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• **Climate Network and Topology?**
The IPCC climate “structure” overestimates the human contribution to climate change.

• **Total Solar Irradiance?**
The TSI likely increased from 1980 to 2002 contrary to the IPCC assumptions. Evidences that the ACRIM TSI composite is more accurate than the PMOD are presented.

• **Global Temperatures?**
The Hockey Stick temperature by Mann has likely misled the GW debate. More recent paleoclimate temperature reconstructions present a much larger pre-industrial variability which better agrees with historical records.

• **Climate Models?**
IPCC climate models fail to reproduce the climate variability before 1960 and greatly disagree with the empirical studies evaluating the 11-year solar signature on climate. Limitations of the multi-linear regression climate models are discussed.

• **Missing Feedbacks and/or Climate Forcings?**
A phenomenological climate model studied to overcome the limitations of the current science is presented. The model well predicts centuries of climate change.

• **Future: Warming or Imminent Cooling?**
A forecast of climate change based on the solar system planetary motion is presented. The model appears to reconstruct with great accuracy the observed climate change since 1850 and predicts a cooling until 2030-2040. The physical mechanisms are unknown.
Mt. Kilimanjaro
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IPCC 2007
interpretation of the climate network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF Terms</th>
<th>RF values (W/m²)</th>
<th>Spatial scale</th>
<th>LOSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-lived greenhouse gases</td>
<td>1.66 [1.49 to 1.83]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halocarbons</td>
<td>0.48 [0.43 to 0.53]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>0.16 [0.14 to 0.18]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>0.34 [0.31 to 0.37]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>-0.05 [-0.15 to 0.05]</td>
<td>Continental to global</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric</td>
<td>0.35 [0.25 to 0.65]</td>
<td>Continental to global</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropospheric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric water vapour from CH₄</td>
<td>0.07 [0.02 to 0.12]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface albedo</td>
<td>-0.2 [-0.4 to 0.0]</td>
<td>Local to continental</td>
<td>Med - Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black carbon on snow</td>
<td>0.1 [0.0 to 0.2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aerosol</td>
<td>-0.5 [-0.9 to -0.1]</td>
<td>Continental to global</td>
<td>Med - Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-0.7 [-1.8 to -0.3]</td>
<td>Continental to global</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud albedo effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear contrails</td>
<td>0.01 [0.003 to 0.03]</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar irradiance</td>
<td>0.12 [0.06 to 0.30]</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net anthropogenic</td>
<td>1.6 [0.6 to 2.4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.4.** Global average radiative forcing (RF) in 2005 (best estimates and 5 to 95% uncertainty ranges) with respect to 1750 for CO₂, CH₄, N₂O and other important agents and mechanisms, together with the typical geographical extent (spatial scale) of the forcing and the assessed level of scientific understanding (LOSU). Aerosols from explosive volcanic eruptions contribute an additional episodic cooling term for a few years following an eruption. The range for linear contrails does not include other possible effects of aviation on cloudiness. (WGI Figure SPM.2)
Only humans can change GHGs!

Topology of the climate system according to the IPCC models

Human activity -> CH4 -> Aerosol

CO2 -> Ozone -> Water Vapor and Cloud Feedback

Albedo

Total Solar Irradiance

Volcano
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Glacial epochs & Milankovitch cycles prove that there are several natural GHG feedback mechanisms!

ice core data from Vostok, Antarctica
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GHGs are changed by humans, the sun and volcanoes.
Secular correlation between solar and climate records

Cosmic rays blast nuclei in the upper atmosphere, producing neutrons which in turn bombard nitrogen, the major constituent of the atmosphere. This neutron bombardment produces the radioactive isotope carbon-14.

Cosmic rays are modulated by solar wind.

IPCC 2001-7: Sun and climate are no longer correlated since 1975 (?)

Solanki's TSI proxy model

The good correlation ends in 1975!
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Did the TSI increase or remain constant after 1980? THE ACRIM - PMOD CONTROVERSY - solved

ACRIM Composite TSI Time Series (Daily Means)

Minima trend between during solar cycles 21 – 23: + 0.037 %/decade
TSI trend between minima during solar cycles 21 – 24, approaching next minima: + 0.008 %/decade

Fractional components of ACRIM Composite:
ACRIM1: 88.7 %
Nimbus7/ERB: 11.3 %

PMOD Composite TSI Time Series (Daily Means)

Minima trend during solar cycles 21 – 23: -0.007 %/decade
Minima trend during solar cycles 21 – 24, (approaching next minima): -0.012 %/decade

Fractional components of PMOD Composite:
Nimbus7/ERB: 21.5 %
ACRIM1: 8.7 %
Nimbus7/ERB: 11.3 %
ACRIM2: 40.3 %
VIRGO: 26.6 %
ACRIM team claims that ERBS/ERBE degraded during the ACRIM-gap because during this time ERBS sensors were experiencing the large high frequency solar irradiance for the first time. ERBS also clearly degraded in 1984-1986 when its mission started.
PMOD team claims that Nimbus7 is corrupted because disagrees with some TSI proxy reconstruction predictions in particular during the periods 1 and 2 (LEAN's 2005, TSI proxy model is the black smooth line).
PMOD correction of Nimbus7 during the ACRIM GAP
PMOD shifts down Nimbus7 record by 0.86 W/m^2 during the ACRIM-gap

29/Sept/1989

Nimbus7/ERB - PMOD

slope +0.142 W/m^2/year

jump +0.47 W/m^2

total jump from 1989.5 to 1992.5 = +0.86 W/m^2
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The TSI experimental teams disagree with PMOD

September 16, 2008

Dear Dr. Scafetta:

Regarding Frohlich’s PMOD TSI composite:

1. Frohlich made unauthorized and incorrect adjustments to the SMM/ACRIM1 and UARS/ACRIM2 TSI results. In the case of ACRIM1 he arbitrarily miss-applied the degradation correction published by the ACRIM1 Science team for the SMM ‘spin mode’ (1981 – 1984) to the 1980 results. He did this without any detailed knowledge of the ACRIM1 instrument or on-orbit performance, original analysis or consultation with the ACRIM1 team. His intent was clearly to revise the solar cycle 21 TSI to agree with Judith Lean’s TSI proxy model.

2. Frohlich chose the ERBS/ERBE database to ‘bridge’ the ACRIM gap when it was clearly inferior to the Nimbus7/ERB gap data. His justification was based on hypothetical ‘upward steps’ in the Nimbus7/ERBE results (‘glitches’ in Frohlich’s words) that no other researchers, including both the original PI (Hickey) and the final science team (Hoyt and Kyle) believe exist. As with ACRIM1 above, Frohlich had no detailed knowledge of the Nimbus7/ERB instrument and made no original analysis or computations. The only obvious purpose appears to be to obtain a TSI composite that agreed with the predictions of Lean’s TSI proxy model.

3. Thus, Frohlich’s PMOD TSI composite is not consistent with the internal data or physics of the Nimbus7 cavity radiometer.

4. The correction of the Nimbus7 TSI values for 1979-1980 proposed by Frohlich is also puzzling. The raw data was run through the same algorithm for these early years and the subsequent years and there is no justification for Frohlich’s adjustment in my opinion.

Sincerely,

Douglas Hoyt

dhoyt@toast.net

Dr. Richard C. Willson
Principal Investigator
ACRIM Experiments
12 Bahama Bend,
Coronado, CA, 92118
Phone: 619-407-7716
Fax: 619-365-9579
E-mail: rwillson@acrim.com

The above statement is included in Scafetta and Willson, GRL 2009
Supporting Material
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TSI proxy models show different patterns!

Lean's model, EPA 2009

Down!

Solanki's model 1, 2007

Solanki's model 2, 2006

Up!
Mixed mode TSI composite ACRIM and KBS07 TSI proxy model

Scafetta N. and R. C. Willson, 2009, ACRIM-gap and TSI trend issue resolved using a surface magnetic flux TSI proxy model, in press on GRL

Mixed mode TSI composite ACRIM and KBS07 TSI proxy model

Scafetta N. and R. C. Willson, 2009, ACRIM-gap and TSI trend issue resolved using a surface magnetic flux TSI proxy model, in press on GRL


KBS07 TSI proxy model contradicts PMOD corrections of Nimbus7 and confirms ACRIM claims of a significant degradation of ERBS during the ACRIM-gap
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After adjusting KBS07 outside the ACRIM-gap, it appears as ACRIM composite.
Incompatibility between PMOD composite and WSKF06 TSI proxy model
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Incompatibility between the 1995-2007 TSI composites and Lean's TSI proxy model

Scafetta N., EPA, presentation February 2009.
From Judith Lean, presentation at the EPA meeting January 2009
KBS07 TSI proxy model is corrected since 1980 with three possible TSI composites compatible with [A] Nimbus7, [C] ERBS, [B] average. The TSI during the last decades has been the largest in four centuries [Scafetta, 2009 in press, GSA Special Paper on Global Climate Change]
Can we trust the global surface temperature record?

Some studies suggest that a significant part of the global warming is due to still uncorrected urban heat island problems. Is about half of the global warming trend on the land since 1980 spurious?


The best data?

Differences between observed and adjusted warming trends around the world. A value of, say, 0.1–0.2 means that the observed trend in that cell was between 0.1 and 0.2°C/decade higher than the adjusted trend.
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Most of the bias appears in poorer countries. Are the demographic data about these countries reliable?
US temp. record suggests that the current warming period is similar to the warming in the 30s!

Did the 20th century have two warming periods?
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Paleoclimate Global surface temperature of the Earth

Average near-surface temperatures of the northern hemisphere during the past 11,000 years (after Dansgaard et al., 1969, and Schonwiese, 1995)

Compatible with the IPCC 1990
Vikings' Greenland today (no trees) and (likely) yesterday.
The Little Ice Age in Europe:
A time of severe cold and great hardship, when the Thames froze regularly and alpine glaciers grew deep into the valleys. The latter is greatly illustrated by painters of Dutch school, showing winter scenes, ice-covered canals, figures skating and sledging.

uncertainties are large. Such studies also help to explain episodes during the climate of the last millennium. For example, several modelling studies suggest that volcanic activity has a dominant role in explaining the cold conditions that prevailed from 1675 to 1715 (Andronova et al., 2007; Yoshimori et al., 2005). In contrast, Rind et al. (2004) estimate from model simulations that the cooling relative to today was primarily associated with reduced greenhouse gas forcing, with a substantial contribution from solar forcing.
The “Hockey Stick” temperature (Mann, Bradley, Hughes 1998). This record surprised the scientific community because the preindustrial climate (<1900) varies 5-10 times less than what was previously expected!
Since 2004 several new paleoclimate temperature reconstructions were proposed. Some of them show a very large pre-industrial variability which better agrees with the *pre-Mann* understanding of climate change!
Both Loehle (2008) and Moberg (2005) reconstructions show a large preindustrial variability because tree ring records are NOT used for the secular reconstruction!

Tree growth may be characterized by non-linear behavior that reduces their secular variability. (biological adaptation and water dependency)
Where IPCC 2001 and 2007 were

1) Total solar irradiance did not change since 1950.
2) Pre-industrial climate (<1900) did not change much (less than 0.2 K).
3) A global anomalous warming was observed since 1900 that rose since 1980.
4) Anthropogenic GHG emission increased monotonically since 1900 and rose since 1950.

Implication: Humans are causing the anomalous warming observed during the last decades

Where we are now

1) Total solar irradiance likely rose between 1970s and 2000.
2) Pre-industrial climate significantly changed (as much as 1.0 K from MWP to LIA).
3) Two apparently similar warming periods are observed during the first (1910-1940) and second half (1970-2000) of the 20th century.
4) Anthropogenic GHG emission increased monotonically since 1900 and rose since 1950.

Expectation: A significant fraction of the warming observed during the last decades is natural (sun or something else).
How climate is modeled

Energy Balance Models and General Circulation Models

All known climate mechanisms are included. All unknown climate mechanisms are ignored. A set of known climate forcings (TSI, GHG, Aerosol, etc) are used as inputs.

Multilinear Regression Analysis of the temperature

A set of forcings is processed by an energy balance climate model that is used to generate waveforms that are assumed to be independent and proportional to the fingerprint of each forcing on the temperature.

Phenomenological Model (my proposal)

The solar signature on climate is directly constructed by using empirical findings where they are more certain, and some general properties of climate which are empirically evaluated.
burning, and mineral dust. Although regional climate change is almost certainly influenced by these complex dynamic and thermodynamic feedbacks, the striking agreement seen in this study between simple model calculations and observations indicates that on the largest scale, temperature responds almost linearly to the estimated changes in radiative forcing. The very good agreement between models and data in the preanthropogenic interval also enhances confidence in the overall ability of climate models to simulate temperature variability on the largest scales.
Crowley's 2000 energy balance model fails to reconstruct Moberg's temperature. This temperature record suggests that the model is seriously underestimating the solar effect on climate and overestimating the volcano and GHG effects. Would global warming debate be different if Moberg published in 1998?
Do the GCM simulations used by the IPCC 2007 fit the temp. data?

The simulation appears to reproduce the global surface temperature only after 1960.

The model fails to correctly reproduce the 1910-1945 warming: observed ~0.45K predicted ~0.20 K

Why didn't they show the data before 1900?
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GISS modelE (blue) fails to reproduce the climate variability before 1960.

Are these IPCC 2007 theoretical projections reliable?

Runaway Global Warming: will the Earth’s climate become like Venus?

Failure to reproduce the climate variability before 1960

Failure to reproduce the cooling after 2002
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There exists a very large uncertainty about the climate sensitivity to GHG forcing!

Doubling CO$_2$ may cause from 1.5 to 4.5 °C and more warming!

Feedbacks, such as clouds, are poorly understood!

Figure 2. Relation between amplifying feedbacks $f$ and climate sensitivity $S$. A truncated normal distribution with a mean of 0.65 and standard deviation of 0.13 for the feedback $f$ (solid blue line) is assumed here for illustration. These values are typical for the current set of GCMs. Because $f$ is substantially positive and the relation between $f$ and $S$ is nonlinear (black line, equation (2)), this leads to a skewed distribution in $S$ (solid red line) with the characteristic long tail seen in most studies. Horizontal and vertical lines mark 5–95% ranges. A decrease in the uncertainty of $f$ by 30% (dashed blue line) decreases the range of $S$, but the skewness remains (dashed red line). The uncertainty in the tail of $S$ depends not only on the uncertainty in $f$ but also on the mean value of $f$. Note that the assumption of a linear feedback (equation (1)) is not valid for $f$ near unity. Feedbacks of 1 or more would imply unphysical, catastrophic runaway effects. (Modified from ref. 8.)
The basic idea is that traditional climate models are incomplete. The contribution of the forcings to climate change is statistically evaluated under minimal assumptions such as linearity and mutual independence of the climate forcings.

The temperature is assumed to be the linear superposition of the several waveform functions $T_f(t)$ that are the temperature fingerprint prototypes generated by a given forcing $f(t)$.

The waveform functions are calculated with an energy balance model (EBM).

The coefficient $a_f$ are the amplification factors:

If $a_f=1$ then the EBM is fine!

(North, Hegerl etc.)

The temperature is assumed to be the linear superposition of the several forcing functions $f(t)$ shifted with a time-lag $l$. This functions are assumed to be the temperature fingerprint prototypes of a given forcing $f(t)$.

The coefficient $b_f$ are the scaling factors.

(Lean, Douglass, Gleisner, etc.)
Difference between MLRA method type [A] and method type [B]

Method [B] uses this kind of constructors for TSI.

Methods A and B give quite different results because the constructor functions are very different.

Method A is more physical in principle because assumes that the climate system has a given heat capacity as predicted by the EBMs.

EBMs imply that the climate sensitivity to low frequency components is larger than the sensitivity to high frequency components.

EBMs are required to analyze long records.

However, the two methods are quite equivalent if we are interested in just one frequency component such as the 11-year solar cycle. In this case B may be better because simpler on short scales!

EBMs by Wigley, Science 2004
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Lean uses method “B”. These evaluations may be OK only if the TSI did not increased from 1980-2002, which is unlikely. The major error is that if TSI increased, the purple line that according to Lean represents the anthropogenic influence is including the TSI upward trend contribution! The 11-year solar signature amplitude (in the boxes) may be OK!
The 11-year cycle solar signature on climate

Comparison between the MLRA model [B] during the last decades and the theoretical prediction of the GISS ModelE in the troposphere and of an EBM in the surface.

The models severely underestimate the climate sensitivity to the 11-year solar cycle by a large factor between 3 and 8!

The boxes on the side of the figures report the estimated max-min amplitude of the 11-year solar signature at different Altitudes from the surface to 16 Km.

http://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelE/transient/Rc_jt.1.06.html

Gleisner and Thejll, GRL 2003
MLRA Model [B]

GISS ModelE

Crowley, 2000
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et al., 1997). A number of independent analyses have identified tropospheric changes that appear to be associated with the solar cycle (van Loon and Shea, 2000; Gleisner and Thejll, 2003; Haigh, 2003; White et al., 2003; Coughlin and Tung, 2004; Labitzke, 2004; Crooks and Gray, 2005), suggesting an overall warmer and moister troposphere during solar maximum. The peak-to-trough amplitude of the response to the solar cycle globally is estimated to be approximately 0.1°C near the surface. Such variations over the 11-year solar cycle make it is necessary to use several decades of data in detection and attribution studies. The solar cycle also affects atmospheric ozone concentrations with possible impacts on temperatures and winds in the stratosphere, and has been hypothesised to influence clouds through cosmic rays (Section 2.7.1.3). Note that there is substantial uncertainty in the identification of

IPCC 2007 contradicts itself by on one side acknowledging the above empirical studies and on the other side using climate models whose predictions are contradicted by these same empirical studies!
In this paper MLRA method [A] is adopted which uses EBM for the obtaining the MLRA waveform functions.

The sun-spot record is used as a TSI proxy.

**Top panel:**
typical EBM prediction regarding the 11-year solar cycle signature

**Bottom panel:**
MLRA amplification factors found for several EBMs.

The amplification factor is about “2” indicating that the EBMs severely underestimate the climate sensitivity to solar forcing.

---


This paper uses MLRA method [A] applied to long sequences.

The amplification factors relative to the solar component is severely suspicious because ranges from negative to large positive values.

MLRA is not appropriate because of the uncertainty in the secular data and the lack of independence between the forcings on this large scale.

Lean and Rind use MLRA method [B] applied to the 1889-2006 temperature record. They find that the sun contributed less than 10% (0.07 K) of the observed warming (0.8 K) during the period.

Below it is my analysis of the same data using MLRA method [A] with a model similar to Crowley 2000 EBM with a relaxation time of 10 years and ACRIM and PMOD TSI record since 1979. The fit is quite good, as the figures show in particular in B1!

Figures A1 and A2 suggest that TSI contributed between 15% and 35%, but the 11-year solar cycle signature is about 0.05K. Figures B1 and B2 suggest that TSI contributed between 35% and 65%, by constraining the model to have the 11-year solar signature at 0.1K.

So, the result strongly depends on the adopted model!
**Limitations of Multilinear Regression Analysis**

[A] Hypothetical TSI climate forcing (gray curve).

[B] Hypothetical climate response (gray curve) and Lean's MLRA-like model reconstruction (black line).

MLRA may be extremely misleading if an erroneous physical model is adopted. I show that a MLRA model similar to those adopted by Lean, where the temperature is assumed to be the linear superposition of the forcing plus a linear trend, artificially well correlates the output signal produced with an energy balance-like model that just dampens the high frequency component of the input forcing.

In this example the MLRA model suggests the presence of an additional upward linear forcing, which does not exist in reality, contributing 40% of the total increase.

---

Traditional EBMs and GCMs fail:

a) to reconstruct the warming and cooling climate variability before 1960.
b) to reconstruct the 11-year solar signature on climate by a large factor.

Where we are!

Multilinear regression analysis models

type [A]: are ambiguous because: 1) the EBMs are ambiguous; 2) they assume independence of the forcings, 3) the data on long time scales are severely uncertain.

type [B]: cannot be used for analyzing long time scales because unphysical. They are useful just for detecting the 11-year solar cycle signature on short records. On the global surface this cycle has a maximum-minimum amplitude of about 0.1 K.

My proposal: The Phenomenological model

The solar signature on climate is directly constructed by using empirical findings where they are more certain, and some general properties of climate which are empirically evaluated.
A close look at the temperature data

a) filtered global surface temperature data with the decadal modulation associated to solar cycle; b) global surface temperature data; c) volcano signature; d) E-Nino signature.

“*” solar maxima position; the ~0.1K solar cycle signature emerges clearly from the filtering.
Measurements of the time constants of the climate system
Scafetta, Comment on "Heat capacity, time constant, and sensitivity of Earth's climate system" by S. E. Schwartz, GRL (2008).

Analysis of the autocorrelation of the temperature fluctuation record based on autoregressive models AR(1) suggests that the climate system is characterized by two relaxation time constants indicating that climate is made of two subsystems with two different heat capacities.

\[ \tau_1 \sim 0.4 \text{ year} \]
\[ \tau_2 \sim 8 \text{ or } 12 \pm 3 \text{ year} \]
These papers suggest that climate is characterized by both short (less than 1 year) and long (decadal scale) characteristic times.

The detection of, albeit damped, solar cycle variations in the surface air temperature is consistent with recent studies that have given a smaller response time constant to solar variations; for example, Douglass & Clader (2002) and Douglass et al. (2004) have reported a response time of $\tau < 1$ year to solar variations and Schwartz (2007) has obtained $\tau = 5 \pm 1$ years for all forcings. These studies agree with a number of results implying short response times to (and rapid recovery from) a variety of rapid radiative changes (Taylor et al. 1997; Dickinson & Schaudt 1998; Lindzen & Giannitis 1998; Santer et al. 2001; Alley et al. 2003; Wigley et al. 2005; Boer et al. 2007). These results are not, in most cases, incompatible with the longer response times (as found, for example, by Wetherald et al. 2001, Hansen et al. 2005, Meehl et al. 2005 and Wigley 2005) because the duration of the forcing in many cases is short and the response time of the system is not the same as for sustained forcing changes, such as that from increased well-mixed greenhouse gases, owing to a relative lack of penetration of the thermal signal into the oceans. Understanding the different time constants for
The phenomenological model assumes that the solar signature is made of the superposition of two signals produced by two basic thermodynamic models (TM) with the two found empirical characteristic time constants. (These models are simplified EBMs)

A simplified model with one time constant is discussed in Scafetta and West, JGR 2007. The model herein discussed was presented by Scafetta at the AGU fall meeting 2008.

There is the need of evaluating the scaling factors $k_1$ and $k_2$

\[
\Delta T_S(t) = \Delta T_{1S}(t) + \Delta T_{2S}(t),
\]

\[
\frac{d\Delta T_{1S}(t)}{dt} = \frac{k_{1S}\Delta I(t) - \Delta T_{1S}(t)}{\tau_{1S}},
\]

\[
\frac{d\Delta T_{2S}(t)}{dt} = \frac{k_{2S}\Delta I(t) - \Delta T_{2S}(t)}{\tau_{2S}}.
\]
The phenomenological model (red curve) I propose well simulates the performance of a typical EBM (green curve) when appropriate sensitivity coefficients are adopted.

Crowley's EBM model calculates the temperature of a vertically averaged mixed-layer ocean/atmosphere that is a function of forcing changes and radiative damping. The mixed layer is coupled to the deep ocean with an upwelling/diffusion equation in order to allow for heat storage in the ocean interior.

Evaluation of $k_1$

We can assume that the processes characterized by a short characteristic time response do not alter drastically the physical properties of the climate system. Thus, on short times the albedo “$a$” and the additional feedback and climate functions “$f$” and “$g$” remain approximately constants.

By differentiating the energy equation I get:

$$\frac{1-a}{4} I \ast f \ast g = s T^4$$

$$k_1 = \frac{dT}{dI} = \frac{T}{4I}$$

$$k_1 = 0.053 \, K/Wm^{-2}$$

Evaluation of $k_2$

This coefficient is determined by assuming that the total 11-year solar signature on climate produced by the superposition of the two signals has a maximum-minimum amplitude of about 0.1 K on the surface, as empirically found. I found:

$$k_2 = 0.28 \, K/Wm^{-2}$$

For $\tau_2 = 8$ year

$$k_2 = 0.41 \, K/Wm^{-2}$$

For $\tau_2 = 12$ year
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The phenomenological solar signatures, as predicted by the model KBS07 proxy TSI satellite

\[ \tau_2 = 12 \text{ year} \]

PSS = PSS2 + PSS1
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The phenomenological solar signature as predicted by the model

1) $\tau_2 = 12$ year and solar [A]
2) $\tau_2 = 8$ year and solar [C]

The model well agrees with this secular temperature reconstruction. The model “predicts” centuries of data!
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The phenomenological solar signature as predicted by the model against the “filtered” global surface temperature

The model well reconstructs the decadal cycles of the temperature. (Look at the details)

The sun contributed from 30% to 65% of the observed warming since 1900.

$\tau_2 = 12$ year and [A]
Are the fast fluctuations of the temperature linked to the solar intermittent irradiance? An analysis based on fractal exponents and Levy anomalous diffusion statistics.


The phenomenological model predicts quite well centuries of climate change data as well as many decadal details as seen during the last 50 years. The climate is quite sensitive to solar changes.

However, the model does not appear to reproduce well the warming during 1910-1945.

A possible explanation is that the used TSI proxy model record is not accurate enough. This is likely because we have seen that these TSI models may fail to reproduce the observed decadal trends in TSI.

Indeed, the TSI proxy models greatly vary, as the figure shows. Which TSI may be correct? Or is there a missing climate forcing?

Where was the TSI maximum? 1945 or 1960?

Hoyt, 1997
Attempting a forecast of climate change: An astronomical gravitational forcing for the Sun and the Earth?
Presented by Scafetta, at AGU fall meeting 2008

Wobbling of the Sun around the center of mass of the solar system.

The Sun wobbles because of the gravitational attraction of the other planets of the solar system.

In particular because of the Jovian planets: Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune.

This generates a tidal force and torque on the sun and on the Earth.

Is this forcing partially shaping solar activity and/or the Earth's climate?

Jose, 1965; Fairbridge and Shirley, 1987; Landscheidt, 1988, 1999; Charvatova and Stvrevstik, 2004; Wilson et al., 2008
Maximum entropy spectral estimates (with 1000 poles) of the global surface temperature (top) and of the velocity of the Sun relative to CMSS (bottom) in function of the period calculated with monthly data since 1860.

Cycle #7 refers mostly to the orbital period of Jupiter, which is 11.86 years; Cycle #9 refers mostly to the synodic period of Jupiter and Saturn, which is about 19.86 years; Cycle #10 refers mostly to the orbital period of Saturn, which is 29.42 years; Cycle #11 is about twice the orbital period of Saturn and five times that of Jupiter and is close to the third higher harmonic of the 178.7 solar cycle periodicity.
[A] Global surface temperature detrended of its quadratic fit plotted against the rescaled 60-year modulation of the velocity of the CMSS: the solar index is lag-shifted by +5 years.

[B] The 20-year oscillation of the climate (grey) plotted against the rescaled velocity (black) of the CMSS detrended of its six decade modulation: no lag-time is applied.
Models of the global climate from 1850 to 2100 based on the reconstruction of the climate multidecadal variability based on the velocity of the Sun relative to the CMSS.

Forecast n. 1 is obtained by overlapping the two solid solar index curves shown previously and the quadratic fit of the global temperature indicated by the dotted curve. Forecast n. 2 assumes a constant trend after 2008. Note that all alternating periods of warming and cooling since 1860 are very well reconstructed by the model. The forecasts indicate that climate may cool until the 2030s. At the end of the 21st century the climate may warm at most by 1 °C relative to today temperature if the quadratic fit forecast holds.

The model suggests that climate is modulated by large 60, 30, 20 and 10 year natural cycles that combined have an amplitude of about 0.40-0.45 °C on the 60 year cycle. This explains the 1910-1945 warming and implies that about 70% of the observed warming from 1975 to 2002 was part of this natural climate cycle during its warm phase.
Two still “unproven” hypotheses:

a) The movement of the planets partially modulates solar activity that then modulates climate. This hypothesis requires that current TSI proxy models are imperfect.

b) The movements of the planets drives a change in the Earth's Length Of the Day and the variation of the LOD constitutes a missing climate forcing that significantly contribute to climate change by altering the ocean and atmospheric currents, for example.

The figures below compare the LOD with the 60 year modulation of the solar velocity around the CMSS. Also, the LOD anticipates the change in global temperature by a 4-5 years.


Scafetta, EPA 2009
Conclusion

Current climate models, such as those adopted by the IPCC, appear to fail to reproduce large details found in the data on all temporal scales.

These details appear to be linked to solar variability.

Thus, climate models are severely underestimating by a large factor the solar effect on climate change on both short and long time scales.

A phenomenological model has been presented. It was shown to predict centuries of past climate change and suggests that up to 65% the observed warming since 1900 was directly or indirectly induced by the sun according to current TSI proxy models.

Climate may be significantly modulated also by an additional forcing that may be directly or indirectly linked to the movement of the planets that may affect the solar activity and/or the Earth.

A cooling is expected until 2030 – 2040 because of a 60 year cycle.
APPENDIX
General properties of the climate sensitivity function $Z(\omega)$ of an EBM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>5-years</th>
<th>10-years</th>
<th>20-years</th>
<th>40-years</th>
<th>80-years</th>
<th>160-years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMPLITUDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 K/Wm$^{-2}$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 K/Wm$^{-2}$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 K/Wm$^{-2}$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 K/Wm$^{-2}$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General energy balance models predict that the climate sensitivity to a cyclical forcing, with a given period and amplitude, increases with the period and decreases with the amplitude. This is mostly due to general out of equilibrium thermodynamic effects and to the damping effect of the ocean thermal inertia.

A phenomenological and simple sun-climate thermodynamic/relaxation model: A first order EBM

\[
\frac{d\Delta T(t)}{dt} = \frac{c\Delta I(t) - \Delta T(t)}{\tau}
\]

\(c = \) conversion constant
\(\tau = \) relaxation time

High frequencies are reduced because of the thermal inertia

Scafetta and West, JGR 2007.
The TSI high frequencies are damped by the relaxation model.
Consistent with Mann and Jones not with Moberg

Volcano signals are too large and deep. The model is likely overestimating the volcano effects on climate


The model fails to reproduce the temperature variability before 1960 as the GISS ModelE fails to do (see slide 36).
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