

Polar Bear Population Forecasts: A Public-Policy Forecasting Audit

Working Paper Version 54: February 19, 2008

J. Scott Armstrong

The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
747 Huntsman, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.

armstrong@wharton.upenn.edu; jscottarmstrong.com; T 610-622-6480

Kesten C. Green

Business and Economic Forecasting, Monash University, Vic 3800, Australia.

Contact: PO Box 10800, Wellington 6143, New Zealand.

kesten@kestengreen.com; T +64 4 976 3245; F +64 4 976 3250

Willie Soon

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge MA 02138, USA.

wsoon@cfa.harvard.edu; T 617-495-7488

Abstract

Calls to list polar bears as a threatened species under the U.S. Endangered Species Act are based on forecasts of large long-term declines in their population. Nine government reports were prepared to “support” the listing decision. We assessed them in the light of evidence-based (scientific) forecasting principles. None referred to works on scientific forecasting methodology. Of the nine, Amstrup, Marcot, and Douglas (2007) and Hunter et al. (2007) were the most relevant to the listing decision. Their forecasts were products of complex sets of assumptions. The first in both cases was the erroneous assumption that General Circulation Models provide valid forecasts of summer sea ice in the regions inhabited by polar bears. We nevertheless audited their conditional forecasts of what would happen to the polar bear population *assuming*, as the authors did, that the extent of summer sea ice would decrease substantially over the coming decades. In all, Amstrup et al. properly applied only 15% of relevant forecasting principles and Hunter et al. only 10%. Their forecasts are unscientific and therefore a disservice to decision makers. We recommend that *all* relevant principles should be observed and forecasting processes audited when important public policy decisions depend on accurate forecasts.

Key words: adaptation, bias, climate change, decision making, endangered species, expert opinion, evaluation, evidence-based principles, expert judgment, extinction, forecasting methods, global warming, habitat loss, mathematical models, scientific method, sea ice.

Introduction

Polar bears have been described by some as the “canaries of climate change.” Despite widespread agreement that the polar bear population rose rapidly over recent years after stricter polar bear hunting rules were imposed, new concerns have been expressed that climate change will threaten the survival of some sub-populations in the 21st Century. Such concerns led the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to consider listing polar bears as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. To list a species that is currently in good health must surely require forecasts that its population would, if it were not listed, decline to levels that threaten the viability of the species. The decision on listing polar bears thus rests on long-term forecasts.

In order provide the necessary forecasts for the listing decision, the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service requested the U.S. Geological Survey to conduct additional analyses. The Geological Survey in turn commissioned nine “administrative reports” to satisfy the request.

We asked “Are the forecasts derived from accepted scientific procedures?”

In order to answer our question, we first examined the references in the nine unpublished government reports. Second, we examined the forecasting methods employed in two of those nine reports by assessing the procedures described in them against forecasting principles. The forecasting principles are based on evidence from scientific research that has revealed which methods provide the most accurate forecasts for a given situation and which methods to avoid.

Scientific forecasting procedures

Scientific research on forecasting has been conducted since the 1930s; important findings from the extensive literature on forecasting were first summarized in Armstrong (1978, 1985).

In the mid-1990s, the Forecasting Principles Project was established with the objective of summarizing all useful knowledge about forecasting. The evidence was codified as principles, or condition-action statements, to provide guidance on which methods to use under different circumstances. The project led to the *Principles of Forecasting* handbook (Armstrong 2001). These principles were formulated by 40 internationally-recognized experts on forecasting methods and were reviewed by 123 leading experts on forecasting methods. The summarizing process alone was a four-year effort. We refer to the evidence-based methods as scientific forecasting procedures.

The strongest form of evidence is that which is derived from empirical studies that compare the performance of alternative methods. Ideally, “performance” is assessed by the ability of the selected method to provide useful *ex ante* forecasts. The weakest form of evidence is based on received wisdom about proper procedures. However, some of these principles seem self-evident (e.g., “Provide complete, simple and clear explanations of methods”) and, as long as they were unchallenged by the available evidence, they were included. Some important principles are counter-intuitive: as a consequence, forecasts derived in ignorance of forecasting principles have no scientific standing.

The principles were derived from many areas, including management, psychology, economics, politics, and weather, with the intention that they would apply to any type of forecasting problem. Some reviewers of our research have suggested that the principles do not apply to the physical sciences. We have asked reviewers for evidence to support that viewpoint, but have been unable to obtain useful responses. Readers can examine the principles and form their own judgments on this issue. For example, might one argue that the principle, “Ensure that information is reliable and that measurement error is low,” does not apply when forecasting climate?

The forecasting principles are available on forecastingprinciples.com, a site sponsored by the International Institute of Forecasters. The site claims to provide “all useful knowledge about

forecasting” and asks visitors to submit any missing evidence. The Forecasting Principles site has been at the top of the list of sites in Internet searches for “forecasting” for many years.

A summary of the principles, currently numbering 140, is provided as a checklist in the Forecasting Audit software available on the site. The strength of evidence is summarized briefly for each principle, and details are provided in Armstrong (2001) as well as in papers posted on the site.

General Assessment of Long-Term Polar Bear Population Forecasts

We examined the references cited in the nine unpublished U.S. Geological Survey Administrative Reports posted on the Internet at http://usgs.gov/newsroom/special/polar_bears/. The reports were Amstrup et al. (2007); Bergen et al (2007); DeWeaver (2007); Durner et al. (2007); Hunter et al. (2007); Obbard et al. (2007); Regehr et al. (2007); Rode et al. (2007); and Stirling et al. (2007). The reports included 444 unique references in total. We were unable to find any references to works providing evidence that the forecasting methods used in the reports had been validated.

Forecasting Audit of Key Papers Prepared to Support the Listing of Polar Bears

We audited the forecasting procedures used in what we judged to be the two reports most crucial to the forecasts. These were Amstrup et al. (2007), which we refer to as AMD, and Hunter et al. (2007), which we refer to as H6.

In conducting the audits, each of the three authors read the paper and independently rated the forecasting procedures described in it by using the Forecasting Audit software at forecastingprinciples.com. The rating scale runs from -2 to +2, with the former indicating the procedures contravene the principle and the latter signifying that it is properly applied. After the initial round of ratings, we examined differences in our ratings in an attempt to reach consensus. To the extent that we had difficulty in reaching consensus, we moved ratings toward “0”.

Clearly forecasting audit ratings involve some subjectivity. Despite this, for each of the papers our ratings after the first round were in substantial agreement. Furthermore, we had little difficulty in reaching consensus by the third round.

In some cases, the two papers did not provide sufficient details to allow for ratings. To resolve this issue, we contacted the authors of the two papers and requested further information. In addition, we asked them to review our ratings and to tell us whether they disagreed with any of them. In their reply, they refused to provide any responses to our requests. (See Note 2 at the end of our paper.)

At various points in our audit report, we cite studies that provide relevant evidence. To ensure that we cited them properly, we sent a copy of our paper to all authors that we cited in a substantive manner in December 2007 asking them to inform us if we had not properly referred to their findings. None of the authors objected to the way that we summarized their research. We also invited them to review the paper.

Audit Findings for AMD

AMD made forecasts of polar bear populations for 45, 75, and 100 years from the year 2000.

AMD implicitly made many assumptions: (1) global warming will occur; (2) this will both reduce the extent of and thin the summer sea ice; (3) polar bears will obtain less food by hunting from the sea ice platform than they do now; (4) they will not obtain adequate supplementary food using other means or from other sources; (5) the bear population will decline; (6) the designation of polar bears as an endangered species will solve the problem and will not have serious

detrimental effects; and (7) there are no other policies that would produce better outcomes than those based on an endangered species classification.

AMD assumed that the general circulation models (GCMs) provide scientifically valid forecasts of global temperature and the extent and thickness of sea ice. They stated (AMD 2007, p. 2 and Fig 2 on p. 83): “Our future forecasts are based largely on information derived from general circulation model (GCM) projections of the extent and spatiotemporal distribution of sea ice.” That is, their forecasts are conditional on long-term global warming forecasts leading to a dramatic reduction in Arctic sea ice during melt-back periods in spring, late summer and fall.

Green and Armstrong (2007) examined long-term climate forecasting efforts and were unable to find a single forecast of global warming that was based on scientific methods. The climate modelers’ procedures did not follow many forecasting principles and some of the contraventions were critical. This formal auditing result is consistent with earlier cautions. For example, Soon et al. (2001) found that the current generation of GCMs is unable to meaningfully calculate the climatic effects of added atmospheric carbon dioxide given the severe limitations from both the uncertainties and unknowns in representing all relevant physical processes related to weather and climate.

The fact that the AMD forecasts rest on the GCM forecasts and that these forecasts lack a scientific basis puts their assumptions into question. Indeed, some climate modelers state that the GCMs do not provide forecasts. Furthermore, the GCM models have not been designed for analysis at a regional level in the way they are used by AMD and H6 (see the discussion of Principle 9.2 in H6 below).

We audited AMD’s polar bear population forecasting procedures to assess whether they would produce valid forecasts assuming valid climate and sea ice forecasts were available as inputs. Of the 140 forecasting principles, we agreed that 24 were irrelevant to the forecasting problem. We then examined principles on which our ratings differed. After two rounds of consultation (i.e., the process involved three rounds in all), we were able to reach consensus on all 116 relevant principles. We were unable to rate 26 relevant principles (Table A.3) due to a lack of information. We attempted to obtain additional information from the authors of the administrative reports, but they refused to cooperate. Full disclosure of the ratings is provided in Tables A.1, A.2 and A.3 in the Appendix.

Overall, we found that AMD contravened 41 principles and apparently contravened 32. No justification was provided for the contraventions. We could see no reason for any contraventions.

We describe some of the more serious problems with the AMD forecasts here:

Make sure forecasts are independent of politics (Principle 1.3)

By politics, we mean any type of organizational biases or pressures. While different stakeholders may prefer particular forecasts, if forecasters are influenced by such considerations, forecast accuracy will suffer. The Executive Summary document¹ noted that “the Secretary of the Interior asked the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to generate new scientific data, models, and interpretations on polar bears and their sea ice habitats, to support the “U.S. Fish and Wildlife service polar bear listing decision” (http://www.doi.gov/news/06_News_Releases/061227.html). The authors of the AMD administrative report are all employees of the U.S. government agencies that are trying to support this decision.

Match the forecasting method(s) to the situation (Principle 6.7)

The forecasts in AMD rely on the opinions of an expert who is knowledgeable in the domain. The opinions were transformed into a complex set of formulae, but were unaided by evidence-based

¹ http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/special/polar_bears/docs/executive_summary.pdf

forecasting principles. Unaided experts' judgments are not appropriate for forecasting in this situation.

One of the most counter-intuitive findings in forecasting is that judgmental forecasts by researchers who ignore accepted forecasting principles have little value in complex and uncertain situations (Armstrong, 1978, p. 91-96; Tetlock 2005). This applies whether the opinions are expressed in words, spreadsheets, or mathematical models. In relation to the latter, Pilkey and Pilkey-Jarvis (2007) documented the failure of domain experts' mathematical models when applied to diverse natural science problems including fish stocks, beach engineering, and invasive plants. It also applies regardless of how much information is used by the experts and whether or not the information is of high quality. Among the reasons for this are:

- a) Complexity: Individuals cannot assess complex relationships through unaided observations.
- b) Coincidence: Individuals confuse correlation with causation.
- c) Feedback: Individuals making judgmental predictions typically do not receive unambiguous feedback they can use to improve their forecasting.
- d) Bias: Individuals have difficulty in obtaining or using evidence that contradicts their initial beliefs. This problem is especially serious among individuals who view themselves as experts.

Despite the lack of validity of unaided forecasts by experts, many public policy decisions are based on such forecasts. Research on persuasion has shown that people have substantial faith in the value of such forecasts and that faith increases when experts agree with one another. Although they may seem convincing at the time, expert forecasts can, a few years later, serve as important cautionary tales. Cerf and Navasky's (1998) book contains 310 pages of examples, such as Fermi Award-winning scientist John von Neumann's 1956 prediction that "A few decades hence, energy may be free". Examples of expert climate forecasts that turned out to be wrong are easy to find, such as UC Davis ecologist Kenneth Watt's prediction in a speech at Swarthmore College on Earth Day, April 22, 1970 that "If present trends continue, the world will be about four degrees colder in 1990, but eleven degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age."

Are such examples merely a matter of selective perception? The first author's review of empirical research on this problem led him to develop the "Seer-sucker Theory," which can be stated as "No matter how much evidence exists that seers do not exist, seers will find suckers" (Armstrong 1980). The amount of expertise does not matter beyond a basic minimum level. There are exceptions to the Seer-sucker Theory: experts can improve their forecasting when they receive well-summarized feedback on the accuracy of their forecasts and reasons why their forecasts were or were not accurate. This situation applies for short-term (up to five day) weather forecasts, but we are not aware of any such regime for long-term global climate forecasting. Even if there were such a regime, the feedback would trickle in over many years before it became useful for improving forecasting. Moreover, experts typically resist negative feedback and prefer to provide excuses for inaccurate forecasts (Tetlock 2005).

Research since 1980 has added support to the Seer-sucker Theory. In particular, Tetlock (2005) recruited 284 people whose professions included "commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends." He asked them to forecast the probability that various situations would or would not occur, picking areas (geographic and substantive) within and outside their areas of expertise. By 2003, he had accumulated over 82,000 forecasts. The experts barely if at all outperformed non-experts and neither group did well against simple rules.

Many comparative empirical studies have concluded that judgmental forecasting by experts is the least accurate of the methods available to make forecasts. For example, Ascher (1978, p. 200), in his analysis of long-term forecasts of electricity consumption, found that that was the case.

AMD also implicitly forecast—that is, they used their judgment unaided by scientific forecasting procedures—that a policy to classify polar bears as a threatened species would save the bears from future possible extinction. AMD did not include forecasts of the costs, planned and unintended, of such a policy.

Be conservative in situations of high uncertainty or instability (Principle 7.3)

Forecasts should be conservative when a situation is unstable, complex or uncertain. Being conservative means moving forecasts towards “no change” or, in cases that exhibit a well established long-term trend and where there is no reason to expect the trend to change, being conservative means moving forecasts toward the trend line. A long-term trend is one that has been evident over a period that is *much longer* than the period being forecast. Conservatism is a fundamental principle in forecasting.

The interaction between polar bears and their environment in the Arctic is complex and there is much uncertainty. For example, AMD associated warm temperatures with lower polar bear survival rates, yet cold temperatures have also been associated with similar outcomes, as this quote illustrates: “Abnormally heavy ice covered much of the eastern Beaufort Sea during the winter of 1973-1974. This resulted in major declines in numbers and productivity of polar bears and ringed seals in 1975” (Amstrup et al. 1986, p. 249). Stirling (2002, p. 68 and 72) further expanded on the complexity of polar bear-sea-ice interactions:

“In the eastern Beaufort Sea, in years during and following heavy ice conditions in spring, we found a marked reduction in production of ringed seal pups and consequently in the natality of polar bears ... The effect appeared to last for about three years, after which productivity of both seals and bears increased again. These clear and major reductions in productivity of ringed seals in relation to ice conditions occurred at decadal-scale intervals in the mid-1970s and 1980s ... and, on the basis of less complete data, probably in the mid-1960s as well ... Recent analyses of ice anomalies in the Beaufort Sea have now also confirmed the existence of an approximately 10-year cycle in the region ... that is roughly in phase with a similar decadal-scale oscillation in the runoff from the Mackenzie River ... However, or whether, these regional-scale changes in ecological conditions have affected the reproduction and survival of young ringed seals and polar bears through the 1990s is not clear.”

Regional variability adds to uncertainty. For example, Antarctic ice mass extent has been growing while sea and air temperatures have been increasing (e.g. Zhang 2007). At the same time, depth-averaged oceanic temperatures around the Southeastern Bering Sea (Richter-Menge et al. 2007) have been cooling in 2006. Despite the warming of local air temperature by $1.6 \pm 0.6^\circ\text{C}$, there was no sharp decline in the area over the continental shelf of the Canadian Beaufort Sea that was ice-covered for the 36 years from 1968 to 2003 (Melling et al. 2005).

Despite the uncertainty, instability, and complexity of the situation, AMD made predictions based on assumptions that we view as questionable. They also used little historical data.

Obtain forecasts from heterogeneous experts (Principle 8.5)

AMD’s polar bear population forecasts were the product of a single expert. Experts vary in their knowledge and the way they approach problems, and bringing more information and different approaches to bear on a forecasting problem improves accuracy. When sufficient information is not available, forecasting can not be assumed valid. Also, in situations where experts might be biased, it is important to obtain forecasts from experts with different biases. Failing to follow this principle increases the risk that the forecasts obtained will be extreme when, in this situation, forecasts should be conservative (see Principle 7.3, above).

Use all important variables (Principle 10.2)

Dyck et al. (2007) recently noted that scenarios of polar bear decline from changing sea-ice habitat alone grossly oversimplify the complex ecological relationships of the situation. In particular, AMD did not adequately consider the adaptability of polar bears. They mentioned the fact that polar bears evolved from brown bears 250,000 years ago (p. 2) but they appear to have underrated the fact that polar bears probably experienced much warmer conditions in the Arctic over that extended time period, with periods when sea ice habitat was less than those expected over the next century according to the GCM projections AMD have used. Several studies (Hamilton and Brigham-Grette 1991; Brigham-Grette and Hopkins 1995; Norgaard-Pedersen et al. 2007) have documented the dramatic reduction of sea ice in both the Northwest Alaskan coast and Northwest Greenland part of the Arctic Ocean during the very warm Interglacial of marine isotope stage 5e *ca.* 130,000 to 120,000 years ago. Brigham-Grette and Hopkins (1995, p. 159) noted that the “winter sea-ice limit was north of Bering Strait, at least 800 km north of its present position, and the Bering Sea was perennially ice-free” and that “[the more saline] Atlantic water may have been present on the shallow Beaufort Shelf, suggesting that the Arctic Ocean was not stratified and the Arctic sea-ice cover was not perennial for some period.” On the face of it, the nature and extent of polar bear adaptability seem crucial to any forecasts that assume dramatic changes in the bears’ environment.

Audit Findings for Hunter et al (H6)

H6 forecast polar bear numbers and their survival probabilities in the southern Beaufort Sea for 45, 75, and 100 years from 2000. To do so, they implicitly assumed the following: (1) global warming will occur; (2) frequent “low-ice years” in the Arctic region will be a consequence of global warming; (3) polar bears cannot adapt to “low-ice years” and their population will decline, (4) the designation of polar bears as an endangered species will solve the problem and will not have serious detrimental effects; and (5) there are no other policies that would produce better outcomes than those based on listing polar bears under the Endangered Species Act. These are key issues and they require scientific forecasts, not assumptions.

Like AMD, H6 accepted GCM forecasts of global warming and reduced extent and thickness of sea ice. They stated that “we extracted forecasts of the availability of sea ice for polar bears in the Southern Beaufort Sea region, using monthly forecasts of sea ice concentrations from 10 IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) fully-coupled general circulation models” (p. 11 of H6). That is, their forecasts are conditional on long-term forecasts of global warming producing dramatic effects. However, Green and Armstrong (2007) were unable to find any forecasts made in accordance with scientific forecasting principles that support the hypothesized predictions of global warming throughout the 21st Century.

We nevertheless audited H6’s polar bear population forecasting procedures to assess whether they would produce valid forecasts if valid climate and sea ice forecasts were available as inputs.

Each of the authors read H6 and independently rated the forecasting procedures described in it using the Forecasting Audit software at forecastingprinciples.com. Of the 140 forecasting principles, we agreed that 35 were irrelevant to the forecasting problem. We then examined principles on which our ratings differed, and after three rounds of consultation we were able to reach consensus on all 105 relevant principles. To the extent that we had difficulty in reaching consensus, we moved ratings toward “0”.

We found that H6's procedures clearly contravened 61 principles (Appendix Table A.4) and probably contravened an additional 19 principles (Appendix Table A.5). We were unable to rate 15 relevant principles (Appendix Table A.6) due to a lack of information.

Many of the contraventions in H6 were similar to those in AMD and we provide the H6 audit details in the Appendix. Here are some examples of contraventions, some of which are, on their own, raise serious questions about the value of the H6 forecasts:

Decisions, actions, and biases (Principles 1.1 – 1.3)

The H6 authors did not describe alternative decisions that might be taken (1.1), nor did they propose relationships between possible forecasts and alternative decisions (1.2). For example, what decision would be implied by a forecast that bear numbers will increase to the point where they become a threat to existing human settlements? These problems relate to the biased manner in which the problem was stated: "USGS science strategy to support U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service polar bear listing decision" (1.3). Research is often prone to bias, sometimes due to unknown preferences or interests, but it is nevertheless important to try to avoid it, and it is clearly improper to undertake a research project on the understanding that there is a desired finding.

Ensure that information is reliable and that measurement error is low (Principle 4.2)

Long-term forecasts require enormous amounts of valid and reliable data. Armstrong (1985, p. 166) refers to two rules of thumb for how much data are needed for extrapolating h years ahead. One calls for $4h^{1/2}$ years of historical data and the other calls for h years. These rules imply that H6 should have based any extrapolations on 40 to 100 years of historical data.

H6 relies heavily on five years of data with unknown measurement errors. Furthermore, did the capture data on which they rely provide representative samples of bears in the southern Beaufort Sea given the vast area involved and difficulties in spotting and capturing the bears? Bears wander over long distances and do not respect administrative boundaries (Amstrup et al. 2004). The validity of the data is likely to be compromised further by imposing a speculative demographic model on the raw capture-recapture data (Amstrup et al. 2001; Regehr et al. 2006).

Ensure that information is reliable and measurement error is low (4.2)

Obtain all important data (4.4)

H6 estimate their key relationship, between ice-free days and the polar bear population, by using data that appear to be unreliable. In addition, they rely on only five years of data with a limited range of climatic-ecological responses. They might, for example, have independently estimated the magnitude of the relationship by obtaining estimates of polar bear populations during much warmer and much colder periods in the past. The supplementary information from Figure 3 of Regehr et al. (2007) shows that 1987, 1993 and 1998 were exceptional seasons with the number of ice-free days longer than 150 days (i.e., substantially above the 135 ice-free days documented for 2004-2005) in the southern Beaufort sea, yet there were no apparent negative impacts on the polar bear population and wellbeing – see for example, Amstrup et al. 2001).

Given that they used only five observations, the above points are moot. It is impossible to estimate a causal relationship in a complex and uncertain situation by using only five data points.

Be conservative in situations of high uncertainty or instability (Principle 7.3)

The situation regarding polar bears in the southern Beaufort Sea is complex and there is much uncertainty. For example, on the basis of five years of data, H6 associated warm temperatures

(and hence more ice-free days) with lower polar bear survival rates, yet as noted earlier, cold temperatures have also been associated with similar outcomes: “Abnormally heavy ice covered much of the eastern Beaufort Sea during the winter of 1973-1974. This resulted in major declines in numbers and productivity of polar bears and ringed seals in 1975” (Amstrup et al. 1986, p. 249).

As noted above, regional changes add to uncertainty, noting the Antarctic ice extent has been growing at the same time that sea and air temperatures have been increasing (e.g. Zhang 2007) while depth averaged oceanic temperatures around the southeastern Bering Sea have been undergoing relative cooling in 2006 (Richter-Menge et al. 2007). Despite the warming of local air temperature by $1.6 \pm 0.6^\circ\text{C}$, there was no sharp decline in the area over the continental shelf of the Canadian Beaufort Sea that was covered in ice for the 36 years from 1968 to 2003 (Melling et al. 2005).

There is general agreement that polar bear populations have been increasing or remained stable in the Alaska regions in recent decades. H6 assumed that there are downward forces that will cause the trend to reverse. Indeed, Armstrong and Collopy (1993) proposed the principle “Do not extrapolate trends if they are contrary to causal forces.” They tested the principle on four data sets involving 723 long-range forecasts and found that following the principle reduced forecast error by 43%. Studies in economics have, however, shown little success in predicting turning points. So, even if one had good reason to expect a trend to reverse, being conservative and avoiding the extrapolation of *any* trend will increase the accuracy of forecasts.

Tailor the forecasting model to the horizon (Principle 9.1)

When forecasting over the long term, as in H6, forecasting models should be based on long-term trends. However, the H6 authors built models based entirely on estimates derived from only five years of recent data.

Match the model to the underlying phenomena (Principle 9.2)

It is important for the readers to know what is meant by “Southern Beaufort Sea” (SB) in the H6 report because of the poor spatial resolution of the GCMs. H6 states: “Because GCMs do not provide suitable forecasts for areas as small as the SB, we used sea ice concentration for a larger area composed of 5 IUCN polar bear management units (Aars et al. 2006) with ice dynamics similar to the SB management unit (Barents Sea, Beaufort Sea, Chukchi Sea, Kara Sea and Laptev Sea; see Rigor and Wallace 2004, Durner et al. 2007). We assumed that the general trend in sea ice availability in these 5 units was representative of the general trend in the Southern Beaufort region.” (p. 12). Given the unique ecological, geographical, meteorological, and climatological conditions in each of the five circumpolar seas, we did not find this assumption to be convincing.

Update frequently (Principle 9.5)

H6 did not include the most recent year, 2006, when estimating their model. From the supplementary information provided in Figure 3 of Regehr et al. (2007), one finds that the number of ice-free days for the 2006 season was about 105: close to the mean of the “good” ice years.

The latest “Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessment, 2006” report by Angliss and Outlaw (2007, p. 218), states that

“The Southern Beaufort Sea [polar bear] Stock is not classified as ‘depleted’ under the MMPA or listed as ‘threatened’ or ‘endangered’ under terms of the Endangered Species Act. This stock is assumed to be within optimum sustainable population levels.”

Use all important variables (Principle 10.2)

With causal models, it is important to incorporate policy variables if they might vary or if the purpose is to decide what policy to implement. H6 did not include policy variables such as seasonal protection of bears' critical habitat, or changes to hunting rules.

Other variables should also be included, such as migration, snow, and wind conditions. For example Holloway and Sou (2002), Ogi and Wallace (2007), and Nghiem et al. (2007) suggested that large-scale atmospheric winds and related patterns play an important role in causing – in some situations with significant time delays – both the decline in extent and thinning of Arctic sea ice; those effects were not correctly included in the GCM forecasts of sea ice (and hence the quality of polar bear habitat).

In addition, Dyck et al. (2007) recently noted that future scenarios of polar bear decline oversimplify the complex ecological relationships of the situation. This is why the extent and kind of polar bear adaptability is crucial to any forecasts that assume dramatic changes in the bears' environment.

Use different types of data to measure a relationship (Principle 10.5)

This principle is important when there is uncertainty about the relationships between causal variables (such as ice extent) and the event being forecast (polar bear population) and when large changes are expected in the causal variables. In the case of the latter condition, H6 accepted the GCM model predictions of large declines in summer ice throughout the 21st century, so their forecasts were sensitive to their estimate the quantitative effect of ice extent on polar bear populations.

Forecast for alternate interventions. (Principle 10.7)

AMD's forecasts were commissioned to inform public policy decisions, but they do not explicitly forecast the effects of different policies. For example, in the event of the polar bear population coming under stress due to inadequate summer food, what would be the costs and benefits of protecting areas by prohibiting marine and land-based activities at critical times? In addition, what would be the costs and benefits of a smaller but stable population of polar bears in some polar sub-regions? And how would the net costs of such alternative policies compare with the net costs of listing polar bears?

Provide easy access to the data (Principle 13.8)

The authors of the reports that we audited have refused to supply the data they used.

When assessing prediction intervals (PIs), list possible outcomes and assess their likelihoods (Principle 14.7)

To assess meaningful PIs, it helps to think of diverse possible outcomes. The H6 authors did not appear to consider, for example, the possibility that polar bears might adapt to terrestrial life over summer months by finding alternative food sources (such as is the case in the Southern Hudson Bay populations, or elsewhere; see references in Stempniewicz 2006; Dyck and Romberg 2007) or by successfully congregating in smaller or localized ice-hunting areas. Consideration of these and other possible adaptations and outcomes would have likely led the H6 authors to be less confident (provide wider prediction intervals) about a bad outcome for bears. Extending this exercise to the forecasts of climate and summer ice extent would have further widened the range of other outcomes.

Summary and conclusions

We inspected the nine administrative reports that were commissioned by the USGS with the stated purpose of supporting the listing of polar bears under the Endangered Species Act. Since the current population of bears is not at a level that causes concern, the case for listing depends upon forecasts of serious declines in bear numbers in decades to come. None of the reports included references to scientific works on forecasting methods.

We found that the two reports most relevant to the listing decision made some questionable assumptions. Even if these assumptions had been valid, the bear population forecasting procedures used in the reports contravened many important forecasting principles. Table 1 summarizes our forecasting audits of the two key reports, Amstrup et al. (2007) and Hunter et al. (2007):

Table 1: Summary ratings from the forecasting audits

<u>Principles</u>	<u>AMD</u>	<u>H6</u>
Contravened	41	61
Apparently contravened	32	19
Not auditable	26	15
Properly applied	17	10

Decision makers and the public should expect to see scientific forecasts of both the polar bear population *and* the net benefits from feasible policies before any decision is made on whether to list polar bears as threatened or endangered. We recommend that important forecasting efforts such as this should observe all relevant principles and that their procedures be audited to ensure that they do so.

Appendix: Full Disclosure of the Codings

Table A.1: Principles contravened in AMD

<i>Setting Objectives:</i>	9.5 Update models frequently.
1.2 Prior to forecasting, agree on actions to take assuming different possible forecasts.	<i>Implementing Methods: Quantitative Models with Explanatory Variables:</i>
1.3 Make sure forecasts are independent of politics.	10.6 Prepare forecasts for at least two alternative environments.
1.4 Consider whether the events or series can be forecasted.	10.8 Apply the same principles to forecasts of explanatory variables.
1.5 Obtain decision makers' agreement on methods.	10.9 Shrink the forecasts of change if there is high uncertainty for predictions of the explanatory variables.
<i>Identify Data Sources:</i>	<i>Combining Forecasts:</i>
3.5 Obtain information from similar (analogous) series or cases. Such information may help to estimate trends.	12.1 Combine forecasts from approaches that differ.
<i>Collecting Data:</i>	12.2 Use many approaches (or forecasters), preferably at least five.
4.2 Ensure that information is reliable and that measurement error is low.	12.3 Use formal procedures to combine forecasts.
<i>Selecting Methods:</i>	12.4 Start with equal weights.
6.1 List all the important selection criteria before evaluating methods.	<i>Evaluating Methods:</i>
6.2 Ask unbiased experts to rate potential methods.	13.6 Describe potential biases of forecasters.
6.7 Match the forecasting method(s) to the situation	13.10 Test assumptions for validity.
6.8 Compare track records of various forecasting methods.	13.32 Conduct explicit cost-benefit analyses.
6.10 Examine the value of alternative forecasting methods.	<i>Assessing Uncertainty:</i>
<i>Implementing Methods: General</i>	14.1 Estimate prediction intervals (PIs).
7.3 Be conservative in situations of high uncertainty or instability.	14.2 Use objective procedures to estimate explicit prediction intervals.
<i>Implementing Judgmental Methods:</i>	14.3 Develop prediction intervals by using empirical estimates based on realistic representations of forecasting situations.
8.1 Pretest the questions you intend to use to elicit judgmental forecasts.	14.5 Ensure consistency over the forecast horizon.
8.2 Frame questions in alternative ways.	14.7 When assessing PIs, list possible outcomes and assess their likelihoods.
8.5 Obtain forecasts from heterogeneous experts.	14.8 Obtain good feedback about forecast accuracy and the reasons why errors occurred.
8.7 Obtain forecasts from enough respondents.	14.9 Combine prediction intervals from alternative forecasting methods.
8.8 Obtain multiple forecasts of an event from each expert.	14.10 Use safety factors to adjust for overconfidence in the PIs.
<i>Implementing Quantitative Methods:</i>	14.11 Conduct experiments to evaluate forecasts.
9.1 Tailor the forecasting model to the horizon.	14.13 Incorporate the uncertainty associated with the prediction of the explanatory variables in the prediction intervals.
9.3 Do not use "fit" to develop the model.	

14.14 Ask for a judgmental likelihood that a forecast will fall within a pre-defined

minimum-maximum interval

Table A.2: Principles apparently contravened in AMD

Structuring the problem:

- 2.1 Identify possible outcomes prior to making forecasts.
- 2.7 Decompose time series by level and trend.

Identify Data Sources:

- 3.2 Ensure that the data match the forecasting situation.
- 3.3 Avoid biased data sources.
- 3.4 Use diverse sources of data.

Collecting Data:

- 4.1 Use unbiased and systematic procedures to collect data.
- 4.3 Ensure that the information is valid.

Selecting Methods:

- 6.4 Use quantitative methods rather than qualitative methods.
- 6.9 Assess acceptability and understandability of methods to users.

Implementing Methods: General

- 7.1 Keep forecasting methods simple.

Implementing Quantitative methods:

- 9.2 Match the model to the underlying phenomena.
- 9.4 Weight the most relevant data more heavily.

Implementing Methods: Quantitative Models with Explanatory Variables:

- 10.1 Rely on theory and domain expertise to select causal (or explanatory) variables.
- 10.2 Use all important variables.
- 10.5 Use different types of data to measure a relationship.

Combining Forecasts:

- 12.5 Use trimmed means, medians, or modes
- 12.7 Use domain knowledge to vary weights on component forecasts.
- 12.8 Combine forecasts when there is uncertainty about which method is best.
- 12.9 Combine forecasts when you are uncertain about the situation.
- 12.10 Combine forecasts when it is important to avoid large errors.

Evaluating Methods:

- 13.1 Compare reasonable methods.
- 13.2 Use objective tests of assumptions.
- 13.7 Assess the reliability and validity of the data.
- 13.8 Provide easy access to the data.
- 13.17 Examine all important criteria.
- 13.18 Specify criteria for evaluating methods prior to analyzing data.
- 13.27 Use ex post error measures to evaluate the effects of policy variables.

Assessing Uncertainty:

- 14.6 Describe reasons why the forecasts might be wrong.

Presenting Forecasts:

- 15.1 Present forecasts and supporting data in a simple and understandable form.
- 15.4 Present prediction intervals.

Learning That Will Improve Forecasting Procedures:

- 16.2 Seek feedback about forecasts.
- 16.3 Establish a formal review process for forecasting methods.

**Table A.3: Principles not rated
due to lack of information in AMD**

Structuring the problem:

2.5 Structure problems to deal with important interactions among causal variables.

Collecting data:

4.4 Obtain all of the important data

4.5 Avoid the collection of irrelevant data

Preparing Data:

5.1 Clean the data.

5.2 Use transformations as required by expectations.

5.3 Adjust intermittent series.

5.4 Adjust for unsystematic past events.

5.5 Adjust for systematic events.

5.6 Use multiplicative seasonal factors for trended series when you can obtain good estimates for seasonal factors.

5.7 Damp seasonal factors for uncertainty

Selecting Methods:

6.6 Select simple methods unless empirical evidence calls for a more complex approach.

Implementing Methods: General

7.2 The forecasting method should provide a realistic representation of the situation

Implementing Judgmental Methods:

8.4 Provide numerical scales with several categories for experts' answers.

Implementing Methods: Quantitative Models with Explanatory Variables:

10.3 Rely on theory and domain expertise when specifying directions of relationships.

10.4 Use theory and domain expertise to estimate or limit the magnitude of relationships.

Integrating Judgmental and Quantitative Methods:

11.1 Use structured procedures to integrate judgmental and quantitative methods.

11.2 Use structured judgment as inputs to quantitative models.

11.3 Use pre-specified domain knowledge in selecting, weighting, and modifying quantitative methods.

11.4 Limit subjective adjustments of quantitative forecasts.

Evaluating Methods:

13.4 Describe conditions associated with the forecasting problem.

13.5 Tailor the analysis to the decision.

13.9 Provide full disclosure of methods.

13.11 Test the client's understanding of the methods.

13.19 Assess face validity.

Assessing Uncertainty:

14.12 Do not assess uncertainty in a traditional (unstructured) group meeting.

Learning That Will Improve Forecasting Procedures:

16.4 Establish a formal review process to ensure that forecasts are used properly.

Table A.4: Principles contravened in H6

Setting Objectives:

- 1.3 Make sure forecasts are independent of politics.
- 1.4 Consider whether the events or series can be forecasted.

Structuring the problem:

- 2.6 Structure problems that involve causal chains.

Identify Data Sources:

- 3.4 Use diverse sources of data.
- 3.5 Obtain information from similar (analogous) series or cases. Such information may help to estimate trends.

Collecting Data:

- 4.4 Obtain all of the important data

Preparing Data:

- 5.2 Use transformations as required by expectations.
- 5.4 Adjust for unsystematic past events.
- 5.5 Adjust for systematic events.

Selecting Methods:

- 6.1 List all the important selection criteria before evaluating methods.
- 6.2 Ask unbiased experts to rate potential methods.
- 6.6 Select simple methods unless empirical evidence calls for a more complex approach.
- 6.7 Match the forecasting method(s) to the situation.
- 6.8 Compare track records of various forecasting methods.
- 6.10 Examine the value of alternative forecasting methods.

Implementing Methods: General

- 7.1 Keep forecasting methods simple.
- 7.2 The forecasting method should provide a realistic representation of the situation.
- 7.3 Be conservative in situations of high uncertainty or instability.
- 7.4 Do not forecast cycles.

Implementing Quantitative Methods:

- 9.1 Tailor the forecasting model to the horizon.
- 9.2 Match the model to the underlying phenomena.
- 9.3 Do not use "fit" to develop the model.
- 9.5 Update models frequently.

Implementing Methods: Quantitative Models with Explanatory Variables:

- 10.2 Use all important variables.
- 10.5 Use different types of data to measure a relationship.
- 10.7 Forecast for alternate interventions.
- 10.9 Shrink the forecasts of change if there is high uncertainty for predictions of the explanatory variables.

Integrating Judgmental and Quantitative Methods:

- 11.1 Use structured procedures to integrate judgmental and quantitative methods.
- 11.2 Use structured judgment as inputs to quantitative models.
- 11.3 Use pre-specified domain knowledge in selecting, weighting, and modifying quantitative methods.

Combining Forecasts:

- 12.1 Combine forecasts from approaches that differ.
- 12.2 Use many approaches (or forecasters), preferably at least five.
- 12.3 Use formal procedures to combine forecasts.
- 12.8 Combine forecasts when there is uncertainty about which method is best.
- 12.9 Combine forecasts when you are uncertain about the situation.
- 12.10 Combine forecasts when it is important to avoid large errors.

Evaluating Methods:

- 13.1 Compare reasonable methods.
- 13.2 Use objective tests of assumptions.
- 13.3 Design test situations to match the forecasting problem.
- 13.5 Tailor the analysis to the decision.
- 13.6 Describe potential biases of forecasters.
- 13.7 Assess the reliability and validity of the data.
- 13.8 Provide easy access to the data.

- 13.10 Test assumptions for validity.
- 13.12 Use direct replications of evaluations to identify mistakes.
- 13.13 Replicate forecast evaluations to assess their reliability.
- 13.16 Compare forecasts generated by different methods.
- 13.17 Examine all important criteria.
- 13.18 Specify criteria for evaluating methods prior to analyzing data.
- 13.26 Use out-of-sample (ex ante) error measures.
- 13.27 Use ex post error measures to evaluate the effects of policy variables.
- 13.31 Base comparisons of methods on large samples of forecasts.

Assessing Uncertainty:

- 14.3 Develop prediction intervals by using empirical estimates based on realistic representations of forecasting situations.
- 14.5 Ensure consistency over the forecast horizon.

- 14.9 Combine prediction intervals from alternative forecasting methods.
- 14.10 Use safety factors to adjust for overconfidence in the PIs.
- 14.11 Conduct experiments to evaluate forecasts.
- 14.13 Incorporate the uncertainty associated with the prediction of the explanatory variables in the prediction intervals.
- 14.14 Ask for a judgmental likelihood that a forecast will fall within a pre-defined minimum-maximum interval (not by asking people to set upper and lower confidence levels).

Presenting Forecasts:

- 15.1 Present forecasts and supporting data in a simple and understandable form.
- 15.2 Provide complete, simple, and clear explanations of methods.

Table A.5: Principles apparently contravened in H6

Setting Objectives:

- 1.1 Describe decisions that might be affected by the forecasts.
- 1.2 Prior to forecasting, agree on actions to take assuming different possible forecasts.

Structuring the problem:

- 2.1 Identify possible outcomes prior to making forecasts.
- 2.3 Decompose the problem into parts.

Identify Data Sources:

- 3.2 Ensure that the data match the forecasting situation.
- 3.3 Avoid biased data sources.

Collecting Data:

- 4.2 Ensure that information is reliable and that measurement error is low.
- 4.3 Ensure that the information is valid.

Preparing Data:

- 5.3 Adjust intermittent series.
- 5.7 Damp seasonal factors for uncertainty
- 5.8 Use graphical displays for data.

Implementing Methods: General

- 7.6 Pool similar types of data.

Implementing Methods: Quantitative Models with Explanatory Variables:

- 10.4 Use theory and domain expertise to estimate or limit the magnitude of relationships.
- 10.8 Apply the same principles to forecasts of explanatory variables.

Evaluating Methods:

- 13.4 Describe conditions associated with the forecasting problem.
- 13.9 Provide full disclosure of methods.

Assessing Uncertainty:

- 14.6 Describe reasons why the forecasts might be wrong.
- 14.7 When assessing PIs, list possible outcomes and assess their likelihoods.
- 14.8 Obtain good feedback about forecast accuracy and the reasons why errors occurred.

Table A.6: Principles not rated due to lack of information in H6

<i>Setting Objectives:</i>	<i>Evaluating Methods:</i>
1.5 Obtain decision makers' agreement on methods	13.11 Test the client's understanding of the methods
<i>Structuring the problem:</i>	13.19 Assess face validity
2.7 Decompose time series by level and trend	<i>Presenting Forecasts:</i>
<i>Identify Data Sources:</i>	15.3 Describe your assumptions
3.1 Use theory to guide the search for information on explanatory variables	<i>Learning That Will Improve Forecasting Procedures:</i>
<i>Collecting Data:</i>	16.2 Seek feedback about forecasts
4.1 Use unbiased and systematic procedures to collect data	16.3 Establish a formal review process for forecasting methods
4.5 Avoid the collection of irrelevant data	16.4 Establish a formal review process to ensure that forecasts are used properly
<i>Preparing Data:</i>	
5.1 Clean the data	
<i>Selecting Methods:</i>	
6.4 Use quantitative methods rather than qualitative methods	
6.5 Use causal methods rather than naive methods if feasible	
6.9 Assess acceptability and understandability of methods to users	

Notes

1) Our interest in the topic of this paper was piqued when the State of Alaska hired us as consultants in late-September 2007 to assess forecasts that had been prepared “to Support U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Polar Bear Listing Decision.” We were impressed by the importance of the issue and, after providing our assessment, we decided to continue working on it and to prepare a paper for publication. These latter efforts have not been funded. We take responsibility for all judgments and for any errors that we might have made.

2) On November 27, 2007, we sent a draft of our paper to the authors of the U.S. Geological Survey administrative reports that we audited and stated:

“As we note in our paper, there are elements of subjectivity in making the audit ratings. Should you feel that any of our ratings were incorrect, we would be grateful if you would provide us with evidence that would lead to a different assessment. The same goes for any principle that you think does not apply, or to any principles that we might have overlooked. There are some areas that we could not rate due to a lack of information. Should you have information on those topics, we would be interested.

Finally, we would be interested in peer review that you or your colleagues could provide, and in suggestions on how to improve the accuracy and clarity of our paper.”

We received a reply from Steven C. Amstrup on November 30, 2007 that said: “We all decline to offer preview comments on your attached manuscript. Please feel free, however, to list any of us as potential referees when you submit your manuscript for publication.”

- 3) We invite others to conduct forecasting audits of AMD, H6, any of the other papers prepared to support the endangered species listing, or any other papers relevant to long-term forecasting of the polar bear population. Note that the audit process calls for two or more raters. The audits can be submitted for publication on pubicpolicyforecasting.com along with the auditors’ bios and any information relevant potential sources of bias.
- 4) We seek information about scientifically developed forecasting studies, published or unpublished, that are relevant to polar bear forecasting.
- 5) We seek further peer review on this paper.

Acknowledgments

We thank Fred Collopy, Don Esslemont, Milton Freeman, Paul Goodwin, Benny Peiser, Tom Stewart, and Phil Tetlock for their reviews on earlier drafts. Janice Dow and Kelly Jin provided editorial assistance.

References

- Amstrup, S.C, Marcot, B.G. and Douglas, D.C. (2007). Forecasting the rangewide status of polar bears at selected times in the 21st century. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Amstrup, S.C., McDonald, T.L. and Durner, G.M. (2004). Using satellite radiotelemetry data to delineate and manage wildlife populations. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 32, 661-679.
- Amstrup, S.C., McDonald, T.L. and Stirling, I. (2001). Polar bears in the Beaufort Sea: A 30-year mark-recapture case history. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 6, 221-234.
- Amstrup, S.C., Stirling, I. and Lentfer, J.W. (1986). Past and present status of polar bears in Alaska. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 14, 241-254.
- Angliss, R.P., and Outlaw, R.B. (2007). Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2006. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-168, 244 p. Available at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/sars/ak2006.pdf>
- Armstrong, J.S. (1978; 1985). *Long-Range Forecasting: From Crystal Ball to Computer*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Armstrong, J.S. (1980). The Seer-sucker theory: The value of experts in forecasting. *Technology Review* 83 (June-July), 16-24.
- Armstrong, J.S. (2001). *Principles of Forecasting: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Armstrong, J. S. and Collopy, F. (1993). Causal Forces: Structuring Knowledge for Time-series Extrapolation. *Journal of Forecasting*, 12, 103-115.

- Ascher W. 1978. *Forecasting: An Appraisal for Policy Makers and Planners*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bergen, S., Durner, G. M., Douglas, D. C. and Amstrup, S. C. (2007). Predicting movements of female Polar bears between summer sea ice foraging habitats and terrestrial denning habitats of Alaska in the 21st Century: Proposed Methodology and Pilot Assessment, USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Brigham-Grette, J., and Hopkins, D.M. (1995). Emergent marine record and paleoclimate of the Last Interglaciation along the Northwest Alaskan coast. *Quaternary Research*, 43, 159-173.
- Cerf, C. and Navasky, V. (1998). *The Experts Speak*. New York: Pantheon. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DeWeaver, E. (2007). Uncertainty in climate model projections of Arctic sea ice decline: An evaluation relevant to polar bears. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Durner, G.M., Douglas, D.C. Nielson, R.M. Amstrup, S.C. and McDonald, T.L. (2007). Predicting the future distribution of polar bear habitat in the Polar Basin from resource selection functions applied to 21st century general circulation model projections of sea ice. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Dyck, M.G., and Romberg, S. (2007). Observations of a wild polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) successfully fishing Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*) and Fourhorn sculpin (*Myoxocephalus quadricornis*). *Polar Biology*, 30, 1625-1628.
- Dyck, M.G., Soon, W., Baydack, R.K., Legates, D.R., Baliunas, S., Ball, T.F., and Hancock, L.O. (2007). Polar bears of western Hudson Bay and climate change: Are warming spring air temperatures the “ultimate” survival control factor? *Ecological Complexity*, 4, 73-84.
- Green, K.C. and Armstrong, J.S. (2007), Global warming: forecasts by scientists versus scientific forecasts. *Energy and Environment*, 18, 997-1021.
- Hamilton, T.D., and Brigham-Grette, J. (1991). The last interglaciation in Alaska: Stratigraphy and paleoecology of potential sites. *Quaternary International*, 10-12, 49-71.
- Holloway, G., Sou, T. (2002). Has Arctic sea ice rapidly thinned? *Journal of Climate*, 15, 1691-1701.
- Hunter, C.M., Caswell, H., Runge, M.C., Amstrup, S.C., Regehr, E.V. and Stirling I. (2007). Polar bears in the Southern Beaufort Sea II: Demography and population growth in relation to sea ice conditions. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Melling, H., Riedel, D.A., and Gedalof, Z. (2005). Trends in the draft and extent of seasonal pack ice, Canadian Beaufort Sea. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32, L24501, doi:10.1029/2005GL024483.
- Nghiem, S.V., Rigor, I.G., Perovich, D.K., Clemente-Colon, P., Weatherly, J.W., and Neumann, G. (2007). Rapid reduction of Arctic perennial sea ice. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L19504, doi:10.1029/2007GL031138
- Norgaard-Pedersen, N., Mikkelsen, N., Lassen, S.J., Kristoffersen, Y., and Sheldon, E. (2007). Reduced sea ice concentrations in the Arctic Ocean during the last interglacial period revealed by sediment cores off northern Greenland. *Paleoceanography*, 22, PA1218, doi:10.1029/2006PA001283.
- Obbard, M.E., McDonald, T.L. Howe, E.J. Regehr, E.V. and Richardson, E.S. (2007). Trends in abundance and survival for polar bears from Southern Hudson Bay, Canada, 1984-2005. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Ogi, M., and Wallace, J.M. (2007). Summer minimum Arctic sea ice extent and the associated summer atmospheric circulation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L12705, doi:10.1029/2007GL029897
- Pilkey, O. H., and Pilkey-Jarvis, L. (2007). *Useless arithmetic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Regehr, E.V., Amstrup, S.C. and Stirling, I. (2006). Polar bears population status in the Southern Beaufort Sea. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Open File Report 1337.

- Regehr, E.V., Hunter, C.M. Caswell, H. Amstrup, S.C. and Stirling, I. (2007). Polar bears in the Southern Beaufort Sea I: Survival and breeding in relation to sea ice conditions, 2001-2006. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Richter-Menge, J. and Coauthors (2007). State of the climate in 2006: Arctic. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 88, S62-S71.
- Rode, K. D., Amstrup, S. C., and Regehr, E.V. (2007), Polar bears in the Southern Beaufort Sea III: Stature, mass, and cub recruitment in relationship to time and sea ice extent between 1982 and 2006. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Soon, W., Baliunas, S., Idso, S. B., Kondratyev, K. Ya., Posmentier, E. S. (2001). Modeling climatic effects of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions: Unknowns and uncertainties. *Climate Research*, 18, 259 – 275.
- Stempniewicz, L. 2006. Polar bear predatory behaviour toward moulting barnacle geese and nesting glaucous gulls on Spitsbergen. *Arctic*, 59. 247-251.
- Stirling, I. (2002). Polar bears and seals in the Eastern Beaufort Sea and Amundsen Gulf: A synthesis of population trends and ecological relationships over three decades. *Arctic*, 55 (Suppl. 1), 59-76.
- Stirling, I., McDonald, T.L. Richardson, E.S. and Regehr, E.V. (2007). Polar bear population status in the Northern Beaufort Sea. USGS Alaska Science Center, Anchorage, Administrative Report.
- Tetlock, P.E. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zhang, J. (2007). Increasing Antarctic sea ice under warming atmospheric and oceanic conditions. *Journal of Climate*, 20, 2515-2529.