
From: AUBREY MEYER <aubrey.meyer@btinternet.com>
To: Martin Manning <martin.r.manning@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, 6 December 2014, 11:58
Subject: Re: Please Review

Dear Martin

Perhaps I should have drawn your attention to the following . . .

- the opening CBAT default [here](#) is precisely the Budget in the UK Climate Act from UKMO
- creating a reference position, this is roughly [in the middle](#) of the AR5 RCP scenarios
- the potential for feedback-effects *is* represented (tonne-for-tonne emissions:concentrations in assumed carbon-equivalence) now, as continuing to wait until after the fact is too late.
- if you [+ the feedback](#) and pull the feedback slider right down, you get UKMO's 'most probable concentration' pathway (for which they gave merely 44% odds of keeping under 2°C).
- if you [+ the feedback](#) and pull the feedback slider right up, you get (roughly) their 'least probable concentration' upper pathway (where the odds of keeping under 2°C where hopeless).
- since feedback effects from the UKCA and also the RCPs behind AR5 were omitted, the array-ranges in CBAT are a plausible way to include them in, as one way or another they should have been
- since climate-sensitivity valuation was limited to a [contest between a range of models that all excluded feedback effects](#)
- it is plausible to have included a wider range of climate sensitivity values, [as has been done in CBAT](#) as well.

In the light of this, when you wrote, *"From a scientist's perspective it seems to be very specific about options"* this is correct. However, going on to say, *"as it does not put in all the uncertainties"* is not correct.

As CBAT puts in ranges covering uncertainties based on actually including (i.e. not excluding) and representing (i.e. not ignoring) what they might be, if anything, its the opposite which is correct, surely?

These carbon-budget considerations as in CBAT Domain 1, are then faithfully carried tonne-for-tonne over into the 'policy-domains', CBAT Domains [2](#), [3](#) & [4](#).

So when you say, *"from a policy maker's perspective this (CBAT) is probably a good way to present things,"* I agree with you and that's exactly what it does in Domains [2](#), [3](#) & [4](#).

However, when you go on to say, "*and it's what they get from economists much of the time,*" I do not agree with you, because that's just what 'they' (not quite sure who you mean?) **don't** get from economists. What 'they' get much of the time is advice based on results from model-scenarios that are largely free of potential feedback-effects, with the low sensitivity values that result from this. As even economist [Nicholas Stern said recently from the IMF](#) omitting these is not appropriate,

So if you do get time to evaluate what is there, that is is a bit more 'steer' as to the constitution of the CBAT concept.

I hope you accept that's: -

- what has been done in CBAT,
- how it has been done and
- why it has been done.

There's a bit more information [here](#) and all this certainly needs to be deepened.

As one of the respondents [here](#) noted, "*CBAT graphs offer a very useful insight into an issue over which many people are very confused.*"

There were many other comments in that vein.

All the best.

Aubrey

Aubrey Meyer
GCI
57 Howard Road
LONDON E17 4SH
www.gci.org.uk

From: AUBREY MEYER <aubrey.meyer@btinternet.com>
To: Martin Manning <martin.r.manning@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, 6 December 2014, 7:44
Subject: Re: Please Review

Dear Martin

In that you responded prompted by the email about 'spam messages', I didn't send you that.

My email was hacked by an unknown third party. Please ignore & delete that email.

The Carbon Budget Accounting Tool [CBAT](#) has been my focus and it is finished now.

CBAT is a user-chooser interactive animation & integration of uncertainties regarding

- sizing/shrinking/sharing future carbon-budgets
- generic measurement of potential rates of feedback-effects
- associated ranges of climate-sensitivities and
- future growth and avoided-(or un-avoided) economic-damages

In brief it is a strategy/policy tool in 4 Domains.

Information about this is [here](#) C&C is Domain 2.

Within a consistent and rational syntax, users can investigate

- options or choices that
- determine the sign and the level of uncertainties
- and various *rates* of the consequences of these choices.

Beyond the basic structure of the tool, CBAT does now predict or prescribe anything.

There have been some favourable reactions to CBAT [here](#)

I would be delighted if are able to use it & give me some feedback when you have the time.

With kind regards

Aubrey

Aubrey Meyer
GCI
57 Howard Road
LONDON E17 4SH
www.gci.org.uk

From: Martin Manning <martin.r.manning@gmail.com>

To: AUBREY MEYER <aubrey.meyer@btinternet.com>

Sent: Saturday, 6 December 2014, 5:27

Subject: Re: Please Review

Dear Aubrey

My apologies for not replying to your email last month. Am rather overloaded trying to finish a paper on atmospheric chemistry that will add to the growing critique of global warming potentials for gases like CH₄, and have got a tight deadline for completing that. But also whenever I did try to reply to your last email my computer hung up for some reason.

I have looked at your new web pages on contraction and convergence but only briefly so far. From a scientist's perspective it seems to be very specific about options as it does not put in all the uncertainties, but from a policy maker's perspective this is probably a good way to present things and it's what they get from economists much of the time. I'd like to compare the results you get with some things that have been done recently by people like Keywan Riahi, but can't do that for a few weeks yet.

Regards
Martin

At 03:12 p.m. 3/12/2014, AUBREY MEYER wrote:

hello,

i have been getting too many spam messages and i wish to add little security to mail i receive with google achieve security, please add your email [here](#) so i can keep getting messages sent from you.

cheers

Aubrey Meyer
GCI
57 Howard Road
LONDON E17 4SH
www.gci.org.uk