

“Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2002” published by WMO  
Executive Summary (31 July, 2002)

Comments by S. Fred Singer 10/11/2002

### **Major WMO Findings**

*Stratospheric chlorine is “at or near the peak, while bromine abundances are probably still increasing.”* (Emphasis added, but there is no evidence for this).

*Short-lived source gases “can potentially reach the stratosphere.”* There is no evidence that methyl bromide with a tropospheric lifetime of only 0.7 years can contribute to stratospheric bromine (and therefore to ozone depletion).

*“Ozone remains depleted at mid-latitudes.”* [Note: No depletion is observed in the tropics.] Careful reading of the text and a look at the evidence establish that there has been no significant depletion in the past decade – in spite of increasing stratospheric chlorine concentration (see above). In fact, there has been an increase: “the lowest annually averaged global total column ozone occurred in 1992-1993.” No explanation is offered. [The depletion between 1980 and 1992 was about 5%, of the same order as the measured natural variability with the solar cycle.]

*“Arctic ozone hole remains unlikely”* --- in spite of 1992 NASA /Gore scare of “hole over Kennebunkport” that led Bush and Congress to advance CFC phaseout by 5 years. The same paragraph also admits that stratospheric aerosols (not chlorine concentration) may be the limiting factor in ozone depletion.

*“Calculations of UV irradiance ... suggest that UV has increased since the early 1980s by 6 – 14 %.”* There are no measurements to support this; in fact, all actual data suggest no change. [This is a long way from the claim of an increase of up to 35% per year, a claim actually published in *Science*.]

*“...radiative forcing due to ozone decreases since 1980 offsets about 20% of the positive forcing due to the increase in ... GH gases over the same period.”* A little-advertised fact.

*“Stratospheric cooling (due mainly to projected carbon dioxide increases) is predicted to enhance future ozone amounts in the upper stratosphere.”* Another little-advertised fact.

Methyl bromide (MeBr): Its lifetime is shrinking, to 0.5 –0.9 yr; its industrial production is 10-40%; the rest is of natural origin.

**WMO Implications for Policy Formulation**

**1. “The Montreal Protocol is working...”**

The Montreal Protocol is not needed

**2. “The ozone layer will remain particularly vulnerable during the next decade...”**

The evidence does not support this conclusion.

**3. Accelerating the recovery of the ozone layer: “if production of MeBr were to cease in 2003”**

There is no evidence to support this statement.

**4. Failure to comply with the Montreal Protocol would delay or could even prevent recovery of the ozone layer: “...continued production of ozone-depleting substances at the 1999 amount would likely extend the recovery of the ozone layer well past the year 2100.”**

Again, no evidence to support this statement.

**5. “recovery of the ozone layer over the coming decades would tend to warm the climate system.”** We agree.

---

**Note Added 4/4/03**

\  
Salby and Callahan conclude that only ~20% of the ozone decline is photochemical; the rest is due to stratospheric circulation

J Clim 2002 pp. 3673 –3685; see also BAMS Feb 2003

\*\*\*\*\*