

The National Academies of
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education
Board on Environmental Change and Society

Fifth Meeting
Committee on Assessing Approaches to Updating the Social Cost of Carbon

May 5, 2016

Keck Center
500 5th Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

[Register Here](#) • [View Webcast](#)

Thursday, May 5

SESSION OPEN TO THE PUBLIC
Keck 100

- 2:20 PM Welcome and Introductions
Richard Newell and Maureen Cropper
- 2:30 – 4:00 PM (each presentation will last 45 minutes total—30 minutes + 15 Q&A)**
- 2:30 PM Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISI-MIP) Overview
Katja Frieler, Lead of the ISI-MIP project, Potsdam Institute of Climate Impact Research (via WebEx)
- 3:15 PM Costs of Perturbations and Feedbacks in the CO₂ and Methane Cycles
David Archer, University of Chicago (via WebEx)
- 4:00 – 5:30 PM Market and Non-Market Damages Panel**
(presentations will take place back-to-back, 30 minutes each, followed by 30 minutes of discussion and Q&A for the panelists)
- 4:00 PM A New Empirical Approach to Global Damage Function Estimation
Michael Greenstone, University of Chicago
- 4:30 PM Non-Market Damages from Climate Change
Michael Hanemann, Arizona State University
- 5:00 PM Discussion and Q&A
- 5:30 PM Opportunity for Public Comments
- 5:45 PM End Open Session

NOTE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS: This meeting is being held to gather information to help the committee conduct its study. This committee will examine the information and material obtained during this, and other public meetings, in an effort to inform its work. Although opinions may be stated and lively discussion may ensue, no

conclusions are being drawn at this time; no recommendations will be made. In fact, the committee will deliberate thoroughly before writing its draft report. Moreover, once the draft report is written, it must go through a rigorous review by experts who are anonymous to the committee. The committee then must respond to this review with appropriate revisions to the report that adequately satisfy both the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine's (the Academies') Report Review Committee and its president before it is considered an Academies report. Therefore, observers who draw conclusions about the committee's work based on today's discussions will be doing so prematurely.

Furthermore, individual committee members often engage in discussion and questioning for the specific purpose of probing an issue and sharpening an argument. The comments of any given committee member may not necessarily reflect the position he or she may actually hold on the subject under discussion, to say nothing of that person's future position as it may evolve in the course of the project. Any inferences about an individual's position regarding findings or recommendations in the final report are therefore also premature.