Event attribution: the emerging science of attributing causes to extreme events

Francis Zwiers PCIC, University of Victoria 13IMSC, 8 June 2016

Introduction

- Enormous interest in event attribution
 - Event and media driven
 - Questions are mostly retrospective
- Requires "rapid response" science
 - Places high demands on process understanding, data, models, and statistical methods
 - <u>Recently assessed</u> by US National Academies of Science
- Critical aspect of the the WCRP Grand Challenge

Event attribution

Photo: F. Zwiers (Jordan River, gathering storm)

Event attribution

- The public asks: Did human influence on the climate system ...
 - Cause the event?
- Most studies ask: Did it ...
 - Affect its odds?
 - Alter its magnitude?
- Some think we should reframe the question ...
 - Rather than "Did human influence ..." (which requires comparison with a counterfactual world)
 - Ask "How much (eg, of a given storm's precipitation) is due to the attributed warming (eg, in the storm's moisture source area)" (after Trenberth et al, <u>2015</u>)

Most studies

- Compare factual and "counterfactual" climates
 - Counterfactual → the world that might have been if we had not emitted the ~600GtC that have been emitted since preindustrial
- These studies almost always
 - Define a class of events rather than a single event
 - Use a probabilistic approach
- Shepherd (<u>2016</u>) defines this as "risk based"
 - Contrasts it with a "storyline" based approach
 - i.e., analysis of the specific event that occurred

"Framing" event attribution studies

- Event type
 - Class vs individual
- Analysis approach
 - "risk based" or "storyline"
- Event definition
 - What spatial scale, duration, etc
- Which risk-based question
 - Did climate change alter the odds, or the magnitude?
- What factors should be taken into account
 - "Conditioning"
 - e.g., coincident SST anomaly pattern, circulation, etc



Risk based questions

- Did human influence alter its likelihood
 Prob(E|forcing) vs Prob(E|¬forcing)
 Prob(E|forcing,SST) vs Prob(E|¬forcing,SST)
- Did human influence alter its magnitude

f(M|E, forcing) vs $f(M|E, \neg forcing)$ f(M|E, forcing, SST) vs $f(M|E, \neg forcing, \widetilde{SST})$

China's Summer of 2013

Photo: F. Zwiers (Lijiang – Black Dragon Pool)

titution in the

How rare was JJA of 2013?



- Estimated event frequency
 - once in 270-years in control simulations
 - once in 29-years in "reconstructed" observations
 - once in 4.3 years relative to the climate of 2013
- Fraction of Attributable Risk in 2013: $(p_1 p_0)/p_1 \approx 0.984$
- Prob of "sufficient causation": $PS=1-((1-p_1)/(1-p_0)) \approx 0.23$

Calgary flood, 2013

Looking towards downtown Calgary from Riverfront Avenue (June 21, 2013), courtesy Ryan L.C. Quan

Calgary floods (Teufel et al, submitted)

Distribution of annual May-June maximum 1-day southern-Alberta precipitation in **CRCM5** under factual and counterfactual conditions (conditional on prevailing global pattern of SST anomalies)



Some unresolved issues

Photo: F. Zwiers (Marsh Wren

Some unresolved issues

- Event characterization
 - Class vs individual, risk-based vs storyline
 - Individual is not completely synonymous with storyline
 - Data assimilation approach of Hannart et al (2016)
- Event definition
- Dependence on models
- Counterfactual state specification uncertainty when conditional approach is used
- Selection bias
 - Need objective event selection criteria
- Communications
 - At each stage of the media and disaster response/ recovery cycle

Retrospective vs prospective?

- Most studies are prompted by specific events
- For the risk-based approach, we could study pre-defined events



Distribution of annualJJA temperature in the 2000's relative to 1961-90 in East Asia with and without ANT forcing





Questions?

Photo: F. Zwiers