

COPY

Northampton UK

14 January 2010

Mr. Matthew J. Brouillette
President & CEO
Commonwealth Foundation
225 State Street, Suite 302
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
By email to xxxxx@xxxxxx

Cc Graham Spanier, President Penn State University
By email to: xxxxx@xxxxxx
Cc Senator Jeffrey E. Piccola
By email to: xxxxx@xxxxxx

Dear Mr Brouillette,

**Email disclosures from the University of East Anglia
reveal corruption of the IPCC Assessment Process**

I commend you for your Policy Brief Vol. 22, No. 02 January 2010, in which you have laid out many of the concerns that arise from the emails that were released from the Climatic Research Unit of the University of East Anglia. You have correctly identified, as alarming, "filename: 1212063122.txt", in which Phil Jones solicits Michael Mann's assistance in deleting email correspondence in connection with the IPCC AR4 process.

Bad as the email looks without any explanation, the reason why Jones sought to erase the record and Mann appeared to be willing to comply is not widely understood but very important. It was an attempt to prevent documentary evidence emerging of the corruption of the IPCC Expert Review Process, which many had suspected.

I would draw to your attention to "Filename: 1154353922.txt", with which undisclosed attachments were sent to Jonathan Overpeck at the University of Arizona from the IPCC Working Group One Technical Support Unit, directed by Susan Solomon at UCAR/NOAA. It refers to an unpublished and unauthorised change to the IPCC Expert Review Process. The email confirms that the Lead Authors and Review Editors agreed to it at the final IPCC Working Group One Lead Authors meeting in Bergen, in late June 2006. The email does not say it, but this was when they would have first realised that Expert Reviewers of the draft objected to the citation of several papers because they failed to meet the IPCC deadline for being published or in press by 16 December 2005. This deadline was an important part of the Expert Review Process by which the

COPY

IPCC Assessment Reports claim to be the consensus of thousands of scientists.

At Bergen the Lead Authors were faced with comments from Expert Reviewers, including one from the Reviewer for the United States of America, to the effect that several papers missed the deadline, and that under the guidelines, which were then in force, all reference to them had to be removed from the IPCC Report. Had these existing guidelines been followed, the McIntyre and McKittrick papers would have been the last word on the 'hockey stick'. At least one of the papers that made up the Chapter 6 "spaghetti diagram" should also have been removed under the guidelines in force at the time of the assessment.

To avoid this difficulty the deadline was changed by Martin Manning from 16 December 2005, which was before the start of the IPCC Expert Review Process, to the 24 July 2006 – a month after its end, thus entirely circumventing it. The new deadline instruction did however state unambiguously that it related only to papers published in 2006. The Lead Authors responded to the comments that pointed out the missed deadlines with various replies, of which the one nearest to being open and transparent was [sic]:

Rejected, guidelines used for preparing the draft have been followed and new guidelines do not pose problems.

The IPCC rules require that all expert comments be put in an open archive, but it required FOIA requests to ensure that they were available on the Internet. The comments and responses that I have so far referred to are online at:

<http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/7786989>

The email from the TSU to Overpeck shows that, after the end of the originally scheduled review stage, additional relevant comments were made by Expert Reviewers and sent to Overpeck, who then sent them to Keith Briffa at the Climatic Research Unit of the University of East Anglia. These and the Lead Authors' responses have never been made public. One Expert Reviewer requested the inclusion of the National Research Council Report on 'Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000 Years' (NRC, 2006) and the report of Wegman et al., 2006, which had been prepared for a Committee of the House of Representatives. NRC, 2006 is cited in the IPCC Report but not in relation to Mann's 'hockey stick' as was requested. The Wegman report is not cited by the IPCC although it was peer-reviewed and was published on 14 July 2006. It specifically confirmed the statistical flaws in the 'hockey stick'.

Another contentious issue revealed in the emails is that a paper by Caspar Ammann of NCAR and Eugene Wahl of NOAA, which at the time of IPCC assessment was not even accepted for publication, was cited as the authority for critical claims in a companion paper, Wahl and Ammann, 2007. The continued citation of this latter, also unpublished, paper in the IPCC report was only possible due to the improper change in publication deadlines but was strictly on the basis that it was to be published in 2006, before the IPCC Report

itself. The unpublished Wahl and Ammann paper cited by the IPCC thus relied upon the other Ammann and Wahl paper to dispute the already published and peer-reviewed papers, which showed Mann's 'hockey stick' failed important statistical verification tests. Expert Reviewers pointed this out in their comments. These comments with the Lead Authors' responses, written most likely by Briffa, are published at Harvard but strongly suggest that Ammann and/or Wahl had closely advised the wording.

Files 1153470204.txt, dated 18 July 2006 and 1155402164.txt dated 31 July 2006 show that Briffa gave Wahl an unfair advantage over McIntyre and McKittrick to, "confidentially", influence the IPCC report in violation of the IPCC Principle of being "comprehensive, objective, open and transparent". In 1155402164.txt Wahl tells Briffa that he cannot guarantee that the Ammann and Wahl paper will be published in 2006. Both must have known that no professional journal would publish a paper heavily reliant upon another unpublished paper and indeed the papers were published together in August 2007, effectively invalidating the IPCC Assessment Process.

You may note that earlier in file 1147982305.txt, Professor Neil Roberts of the University of Plymouth sent a "private" comment to Coordinating Lead Author Jonathan Overpeck with a relevant comment on the second draft of Chapter 6. Overpeck replied on 18 May 2006 with copies to Briffa and Eystein Jansen explaining to Roberts that his comments must go through the official IPCC Review process. Roberts comment and a positive response does indeed appear in the Harvard open archive as comment 6-85.

After telling Roberts and Briffa "We've been asked to keep everything squeaky clean" we find Overpeck, in file 1148266730.txt on 21 May 2006, dissembling over the "in press" Wahl and Amman paper which, according to the then current rules, should have been in press on 16 December 2005 or citations of it removed from the IPCC Report.

In an earlier relaxation to the deadline, the TSU had said that by late February 2006 the TSU had to be in possession of a preprint but in May it was still not clear which was the final version. In reality the finally published Wahl and Ammann, 2007, paper shows an acceptance date of 1 March 2006 and is significantly different from the earlier drafts as Wahl admits to Jones in 1189722851.txt. Clearly its citation in the IPCC report was improper and known to be so by all concerned.

At the beginning of 2008 I began to ask questions of the Review Editor, John Mitchell, of the British Met Office who had overseen the expert review process of Chapter 6. Rather than answer my letter he forwarded it to Susan Solomon whose reply I have attached. You will note that many were advised of my enquiries, including Keith Briffa even before I made any approach to him. As a consequence of Briffa ignoring a later request to him in person, I made a formal request to UEA/CRU on 5 May 2008 for all the information on the IPCC AR4 assessment process.

COPY

After learning of the changes in the publication guidelines after the Bergen meeting, I sent specific details of what I was looking for to UEA/CRU on 27 May 2008. The same day, in 1211924186.txt, Tim Osborn from CRU asked Ammann if his emails were confidential. Ammann replies that he would check and on 28 May 2008, in 1212009215.txt, UEA/CRU management discussed my request for information. When Ammann had not replied on 29 May 2008, Jones asked Mann to delete all AR4 emails and get Wahl to do the same.

No significant information was released as a result of requests made to the Met Office, UEA/CRU, Reading or Oxford Universities under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. However those released on the Internet in November 2009 show there were good reasons why they would resist disclosure.

This is not just a scandal about Jones and Mann or the Climatic Research Unit and Penn State University. It involves the controlling circle of individuals that has steered IPCC reports from the second assessment onwards. The inclusion of Renate Christ in Solomon's email shows, the scandal was at least known about in the IPCC Secretariat and Bureau and should have been known to the Panel and its government representatives.

Penn State University and the University of East Anglia are to be commended for promptly recognising the importance of this matter and announcing enquiries. The individual chosen to head the enquiry at the University of East Anglia has impeccable credentials and I have no reason to doubt that Penn State University's enquiries will rely upon a person of equal standing, but I share your concern over the perception of a conflict of interest. I would add my concern that enquiries set up by the institutions may not have the resources or the inclination to reach into the dark areas of the IPCC Process, which this email snapshot reveals and which is the driving force of the behaviour it shows.

I am particularly concerned that Penn State University announced yesterday that they would be completing their enquiry at the end of January without, so far as I am aware, having made any call for evidence from such as myself to explain what the emails are about. The issues that I have described are just a few among the many that require a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent investigation.

Yours Sincerely,

David Holland MIET
xxxxxxx@xxxxxx
+44 1nnn nnnnnn

COPY

Subject: Re: [Wg1-ar4-re] FW: IPCC Review Editors report.

Date: Fri, 14 Mar 2008 11:52:09 -0600

From: Susan Solomon <Susan.Solomon@noxxxxov>

To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist) <john.f.mitchell@metoffxxxxxx>, wg1-ar4-re@joss.ucar.edu, rchrist@xxxxxt, ipcc-wg1@ucar.edu

CC: Brian Hoskins <hoskins@mexxxxg.ac.uk>, k.briffa@xxxxxx, jean.jouzel@xxxxxxx

Referenc <E40ECC4BCBB70543AB323A3492ACB3464C0A01@EXXMAIL01.desktop.frd.metoffice.c om>
es:

John

I feel that the most appropriate response will be from you, since you have been queried.

I will offer the following points that may be useful to you or others in replying to the queries that you or other REs may have received but of course it is up to you how you wish to respond.

The IPCC process assesses the published scientific and technical literature or, in some cases 'gray literature', based on the judgment of the authors. In general gray literature is used very seldom in WG1 although such material as industry technical reports are used more frequently in WG3. Unpublished draft papers or technical reports referenced in the chapters are made available to reviewers for the purposes of the review, not the underlying datasets used. IPCC does not have the mandate nor resources to operate as a clearing house for the massive amounts of data used in the underlying papers referenced. The governance of conduct of research, and the governance and requirements of the scientific literature are not IPCC's role.

The review editors do not determine the content of the chapters. The authors are responsible for the content of their chapters and responding to comments, not REs. Further explanations, elaboration, or re-interpretations of the comments or the author responses, would not be appropriate. All of the comments, and all of the authors' responses, have been made available. These are the proper source for anyone seeking to understand what comments were made and how the authors dealt with them, and it would be inappropriate to provide more information beyond the reference to the web pages where this can be found.

best regards,

Susan

COPY

At 12:23 PM +0000 3/14/08, Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist) wrote:

Susan

I have received the following letter from David Holland, who has links with Stephen McIntyre and his Climate Audit website, on the review process for chapter 6 of AR4 . I have discussed this briefly with Jean and we do not think there is an issue. However, given the wider nature of the questions, I think it would be more appropriate for any response to come through IPCC rather than me as an individual. I will wait to hear from IPCC before I respond. I am in Exeter for the first three days of next week (+44 nnnn nnnnnn) if you want to discuss this further.

I understand Brian has received a similar enquiry, hence I have included his name on the copy list.

John