

When writing the SPM, the authors are facing a dilemma: either they speak as scientists and must therefore recognize that there are too many unknowns to make reliable predictions, both in the mechanisms at play and in the available data; or they try to convey what they "consensually" think is the right message but at the price of giving up scientific rigour. They deliberately chose the latter option. The result is they have distorted the scientific message into an alarmist message asking for urgent reaction, which is quite contrary to what the scientific message conveys.

*physicist Pierre Darriulat on the IPCC Summary for Policymakers
UK House of Commons Energy & Climate Change Committee submission
December 2013*

TinyUrl.com/p4g522u