

## IPCC AR6 Report Review

The first impression from the IPCC AR6 Summary for Policymakers was, what a boring rehash of the just as flawed AR5 report. Although they may have set a new record for the use of the word likely. The news reports and accompanying narratives have tried to spice up the report with the “we’re all going to die if we do not act immediately narratives”. But the IPCC’s general approach has not changed from AR5 to AR6. The analysis is still based primarily on computer models that are focussed on the Modern Temperature Record (MTR, 1750 or 1850 to the Present). There are many problems with the computer models with the main issues outlined below.

- The computer models are overly sensitive to CO<sub>2</sub>. And you do not have to take my word for it. From the [AAAS](#), “Many of the world’s leading models are now projecting warming rates that most scientists, including the modelmakers themselves, believe are implausibly fast.” Gavin Schmidt (NASA-GISS) just came out and said, “It’s become clear over the last year or so that we can’t avoid this,”. Strange that the IPCC “Climate Scientists” are just now coming to this realization. Dr. John Christy (University of Alabama, Huntsville (UAH)) pointed out that very obvious fact many years ago (using the CMIP5 protocol). The updated models (CMIP6) used for this (the IPCC AR6) report were reviewed earlier this year by Dr. Christy ([CSS-6 – John Christy – January 2021](#)). The results rather than improving, have become more erratic and inaccurate. Maybe the programmers should have stuck with the CMIP5 protocol and used the Russian Model as their starting point (low CO<sub>2</sub> Climate Sensitivity and a negative cloud forcing function). Or they could continue with CMIP6 and actually turn on the Cosmic Ray Flux and High Energy Particle solar forcings built into the new protocol. During Beta testing, the modellers were able to model the MTR temperature incorporating the new natural natural forcings (i.e.: CO<sub>2</sub> forcings were not required). Not surprising, since I was also able to model the MTR ([Open Letter Addendum](#) and [OPS-8 – Basic Climate Model](#)), using just a combination of Total Solar Irradiance (TSI, as a proxy) and the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation (AMO). Some minor CO<sub>2</sub> forcing could be added to strengthen the match.
- The models are still obviously using their positive water vapor feedback theory (or more accurately fudge factor) to exaggerate the theoretical CO<sub>2</sub> warming effects (i.e.: the CO<sub>2</sub> climate sensitivity). The problem with that, according to [NOAA](#), the atmospheric relative humidity data has been declining steadily since 1948. The atmospheric specific humidity does show a very minor increase (near the surface), but the rest of the atmosphere is trending down (like the relative humidity). Also, the models cannot account for the complexity of clouds. The additional water vapor is obviously not staying in the atmosphere unless, that water vapor is transitioning to more cloud cover/precipitation (which cools the planet).
- As pointed out by Roger Pielke Jr., the AR6 Report is still using the unrealistic discredited RCP8.5 emissions projection. Using excessive emission scenarios with overly aggressive emission (i.e.: CO<sub>2</sub>) sensitivities might suggest that the IPCC is not being as objective as one might suspect from a scientific organization (oh wait, that’s right they are not a scientific organization and it shows).
- And for those that need a reminder, in the IPCC’s own words, “The climate system is a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.”

Yet, our idiotological leaders are still using these Computer Models to justify implementing their uneconomic, unreliable green initiatives.

Computer Models aside, this report is no different than earlier reports. They are all missing that all important empirical Temperature/CO<sub>2</sub> dataset that shows CO<sub>2</sub> driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale. Empirical data is required to transform a theory (in this case the CAGW alarmist narrative) into an accepted scientific principle. That empirical data does not exist.

The report is also subject to the usual cherry-picking methods used by the CAGW alarmist crowd. I recently posted [OPS-53 – Cherry Picking Data – CAGW Alarmist Style](#) which highlights the standard computer model cherry-pick and a few links to forest fires, hurricane, etc. cherry-picks. A few examples from the report are listed below (and there are many more).

A.1.2 “Each of the last four decades has been successively warmer than any decade that preceded it since 1850”. I suspect the survivors of the Dirty Thirties may have something to say about that. Measured temperatures were much hotter back then. If only the climate scientists of the time could have homogenized those temperatures down as easily as our “climate scientists” do. Sure would have saved a lot of pain and suffering. My posts ([CSS-8 – Earth Day 2021](#) and [OPS-49 – Temperature Manipulation](#)) touch on the homogenization process but for an in depth look at the homogenization fiasco, review Tony Heller’s work. How much of the “HOTTEST YEARS EVER” is due to homogenization?

A.1.5 “Human influence very likely contributed to the decrease in Northern Hemisphere spring snow cover since 1950.” So, is human influence just a spring phenomenon now? Strange that both fall and winter snow cover increased.

Figure SPM.1 (Panel a) Good to see the Hockey Schtick is back. Go back to the [OPS-53](#) post to see what a variety of Holocene Temperature data sets look like when plotted against CO<sub>2</sub> (scaled to reflect the CAGW alarmist narrative that CO<sub>2</sub> is primarily responsible for the MTR warming). Strange how the report does not show the entire Holocene on this panel. But not really that strange when you consider that would destroy their narrative. The pre-MTR Holocene temperature swings had nothing to do with CO<sub>2</sub> (which was essentially flat). Those natural forcings (solar, directly or indirectly) did not stop just because the IPCC programmers decreed it so. They were still active throughout the MTR and will continue to be active in the future (just not in the virtual reality created by the IPCC). The models are useless for Hindcasting and are therefore useless for Forecasting (GIGO). Does not say much positive for the IPCC report.

Figure SPM.1 (Panel b) This has been covered in the earlier discussion. The computer models shown in Panel b are only using TSI for solar forcing. If all the available CMIP6 solar forcings were used the simulated solar curve would reflect similar results (without CO<sub>2</sub> contribution) to the simulated human & natural curve.

A.2.3 “In 2019, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were higher than at any time in at least 2 million years”, etc. The statement is most likely (to use IPCC parlance) correct. However, the sentiment is meaningless unless an empirical Temperature/CO<sub>2</sub> data set that shows CO<sub>2</sub> driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale is brought forward. The scientific method requires empirical data (data that you will not find in this or any other IPCC report). Here are a few statements (just as valid as the IPCC statements) that you will not find in any IPCC report.

The Little Ice Age (a very cold period) correlates with the Holocene's lowest solar activity period. And the Modern Maximum (the Holocene's highest solar activity) correlates with the HOTTEST YEARS EVER ([CSS-12g](#)). Solar activity ([CSS-12f](#)) peaked in 1950, remained flat until the turn of the century and has declined slightly since.

The LIA cold temperatures were not due to CO<sub>2</sub> (human emissions or natural) since CO<sub>2</sub> was virtually flat pre-MTR. Temperatures began rising centuries before CO<sub>2</sub> increases began. And over 86% of human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions occurred post-1950 (i.e.: human CO<sub>2</sub> influence is primarily limited to the post-1950 period).

However, CO<sub>2</sub> was not acting alone post-1950 ([CSS-7 – CO<sub>2</sub> – The FECKLESS GreenHouse Gas](#)). From 1945 to 1975, temperatures dropped (even using the over-homogenized (i.e.: manipulated) surface data sets) despite rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels, leading to the 1970's the ICE AGE IS COMING scare. Temperatures increased dramatically from 1975 to the turn of the century. Was CO<sub>2</sub> contributing, sure. But a significant portion of the warming was also due to the AMO increase and a series of strong el Nino's (warm ENSO cycles) beginning in 1998. The temperature "PAUSE" from 2002 to 2015 is real ([OPS-40 – UAH Update – January 2021](#)) and corresponds to the shallow decline in solar activity that began at the turn of the century. Homogenization (the art of turning measured temperatures into "official" temperatures) also played a significant role. How did those record Dirty Thirties temperatures disappear? I do not see that very important value highlighted anywhere in the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) report.

The HOTTEST YEARS EVER include a very strong ENSO cycle (the warm el Ninos in 2016, 2017 and 2020) immediately following the "PAUSE". CO<sub>2</sub> had very little to do with the significant temperature increases from 2015 to 2020.

Temperatures have dropped by 0.71 °C since the 2016 peak and 0.6 °C from the 2020 peak. Global temperatures were back in the "PAUSE" range despite the record temperatures set by the "Heat Dome" over the Pacific Northwest in Late June 2021. It may have been hot in the Pacific Northwest, but it was unusually cold in many other areas of the world. The global average temperatures at the time were only +0.2 °C above the 1979 to 2000 average.

There are so many points that the IPCC just conveniently ignores (that little problem of a Grand Solar Minimum for one). I have covered most of them in my writings ([climatechangeandmusic.com](#)) so I will cut this review off here. Reviewing anything past Section A is really pointless. All the projections and possibilities that are laid out in the report are based on flawed computer models (a fact that the alarmist community has just acknowledged). Putting out the report and discrediting the sole "proof" at the same time just reflects the IPCC's total incompetence. Also keep in mind that computer models are proof of absolutely nothing (an ongoing measure of incompetence).

Here are a couple of good videos reviewing the IPCC report.

Suspicious Observers - [EPIC FAILURE | 2021 IPCC Report - YouTube](#)

Sky News Australia - [IPCC report 'not a proper scientific document' - YouTube](#)