NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

SYNTHESIS OF EVIDENCE YIELDS HIGH SOCIAL COST OF CARBON DUE TO STRUCTURAL MODEL VARIATION AND UNCERTAINTIES

Frances C. Moore
Moritz A. Drupp
James Rising
Simon Dietz
Ivan Rudik
Gernot Wagner

Working Paper 32544
http://www.nber.org/papers/w32544

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
June 2024

M.D. gratefully acknowledges support from the DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy (EXC 2037 and CLICCS) project no. 390683824, contribution to the Center for Earth System Research and Sustainability (CEN) of Universität Hamburg. We are very grateful to our many survey respondents, to David Anthoff, Kenneth Gillingham, Frikk Nesje, James Archsmith, Radley Horton, Jim Stock, Bob Litterman, and seminar audiences at AERE 2022, AURO 2023, CESifo 2023, ASSA 2024, University of Potsdam, University of California San Diego, Columbia Business School, Harvard Kennedy School, and at PIK for helpful comments, to Robert Bao for technical assistance, and to Johanna Darmstadt, Luc Esprabens, David Lucius, Nele Steinbrecher, Henry Williams, Angela Zeng, and particularly to Mark Lustig, for excellent research assistance. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Synthesis of Evidence Yields High Social Cost of Carbon Due to Structural Model Variation and Uncertainties
Frances C. Moore, Moritz A. Drupp, James Rising, Simon Dietz, Ivan Rudik, and Gernot Wagner
NBER Working Paper No. 32544
June 2024
JEL No. Q0,Q50,Q54

ABSTRACT

Estimating the cost to society from a ton of carbon dioxide (CO2) released into the atmosphere requires connecting a model of the climate system with a representation of the economic and social effects of changes in climate, as well as the valuation and aggregation of diverse, uncertain impacts across both time and space. The literature on this cost, termed the social cost of carbon (SCC), is large and growing. Prior work has largely focused on better constraining the values of parameters such as climate sensitivity, the discount rate, and the damage function. A growing literature has also examined the effect of varying more fundamental structural elements of the models supporting SCC calculations. These structural model choices—including the introduction of climate or economic tipping points, changing the structure of economic preferences, and accounting for the persistence of climate damages—have been analyzed in piecemeal, uncoordinated fashion, leaving their relative importance unclear. Here we perform a comprehensive synthesis of the evidence on the SCC, combining 1823 estimates of the SCC from 147 studies published between 2000 and 2020 with a survey of the authors of these studies. The distribution of published SCC values for a 2020 pulse year is wide and substantially right-skewed, showing evidence of a heavy right tail (truncated mean of $132, median $39). Analysis of variance reveals important roles for structural elements in driving SCC estimates, particularly the inclusion of persistent damages via effects on economic growth, representation of the Earth system, and distributional weighting. However, our survey reveals that experts believe the literature is biased downwards due to an under-sampling of structural model variations, as well as biases in damage-function and discount-rate parameters. To address this imbalance, we train a random forest model on variation in the literature and use it to generate a synthetic SCC distribution that more closely matches expert assessments of appropriate model structure and discounting. This synthetic distribution has a median and mean of $185 and $284 per ton CO2, respectively, for a 2020 pulse year (5%–95% range: $32–$874), higher than all official government estimates, including a 2023 update from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Frances C. Moore
Department of Environmental Science
and Policy
1023 Wickson Hall
University of California, Davis
Davis One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
fmoore@ucdavis.edu

Moritz A. Drupp
University of Hamburg
Von-Melle-Park 5
Hamburg 20146
Germany
Moritz.Drupp@uni-hamburg.de

James Rising
University of Delaware
jrising@udel.edu

Simon Dietz
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
Aldwych London WC2A 2AE
England
S.Dietz@lse.ac.uk

Ivan Rudik
Dyson School of Applied Economics
and Management
Cornell University
462 Warren Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
and NBER
irudik@cornell.edu

Gernot Wagner
Columbia Business School
665 West 130th Street
392 Henry R. Kravis Hall
New York, New 10027
gwagner@columbia.edu

A data appendix is available at http://www.nber.org/data-appendix/w32544

1 Introduction

Anthropogenic climate change affects the welfare of people around the world, and will continue to do so for centuries into the future. Because these costs are largely not incorporated into energy, land-use, and other economic decisions, climate change has been termed "the greatest and widest-ranging market failure ever seen" [1, p. i]. Incorporating climate costs into the prices of economic activities that emit greenhouse gases, either directly through carbon pricing or indirectly through emission-regulation or subsidies of cleaner alternatives, is essential for averting the worst climate outcomes. Quantifying these costs is extremely challenging as it involves projecting and valuing the effects of climate change in all countries and sectors far into the future, an exercise that is rife with uncertainties and contestation.

The external costs of carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions are summarized by the 'social cost of carbon' (SCC): the present value of all future impacts from an additional metric ton of CO_2 emissions. The SCC is key for understanding the benefits of emissions-reduction policies and is used for climate and energy policy analysis in the United States, Europe, and numerous other countries and sub-national jurisdictions around the world as well as by companies and other institutions [2, 3]. Integrated assessment models (IAMs) commonly used to calculate the SCC have been criticized on various grounds, including inaccurate climate and carbon-cycle modeling, ignoring irreversibilities and tipping points in the climate system, failing to adequately model uncertainty or the potential for catastrophic outcomes, and relying on dated science in the representation of climate impacts [4–8].

The continuing importance of the SCC as a tool for climate policy analysis [2] and recognition of failings in IAMs currently used to calculate it has led to a surge of research seeking to improve, expand, and update the estimates. Major strands of this literature include: improving modeling of Earth system dynamics [9–12]; disentangling preferences over risk and time using more complex utility functions [13–15]; representing tipping points and associated uncertainties in damages [16–19]; addressing model uncertainty, ambiguity, and learning of new information [20–24]; allowing climate damages to affect the growth rate rather than just the level of economic output[11, 25–27]; calibrating aggregate climate damages on recent economic and scientific evidence [11, 20, 25, 28, 29]; modeling the distribution of climate damages and incorporating inequality aversion [30–32]; and allowing for climate damages to non-market goods, such as natural systems or cultural heritage, which are imperfectly substitutable with market-traded goods [33–36]. (Section S3 contains more detailed discussion and examples of different elements of model structures used to calculate the SCC discussed in this paper).

Although this literature is now substantial, it has accumulated piecemeal. The vast majority of papers make one or two structural adjustments to a simpler IAM and report how these alter SCC values, often with an exploration of associated parametric uncertainty. The collective implications of the full suite of issues addressed by this literature have not been assessed. Previous syntheses have quantified the distribution of SCC estimates and explored a limited set of covariates, such as publication year and discounting [37, 38], as well as the possible role of publication bias [39]. Previous modeling studies have made multiple simultaneous changes to individual IAMs [12, 40], or have undertaken systematic IAM inter-comparisons and evaluations [41, 42], albeit focusing on a limited number of IAMs with comparable model structures. Previous expert surveys have either imposed very specific structure or none at all [43–45], or have focused on carbon prices [46]. Thus, prior studies only illuminate the role of a subset of mechanisms and structural models.

This paper provides the most comprehensive assessment to date of SCC estimates, including how elements of model structure shape the SCC. It builds on two complementary approaches. First, we perform an analysis of SCC values published in the peer-reviewed literature between 2000 and 2020. After reviewing over 2800 abstracts, we identified 1823 estimates (or distributions of estimates) published in 147 studies. We recorded SCC estimates and, where reported, the distribution of parametric uncertainty, along with 31 covariates capturing details of the estimate itself (e.g., SCC year, discounting scheme, and socio-economic and emissions scenarios), important elements of model structure (e.g., growth-rate damages, distributional weighting, and representation of the utility function), and sources of parametric variation (e.g., distributions over productivity growth, climate sensitivity, discount rates and damage-function parameters). Second, to help place the literature distribution in a broader context, we conduct an expert survey of the authors of the SCC papers in our analysis. We elicit expert estimates of both the distribution of published SCC values in the peer-reviewed literature and their best estimate of the SCC distribution, all things considered. We also ask experts to break down the wedge between these two SCC estimates into component parts, generating information on what experts perceive as potentially missing from on underrepresented in the literature. Furthermore, we elicit experts' views on the degree to which various model structures as currently implemented in the literature *improve* SCC estimates, using this quality assessment to inform our final synthetic SCC estimate.

Our study therefore contains two complementary data-generating processes: a meta-analysis, which collects much richer data on published SCC estimates and their determinants than in previous studies, and an expert survey. We combine these lines of evidence to produce a synthetic SCC distribution using a random forest model trained on variation in the literature but sampled to more closely match experts' assessment of model structure and discounting parameters. The resulting SCC distribution essentially amounts to a structured re-weighting of published SCC estimates to better match expert-elicited model structure and discounting, emphasizing features identified by the random forest model as most important in driving variance in the SCC distribution. Additional details on the literature review, coding of values, data cleaning and processing, expert survey, construction of the synthetic SCC are provided in Section S2.

2 The SCC Distribution

The systematic review of the literature yields 1823 SCC estimates (or distributions) from 147 studies (full references given in Section S4). Many studies report multiple SCC estimates. For each of the 1823 estimates, we collect information on the central SCC estimate, emission pulse year, discounting, damage function, economic and emissions scenario, model structure, and distribution resulting from parametric uncertainty (where reported, specifically 832 of the 1823 estimates). Section S1 provides descriptive statistics and summary information on these estimates.

To characterize the distribution of SCC values appearing in the published literature, we sample from the dataset using a hierarchical sampling scheme. We draw 10 million SCC values sampling uniformly from the 147 studies in the dataset, then sample uniformly from the set of estimates within each paper (i.e. unique SCC year-discounting-scenario-model structure combinations), and finally from the parametric uncertainty of each estimate, if applicable. Alternate sampling schemes that account for non-independence between papers using sets of shared authors, or for different quality of studies using a normalized citation-based weighting, give quantitatively similar distributions (Table S4).

Figure 1 shows the distribution of SCC values reported in the literature, both across all estimates (top row) and split based on characteristics of the estimates and studies. The Figure gives the distribution of SCCs for pulse years between 2010 and 2030, which we use as the 2020-SCC equivalent sample from the literature. The variation in SCC values is substantial and asymmetric, exhibiting a long right tail, and a mean value (\$132 per tCO_2 after truncating the upper and lower 0.1% of values) that is several times times higher than the median (\$39). Statistical tests show evidence for a heavy tail in the SCC distribution [8], echoing Anthoff and Tol [47], with a slope of the mean excess function greater than 1 and α values between 1 and 2, indicative of a distribution with infinite variance but finite mean (see Table S5 in the SI).

Figure 1 also shows how the 2020 SCC distribution differs based on particular characteristics of the estimate. The second panel shows variation across model structure, relative to a set of reference estimates with similar structure to the original DICE model (versions up to 2016). These suggest important roles for the representation of the Earth system, the persistence of damages to the economy via impacts on the growth rate, and limited substitutability between aspects of climate damages and consumption goods in the utility function. The third panel shows the well-documented sensitivity



Figure 1: **Distribution of the 2020 SCC from the published literature (2020 $ per ton CO_2).** Distribution and top boxplot show the distribution of all 2010-2030 SCC values (which we treat as the 2020-equivalent sample) from the published literature (equal weighting of all 147 papers). Other boxplots show subsets of the 2010-2030 distribution split by characteristics of published estimates, specifically model structure, discount rate, publication year, damage function, and paper type. The reference distribution refers to SCC estimates coded as not having structural changes, similar to the DICE model (versions up to 2016). Boxplots show the median (line), inter-quartile range (box), 5-95% range (solid line) and 2.5-97.5% range (dashed lines). Dots show the mean after trimming the upper and lower 0.1% of each distribution. Numbers for each plot show the number of papers and, in parentheses, the number of estimates included in each boxplot.

to discounting assumptions, with estimates using less than a 2.5% discount rate producing an SCC distribution with median and mean values twice those obtained using higher discount rates ($231 per ton CO_2 vs $107 for the truncated mean, $78 vs $37 for the median). The fourth panel documents a shift towards higher SCC values in papers published in the second half of our sample period, a finding similar to that reported previously [38].

The final panel in Figure 1 shows estimates disaggregated by whether the primary goal of the paper was one of empirical improvement (e.g., more accurately representing Earth system dynamics or improving damage function estimation), integration of new elements into SCC models (e.g., integrating model ambiguity, inequality aversion, or Epstein-Zin utility), or sensitivity analysis (e.g., SCC variation with alternate damage functions or discount rates). It shows fairly similar distributions across the three paper types, but with slightly higher SCC values in papers introducing empirical improvements.

2.1 Drivers of Variance in SCC Estimates

Figure 1 documents wide variation in published SCC estimates. The large set of covariates we record allows us to investigate how many different features of SCC modeling—including structural model features, parametric uncertainty, and other model covariates—affect SCC values. While Figure 1 shows distributions under different univariate splits of the data, multivariate analysis can better identify the effects of particular model structures and parameter values. Figure 2a shows estimated effects of structural model characteristics on SCC values after controlling for other aspects of model structure, SCC year, emissions and socio-economic scenarios, and discount rate. We plot relative changes in the SCC attributable to individual elements of model structure, relying on the fact that many papers report modeling results both with and without model changes in order to highlight relative effects. These are recorded explicitly in our data collection process and form the basis of the results shown in the figure.

Figure 2a shows large increases in the SCC (on the order of 50%) due to a number of structural model elements, specifically improvements to the representation of the Earth system, inclusion of impact tipping points, and elements of damages such as limited substitutability with consumption goods and persistent effects on economic output. Inclusion of distributional weights (typically used to represent aversion to inequality) has the largest effect on relative SCC values, on average more than doubling estimates, reflecting the regressive nature of climate-change impacts, [48, 49]. Allowing for learning over time (typically about equilibrium climate sensitivity or the damage function) tends to decrease the SCC. This is consistent with theoretical models showing that the additional emissions allowed by laxer climate policy can provide a more informative signal about uncertain parameters and lead to



Figure 2: **Drivers of variance in published SCC estimates.** a) Effects of structural model characteristics on log SCC, controlling for other aspects of model structure, SCC year, emissions and socio-economic scenarios, and discount rate. b) ANOVA decomposition of the variance of logged SCC estimates in the literature, based on a regression of the full distribution of logged SCC estimates on the full set of covariates describing discounting, model structure, and inclusion of parametric uncertainty, as well as paper fixed-effects.

better future climate policy [24]. Additional regression models using other types of variation in the data are reported in Section S.2.1.9 and Figure S9.

Figure 2b shows results of an ANOVA decomposition of the SCC variance in the full distribution, after controlling for individual papers' mean values through the inclusion of paper fixed effects. Figure 2b shows that the single largest driver of the variance is discounting, followed by model and model uncertainty (i.e., this groups together the identity of the IAM, e.g., DICE, FUND, or PAGE, with the model uncertainty/ambiguity structural model effects), persistent/growth damages, and the Earth system representation (i.e., transient climate response, carbon cycle parametrization, equilibrium climate sensitivity, and structure of the Earth system model component). Note that the overall share of the variance explained by discounting and damage-function parameters (i.e., damage function, adaptation rates, and the income elasticity of damages) is only 35%, with most of the remainder relating to structural model choices and model uncertainty.

3 Placing the SCC Literature in Context Through Expert Surveys

Figure 1 shows the distribution of 2020 SCC values published in the scientific literature between 2000 and 2020. Although it provides a useful reference point to characterize SCC values across the full set of published studies, this distribution lacks a clear interpretation. The literature distribution may be influenced by factors such as researcher interest, model availability and tractability, and path-dependency in choices of certain model parameters such as those in the discount rate and damage function, issues discussed in more detail in S.2.2.3. Therefore, we complement the literature survey described in Section 2 with a survey of expert views on the SCC literature, placing this distribution and the set of model structures and parameters that determine it into a larger context. We distributed a survey to the population of 176 authors of SCC estimates in our literature review in May 2022, from which we received 68 partial and 48 full responses. Section S.2.2 provides further details on survey design, distribution, and analysis.

Figure 3a provides evidence that survey respondents perceive a substantial downward bias in the published literature. More than four fifths of experts (82.8%) report best-estimate SCC values (considering all drivers of the SCC and relevant uncertainties) that are higher than their estimates of the existing literature distribution (9.1% believe the two values are roughly equal, and the same number believe the literature is over-estimating the SCC). On average across complete responses, experts' best-estimate 2020 SCC (\$142 per ton CO_2) is more than double their literature estimate of \$60.

Experts' mean literature estimate is substantially below the mean from our literature analysis of \$132, and about 50% larger than our literature median of \$39 (Figure 1). A number of reasons could account for why experts underestimate the mean SCC in the literature, including the exclusion of papers published prior to 2000 from our literature survey (which may report lower values [38]), the prominence of focal SCC estimates around \$50 for instance from official US government guidance at the time of the survey [51], or experts being unfamiliar with some of the papers contributing to the long right tail of the SCC distribution that have a substantial effect on the mean value (see Section S.2.1.6 for further discussion).

Figure 3b shows how experts decompose the perceived downward bias in the literature into constituent elements (individual responses documenting significant heterogeneity in both the wedge magnitude and decomposition are shown in Figure S19). Damage-function and discounting parameters make up around a third of the \$82 wedge between the experts' estimates. Around two thirds of the SCC wedge is driven by structural model choices, particularly limited substitutability of non-market goods (13%),



Figure 3: **Expert survey on SCC values, model structure, and discounting.** a) Expert assessment of the mean SCC value in the literature and their best estimate of the mean of the SCC distribution, accounting for any systematic biases or over- or under-representation of different model elements in the published literature. Grey lines connect estimates from the same respondent. Data shown for 48 experts providing a quantitative breakdown of the wedge between literature and best-estimate SCCs. Mean values for all 68 experts are $66 for the literature and $160 for the best-estimate. b) Experts' attribution of the difference between their estimated mean literature SCC value and the full or comprehensive SCC. Results shown averaging over all 48 expert responses, decomposing the average wedge between $60 per ton CO_2 and $142. Values in parentheses show the dollar value attributed to each element. PRTP = pure rate of time preference; EMUC = elasticity of marginal utility of consumption. c) Expert evaluation of 9 elements of model structure (blue solid line) with frequency in the published literature shown for comparison (red dashed line). Expert responses to the question "To what extent do you agree with the statement: 'Papers that include X produce better SCC estimates than those that exclude it'?" (Figure S20) are converted into model inclusion probabilities using Bayesian hierarchical modeling of expert responses (described in Section S.2.2.6) d) Distribution of discount rates in an expert assessment by Drupp et al. [50] (blue solid line) compared to the distribution in the published literature for 2020 SCC values (red dashed line).

persistent/growth damages (9%), tipping points in the climate system (8%) and in damages (8%), and distributional weights (6%). Experts also estimate a smaller upward bias in literature estimates related to an under-representation of technical progress, adaptation and learning, which contribute negatively to the SCC wedge.

Figures 3c and 3d compare expert assessment of key determinants of the SCC (specifically model structure and discounting) with their representation in the published literature. Overall, experts are positive on the 9 variations in model structure investigated. Over 50% of experts agree or strongly agree that models including these elements are preferred (over a baseline model approximating the DICE-2016 IAM [52] with a 2020 SCC of around \$40 per tCO_2) for all elements except aversion to model uncertainty or ambiguity (Figure S20). The strongest agreement is on improvements to Earth system modeling, including the integration of climate-system tipping points, and the incorporation of limited substitutability between market and non-market goods in the utility function, with some polarization over the issue of whether distributional weighting, as applied in the literature, improves SCC estimates.

Figure 3c shows these responses converted into a joint probability distribution over model structure (i.e. inclusion or exclusion of the different structural model elements) using a hierarchical Bayesian model (described further in Section S.2.2.6). Because of general agreement among experts on the value of these structural model elements, average probabilities are high, ranging from a mean of 0.58 for ambiguity or model uncertainty to 0.69 for Earth system improvements. Representation of these model structures in the published literature, however, is far lower, with values ranging from 0.23 (Earth system modeling) to 0.02 for climate tipping points and model ambiguity.

Figure 3d depicts a similar gap between expert assessment of discount rates (based on a prior expert survey reported in Drupp et al. [50]) and the distribution in the literature, with economic experts giving a mean of 2.3% (similar to recommendations by expert philosophers found in a related survey [53]), more than a percentage point lower than the literature mean of 3.4%. Figures 1 and 2 both suggest that these discrepancies in model structure and discounting between the published literature and expert assessment would push published SCCs downward, validating experts' concerns over a downward bias in the literature (Figure 3a), and the attribution of this bias (Figure 3b).

4 The Synthetic SCC Distribution

4.1 Motivation and Approach

In order to address the potential bias in the published literature documented in Figure 3c and d, we combine information from both the literature analysis and expert assessments to generate a synthetic SCC distribution that more closely matches expert assessment of discounting and model structure. This process involves first using the variance across the 1823 published SCC distributions with 31 explanatory variables to train a random forest model, then generating predictions from this model using distributions over input variables based on expert survey results shown in Figures 3c and d. This amounts to a re-weighting of the literature to produce an SCC distribution with structure and discounting characteristics closer to expert assessments (and with other desirable characteristics, such as recent publication year, inclusion of parametric uncertainty, and inclusion of non-market damages). The random forest model identifies which set of variables are most important in driving variance across SCC distributions, and should therefore be targeted for re-weighting.

The random forest model estimates a set of 500 regression trees, each based on the 31 explanatory variables and a random bootstrap of the 1823 SCC estimates. At each branch in the tree, the algorithm chooses the variable from of a random sample of 10 of the possible 31 variables that divides the sample into two groups with the largest variance between them. Our data structure is unusual in that each of the 1823 observations are a distribution (of which 54% are single-estimate point distributions). We therefore use an adapted splitting algorithm based on the Anderson-Darling k-Sample test to maximize distance between the two distributions at each split. Trees with fewer than 7 nodes or very large leaves are pruned, leaving a final 403 regression trees.

Figure S21 shows the importance of different variables from the fitted random forest. The model appropriately identifies the SCC pulse year and discount rate as the two most important variables. Elements of the damage function and the inclusion of persistent growth damages appear as important, as does the publication year (echoing previous findings from Tol [38]) and parametric uncertainty in total factor productivity growth (also identified as important in Gillingham et al. [41] and Rennert et al. [3]). Additional information on the random forest model is detailed in S.2.3.

We query the random forest model with just over 1800 draws from the space of model structures and discount rates obtained from expert surveys (Figure 3c and d), also including other desirable SCC characteristics such as inclusion of parametric uncertainty, accounting for non-market damages, and recent publication year (detailed in S.2.3). Figure 4 illustrates the process for generating a prediction for a single sample from the input variable space. Each tree identifies the set of published SCC estimates with characteristics corresponding to the sample's, for the set of variables chosen as splits along the path for that regression tree. The subset of published estimates for each of the 403 regression trees (the "leaves" in Figure 4) then forms the random forest's prediction for the sample. The set of published estimates contributing to this prediction will not perfectly match all characteristics of the input. For instance, some variables may not appear as splits on a given tree's path, meaning the leaf does not condition on that variable at all. Some model structures combining multiple elements are either very sparse in the literature or are not represented at all (see Figure S4). In these cases, random forest estimates will average over available relevant model structures, but cannot extrapolate interaction effects between combinations of model structures not currently represented in the published literature. However, the set of published estimates contributing to the random forest prediction will match *more* closely with the input sample than the literature as a whole and will match *most* closely on the variables with the largest effect on the SCC, since these variables will appear as splits in the regression trees more frequently.

4.2 The 2020 Synthetic SCC Distribution

Figure 5a gives the 2020 synthetic SCC. The distribution has a median value of $185 per ton CO_2, an inter-quartile range of $97-369 and a mean of $283, after truncating the upper and lower 0.1% of the distribution. For comparison, Figure 5a also shows two sets of SCC estimates from the US government—values from the 2021 Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases (IWG) [51] and a 2023 analysis by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) [54] as well as official SCC estimates by the German Environment Agency (German EPA). The near-complete separation between the IWG distribution and our synthetic SCC is striking: the 75th percentile of the IWG distribution ($52 per ton CO_2) corresponds to the 10th percentile of the synthetic distribution.

The EPA distribution has a much closer overlap with the synthetic SCC distribution, with a median value of $157 per ton CO_2 reasonably similar to the synthetic median of $185. Compared to the IWG values, the EPA analysis integrates a number of modeling improvements that make it more similar to the set of inputs into the synthetic SCC, including improved representation of the Earth system, discount rates closer to the expert assessment in Drupp et al. [50], and a fuller inclusion of parametric uncertainties in economic growth, climate damages, and Earth system dynamics. However, the two distributions still differ substantially at higher SCC values: the synthetic distribution places 27% probability on SCC values over $350 per ton CO_2, compared with only 17% for the EPA distribution. This could be attributable to the integration of a wider set of model structures into the synthetic SCC distribution, particularly allowing for persistent climate damages, the inclusion of tipping points, distributional weights, and limited substitutability between climate damages and consumption goods (Figure 1). By contrast, the German EPA [55] applies distributional weighting in the FUND model and reports two SCC estimates: A lower estimate of $223, located between our median and mean synthetic SCC, which serves as the main political benchmark, using a pure rate of time preference of 1 percent, and a higher estimate of $777 using a pure rate of time preference of 0 percent, to be used in sensitivity analyses.

One of the advantages of the random forest model trained on the literature is that it can provide SCC estimates under a range of alternate specifications. Figure 5b uses this capability to show predicted SCC distributions under alternate input specifications, decomposing the difference between the synthetic SCC distribution and random forest predictions designed to match the DICE model [52]. Reassuringly, the random forest estimates using inputs designed to match the DICE model correspond well to published values from DICE (e.g., $43 per ton CO_2 in 2020 US dollars from Nordhaus [52] compared to an inter-quartile range of $25-$71 in Figure 5b). As expected, the decomposition shows large effects of the discount rate, as well as important roles for certain elements of model structure



Figure 4: **Illustration of process for generating synthetic SCC distribution.** The random forest is estimated using published SCC estimates (a) then queried using draws from model structure and discount rate distributions based on expert assessments (b). Each draw (c), has a single path through each regression tree to a terminal "leaf", which contains the set of published distributions constituting that tree's prediction for that set of inputs (d). Distributions from all regression trees are aggregated to generate the random forest model's prediction for that input (e). The synthetic SCC comes from aggregating the predictions over 1800 draws from the input distribution space. Boxplots show the median (line), inter-quartile range (box), 5-95% range (solid line) and 2.5-97.5% range (dashed lines). Dots show the mean after trimming upper and lower 0.1%.

and parametric uncertainty, particularly the representation of the Earth system, inclusion of persistent damages via impacts to economic growth, and allowing for uncertainty in damages, TFP growth, and discount rate parameters.

Figure S22 shows additional distributions generated from the random forest model showing sensitivity of the synthetic SCC to structural assumptions, discount rate, publication year, pulse year, and damage function. Of note is the importance of model structure seen in Figure S22b: keeping all else equal, moving from an SCC with no differences in model structure from the standard DICE model to one with all 9 elements described in this paper included, increases the median SCC from \$124 to \$245 per ton CO_2 and the mean from \$186 to \$367.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

We present the most comprehensive synthesis to date of SCC estimates, as well as their parametric and structural drivers. Based on 1823 SCC distributions from 147 studies, we document a distribution over published 2020 SCC values that is both wide (with a 90% confidence range spanning 2 orders of magnitude) and substantially right-tailed (with a mean value of \$132 per ton CO_2 more than 4 times the median value of \$39). Analysis of variance in published SCC estimates recovers the well-known importance of discounting and damage-function parameters (explaining about one third of the variance in published SCC estimates), but also shows a critical role for key elements of model structure, including the representation of the Earth system, inclusion of persistent climate impacts to the economy, and specification of the utility function.

Published SCC values are placed in a broader context using a survey of authors of original SCC estimates in the literature. Experts on average perceive a substantial downward bias in published SCC values and attribute the majority of that bias to an under-representation of alternate model structures, as well as discounting and damage parameters. Comparison of expert elicitations with the published literature validates this assessment, with both higher discount rates and lower representation of alternate model structures in the published literature compared to expert responses.

Our synthetic SCC distribution partially addresses this concern by effectively re-weighting published SCC estimates to more closely match expert assessments of model structure and discount rates (as well as other desirable qualities such as more recent publication years and inclusion of parametric uncertainties). This procedure is necessarily constrained by the published literature: some combinations of model structure and parameters simply do not exist in the literature and therefore will not appear in the synthetic SCC distribution. More original modelling studies are required to fill those



Figure 5: **Synthetic 2020 SCC Distribution and Decomposition**. a) Synthetic SCC distribution generated from the random forest model forced by input distributions over model structure and discounting shown in 3c and d. 2020 SCC distributions from two US government SCC assessments, a 2023 EPA analysis [54] and the 2021 update from the Interagency Working Group [51]. Boxplots show the median (line), inter-quartile range (box), 5-95% range (solid line) and 2.5-97.5% range (dashed lines). Dots show the mean after trimming the upper and lower 0.1% of each distribution. Dots show the two SCCs provided by the German EPA [55] under two pure rates of time preference (0% and 1%) . b) Decomposition of the difference in the synthetic SCC distribution and the random forest predictions given inputs (over model structure, discounting, damages, and treatment of uncertainty) corresponding the the DICE model [52]. Because of interactions, the decomposition depends on the order in which elements are added. Figure shows values averaging over interaction effects using 30 randomly selected different orderings. Error bars shows the interquartile range.

gaps. However, our analysis yielding synthetic SCCs does produce a distribution that is *more* similar to expert assessments than the published distribution, and is *most* similar for those variables identified in the random forest model as most important in driving SCC variance.

The resulting synthetic SCC is substantially larger than values in the published literature (median value more than 4.5 times larger, mean more than double). This relative increase (from literature to synthetic) matches how experts' average estimates more than double from their literature to best-estimate mean SCCs. The absolute value of the synthetic SCC (mean of $283) is still substantially higher than experts' best-estimate SCC. This is not surprising, given that experts substantially underestimate the mean SCC in the literature. The synthetic and expert best-estimate SCC values can be rationalized if experts underestimate the absolute value of the mean literature SCC (for reasons discussed in Section 3), while providing reasonable estimates of the proportional effects of correcting biases in the published literature. Interpreted this way, concordance between the synthetic and expert best-estimate SCCs is striking given they are generated from very different processes: both suggest that correcting biases in published SCC estimates increase mean values by just over a factor of two.

Our synthetic is higher than most official government estimates, including an extensive recent update by U.S. EPA [54]. Current guidance to agencies from the IWG requires them to "use their professional judgment to determine which estimates of the SC-GHG reflect the best available evidence, are most appropriate for particular analytical contexts, and best facilitate sound decision-making." [56]. Our findings strongly suggest that the 2021 IWG estimates are unlikely to provide a sound basis for analyses requiring a valuation of climate change damages. They are inconsistent with available evidence from both the published scientific literature, expert views, and our synthetic SCC that combines key elements of both.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to our many survey respondents, to David Anthoff, Kenneth Gillingham, Frikk Nesje, James Archsmith, Radley Horton, Jim Stock, Bob Litterman, and seminar audiences at AERE 2022, AURÖ 2023, CESifo 2023, ASSA 2024, University of Potsdam, University of California San Diego, Columbia Business School, Harvard Kennedy School, and at PIK for helpful comments, to Robert Bao for technical assistance, and to Johanna Darmstadt, Luc Esprabens, David Lucius, Nele Steinbrecher, Henry Williams, Angela Zeng, and particularly to Mark Lustig, for excellent research assistance.

Funding

M.D. gratefully acknowledges support from the DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy (EXC 2037 and CLICCS) project no. 390683824, contribution to the Center for Earth System Research and Sustainability (CEN) of Universität Hamburg.

Author contributions:

All authors designed the literature review and participated in data collection. FCM and JR led the data analysis of the literature values and created Figures 1, 2, 4 and 5. MAD led development and administration of the expert survey and analysis of results, including Figure 3. All authors contributed to the writing.

Competing interests:

Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data and materials availability:

All data, code, and materials from the literature analysis will be made available upon publication. Expert survey data is available in an anonymized format; this allows producing all main figures and results with the sole exception of supporting analyses that draw on data merged with expert characteristics in Sections S.2.2.4 and S.2.2.5.

References

1. Stern, N. *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
2. Aldy, J. E., Kotchen, M. J., Stavins, R. N. & Stock, J. H. Keep climate policy focused on the social cost of carbon. *Science* **373,** 850–852 (2021).
3. Rennert, K. *et al.* Comprehensive evidence implies a higher social cost of CO2. *Nature* **610,** 687–692 (2022).
4. Stern, N. The structure of economic modeling of the potential impacts of climate change: grafting gross underestimation of risk onto already narrow science models. *Journal of Economic Literature* **51,** 838–59 (2013).
5. Pindyck, R. S. Climate change policy: what do the models tell us? *Journal of Economic Literature* **51,** 860–72 (2013).
6. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine and others. *Valuing climate damages: updating estimation of the social cost of carbon dioxide* (National Academies Press, 2017).
7. Wagner, G. *et al. Eight priorities for calculating the social cost of carbon* 2021.
8. Weitzman, M. L. GHG targets as insurance against catastrophic climate damages. *Journal of Public Economic Theory* **14,** 221–244 (2012).
9. Otto, A., Todd, B. J., Bowerman, N., Frame, D. J. & Allen, M. R. Climate system properties determining the social cost of carbon. *Environmental Research Letters* **8,** 024032 (2013).
10. Dietz, S., van der Ploeg, F., Rezai, A. & Venmans, F. Are economists getting climate dynamics right and does it matter? *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **8,** 895–921 (2021).
11. Ricke, K., Drouet, L., Caldeira, K. & Tavoni, M. Country-level social cost of carbon. *Nature Climate Change* **8,** 895–900 (2018).
12. Hänsel, M. C. *et al.* Climate economics support for the UN climate targets. *Nature Climate Change* **10,** 781–789 (2020).
13. Cai, Y. & Lontzek, T. S. The social cost of carbon with economic and climate risks. *Journal of Political Economy* **127,** 2684–2734 (2019).
14. Crost, B. & Traeger, C. P. Optimal CO 2 mitigation under damage risk valuation. *Nature Climate Change* **4,** 631–636 (2014).
15. Daniel, K. D., Litterman, R. B. & Wagner, G. Declining CO2 price paths. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116,** 20886–20891 (2019).

16. Nordhaus, W. Economics of the disintegration of the Greenland ice sheet. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116,** 12261–12269 (2019).

17. Lemoine, D. & Traeger, C. P. Economics of tipping the climate dominoes. *Nature Climate Change* **6,** 514–519 (2016).

18. Cai, Y., Judd, K. L., Lenton, T. M., Lontzek, T. S. & Narita, D. Environmental tipping points significantly affect the cost- benefit assessment of climate policies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112,** 4606–4611 (2015).

19. Dietz, S., Rising, J., Stoerk, T. & Wagner, G. Economic impacts of tipping points in the climate system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).

20. Rudik, I. Optimal climate policy when damages are unknown. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **12,** 340–73 (2020).

21. Lemoine, D. & Traeger, C. Watch your step: optimal policy in a tipping climate. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **6,** 137–66 (2014).

22. Berger, L., Emmerling, J. & Tavoni, M. Managing catastrophic climate risks under model uncertainty aversion. *Management Science* **63,** 749–765 (2017).

23. Lemoine, D. & Traeger, C. P. Ambiguous tipping points. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **132,** 5–18 (2016).

24. Lemoine, D. & Rudik, I. Managing climate change under uncertainty: Recursive integrated assessment at an inflection point. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **9,** 117–142 (2017).

25. Moore, F. C. & Diaz, D. B. Temperature impacts on economic growth warrant stringent mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change* **5,** 127–131 (2015).

26. Dietz, S. & Stern, N. Endogenous growth, convexity of damage and climate risk: how Nordhaus' framework supports deep cuts in carbon emissions. *The Economic Journal* **125,** 574–620 (2015).

27. Moyer, E. J., Woolley, M. D., Matteson, N. J., Glotter, M. J. & Weisbach, D. A. Climate impacts on economic growth as drivers of uncertainty in the social cost of carbon. *The Journal of Legal Studies* **43,** 401–425 (2014).

28. Moore, F. C., Baldos, U., Hertel, T. & Diaz, D. New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature communications* **8,** 1–9 (2017).

29. Rode, A. *et al.* Estimating a social cost of carbon for global energy consumption. *Nature* **598,** 308–314 (2021).

30. Dennig, F., Budolfson, M. B., Fleurbaey, M., Siebert, A. & Socolow, R. H. Inequality, climate impacts on the future poor, and carbon prices. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112,** 15827–15832 (2015).

31. Anthoff, D. & Emmerling, J. Inequality and the social cost of carbon. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **6,** 243–273 (2019).

32. Rezai, A. & Van der Ploeg, F. Intergenerational inequality aversion, growth, and the role of damages: Occam's rule for the global carbon tax. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **3,** 493–522 (2016).

33. Sterner, T. & Persson, U. M. An even sterner review: Introducing relative prices into the discounting debate. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* (2020).

34. Bastien-Olvera, B. A. & Moore, F. C. Use and non-use value of nature and the social cost of carbon. *Nature Sustainability* **4,** 101–108 (2021).

35. Weitzman, M. L. What Is The" Damages Function" For Global Warming—And What Difference Might It Make? *Climate Change Economics* **1,** 57–69 (2010).

36. Drupp, M. A. & Hänsel, M. C. Relative prices and climate policy: How the scarcity of nonmarket goods drives policy evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **13,** 168–201 (2021).

37. Tol, R. S. J. The marginal damage costs of carbon dioxide emissions: an assessment of the uncertainties. *Energy Policy* **33,** 2064–2074. ISSN: 03014215 (Nov. 2005).

38. Tol, R. S. Social cost of carbon estimates have increased over time. *Nature Climate Change,* 532–536 (2023).

39. Havranek, T., Irsova, Z., Janda, K. & Zilberman, D. Selective reporting and the social cost of carbon. *Energy Economics* **51,** 394–406 (2015).

40. Kikstra, J. *et al.* The social cost of carbon dioxide under climate-economy feedbacks and temperature variability. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16** (2021).

41. Gillingham, K. *et al.* Modeling uncertainty in integrated assessment of climate change: A multimodel comparison. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **5,** 791–826 (2018).

42. Rose, S. K., Diaz, D. B. & Blanford, G. J. Understanding the social cost of carbon: a model diagnostic and inter-comparison study. *Climate Change Economics* **8,** 1750009 (2017).

43. Pindyck, R. S. The social cost of carbon revisited. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **94,** 140–160 (2019).

44. Howard, P. H. & Sylvan, D. The economic climate: Establishing expert consensus on the economics of climate change. *Institute for Policy Integrity,* 438–441 (2015).

45. Schauer, M. J. Estimation of the greenhouse gas externality with uncertainty. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **5,** 71–82 (1995).

46. Drupp, M. A., Nesje, F. & Schmidt, R. C. Pricing Carbon: Evidence from Expert Recommendations. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **forthcoming** (2024).

47. Anthoff, D. & Tol, R. S. J. *Testing the Dismal Theorem* 2020.

48. Hsiang, S. *et al.* Estimating Economic Damage from Climate Change in the United States. *Science* **356,** 1362–1369 (2017).

49. Burke, M., Hsiang, S. M. & Miguel, E. Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature* **527,** 235–239. ISSN: 0028-0836 (Oct. 2015).

50. Drupp, M. A., Freeman, M. C., Groom, B. & Nesje, F. Discounting disentangled. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **10,** 109–34 (2018).

51. IAWG. *Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon, Methane, and Nitrous Oxide Interim Estimates Under Executive Order 13990* 2021.

52. Nordhaus, W. Projections and uncertainties about climate change in an era of minimal climate policies. *American economic journal: economic policy* **10,** 333–360 (2018).

53. Nesje, F., Drupp, M. A., Freeman, M. C. & Groom, B. Philosophers and economists agree on climate policy paths but for different reasons. *Nature Climate Change* **13,** 515–522 (2023).

54. EPA. *EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances* Nov. 2023.

55. Umweltbundesamt. Methods convention 3.1 for determining external environmental costs - cost estimates. https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/sites/default/files/medien/1410/publikationen/2020-12-21_methodenkonvention_3_1_kostensaetze.pdf (2020).

56. IAWG. *Memorandum from the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases* Dec. 2023. https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/IWG-Memo-12.22.23.pdf.