

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

**November 13, 2015**

**Meeting Location:  
Venable LLP Conference Center  
575 7th St NW, Washington, DC 20004**

**Friday, November 13, 2015**

**Venable LLP Conference Center  
The Capitol Room**

**OPEN SESSION (open to the public)**

Note: speakers participating in person=[P], or remotely=[V]

**All speakers have received a series of questions that they have been asked to address in their presentations. The list of questions can be found at the end of this agenda.**

In Sessions 1 and 2 (part 1), each speaker will be given 30 minutes to address a series of specific questions on the current state of evidence and approaches, options for integration into IAMs, and future research needs. For Session 2 (part 2), each speaker will be given 20 minutes for presentations. All sessions will end with 30 minutes of questions from the committee to each session's panel.

12:00 pm -2:00 pm SESSION 1: Damage Models for Existing Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) and Areas of Research

Kenneth Gillingham [P] and William Nordhaus [V], Yale University  
Improving the damage portion of IAMs  
DICE model  
David Anthoff [V], University of California (UC), Berkeley  
FUND model  
Chris Hope [V], University of Cambridge  
PAGE model

2:00-2:15 pm BREAK

2:15- 3:45 pm SESSION 2, part 1: Current State of Evidence and Approaches, Options for Integration into IAMs

Leon Clarke, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory [P]  
Sol Hsiang, UC Berkeley [P]

3:45-4:00 pm BREAK

4:00-5:30 pm SESSION 2, part 2: Current State of Evidence and Approaches, Future Research Needs

Each speaker will be given 20 minutes. The session will end with 30 minutes of questions from the committee.

Robert Mendelsohn [V], Yale University  
John Reilly [V], Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)  
Wolfram Schlenker [V], Columbia University

5:30 -5:45 pm Discussion and Wrap-up  
**Maureen Cropper and Richard Newell, Co-Chairs**

5:45 pm ADJOURN

\*\*\*\*\*

**Questions for Presenters at third meeting**

1. How can the characterization of damages used to estimate the SCC be improved over the next 1-3 years through incorporation of existing evidence or changes to modeling approaches?
2. What improvements can be made with respect to representation of market and non-market damages for particular sectors, catastrophic impacts, adaptation, changes in vulnerability/resiliency, and interactions among these aspects of climate damages?
3. What are the technical merits and challenges of using a damage function that aggregates across multiple damage categories relative to explicitly modeling individual damage categories (e.g., sectoral or regional)?
4. What criteria can be used to assess the reliability of potential improvements to damage functions used for SCC estimation, with respect to both modeling approach and specific evidence?
5. What research areas are of the highest priority to improve the characterization of damages over time?

\*\*\*\*\*

**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.