $x_{0}$ ,  $\sigma_{\textrm{\tiny{L}}}$  and  $\sigma_{\textrm{\tiny{+}}}$  are adjusted to fit the best estimates and 90% uncertainty ranges:

$$
x_0 \approx \frac{\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}(P05 + P95) - (2\alpha + f)Best}{\frac{8}{5}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} - (2\alpha + f)}
$$

$$
\sigma_+ = \frac{(\alpha + f)(P95 - x_0) + \alpha (x_0 - P05)}{(\alpha + f)^2 - \alpha^2}
$$

and

8SM

$$
\sigma_{-} = \frac{(\alpha + f)(x_0 - P05) + \alpha (P95 - x_0)}{(\alpha + f)^2 - \alpha^2}
$$

with

 $\alpha = 0.05 \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{f^2}{2}\right) \approx 0.2425$ 

The total anthropogenic ERF distribution was then derived through a Monte Carlo approach (10<sup>6</sup> independent shots), summing the random estimates of all components. This approach assumes that all forcing agent uncertainties are independent. The results are provided in Table 8.SM.5.



(8.SM.5)



# **8.SM.8 Table with Values and Uncertainties to Support Figure 8.17**

Table 8.SM.6 | Radiative forcing (RF, in W m<sup>-2)</sup> by emitted components as shown in Figure 8.17. The RF values are made consistent with Table 8.6. For emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, CO, NMVOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> the values for the influence on CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and ozone are based on Stevenson et al. (2013) and Shindell et al. (2009). The seven models altogether performing the calculations for these compounds (six models in Stevenson et al., (2013); and one model in Shindell et al., (2009) have been treated with equal weight. For CO, CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOC only fossil fuel emissions have been taken into account. The split between NO<sub>x</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub> of 40/60 on the RF of nitrate is from Shindell et al. (2009). The BC and OC from biomass burning is set to +0.2 and –0.2, respectively and thus a net RF of biomass burning of 0.0, in line with Table 8.4. BC ari is RF of BC from aerosol–radiation interaction, formerly denoted as direct aerosol effect. Unlike in AR4 (Table 2.13) the N<sub>2</sub>O influence on RF of ozone has been set to zero, due to insufficient quantification of this and particularly the vertical profile of the ozone change. ERFaci is effective radiative forcing of aerosol–cloud interaction.



**Table 8.SM.7 |** Percentage uncertainty in values provided in Table 8.SM.6.



Section 8.3.2. Radiative efficiencies for halocarbons

with higher temporal results from Spectral Radiation-

with higher temporal results from Goddard Institute

# **8.SM.9 Description of Forcing Time Series to Support Figure 8.18**

**Table 8.SM.8 |** Supplementary for Figure 8.18: Time evolution forcing.



(Skeie et al., 2011b).

**Forcing Agent Data Sources for Time Evolution**

Time series scaled to fit the best estimate for 2011.

Surface albedo (BC on snow) Values for 1850, 1930, 1980 and 2000 from ACCMIP (Lee et al., 2013) combined with higher temporal results from Oslo CTM2

Contrails **The best estimate for contrails** (RF) or combined contrails and contrail induced cirrus (ERF) is scaled to aircraft kilometres flown

Solar TSI reconstructions (Krivova et al., 2010; Ball et al., 2012) standardized to Physikalisch-Meteorologisches Observatorium Davos

Volcanic aerosols **Mean of (Gao et al., 2008**; Crowley and Unterman, 2013) between 1750 and 1850 and (Sato et al., 1993; updated version of April, 2013) from 1850 to present. RF is calculated as RF = AOD  $*$  (-25.0) W m<sup>-2</sup>.

in table downloaded from the following website: http://www.airlines.org/Pages/Annual-Results-World-Airlines.aspx.

(PMOD) and Total Irradiance Monitor (TIM) data is divided by 4 and multiplied by the Earth co-albedo (1 – 0.3) and multiplied with 0.78 to account for absorption in the stratosphere (see Section 8.4.1). TSI provided in the Supplementary Material Table 8.SM.3.

# **8.SM.10 Uncertainties in Trends in Forcing to Support Figure 8.19**



**Figure 8.SM.3 |** Linear trend in anthropogenic, natural and total forcing for the indicated years. The uncertainty ranges (90% confidence range) are combined from uncertainties in the forcing values (from Table 8.6) (upward vertical lines) and the uncertainties in selection of time period (downward vertical lines). Monte Carlo simulations were performed to derive uncertainties in the forcing based on ranges given in Table 8.6 and linear trends in forcing. The sensitivity to time periods has been derived from changing the time periods by  $\pm 2$  years.

# **8.SM.11 Definition and Methods to Calculate Metric Values to Support Section 8.7.1**

#### **8.SM.11.1 Equations for the Global Warming Potential**

The Absolute Global Warming Potential (AGWP) is the time-integrated radiative forcing due to a 1 kg *pulse* emission of gas  $i$  (usually in W  $m^{-2}$  yr kg<sup>-1</sup>). The Global Warming Potential (GWP) for gas *i* is obtained by dividing the AGWP $_{\rm i}$  by the AGWP of a reference gas, normally CO $_2$ :

$$
\frac{GWP_{i}(H)}{AGWP_{cO_{2}}(H)} = \frac{AGWP_{i}(H)}{\int_{0}^{H}RF_{iO_{2}}(t)dt}
$$
\n(8.5M.6)

where H is the time horizon;  $R\mathit{F}_{i}$  is the radiative forcing due to a  $pulse$ emission of a gas  $i$  given by

$$
R F_i = A_i R_i \tag{8.5M.7}
$$

where  $A_i$  is the  $RF_i$  per unit mass increase in atmospheric abundance of species *i* (radiative efficiency (RE)), and  $R_i$  is the fraction of species  $i$  remaining in the atmosphere after the pulse emissions. The GWP are currently not defined using the Effective Radiative Forcing (ERF, Section 8.1.1.2), but this could be considered as a potential improvement of the concept.

$$
R_i(t) = \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_i}\right) \tag{8.5M.8}
$$

where  $\tau_i$  is the perturbation lifetime and thus, for these species,

$$
AGWP_i(H) = \int_0^H RF_i(t)dt = A_i \tau \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{H}{\tau}\right)\right)
$$
\n(8.5M.9)

The atmospheric decay of a pulse consists of many different time scales (Prather, 1994). Nevertheless, for gases with atmospheric lifetimes larger than the mixing times of the major reservoirs (>3 years), the decay can be approximated as it is here with a single e-fold time equal to the perturbation lifetime. In this case the total integrated impacts are exact (Prather, 2007). For very short-lived gases (<1 year), the single e-fold also provides the correct integral, but the impacts occur over a longer time frame than expected from the perturbation lifetime.

For  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ ,  $R<sub>i</sub>$  is more complicated because its atmospheric response time (or lifetime of a perturbation) cannot be represented by a simple exponential decay (Joos et al., 2013). The decay of a perturbation of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> following a pulse emission at time  $t$  is usually approximated by a sum of exponentials (Forster et al., 2007; Joos et al., 2013):

$$
R_{cO_2}(t) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_i}\right)
$$
 (8.5M.10)

The AGWP<sub>CO2</sub> is then (Shine et al., 2005):

$$
AGWP_{CO_2}(H) = A_{CO_2} \left\{ a_0 H + \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i \tau_i \left( 1 - \exp\left( -\frac{H}{\tau_i} \right) \right) \right\}
$$
\n(8.5M.11)

#### **8.SM.11.2 Equations for the Global Temperature Change Potential**

The Absolute Global Temperature change Potential (AGTP) can be represented as (Boucher and Reddy, 2008; Fuglestvedt et al., 2010):

$$
AGTP_i(H) = \int_0^H RF_i(t)R_r(H-t)dt
$$
\n(8.5M.12)

where  $R<sub>T</sub>$  is the climate response to a unit forcing and can be represented as a sum of exponentials,

$$
R_r(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{c_j}{d_j} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{d_j}\right)
$$
 (8.5M.13)

where the parameters  $c_i$  are the components of the climate sensitivity and  $d_i$  are response times. The first term in the summation can crudely be associated with the response of the ocean mixed layer to a forcing and the higher order terms the response of the deep ocean (Li and Jarvis, 2009). The equilibrium climate sensitivity is given by the equilibrium response to a sustained unit forcing,  $\lambda = \Sigma c_j$ .

8SM

The simplest form of  $R<sub>T</sub>$  is a single response term ( $M = 1$ ) (Shine et al., 2005; Olivié et al., 2012). A better representation of the climate response, however, is two or three terms ( $M = 2$ , 3) (Boucher and Reddy, 2008; Li and Jarvis, 2009; Olivié et al., 2012). We use  $R<sub>T</sub>$  from Boucher and Reddy (2008) which assumes two exponential terms and is based on the Hadley Centre Coupled Model version 3 (HadCM3) model (Table 8.SM.9). The climate sensitivity is 1.06 K (W m<sup>-2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup>, equivalent to a 3.9 K equilibrium response to  $2 \times CO<sub>2</sub>$ .

Using the equations above, the AGTP with a time horizon  $H$  for the non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases:

$$
AGTP_i(H) = A_i \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{\tau c_j}{\tau - d_j} \left( \exp\left(-\frac{H}{\tau}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{H}{d_i}\right) \right)
$$
\n(8.5M.14)

and the AGTP for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  is

$$
AGTP_{CO_2}(\mathsf{H}) = \mathsf{A}_{CO_2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \left\{ a_0 c_j \left( 1 - \exp\left( -\frac{H}{d_j} \right) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{a_i \tau_i c_j}{\tau_i - d_j} \left( \exp\left( -\frac{H}{\tau_i} \right) - \exp\left( -\frac{H}{d_j} \right) \right) \right\}
$$
\n
$$
(8.5M.15)
$$

**Table 8.SM.9** | Parameter values for the response to a pulse of radiative forcing used in the AGTP calculations

	1st Term	2nd Term
$c_i$ (K(W m <sup>-2</sup> ) <sup>-1</sup> )	0.631	0.429
$d_i$ (years)	8.4	409.5

#### **8.SM.11.3 Updates of Metric Values**

The metric values need updating as a result of new scientific knowledge, but also because of changes in lifetimes and REs caused by changing atmospheric background conditions (Reisinger et al., 2011). For the reference gas CO<sub>2</sub>, changes in AGWP<sub>c02</sub> and AGTP<sub>c02</sub> will affect the GWP and GTP of all other gases. With increasing  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  levels in the atmosphere the marginal RF is reduced, while at the same time the ocean uptake is reduced and airborne fraction increased (Caldeira and Kasting, 1993). These changes are in opposite directions, but do not totally cancel, and hence lead to changes in  $AGWP_{CO2}$  (Figure 8.30) and  $AGTP<sub>CO2</sub>$ .

To convert the RE values given per ppbv values to per kg (Shine et al., 2005), they must be multiplied by (M<sub>A</sub>/M<sub>i</sub>)(10<sup>9</sup>/T<sub>M</sub>) where M<sub>A</sub> is the mean molecular weight of air (28.97 kg kmol−1),  $M_i$  is the molecular weight of species i and  $T_M$  is the total mass of the atmosphere, 5.1352  $\times$  10<sup>18</sup> kg (Trenberth and Smith, 2005).

#### 8.SM.11.3.1 Metric Values for Carbon Dioxide

The radiative forcing for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  can be approximated using the expression based on radiative transfer models (Myhre et al., 1998):

$$
RF = \alpha \log \left( \frac{C_0 + \Delta C}{C_0} \right) \tag{8.5M.16}
$$

where  $\alpha$  = 5.35 W m<sup>-2</sup>, C<sub>0</sub> is the reference concentration and ∆C is the change from the reference. The radiative efficiency is the change in RF for a change in the atmospheric abundance,



or if  $\Delta C \rightarrow 0$  then the derivative can be used:

$$
RE = \frac{dRF}{d\Delta C}\Big|_{\Delta C = 0} = \frac{\alpha}{C_0}
$$
 (8.5M.18)

At current CO<sub>2</sub> levels (391 ppm) and for  $\Delta C = 1$  ppm, the radiative efficiency (RE) of CO<sub>2</sub> is 1.37  $*$  10<sup>-05</sup> W m<sup>-2</sup> ppb<sup>-1</sup>. The difference between using  $\Delta C = 1$  ppm and the derivate is 0.13%. For CO<sub>2</sub>, using a molecular weight of 44.01 kg kmol<sup>-1</sup>, the A becomes 1.7517 \* 10<sup>-15</sup> W m<sup>-2</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>.

The impulse response function (IRF) has been updated from AR4. Table 8.SM.10 shows the parameters of the IRF used in AR5 based on Joos et al. (2013) and Figure 8.SM.4 shows the IRFs from the four previous IPCC assessment reports together with the new IRF used in AR5. Table 8.SM.11 gives calculated values for integrated IRF and AGWPs for CO<sub>2</sub>.

**Table 8.SM.10 |** Parameter values for the sum of exponentials (Equation 8.SM.10) describing the fraction of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  remaining in the atmosphere after a pulse emission of CO<sub>2</sub> (Joos et al., (2013).

	1st Term	2nd Term	3rd Term	4th Term
Coefficient (unitless)	0.2173	0.2240	0.2824	0.2763
Time Scale $(\tau)$ , years)	٠	394.4	36.54	4.304

**Table 8.SM.11 |** Mean and uncertainty range for the time-integrated IRF and AGWP from Joos et al. (2013). The AGWP for AR5 uses the integrated IRF based on Equation 8.SM.10 and Table 8.SM.9 and a radiative efficiency for a 1 ppm change at 391 ppm.





Figure 8.SM.4 | The impulse response functions (IRFs) from the five IPCC Assessment Reports. The First Assessment Report (FAR) IRF (dotted) is based on an unbalanced carboncycle model (ocean only) and thus is not directly comparable to the others. The Second Assessment Report (SAR) IRF is based the CO<sub>2</sub> response of the Bern model (Bern-SAR), an early generation reduced-form carbon cycle model (Joos et al., 1996), and uses a 10 GtC pulse emission into a constant background without temperature feedbacks (Enting et al., 1994). The IRF was not updated for the Third Assessment Report (TAR), but a different parameterisation was used in World Meterological Organisation (WMO)/United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1998 (WMO, 1999) The Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) IRF is based on the Bern 2.5CC Earth System Model of Intermediate Complexity (EMIC) (Plattner et al., 2008). A pulse size of 40 GtC is used and includes temperature feedbacks. The Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) IRF is based on a model intercomparison and uses a pulse size of 100 GtC and includes temperature feedbacks (Joos et al., 2013). Apart from FAR, the changing IRF in each assessment report represents increasing background concentrations and improved models.

#### 8.SM.11.3.2 Metric Values for Methane

The RE of  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  is scaled to include effects on ozone and stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O, so that the AGWP becomes

AGWP<sub>CH<sub>a</sub></sub> 
$$
(H) = (1 + f_1 + f_2) A_{CH_4} \int_0^H e^{-t/\tau} dt =
$$
  
\n
$$
(1 + f_1 + f_2) A_{CH_4} \tau (1 - e^{-H/\tau})
$$
\n(8.5M.19)

where  $f_1$  is due to effects on ozone and  $f_2$  is due to stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O. The AGTP is modified in a similar way.

These indirect effects were included in AR4 by increasing the direct RF from CH<sub>4</sub> by 25% (due to tropospheric ozone) and 15% (due to stratospheric  $H_2O$ ). New studies provide updated values and include more effects. By accounting for aerosol responses, Shindell et al. (2009) found that the GWP for  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  increased by about 40% while Collins et al. (2010) found that the GTP for  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  increased by 5 to 30% when the effect of ozone on  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  was included. Boucher et al. (2009) included the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> from oxidation of CH<sub>4</sub> from fossil sources and calculated a GWP<sub>100</sub> higher than given in AR4 (27 to 28 versus 25). They found that  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  oxidation had a larger effect on GTP values and this effect was larger than the direct  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  effect for time horizons beyond 100 years.

In AR5 we use updated estimates for the indirect effects of  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  on ozone based on recent studies (Shindell et al., 2005; Shindell et al., 2009; Collins et al., 2013; Holmes et al., 2013; Stevenson et al., 2013). Based on these studies we assess the indirect effect on ozone (tropospheric and stratospheric) to  $f_1 = 0.5$  (0.2 to 0.8) of the direct effect. The indirect RF from CH<sub>4</sub> via changes in stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O is retained as  $f_2$  $= 0.15$  of the direct effect. Thus, we increase the direct effect of CH<sub>4</sub> by  $f_1 + f_2 = 0.65$  to account for RF from both O<sub>3</sub> and stratospheric H<sub>2</sub>O. We also present metric values for  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  of fossil origin (based on Boucher et al., (2009); Table 1). If these metric values are used the carbon emitted as  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  must not be included in the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (which are often based on total carbon content).

#### 8.SM.11.3.3 Metric Values for Nitrous Oxide

The indirect effect of increased  $N_2O$  abundance on  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  changes via stratospheric ozone, UV fluxes and OH levels is included in GWPs and GTPs. The reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> (-36 molecules per +100 molecules N<sub>2</sub>O) offsets some of the climate impact from  $N_2O$  emissions. The AGWP becomes

$$
AGWP_{N_2O}(H) = A_{N_2O}\left(1 - 0.36\left(1 + f_1 + f_2\right)\frac{RE_{CH_4}}{RE_{N_2O}}\right)\tau\left(1 - e^{-H/\tau}\right)
$$
\n(8.5M.20)

where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are the indirect effects for CH<sub>4</sub>. The AGTP is modified in a similar way.

#### **8.SM.11.4 Time Horizons**

In previous IPCC assessments, GWP values were given for 20-, 100 and 500-year time horizons, while here we only use 20 and 100 years. Instead of using GWP values for 500 years we show the response to emissions of some extremely long-lived gases such as PFCs; see Figure 8.SM.5. Once these gases are emitted they stay in the atmosphere and contribute to warming on very long time scales (99% of an emission of PFC-14 is still in the atmosphere after 500 years). For comparison



Figure 8.SM.5 | Temperature response due to 1-kg pulse emissions of greenhouse gases with a range of lifetimes (given in parentheses). Calculated with a temperature impulse response function taken from Boucher and Reddy (2008) which has a climate sensitivity of 1.06 K (W m<sup>-2</sup>)<sup>-1</sup>, equivalent to a 3.9 K equilibrium response to 2  $\times$  CO<sub>2</sub> (unit for carbon dioxide is  $kg CO<sub>2</sub>$ ).

we also include gases with lifetimes of the order of centuries down to a decade. A 1 kg pulse of  $SF<sub>6</sub>$  has a temperature effect after 500 years that is of the order of 35,000 larger than that of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ . The corresponding numbers for  $CF_4$  and  $C_2F_6$  are 11,000 and 18,000, respectively. There are large uncertainties related to temperature responses (as well as the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  response) on time-scales of centuries, but these results nevertheless indicate the persistence and long-lived warming effects of these gases.

One reason for not using a time horizon of 500 years is the increasing uncertainty in radiative efficiency, carbon uptake and ambiguity in the interpretation of GWP $_{500}$ , especially for gases with short adjustment times relative to the time scale of the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  perturbation. As explained in Section 8.7.1.2, the GWP gives the ratio of two integrals: one of a pulse of a non-CO<sub>2</sub> gas that decays to zero and that of the CO<sub>2</sub> response for which 20 to 40% of a pulse remains in the atmosphere for centuries. Figure 8.SM.5 also shows that the temperature response to a pulse of the relatively short-lived HFC-134a is close to zero for several centuries before the 500-year time horizon, while the GWP<sub>500</sub> is 371. This example highlights how the integrated nature of GWP means that the GWP value at a particular time may give misleading information about the climate impacts at that time, as the time scale used in the GWP becomes very different from the residence time of the emitted compound.

# **8.SM.12 Uncertainty Calculations for Global Warming Potential to Support Section 8.7.1**

In the absence of detailed uncertainty assessment, a first estimate of uncertainty for a given function,  $f$ , and input parameters,  $x_{i}$ , can be based on a first-order Taylor expansion of the variance in  $f$  leading to the well-known adding in quadrature approximation (Morgan and Henrion, 1990),

$$
\Delta f = \sqrt{\sum_{i} (\Delta f_i)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \Delta x_i\right)^2}
$$
 (8.5M.21)

where ∆f represents the uncertainty of each term, defined as the sensitivity to a marginal change multiplied by the error in the term. This approximation assumes that the uncertainties are small,  $\Delta x_i \propto x_i$ , the uncertainties are normally distributed,  $f$  is smooth for the range of input values and, most importantly, the uncertainties are independent.

If f is a product of two terms  $(f = xy)$ , then it can be shown that

$$
= \left(\frac{\Delta x}{x}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{\Delta y}{y}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\Delta f}{f}\right)^{2}
$$
 (8.5M.22)

We estimate the uncertainty in AGWP<sub>CO2</sub> using the uncertainty in  $A_{CO2}$ and  $I_{CO2}$ 

$$
AGWP_{CO_2}(H) = A_{CO_2}I_{CO_2}(H)
$$

where

$$
I_{cO_2}(H) = \int_0^{\infty} IRF_{CO_2}(t)dt
$$
 (8.5M.23)

In the case of the AGWP for non-CO<sub>2</sub> species, the expression becomes

$$
\Delta AGWP = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial AGWP}{\partial A}\right)^2 \Delta A^2 + \left(\frac{\partial AGWP}{\partial \tau}\right)^2 \Delta \tau^2}
$$

for

$$
f = AGWP(A, \tau) \tag{8.5M.24}
$$

where the expressions for the AGWP are from Equations 8.SM.9, 8.SM.19 and 8.SM.20. The uncertainty in the AGWP for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  is based on Equation 8.SM.23.

Table 8.SM.12 shows the uncertainty data and source used in the analysis. Many of the input parameters are given for a 1-σ range and we scale the uncertainty by 1.645 to convert to 90% confidence for consistency with rest of AR5. In some cases this represents a strong and uncertain assumption since the high-end uncertainties are not necessarily well defined. The estimated uncertainties should be seen as a rough first order evaluation to get an impression of the order of magnitude and the main contributions to total uncertainty.

Table 8.SM.13 shows the uncertainty for the AGWP of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>1</sub> CFC-11, CFC-12 and HFC-134a, Table 8.SM.14 shows the corresponding uncertainty for the GWPs, and Figure 8.SM.6 shows the contribution of each term  $\Delta f_i$  in Equation 8.SM.21 to the uncertainty. The uncertainty in AGWP is generally dominated by the perturbation lifetime, though this varies depending on the lifetime relative to the time horizon. The uncertainty in the AGWP $_{CH4}$  has an important contribution from the indirect effects, particularly the forcing from ozone changes. Except for  $CH_{4}$ , the uncertainty in the GWPs is dominated by the uncertainty in  $AGWP<sub>CO2</sub>$ .

Table 8.SM.12 | Uncertainty data, assumptions and sources used for the analysis. Note that uncertainties are assumed to be normally distributed and further analysis is required to determine the correct distribution.



Table 8.SM.13 | The estimated uncertainty in the AGWP for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, CFC-11, CFC-12, and HFC-134a showing the results of the full uncertainty analysis ('Full') and the effects of adding the uncertainty of different terms one at a time in the order (from left to right) of the next largest contributions. All values (±∆x) are percentages of the expected value, x, for a 90% confidence interval.





Table 8.SM.14 | The estimated uncertainty in the GWP for CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, CFC-11, CFC-12, and HFC-134a showing the results of the full uncertainty analysis ('Full') and the effects of adding the uncertainty of different terms one at a time in the order (from left to right) of the next largest contributions. All values (±∆x) are percentages of the expected value, x, for a 90% confidence interval.  $+CO_2$  represents the uncertainty in AGWP<sub>CO2</sub>.







Figure 8.SM.6 | The contribution of each term to the uncertainty in the AGWP, ∆AGWP is obtained by adding each term in quadrature according to Equation 8.SM.21. I<sub>CO2</sub> has data available only for four data points. For AGWP<sub>N2O</sub> the contribution from the radiative efficiency and indirect effect of CH<sub>4</sub> are combined in quadrature. In uncertainty analysis, the contributions are added in quadrature (Equation 8.SM.21), which will amplify the differences.

# **8.SM.13 Calculations of Metric Values for Halocarbons to Support Section 8.7.2**

The method used to calculate the radiative efficiencies (REs) and GWPs in Table 8.A.1 is discussed briefly here. More details are available at the following website: http://cicero.uio.no/halocarbonmetrics/.

#### **8.SM.13.1 Lifetimes**

The lifetime of each compound is taken from WMO (2011) when available. For some compounds, when WMO lifetimes are not available, lifetimes are taken from the published literature (sources of lifetime estimates are given here: http://cicero.uio.no/halocarbonmetrics/). For a few compounds, lifetimes could not be found in the literature and only the RE (and not the GWP) could be calculated. The REs of these compounds, assuming a homogeneous mixing in the atmosphere, are given in Table 8.SM.15.

#### **8.SM.13.2 Absorption Cross Sections**

The absorption cross sections used for the RE and GWP calculations come from a variety of sources, including the High-Resolution Transmission (HITRAN)-2008 (Rothman et al., 2009) and Gestion et Etude des Informations Spectroscopiques Atmosphériques (GEISA)-2011 (Jacquinet-Husson et al., 2011) databases, authors of published papers,

and supplementary material to published papers. A table that lists the absorption cross-sections used to calculate the RE for each compound can be found at the following website: http://cicero.uio.no/halocarbonmetrics/. Experimental absorption cross-sections have been used for the majority of compounds, but for a few compounds theoretical spectra were used because of unavailability of experimental spectra.

#### **8.SM.13.3 Instantaneous Radiative Efficiency**

The simple method from Pinnock et al. (1995) has been adopted here for the calculation of RE, except that a revised version of the Pinnock et al. curve has been used. This ensures a common method for deriving RE from absorption cross sections, and hence greater internal consistency, in contrast to the many different methods/assumptions used for calculation of RE used in the literature. The new curve, at 1 cm $^{-1}$  spectral resolution (rather than the original 10 cm–1 resolution used in Pinnock et al., (1995) is based on calculations with the Oslo Line-by-Line (LBL) model (Myhre et al., 2006), and is shown in Figure 8.SM.7.

Table 8.SM.15 | Calculated radiative efficiencies (REs) for compounds where lifetime estimates are unknown. Note that homogeneous mixing in the atmosphere is assumed; hence the REs presented here are probably upper estimates.





Figure 8.SM.7 | Radiative forcing efficiency (for a 0 to 1 ppbv increase in mixing ratio) per unit cross section calculated with the Oslo Line-by-Line (LBL) model.

#### **8.SM.13.4 Stratospheric Temperature Adjustment**

The revised Pinnock et al. curve shown in Figure 8.SM.7 applies for instantaneous radiative forcing efficiency. To take into account stratospheric temperature adjustment, a factor has been applied based on results from previous studies. For most compounds, the instantaneous REs have been increased by 10% (Pinnock et al., 1995; Myhre and Stordal, 1997; Jain et al., 2000; Naik et al., 2000; Forster et al., 2005) to account for stratospheric temperature adjustment. For a few selected compounds, explicit model calculations have been carried out using the Oslo LBL model (Myhre et al., 2006). These calculations show increases of 9.1%, 10.5%, and 10.5% for CFC-11, CFC-12 and  $CF_{4}$ , respectively, when taking into account the stratospheric temperature adjustment, while there is a reduction of 5.0% for HFC-41. The assumed increase of 10% for the remaining compounds is considered a good approximation, based on our calculations and the literature (e.g., Pinnock et al., 1995; Myhre and Stordal, 1997).

#### **8.SM.13.5 Lifetime Correction**

Fractional correction factors to the RE, to take into account the nonuniform mixing in the atmosphere, have previously been presented in Freckleton et al. (1998) and Sihra et al. (2001). Here, the method of Sihra et al. (2001) has been extended by including the results of Sellevag et al. (2004), and by carrying out new calculations using essentially the

model, (Myhre and Stordal, 1997) and a similar setup as in Sellevag et al. (2004). One fractional correction curve has been calculated for the compounds dominated by loss through photolysis in the stratosphere, and one curve for compounds that are lost mainly by reaction with OH. The first curve was calculated by applying an exponential curve fit which gives the formula  $f(\tau) = 1 - 0.1826 \tau^{-0.3339}$ , where f is the fractional correction and  $\tau$  is the lifetime in years. The empirical fit for the latter curve was constrained to form an S-shaped curve with the formula  $f(\tau) = (a\tau)^b / (1 + c\tau^d)$ , and the constants have values  $a =$ 2.962,  $b = 0.9312$ ,  $c = 2.994$  and  $d = 0.9302$ . The resulting two curves are shown in Figure 8.SM.8 and have been applied when calculating REs and GWPs for compounds where the lifetime is known. For shorterlived compounds (less than about 2 to 3 years), the fractional correction depends on where the compound is emitted and so no unique curve can be defined. Here it has been assumed that the geographical distribution is similar to the approach in Sellevag et al. (2004). These fractional corrections have been made to the RE after the instantaneous RE has been modified for stratospheric temperature adjustment as described in the paragraph above.

same models (Oslo CTM2, Søvde et al., 2008); and Oslo Broadband



Figure 8.SM.8 | Factor needed to correct radiative efficiency (RE) to account for non-uniform vertical and horizontal distribution versus atmospheric lifetime. The red symbols are for compounds whose main loss mechanism is stratospheric photolysis while the blue symbols are for compounds that are lost in the troposphere mainly by reaction with OH. Dark blue symbols have been used in the calculation of the S-shaped fit and dark red symbols have been used in the calculation of the exponential fit. Light blue and light red symbols are shown for comparison. The curve from Sihra et al. (2001) represents an empirical least squares fit to the fractional correction factors from Jain et al. (2000). For compounds where several different absorption bands have been used in the RF calculations, both the mean and the standard deviation of the fractional corrections are shown.

# **8.SM.14 Metric Values for Other Near-Term Climate Forcers to Support Section 8.7.2**

Derwent et al. (2001) report a GWP<sub>100</sub> of 5.8 for the effects of H<sub>2</sub> emissions on  $CH<sub>4</sub>$  and ozone. For global emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> Fuglestvedt et al. (2010) calculated GWPs of –140 and –40 for 20 and 100 years, respectively. The GTPs are –41 and –6.9 for the same time horizons (for both metrics the values are given on an  $SO<sub>2</sub>$  basis and account only for the aerosol radiation interaction of sulphate). For  $SO<sub>2</sub>$  Shindell et al. (2009) calculated  $-22 \pm 20$  (aerosol–radiation interaction only) and  $-76 \pm 69$  (aerosol-radiation interaction and aerosol-cloud interactions) for GWP<sub>100</sub>, and  $-78 \pm 70$  and  $-268 \pm 241$  for GWP<sub>20</sub>. For NH<sub>3</sub> Shindell et al. (2009) calculated  $-19 \pm 22$  (aerosol-radiation interaction only) and  $-15 \pm 18$  (aerosol-radiation interaction and aerosol-cloud interactions ) for GWP<sub>100</sub>, and –65  $\pm$  76 and –53  $\pm$  62 for GWP<sub>20</sub>. Due to competition for ammonium between nitrate and sulphate, the net aerosol forcing from either SO<sub>2</sub> or NH<sub>3</sub> emissions is the residual of larger responses of opposite signs, which leads to the high uncertainty in their numbers. (These values are based on IRF for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  from AR4.) The GWP<sub>100</sub> and GTP<sub>100</sub> values can be scaled by 0.94 and 0.92, respectively, to account for updated values for the reference gas  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ .

# **8.SM.15 Metric Values for Halocarbons Including Climate–Carbon Feedback for Carbon Dioxide to Support Section 8.7.2**

Table 8.SM.16 | GWP and GTP with climate-carbon feedbacks included for halocarbons. The additional effect (delta) and the total effect are given. (Climate-carbon feedbacks in response to the reference gas  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  are always included).



Table 8.SM.16 (continued)





Table 8.SM.16 (continued)



8SM



Table 8.SM.16 (continued)





Table 8.SM.16 (continued)









Table 8.SM.16 (continued)











# **8.SM.16 Metric Values to Support Figure 8.32 and Figure 8.33**

**Table 8.SM.17 |** Metric values used for Figures 8.32 and 8.33.



# **8.SM.17 Metric Values for Sectors to Support Section 8.7.2**

Table 8.SM.18 | GWPs and GTPs for NO<sub>x</sub>, BC, OC and SO<sub>2</sub> from various sectors (metrics for SO<sub>2</sub> are given on SO<sub>2</sub> basis, while for NO<sub>x</sub> they are given on a nitrogen basis). For the reference gas CO<sub>2</sub>, RE and IRF from AR4 are used in the calculations. The GWP<sub>100</sub> and GTP<sub>100</sub> values can be scaled by 0.94 and 0.92, respectively, to account for updated values for the reference gas  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ . For 20 years the changes are negligible. ari is aerosol–radiation interaction.



Notes:

a Myhre et al. (2011)

<sup>b</sup> Fuglestvedt et al. (2010)

<sup>c</sup> Collins et al. (2010)

<sup>d</sup> Shindell and Faluvegi (2010)

<sup>e</sup> Ødemark et al. (2012)

<sup>f</sup> Shindell et al. (2008)

<sup>g</sup> Bond et al. (2011)

<sup>h</sup> Köhler et al. (2013)

# **8.SM.18 Further Information on Temperature Impact from Various Sectors to Support Section 8.7.2**

**Table 8.SM.19 |** Information about emissions and metric values used in calculations of temperature impacts of sectors.



AGTPs for the aerosols OC and  $SO<sub>2</sub>$  are from Fuglestvedt et al. (2010). For BC, the metric parameterization is based on Bond et al. (2013); the RF of the aerosol radiation interaction (0.71 W  $\rm m^{-2}$ ) and snow and ice albedo effects (0.1 + 0.03 W m<sup>-2</sup>).

The parameters for the ozone precursors  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  is from the global run in Wild et al. (2001), CO from Derwent et al. (2001) and VOC from Collins et al. (2002), as given by Fuglestvedt et al. (2010). For  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  emissions from shipping and aircraft, the parameters are from Fuglestvedt et al. (2008) and Wild et al. (2001), respectively, as given by Fuglestvedt et al. (2010).

The parameters for the indirect effect of contrails and contrail induced cirrus (CIC) are updated for AR5. The lifetime is set to 5 hours, as in Fuglestvedt et al. (2010), while the REs are based on a radiative forcing of 10 m W  $m^{-2}$  and 50 m W  $m^{-2}$  for contrails and the sum of contrails and CIC, respectively. The calculations are based emissions from aviation of about 776 Tg(CO<sub>2</sub>), which comes from EDGAR 2008 (http:// edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=42).

The aerosol–cloud interaction has been calculated with a scaling relative to the direct effect of sulphate. The scaling is  $-0.45$  /  $-0.4 = 1.125$ and is used across almost all sectors (i.e., no separate scaling used for aerosol–cloud interaction for shipping). We do not account for any aerosol–cloud interaction from the aviation sector, as we include the impact of contrails and CIC.

We have tested the effect of various aerosol–cloud interaction values and attributions to components (e.g., attributing aerosol–cloud interaction equally to OC and sulphate, setting the aerosol–cloud interaction at the maximum or minimum of its 90% confidence interval, choosing a larger BC forcing, etc.). The ranking of sectors for global emissions differs little between the different parameterizations and mostly for the shortest time horizons.

The calculations presented here do not include the climate–carbon feedback for non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which can substantially increase those values (Collins et al., 2013). Emissions: Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) 2008 (http://edgar.jrc. ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=42). VOC emissions are converted to carbon mass units based on IPCC (2006). BC and OC emissions for year 2005 are taken from Shindell et al. (2012). Emission data requires frequently updates when new information become available (e.g., Lam et al., (2012). BC and OC emission from biomass burning are taken from Lamarque et al. (2010).

Figure 8.34 is based on the calculations and data described above. Figure 8.SM.9 shows the net temperature responses as function of time for one year pulse emissions. Figure 8.SM.10 shows the net temperature responses as function of time assuming constant emissions from the various sectors.

Figures 8.32 and 8.33 are based on the emission data given above for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, BC, OC, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and CO. The following metric values used are given in Table 8.SM.18.



**Figure 8.SM.9 |** Temperature responses from the various sectors as function of time for 1-year pulse emissions.



**Figure 8.SM.10 |** Temperature responses from the various sectors as function of time, assuming constant emissions.

8SM

# **References**

- Baliunas, S., and R. Jastrow, 1990: Evidence for long-term brightness changes of solar-type stars. Nature, **348**, 520–523.
- Ball, W., Y. Unruh, N. Krivova, S. Solanki, T. Wenzler, D. Mortlock, and A. Jaffe, 2012: Reconstruction of total solar irradiance 1974–2009. Astron. Astrophys., **541**, A27.
- Bond, T., C. Zarzycki, M. Flanner, and D. Koch, 2011: Quantifying immediate radiative forcing by black carbon and organic matter with the Specific Forcing Pulse. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **11**, 1505–1525.
- Bond, T. C., et al., 2013: Bounding the role of black carbon in the climate system: A scientific assessment. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **118**, 5380–5552.
- Boucher, O., and M. Reddy, 2008: Climate trade-off between black carbon and carbon dioxide emissions. Energ. Policy, **36**, 193–200.
- Boucher, O., P. Friedlingstein, B. Collins, and K. P. Shine, 2009: The indirect global warming potential and global temperature change potential due to methane oxidation. Environ. Res. Lett., **4**, 044007.
- Butler, J., B. Johnson, J. Rice, E. Shirley, and R. Barnes, 2008: Sources of differences in on-Orbital total solar irradiance measurements and description of a proposed laboratory intercomparison. J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol., **113**, 187–203.
- Caldeira, K., and J. Kasting, 1993: Insensitivity of global warming potentials to carbon-dioxide emission scenarios. Nature, **366**, 251–253.
- Clette, F., D. Berghmans, P. Vanlommel, R. Van der Linden, A. Koeckelenbergh, and L. Wauters, 2007: From the Wolf number to the International Sunspot Index: 25 years of SIDC. Adv. Space Res., **40**, 919–928.
- Collins, W., R. Derwent, C. Johnson, and D. Stevenson, 2002: The oxidation of organic compounds in the troposphere and their global warming potentials. Clim. Change, **52**, 453–479.
- Collins, W. J., S. Sitch, and O. Boucher, 2010: How vegetation impacts affect climate metrics for ozone precursors. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **115**, D23308.
- Collins, W. J., M. M. Fry, H. Yu, J. S. Fuglestvedt, D. T. Shindell, and J. J. West, 2013: Global and regional temperature-change potentials for near-term climate forcers. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 2471–2485.
- Crowley, T. J., and M. B. Unterman, 2013: Technical details concerning development of a 1200-yr proxy index for global volcanism. Earth Syst. Sci. Data, **5**, 187–197.
- Daniel, J., E. Fleming, R. Portmann, G. Velders, C. Jackman, and A. Ravishankara, 2010: Options to accelerate ozone recovery: Ozone and climate benefits. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **10**, 7697–7707.
- DeLand, M., and R. Cebula, 2012: Solar UV variations during the decline of Cycle 23. J. Atmos. Sol. Terres. Phys., **77**, 225–234.
- Derwent, R., W. Collins, C. Johnson, and D. Stevenson, 2001: Transient behaviour of tropospheric ozone precursors in a global 3-D CTM and their indirect greenhouse effects. Clim. Change, **49**, 463–487.
- Enting, I. G., T. M. L. Wigley, and M. Heimann, 1994: Future Emissions and Concentrations of Carbon Dioxide: Key Ocean/Atmosphere/Land Analyses. CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research Technical Paper no. 31.
- Feulner, G., 2011: Are the most recent estimates for Maunder Minimum solar irradiance in agreement with temperature reconstructions? Geophys. Res. Lett., **38**, L16706.
- Fontenla, J., O. White, P. Fox, E. Avrett, and R. Kurucz, 1999: Calculation of solar irradiances. I. Synthesis of the solar spectrum. Astrophys. J., **518**, 480–499.
- Forster, P., et al., 2005: Resolution of the uncertainties in the radiative forcing of HFC-134a. J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer, **93**, 447–460.
- Forster, P., et al., 2007: Changes in atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H. L. Miller (eds.)] Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 129–234.
- Foukal, P., A. Ortiz, and R. Schnerr, 2011: Dimming of the 17<sup>th</sup> century sun. Astrophys. J. Letters, **733**, L38.
- Fox, N., et al., 2011: Accurate radiometry from space: an essential tool for climate studies. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A, **369**, 4028–4063.
- Freckleton, R., E. Highwood, K. Shine, O. Wild, K. Law, and M. Sanderson, 1998: Greenhouse gas radiative forcing: Effects of averaging and inhomogeneities in trace gas distribution. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., **124**, 2099–2127.
- Frohlich, C., 2009: Evidence of a long-term trend in total solar irradiance. Astron. Astrophys., **501**, L27–U508.

Fuglestvedt, J., T. Berntsen, G. Myhre, K. Rypdal, and R. Skeie, 2008: Climate forcing from the transport sectors. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **105**, 454–458.

- Fuglestvedt, J. S., et al., 2010: Transport impacts on atmosphere and climate: Metrics. Atmos. Environ., **44**, 4648–4677.
- Gao, C., A. Robock, and C. Ammann, 2008: Volcanic forcing of climate over the past 1500 years: An improved ice core-based index for climate models. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **113**, D23111.

- Haigh, J., A. Winning, R. Toumi, and J. Harder, 2010: An influence of solar spectral variations on radiative forcing of climate. Nature, **467**, 696–699.
- Hall, J., and G. Lockwood, 2004: The chromospheric activity and variability of cycling and flat activity solar-analog stars. Astrophys. J., **614**, 942–946.
- Hansen, J., M. Sato, P. Kharecha, and K. von Schuckmann, 2011: Earth's energy imbalance and implications. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **11**, 13421–13449.
- Harder, J., J. Fontenla, P. Pilewskie, E. Richard, and T. Woods, 2009: Trends in solar spectral irradiance variability in the visible and infrared. Geophys. Res. Lett., **36**, L07801.
- Hathaway, D., R. Wilson, and E. Reichmann, 2002: Group sunspot numbers: Sunspot cycle characteristics. Sol. Phys., **211**, 357–370.
- Holmes, C. D., M. J. Prather, O. A. Søvde, and G. Myhre, 2013: Future methane, hydroxyl, and their uncertainties: Key climate and emission parameters for future predictions. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 285–302.
- Hoyt, D., and K. Schatten, 1998: Group Sunspot Numbers: A new solar activity reconstruction. Sol. Phys., **179**, 189–219.
- IPCC, 2006: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.
- Jacquinet-Husson, N., et al., 2011: The 2009 edition of the GEISA spectroscopic database. J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer, **112**, 2395–2445.
- Jain, A. K., B. P. Briegleb, K. Minschwaner, and D. J. Wuebbles, 2000: Radiative forcings and global warming potentials of 39 greenhouse gases. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **105**, 20773–20790.
- Joos, F., M. Bruno, R. Fink, U. Siegenthaler, T. Stocker, and C. LeQuere, 1996: An efficient and accurate representation of complex oceanic and biospheric models of anthropogenic carbon uptake. Tellus B, **48**, 397–417.
- Joos, F., et al., 2013: Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: A multi-model analysis. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 2793–2825.
- Judge, P., G. Lockwood, R. Radick, G. Henry, A. Shapiro, W. Schmutz, and C. Lindsey, 2012: Confronting a solar irradiance reconstruction with solar and stellar data (Research Note). Astron. Astrophys., **544**, A88.
- Koehler, M. O., G. Raedel, K. P. Shine, H. L. Rogers, and J. A. Pyle, 2013: Latitudinal variation of the effect of aviation NOx emissions on atmospheric ozone and methane and related climate metrics. Atmos. Environ., **64**, 1–9.
- Krivova, N., L. Vieira, and S. Solanki, 2010: Reconstruction of solar spectral irradiance since the Maunder minimum. J. Geophys. Res. Space Phys., **115**, A12112.
- Lam, N. L., et al., 2012: Household light makes global heat: High black carbon emissions from kerosene wick lamps. Environ. Sci. Technol., **46**, 13531–13538.
- Lamarque, J., et al., 2010: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: Methodology and application. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **10**, 7017–7039.
- Lean, J., and M. Deland, 2012: How does the sun's spectrum vary? J. Clim., **25**, 2555–2560.
- Lee, Y. H., et al., 2013: Evaluation of preindustrial to present-day black carbon and its albedo forcing from Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP). Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 2607–2634.
- Li, S., and A. Jarvis, 2009: Long run surface temperature dynamics of an A-OGCM: The HadCM3 4xCO<sub>2</sub> forcing experiment revisited. Clim. Dyn., 33, 817-825.
- Lockwood, M., and M. Owens, 2011: Centennial changes in the heliospheric magnetic field and open solar flux: The consensus view from geomagnetic data and cosmogenic isotopes and its implications. J. Geophys. Res. Space Phys., **116**, A04109.
- Morgan, M. G., and M. Henrion, 1990: A Guide to Dealing with Uncertainty in Quantitative Risk and Policy Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.
- Myhre, G., and F. Stordal, 1997: Role of spatial and temporal variations in the computation of radiative forcing and GWP. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **102**, 11181– 11200.

Gray, L., et al., 2010: Solar influences on climate. Rev. Geophys., **48**, RG4001.

- Myhre, G., E. J. Highwood, K. P. Shine, and F. Stordal, 1998: New estimates of radiative forcing due to well mixed greenhouse gases. Geophys. Res. Lett., **25**, 2715–2718.
- Myhre, G., F. Stordal, I. Gausemel, C. J. Nielsen, and E. Mahieu, 2006: Line-by-line calculations of thermal infrared radiation representative for global condition: CFC-12 as an example. J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer, **97**, 317–331.
- Myhre, G., et al., 2011: Radiative forcing due to changes in ozone and methane caused by the transport sector. Atmos. Environ., **45**, 387–394.
- Naik, V., A. K. Jain, K. O. Patten, and D. J. Wuebbles, 2000: Consistent sets of atmospheric lifetimes and radiative forcings on climate for CFC replacements: HCFCs and HFCs. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **105**, 6903–6914.
- Ødemark, K., S. B. Dalsoren, B. H. Samset, T. K. Berntsen, J. S. Fuglestvedt, and G. Myhre, 2012: Short-lived climate forcers from current shipping and petroleum activities in the Arctic. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **12**, 1979–1993.
- Olivié, D. J. L., G. Peters, and D. Saint-Martin, 2012: Atmosphere response time scales estimated from AOGCM Experiments. J. Clim., **25**, 7956–7972.
- Pinnock, S., M. D. Hurley, K. P. Shine, T. J. Wallington, and T. J. Smyth, 1995: Radiative forcing of climate by hydrochlorofluorocarbons and hydrofluorocarbons. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **100**, 23227–23238.
- Plattner, G. K., et al., 2008: Long-term climate commitments projected with climatecarbon cycle models. J. Clim., **21**, 2721–2751.
- Pongratz, J., T. Raddatz, C. H. Reick, M. Esch, and M. Claussen, 2009: Radiative forcing from anthropogenic land cover change since AD 800. Geophys. Res. Lett., **36**, L02709.
- Prather, M., 1994: Lifetimes and eigenstates in atmospheric chemistry. Geophys. Res. Lett., **21**, 801–804.
- Prather, M., 2007: Lifetimes and time scales in atmospheric chemistry. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London A, **365**, 1705–1726.
- Prather, M. J., C. D. Holmes, and J. Hsu, 2012: Reactive greenhouse gas scenarios: Systematic exploration of uncertainties and the role of atmospheric chemistry. Geophys. Res. Lett., **39**, L09803.
- Reisinger, A., M. Meinshausen, and M. Manning, 2011: Future changes in global warming potentials under representative concentration pathways. Environ. Res. Lett., **6**, 024020.
- Rigby, M., et al., 2013: Re-evaluation of the lifetimes of the major CFCs and CH<sub>3</sub>CCl<sub>3</sub> using atmospheric trends. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 2691–2702.
- Rothman, L., et al., 2009: The HITRAN 2008 molecular spectroscopic database. J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer, **110**, 533–572.
- Sato, M., J. E. Hansen, M. P. McCormick, and J. B. Pollack, 1993: Stratospheric aerosol optical depths, 1850–1990. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **98**, 22987–22994.
- Schmidt, G., et al., 2011: Climate forcing reconstructions for use in PMIP simulations of the last millennium (v1.0). Geosci. Model Dev., **4**, 33–45.
- Schmidt, G. A., et al., 2012: Climate forcing reconstructions for use in PMIP simulations of the Last Millennium (v1.1). Geosci. Model Dev., **5**, 185–191.
- Schrijver, C., W. Livingston, T. Woods, and R. Mewaldt, 2011: The minimal solar activity in 2008–2009 and its implications for long-term climate modeling. Geophys. Res. Lett., **38**, L06701.
- Sellevåg, S. R., C. J. Nielsen, O. A. Søvde, G. Myhre, J. K. Sundet, F. Stordal, and I. S. A. Isaksen, 2004: Atmospheric gas-phase degradation and global warming potentials of 2-fluoro ethanol, 2,2-difluoroethanol, and 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol. Atmos. Environ., **38**, 6725–6735.
- Shapiro, A., W. Schmutz, E. Rozanov, M. Schoell, M. Haberreiter, A. Shapiro, and S. Nyeki, 2011: A new approach to the long-term reconstruction of the solar irradiance leads to large historical solar forcing. Astron. Astrophys., **529**, A67.
- Shindell, D., and G. Faluvegi, 2010: The net climate impact of coal-fired power plant emissions. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **10**, 3247–3260.
- Shindell, D., G. Faluvegi, N. Bell, and G. Schmidt, 2005: An emissions-based view of climate forcing by methane and tropospheric ozone. Geophys. Res. Lett., **32**, L04803.
- Shindell, D., et al., 2008: Climate forcing and air quality change due to regional emissions reductions by economic sector. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **8**, 7101–7113.
- Shindell, D., et al., 2012: Simultaneously mitigating near-term climate change and improving human health and food security. Science, **335**, 183–189.
- Shindell, D. T., G. Faluvegi, D. M. Koch, G. A. Schmidt, N. Unger, and S. E. Bauer, 2009: Improved attribution of climate forcing to emissions. Science, **326**, 716–718.
- Shindell, D. T., et al., 2013: Radiative forcing in the ACCMIP historical and future climate simulations. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 2939–2974.
- Shine, K., J. Fuglestvedt, K. Hailemariam, and N. Stuber, 2005: Alternatives to the global warming potential for comparing climate impacts of emissions of greenhouse gases. Clim. Change, **68**, 281–302.
- Sihra, K., M. Hurley, K. Shine, and T. Wallington, 2001: Updated radiative forcing estimates of 65 halocarbons and nonmethane hydrocarbons. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **106**, 20493–20505.
- Skeie, R., T. Berntsen, G. Myhre, K. Tanaka, M. Kvalevag, and C. Hoyle, 2011a: Anthropogenic radiative forcing time series from pre-industrial times until 2010. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **11**, 11827–11857.
- Skeie, R., T. Berntsen, G. Myhre, C. Pedersen, J. Strom, S. Gerland, and J. Ogren, 2011b: Black carbon in the atmosphere and snow, from pre-industrial times until present. Atmos. Chem. Phys., **11**, 6809–6836.
- Søvde, O. A., M. Gauss, S. P. Smyshlyaev, and I. S. A. Isaksen, 2008: Evaluation of the chemical transport model Oslo CTM2 with focus on arctic winter ozone depletion. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **113**, D09304.
- Steinhilber, F., J. Beer, and C. Frohlich, 2009: Total solar irradiance during the Holocene. Geophys. Res. Lett., **36**, L19704.
- Stevenson, D., R. Doherty, M. Sanderson, W. Collins, C. Johnson, and R. Derwent, 2004: Radiative forcing from aircraft NOx emissions: Mechanisms and seasonal dependence. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **109**, D17307.
- Stevenson, D. S., et al., 2013: Tropospheric ozone changes, radiative forcing and attribution to emissions in the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP). Atmos. Chem. Phys., **13**, 3063–3085.
- Svalgaard, L., and E. Cliver, 2010: Heliospheric magnetic field 1835-2009. J. Geophys. Res. Space Phys., **115**, A09111.
- Svalgaard, L., C. Mandrini, and D. Webb, 2012: How well do we know the sunspot number? Comp. Magnet. Min. Character. Quiet Times Sun Stars, **286**, 27–33.
- Trenberth, K., and L. Smith, 2005: The mass of the atmosphere: A constraint on global analyses. J. Clim., **18**, 864–875.
- van Vuuren, D., J. Edmonds, M. Kainuma, K. Riahi, and J. Weyant, 2011: A special issue on the RCPs. Clim. Change, **109**, 1–4.
- Wang, Y., J. Lean, and N. Sheeley, 2005: Modeling the sun's magnetic field and irradiance since 1713. Astrophys. J., **625**, 522–538.
- Wild, O., M. Prather, and H. Akimoto, 2001: Indirect long-term global radiative cooling from NOx emissions. Geophys. Res. Lett., **28**, 1719–1722.
- WMO, 1999: Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1998, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project. World Meteorological Organisation, Report No. 44. World Meterological Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland.
- WMO, 2011: Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2010. Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project Report. World Meteorological Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland, 516 pp.
- Wright, J., 2004: Do we know of any Maunder minimum stars? Astron. J., **128**, 1273–1278.