

# **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST**

## **Part 2(b)**

**Emails between paper  
authors 30<sup>th</sup> May to 12<sup>th</sup>  
June 2012**

**Gergis emails 1 - 64**

Subject: FW: Gergis et al 2012  
Date: Thursday, 31 May 2012 10:33 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Gergis et al 2012

sigh....

----- Forwarded Message

From: Steve McIntyre <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca>  
Date: Wed, 30 May 2012 20:30:52 -0400  
To: 'Raphael Neukom' <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>, Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: 'JCLIM Chief Editor' <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, <valerie.masson@cea.fr>  
Subject: RE: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Sir and Madame,

Gergis et al 2012 states:

Our temperature proxy network was drawn from a broader Australasian domain  
(90°E 140°W,  
10°N 80°S) containing 62 monthly/annually resolved climate proxies from  
approximately 50 sites  
201 (see details provided in Neukom and Gergis, 2011).

You've archived the 27 series that you screened from the 62, but have not archived  
the original population of 62 series that entered into the analysis. Could you  
please provide me with a copy of this data.

Pretty please with sugar on it,  
Steve McIntyre

From: JCLIM Chief Editor [mailto:jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu]  
Sent: May-30-12 8:01 PM  
To: Steve McIntyre  
Cc: Raphael Neukom; Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr. McIntyre,

Thank you for your inquiry. Please communicate directly with the authors  
regarding access to their data.

Sincerely,  
Tony Broccoli

On 5/27/2012 11:06 PM, Steve McIntyre wrote:  
Since I originally looked for this data late last week, I notice that the 27 proxy  
series retained in the Australia analysis have been archived at NOAA. This is good  
and appreciated. However, since these are screened from a larger population, the  
original population needs to be archived as well. Thanks very much, Steve McIntyre

From: Steve McIntyre [mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca]  
Sent: May-27-12 3:09 PM  
To: Anthony Broccoli (jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu)  
Cc: Raphael Neukom (neukom@giub.unibe.ch); Joelle Gergis  
(jgergis@unimelb.edu.au)  
Subject: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr Broccoli,  
I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.

There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.

The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the one that is made available.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,  
Stephen McIntyre

----- End of Forwarded Message

Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012  
Date: Friday, 1 June 2012 2:00 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Steve McIntyre <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca>, 'Raphael Neukom' <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Cc: 'JCLIM Chief Editor' <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, <valerie.masson@cea.fr>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Gergis et al 2012

Mr McIntyre

We have already archived all the records needed to replicate the analysis presented in our Journal of Climate paper with NOAA's World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/recons.html>

While the vast majority of the records contained in the full Australasian network are already lodged with NOAA, some records are not yet publically available. Some groups are still publishing their work, others have only released their data for use in a particular study and so on.

The compilation of this database represents years of our research effort based on the development of our professional networks. We risk damaging our work relationships by releasing other people's records against their wishes. Clearly this is something that we are not prepared to do.

We have, however, provided an extensive contact list of all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study 'Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years' published in The Holocene (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate protocol of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis etc, just as we have done. This is commonly referred to as 'research'.

We will not be entertaining any further correspondence on the matter.

Regards

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 31/05/12 10:30 AM, "Steve McIntyre" <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca> wrote:

Dear Sir and Madame,

Gergis et al 2012 states:

Our temperature proxy network was drawn from a broader Australasian domain (90°E-140°W, 10°S-20°S) containing 62 monthly-annually resolved climate proxies from approximately 50 sites (see details provided in Neukom and Gergis, 2011).

You've archived the 27 series that you screened from the 62, but have not archived the original population of 62 series that entered into the analysis. Could you please provide me with a copy of this data.

Pretty please with sugar on it,  
Steve McIntyre

From: JCLIM Chief Editor [mailto:jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu]  
Sent: May-30-12 8:01 PM  
To: Steve McIntyre  
Cc: Raphael Neukom; Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr. McIntyre,

Thank you for your inquiry. Please communicate directly with the authors regarding access to their data.

Sincerely,  
Tony Broccoli

On 5/27/2012 11:06 PM, Steve McIntyre wrote:  
Since I originally looked for this data late last week, I notice that the 27 proxy series retained in the Australia analysis have been archived at NOAA. This is good and appreciated. However, since these are screened from a larger population, the original population needs to be archived as well. Thanks very much, Steve McIntyre

From: Steve McIntyre [mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca]  
Sent: May-27-12 3:09 PM  
To: Anthony Broccoli (jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu)  
Cc: Raphael Neukom (neukom@giub.unibe.ch); Joelle Gergis (jgergis@unimelb.edu.au)  
Subject: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr Broccoli,  
I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the

last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.

There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.

The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the one that is made available.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,  
Stephen McIntyre

Subject: Climate Audit post  
Date: Friday, 1 June 2012 3:47 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED], Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>,  
"s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Climate Audit post

We should all be aware that this is unfolding:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

On 1/06/12 3:27 PM, "David Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi,

Gavin is a good guy, with lots of experience dealing with M&M.

I suggest that you forward to Gavin your recent email to McIntyre. I believe that you cannot release data which was provided to you for your own use and on the condition that it was not more widely released.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Joelle Gergis  
Sent: 01 June 2012 14:59  
To: Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly  
Subject: FW: unsolicited advice

----- Forwarded Message  
From: "Schmidt, Gavin A. (GISS-6110)" <gavin.a.schmidt@nasa.gov  
<UrlBlockedError.aspx> >  
Date: Thu, 31 May 2012 23:53:23 -0500  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au <UrlBlockedError.aspx> >  
Subject: unsolicited advice

Joelle, (not sure that we've met, but we have been in at least indirect email contact, so I hope you don't mind the familiarity! Plus we are on the same committee now...)

4

Subject: Re: reprint request  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 10:11 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <jrbouldin@ucdavis.edu>  
Conversation: reprint request

Hi Jim

Here's a link to the paper:

<http://climatehistory.com.au/publications/>

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 2/06/12 2:35 AM, "Jim Bouldin" <jrbouldin@ucdavis.edu> wrote:

Dear Joelle,

Could I please get a copy of your early online paper at J. Climate titled: "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" including any supplemental information that may exist. My institutional subscription does not allow access to "early online" papers.

Thank you,  
Jim Bouldin



5

Subject: FW: Information Query  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 10:18 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <mike@asecretcountry.com>  
Cc: Rebecca Scott <rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Information Query

Mr Williams

The majority of records used in our study are already available on the NOAA World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology.

For anything else, we have provided an extensive contact list of all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study "Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years" published in The Holocene (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate protocol of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis etc

Regards

Joelle

----- Forwarded Message

From: Rebecca Scott <rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 08:22:29 +1000  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Joshua Cockfield <jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Fwd: Information Query

Hi all,

Please see email I have received which needs your attention on Monday

Regards, Rebecca

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mike Williams <mike@asecretcountry.com>  
Date: 2 June 2012 7:46:17 AM AEST  
To: "rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au" <rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Information Query  
Reply-To: Mike Williams <mike@asecretcountry.com>

Hi Rebecca.

I found your email link on this page  
<http://newsroom.melbourne.edu/studio/ep-149>  
The article is talking about this paper here

<<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>>

I am after the 35 "Climate Proxies" the authors did not use for their study.  
Could you forward them to me please.

Thanks

Mike Williams

----- End of Forwarded Message

6

Subject: RE: Data Request  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 11:28 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Mike Williams <mike@asecretcountry.com>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Rebecca Scott  
<rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Data Request

Dear Mr Williams,

Thank you for your interest in our study.  
You should have already received a reply to your data request from Dr Gergis, the  
lead author on the paper. It describes exactly where and how you can access those  
data. It was sent at 10:19am this morning.

Best wishes, Data

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Mike Williams [mike@asecretcountry.com]  
Sent: 02 June 2012 10:49  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Data Request

Dr Karoly

I was told by Dr Gergis to contact you.  
Could you please send me the unused 35 "Climate Proxies" from your paper listed  
below.

Thanks for you time

Mike Williams

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

7

Subject: RE: Gergis et al 2012  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 11:39 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Anthony Broccoli <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, "amspubs@ametsoc.org"  
<amspubs@ametsoc.org>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
<jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Gergis et al 2012

Hi Tony,

Can you provide clear guidance on the data access and data archival policies for papers in AMS journals?

There is no clear guidance in the information for authors in the Authors' Guides section of the AMS Periodicals web site. Section 2 of the file listed under Ethical Guidelines for Authors etc states:

"2. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information (literature and data) and methodology used to permit the author's peers to test the paper's scientific conclusions."

Our manuscript does that.

Steve McIntyre in his email below says that he would like our paper to be retracted (or even rejected) because it does not meet his data access requirements.

What are the AMS data access requirements for publications in AMS journals?

Best wishes, David

-----  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
-----

From: Joelle Gergis  
Sent: 28 May 2012 11:39  
To: Anthony Broccoli  
Cc: Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

Hi Anthony

This is the first time Steven McIntyre has requested data used in our recently released Journal of Climate paper:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

If he had the courtesy of asking us directly, we would have informed him that we have archived all records used in the analysis through the NOAA World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/recons.html>

Given the paper was only released on 17 May, NOAA are still in the process of developing a feature page for the reconstruction, but here is the draft:

[http://hurricane.ncdc.noaa.gov/pls/paleox/f?p=519:1:3345151224849419:::Pl\\_STUDY\\_ID:12915](http://hurricane.ncdc.noaa.gov/pls/paleox/f?p=519:1:3345151224849419:::Pl_STUDY_ID:12915)

We are not in a position to pass on the entirety of our database as some records are not yet publically available. It has taken years to develop working relationships with individual researchers, some groups are still publishing their work, others have only released their data for a particular study and so on.

The compilation of this database represents years of our research effort based on the development of our professional networks. We risk damaging our working relationships by releasing other people's records against their wishes so is clearly something we are unprepared to do to satisfy the curiosity of a notorious climate change skeptic.

We did, however, provide an extensive contact list for all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study "Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years" published in The Holocene (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate process of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis and so on, just as we have done.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 28/05/12 5:09 AM, "Steve McIntyre" <[smcintyre25@yahoo.ca](mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca)> wrote:

> Dear Dr Broccoli,  
> I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual  
> late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction  
> spanning the last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.  
>  
> There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of

> paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several  
> committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once  
> again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the  
> proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission  
> from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please  
> retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom  
> and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.  
>  
> The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset  
> from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the  
> one that is made available.  
>  
> Thank you for your attention.  
>  
> Yours truly,  
> Stephen McIntyre  
>  
>

8

Subject: RE: Data Request  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 11:51 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Mike Williams <mike@asecretcountry.com>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Data Request

Dear Mr Williams,

I am one of the authors of the Gergis et al study, not one of the original authors of the studies referred to by Dr Gergis.

I think that you have misinterpreted the content of the email that you received from Dr Gergis. It said in the relevant part:

"For anything else, we have provided an extensive contact list of all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study 'Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years' published in The Holocene (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate protocol of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis etc"

You will need to access the list of the data contributors in Table S3 in the study referred to above, published recently in the journal "The Holocene", look for the data that is publicly available in the NOAA web site for the NOAA World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology, and then contact the original authors of the studies and data sets listed in Table S3, as we have done, for the other data sets.

All the data that were used in the reconstructions in our study that you found fascinating are available at the NOAA WDC for Palaeoclimatology at <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/recons.html>

Best wishes, David

PS I am going to spend the rest of the weekend doing things other than replying to your emails.

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Mike Williams [mike@asecretcountry.com]  
Sent: 02 June 2012 11:36  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Data Request

Dear Prof Karoly

Thank you for your interest in our study.

I find it fascinating.!

You should have already received a reply to your data request from Dr Gergis, the lead author on the paper. It describes exactly where and how you can access those data. It was sent at 10:19am this morning.

Yes I did thanks.

"...follow the appropriate protocol of contacting the original authors.."

I am contacting the original authors, you are one of them.  
Could I have the data please.

Thanks

Mike Williams

Best wishes, Data

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Mike Williams [mike@asecretcountry.com]  
Sent: 02 June 2012 10:49  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Data Request

Dr Karoly

I was told by Dr Gergis to contact you.  
Could you please send me the unused 35 "Climate Proxies" from your paper listed below.

Thanks for you time

Mike Williams

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>



9

Subject: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 7:03 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Rosanne D'arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>, <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>, Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsley's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record

(listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>

Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000

To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>

Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Guys,

No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the moment.

I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he didn't let on what was behind it.

Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his commentary.

I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper look at it this weekend).

Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.

He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

Best wishes,  
Tas

---

Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232 3209 and DELETE the message.

Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

----- End of Forwarded Message

10

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Saturday, 2 June 2012 9:50 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Rosanne D'Arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Thanks Rosanne, can I please just confirm if this is an ok to partial or full release?

Hope all's well with you

Joelle

On 02/06/2012, at 9:03 PM, "Rosanne D'Arrigo" <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu> wrote:

Joelle - ok  
cheers  
Rosanne

On Jun 2, 2012, at 5:04 AM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>

Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000

To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>,

Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Guys,

No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had....he didn't let on what was behind it.

Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his commentary.

I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper look at it this weekend).

Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.

He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

Best wishes,  
Tas

---

Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232 3209 and DELETE the message.

Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

----- End of Forwarded Message  
<Neukom\_and\_Gergis\_Holocene\_2012.pdf><NOAA\_PAGES 2k Data Availability for

Reviewers of 2k T Consortium Paper.doc>

Rosanne D'Arrigo  
Associate Director, Biology and Paleoenvironment Division  
Lamont Research Professor, Tree-Ring Lab  
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University

rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu  
TEL 845-365-8617  
FAX 845-365-8152

11

Subject: Re: unsolicited advice  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:09 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: "Schmidt, Gavin A. (GISS-6110)" <gavin.a.schmidt@nasa.gov>  
Conversation: unsolicited advice

Hi Gavin

Thanks for your email. Unfortunately I received it after I already responded to McIntyre (below) after discussion with senior colleagues.

As you might imagine I am in a difficult situation here.

Firstly, earlier in the week I was copied on to a barrage of emails directed to journal editors and IPCC lead authors demanding that all Neukom and Gergis work be retracted from journals and the IPCC palaeo chapter draft. I found this extremely aggressive behaviour as he had not yet contacted me once directly to ask. Needless to say this got me offside immediately, hence my unwillingness to cooperate with him from the start.

Unlike the Northern Hemisphere, an extensive consolidation of high resolution Southern Hemisphere records has only happened very recently. Raphael Neukom and I published this compilation in *The Holocene*, just presenting a C20th climate sensitivity assessment.

Even for this analysis based on the instrumental period, some groups were very sensitive about the release of their records as many groups are still actively publishing, extending further back in time etc etc but agreed to allow their record to be involved in the review.

It was a very delicate exercise to access all of the SH records. As leader of the PAGES Aus2K group I have done my very best to encourage full release of records but sometimes this just isn't possible. Instead, we have made explicit agreements with some groups about their records use and release, which we really must honour to keep people involved in the sort of large-scale multi proxy work our groups and others around the world are trying to do.

As you mentioned, we also have a major paper on SH temperature nearing submission which uses the full SH database. Obviously we will be releasing all records used in that study online if/when it is published but not before. It has taken us years to compile the data so hopefully it makes sense that we would be entitled to publish it first.

In the case of the Australasian subset, as I mentioned in the email I sent McIntyre, the vast majority of the records are already accessible on the NOAA website. There were a few non publically available records that were used in the R27 temperature network. So what I did was email the group asking to release the processed version of the records used in the study, and thankfully they agreed. These previously non public records are all found here:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

If McIntyre could be bothered to read our SH review paper and look online, he would see that now only eight records from Australasia require permission:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O ice core record  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na ice core record



Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180 coral records  
Kathy Allen's CTP west tree ring record  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris tree ring records  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw tree ring record

Over the weekend I have been busy discussing the issue with our team and the above data providers. The best solution we could come up with was the release of the 1921-1990 calibration section of the record needed to replicate our screening process and make this available at the above link.

Four of the groups have agreed to this partial release, and I am still waiting for the other two to get back to me. I anticipate that possibly only one of the groups may not agree (but I will keep my fingers crossed).

As you can see, it is difficult to keep everyone happy here. I think it is completely lazy of McIntyre to expect people to run around and do his 'research' for him. So while I want to be as transparent as possible (we most certainly have nothing to hide), there is a trust process involved in this sort of collaborative research that needs to be maintained.

If you have any other thoughts or advice on this, I'd be very happy to hear it!

Thanks for being in touch, hope you're well...

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Date: Fri, 1 Jun 2012 14:00:37 +1000  
To: Steve McIntyre <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca>, 'Raphael Neukom' <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Cc: 'JCLIM Chief Editor' <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, <valerie.masson@cea.fr>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

Mr McIntyre

We have already archived all the records needed to replicate the analysis presented in our Journal of Climate paper with NOAA's World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/recons.html>

While the vast majority of the records contained in the full Australasian network are already lodged with NOAA, some records are not yet publically available. Some

groups are still publishing their work, others have only released their data for use in a particular study and so on.

The compilation of this database represents years of our research effort based on the development of our professional networks. We risk damaging our work relationships by releasing other people's records against their wishes. Clearly this is something that we are not prepared to do.

We have, however, provided an extensive contact list of all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study 'Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years' published in *The Holocene* (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate protocol of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis etc, just as we have done. This is commonly referred to as 'research'.

We will not be entertaining any further correspondence on the matter.

Regards

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 31/05/12 10:30 AM, "Steve McIntyre" <[smcintyre25@yahoo.ca](mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca)> wrote:

> Dear Sir and Madame,  
>  
> Gergis et al 2012 states:  
>  
> Our temperature proxy network was drawn from a broader Australasian domain  
> (90°E-140°W,  
> 10°N-80°S) containing 62 monthly-annually resolved climate proxies from  
> approximately 50 sites  
> 201 (see details provided in Neukom and Gergis, 2011).  
>  
> You've archived the 27 series that you screened from the 62, but have not  
> archived the original population of 62 series that entered into the analysis.  
> Could you please provide me with a copy of this data.  
>  
> Pretty please with sugar on it,  
> Steve McIntyre

>  
>  
>  
>  
>

> From: JCLIM Chief Editor [mailto:jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu]  
> Sent: May-30-12 8:01 PM  
> To: Steve McIntyre  
> Cc: Raphael Neukom; Joelle Gergis  
> Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

> Dear Dr. McIntyre,

> Thank you for your inquiry. Please communicate directly with the authors  
> regarding access to their data.

> Sincerely,  
> Tony Broccoli

> On 5/27/2012 11:06 PM, Steve McIntyre wrote:  
> Since I originally looked for this data late last week, I notice that the 27  
> proxy series retained in the Australia analysis have been archived at NOAA.  
> This is good and appreciated. However, since these are screened from a larger  
> population, the original population needs to be archived as well. Thanks very  
> much, Steve McIntyre

> From: Steve McIntyre [mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca]  
> Sent: May-27-12 3:09 PM  
> To: Anthony Broccoli (jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu)  
> Cc: Raphael Neukom (neukom@giub.unibe.ch); Joelle Gergis  
> (jgergis@unimelb.edu.au)  
> Subject: Gergis et al 2012

> Dear Dr Broccoli,

> I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual  
> late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction  
> spanning the last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.

> There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of  
> paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several  
> committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once  
> again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the  
> proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission  
> from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please  
> retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom  
> and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.

> The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset  
> from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the  
> one that is made available.

> Thank you for your attention.

> Yours truly,

> Stephen McIntyre  
>  
>  
>

----- End of Forwarded Message

On 1/06/12 2:53 PM, "Schmidt, Gavin A. (GISS-6110)" <gavin.a.schmidt@nasa.gov> wrote:

> Joelle, (not sure that we've met, but we have been in at least indirect email  
> contact, so I hope you don't mind the familiarity! Plus we are on the same  
> committee now...)

>  
> This is just a quick note related to the data archiving for your J. Clim  
> paper. As you are no doubt well aware, this has (unsurprisingly) got the  
> attention of Steve McIntyre et al, and they have already started on their  
> critiques.

>  
> While there is no chance whatsoever that they will examine your work and find  
> no faults, the one area where you don't want to be seen to be at fault is on  
> the area of data access. While the R27 proxies have been archived at NCDC, the  
> wider data set from which these were picked has not. This leads you open to  
> the charge of inappropriate cherry picking. While I think your justifications  
> and validations of the reconstruction are good (though I look forward to  
> reading the Neukom et al, in prep paper), there is very little with as much  
> 'skeptical resonance' as withholding data (for whatever reason). If it is at all  
> possible, I strongly urge you to put the whole thing online somewhere ASAP -  
> don't do this to please McIntyre (an impossibility), but do it so that  
> McIntyre et al are deprived of a talking point.

>  
> Please don't let yourself and your paper (and PAGES-2k indirectly) become  
> another part of the litany of skeptic complaints about data - because once  
> this gets going, it doesn't go away - regardless of the justification,  
> subsequent vindication, integrity of the method, or robustness of the results.  
> If people are going to criticise you (and they will), you are much, much  
> better off fighting the battles on the statistical methods side than the data  
> withholding side (for one thing, very few people understand or follow  
> technical criticisms, while almost everyone understands criticisms about data  
> access).

> with regards,

> Gavin

> =====

> Gavin Schmidt  
> NASA/Goddard Institute for Space Studies  
> 2880 Broadway  
> New York, NY 10025  
> Tel: (212) 678 5627  
> Email: Gavin.A.Schmidt@nasa.gov  
> URL: <http://www.giss.nasa.gov/staff/gschmidt.html>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:15 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>, Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks for this Tas

I will wait to hear from Mark and Ian to see if it is ok to release the attached record published in Goodwin 2004.

Please let me know if you are happy with partial (1921-1990) or full release of the record on NOAA.

All the best

Joelle

On 2/06/12 7:43 PM, "Tas van Ommen" <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au> wrote:

> Hi All,  
>  
> To be clear - the only data used in the screening for rejected series is  
> 1921-1990.  
>  
> Ironically, in the Law Dome d18O case, this time slice is already archived  
> from some years back (1800-2000AD), and I've already passed a copy to McIntyre  
> today.  
>  
> Data outside this time window have had no involvement in the Aus2k  
> reconstruction and for LD, I want to have this data subject to peer review  
> before public release. This is imminent anyway.  
>  
> I believe this is a sensible approach and hard to criticize (surely review of  
> data sets prior to release makes sense). If common sense appears not to be  
> defensible then I will reconsider, but I think this is a reasonable position.  
>  
> For LD sodium, a 700 year series is already publicly archived with The  
> Australian Antarctic Data Centre. It is probably identical to the series Ian  
> Goodwin provided. In recent times there have been a few tiny dating  
> improvements, but none I know of in the calibration/screening period. I would  
> support release of the 1921-90 sodium data, with a note to point out that a  
> longer series is archived at AADC, BUT Mark Curran and Ian Goodwin should be  
> the final advisors on this.  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> Tas  
>  
>  
>  
> Sent from mobile  
>

> On 02/06/2012, at 19:08, "Joelle Gergis" <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:  
>  
>> Hi everyone  
>>  
>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction  
>> for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>  
>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>  
>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>  
>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in  
>> this study publically available.  
>>  
>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change  
>> sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for  
>> discussion on his blog:  
>>  
>>  
>> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more>  
>> -16194  
>>  
>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he  
>> was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI,  
>> begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>  
>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to  
>> proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any  
>> further.  
>>  
>> Tas Van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the  
>> calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>  
>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek  
>> permission to use:  
>>  
>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d18O, Tonga\_TNI2\_d18O  
>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>  
>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your  
>> record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>  
>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full  
>> record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is  
>> currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>

>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined  
>> in the attached Word document).

>>  
>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width  
>> measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study  
>> is only made available.

>>  
>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga  
>> records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware  
>> that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while  
>> since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

>>  
>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data  
>> access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this  
>> is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's  
>> research effort.

>>  
>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

>>  
>> Thanks in advance for your help with this

>>  
>> Joelle

>>  
>> --

>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>

>>  
>>  
>>

>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

>>  
>> UNCLASSIFIED

>>  
>> Hi Guys,

>>  
>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law  
>> Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had....he didn't  
>> let on what was behind it.

>>  
>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't  
>> mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date  
>> with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request

>> to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his  
>> commentary.  
>>  
>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email.  
>> This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the  
>> same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider and  
>> Steig 2006, and which he has access to.  
>>  
>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is  
>> that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all  
>> likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper  
>> look at it this weekend).  
>>  
>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants  
>> now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for  
>> correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for  
>> the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual  
>> correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.  
>>  
>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not  
>> necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his  
>> approach, or this issue, please come back to me.  
>>  
>> Best wishes,  
>> Tas

---

>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are  
>> not the  
>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>> communication is  
>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>> transmission in error,  
>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232  
>> 3209 and  
>> DELETE the message.  
>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

>> ----- End of Forwarded Message  
>> <Neukom\_and\_Gergis\_Holocene\_2012.pdf>  
>> <NOAA\_PAGES 2k Data Availability for Reviewers of 2k T Consortium Paper.doc>

---

> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are  
> not the  
> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
> communication is  
> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
> transmission in error,  
> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232



> 3209 and  
> DELETE the message.  
> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>  
>

---

13

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:17 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Dear Kathy

Thanks very much for your support on this.

Just to be clear you are happy for me to post the 1921-1990 portion of the processed CTP west record with NOAA but not the full processed data set like CTP east:

[ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/contributions\\_by\\_author/gergis2012/gergis2012australasia.txt](ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/contributions_by_author/gergis2012/gergis2012australasia.txt)

While I hope that the strategy of proving all records for the calibration period only, I anticipate he will still try and demand the full record.

Please let me know how you'd like me to proceed.

Hope all is well with you

Joelle

On 3/06/12 11:36 AM, "Kathryn Allen" <kathryn.allen@monash.edu> wrote:

> Hi Joelle et al.,

>

> More than happy for you to send the west coast CTP 1921 - 1990 as Tas  
> suggested. i think it would probably be clearer, and force greater  
> transparency on McIntyre's behalf (and better comparison with the  
> original reconstruction), to send on the processed version of the  
> record for this time period.

>

> Cheers,

> Kathy

>

>

> On 02/06/2012, Joelle Gergis <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

>> Hi everyone

>>

>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

>>

>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

>>

>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>> study are now archived with NOAA:

>>

>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

>>

>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in  
>> this study publically available.

>>  
>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change  
>> sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for  
>> discussion on his blog:  
>>  
>>  
<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more>  
>> -16194  
>>  
>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he  
>> was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI,  
>> begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>  
>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to  
>> proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any  
>> further.  
>>  
>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the  
>> calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>  
>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
>> seek permission to use:  
>>  
>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>  
>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>  
>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full  
>> record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is  
>> currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>  
>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>  
>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width  
>> measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study  
>> is only made available.  
>>  
>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga  
>> records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware  
>> that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while  
>> since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>  
>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
>> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly  
>> this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising

>> anyone's research effort.  
>>  
>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>>  
>> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>> --  
>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
>>  
>> UNCLASSIFIED  
>>  
>> Hi Guys,  
>>  
>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law  
>> Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had....he didn't  
>> let on what was behind it.  
>>  
>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up  
>> to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his  
>> request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his  
>> commentary.  
>>  
>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email.  
>> This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the  
>> same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider and  
>> Steig 2006, and which he has access to.  
>>  
>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is  
>> that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all  
>> likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper  
>> look at it this weekend).  
>>  
>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants  
>> now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for

>> correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for  
>> the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual  
>> correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some  
>> purpose.  
>>  
>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and  
>> not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around  
>> his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.  
>>  
>> Best wishes,  
>> Tas  
>>  
>>  

---

>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are  
>> not the  
>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>> communication is  
>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>> transmission in error,  
>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232  
>> 3209 and  
>> DELETE the message.  
>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>  
>>  

---

>> ----- End of Forwarded Message  
>>  
>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:19 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi Matt

Thanks for your positive response to this. I will wait to hear back from you once you speak with your HoD before releasing anything.

Just to be clear, please let me know if you are happy with partial (1921-1990) or full release of the record on NOAA.

Look forward to hearing from you again soon.

Thanks again

Joelle

On 4/06/12 10:58 AM, "Matthew Brookhouse" <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:

> Joelle  
>  
> Don't apologise - I'm sorry to see you pursued in this way. Asides, it  
> seems that the headache is all yours not ours.  
>  
> As we discussed, the snow gum record was under development at the time.  
> I have since accessed a larger set of dead/fallen trees to enrich the  
> dataset. I am happy to have the data I provided made more openly  
> accessible. I can only re-iterate that at the time the dataset was under  
> development (and has subsequently been added to) and was unpublished at  
> the time.  
>  
> Before you do make my data publicly available, I wish to seek advice  
> from the HoS here to see whether there is paperwork for me to handle  
> prior to releasing data.  
>  
> m  
>  
>  
> On 2/06/2012 7:04 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>> Hi everyone  
>>  
>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>  
>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>  
>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>  
>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used

>> in this study publically available.  
>>  
>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate  
>> change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database  
>> for discussion on his blog:  
>>  
>>  
>> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more>  
>> -16194  
>>  
>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
>> he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of  
>> FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>  
>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
>> to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this  
>> situation any further.  
>>  
>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
>> the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>  
>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
>> seek permission to use:  
>>  
>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d18O, Tonga\_TNI2\_d18O  
>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>  
>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>  
>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
>> full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection  
>> that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>  
>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>  
>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
>> width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in  
>> our study is only made available.  
>>  
>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
>> Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I  
>> am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has  
>> been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>  
>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
>> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations.

>> Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without  
>> jeopardising anyone's research effort.

>>  
>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

>>  
>> Thanks in advance for your help with this

>>  
>> Joelle

>>  
>> --

>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>

>>  
>>

>>

>> ----- Forwarded Message

>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>

>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000

>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]; Joelle Gergis

>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran

>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>

>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

>>

>> UNCLASSIFIED

>>

>> Hi Guys,

>>

>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the  
>> Law Dome d18O data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had....he  
>> didn't let on what was behind it.

>>

>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were  
>> up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got  
>> back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the  
>> purpose of his commentary.

>>

>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an  
>> email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the  
>> data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d18O that was used by  
>> Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

>>

>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude  
>> is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in  
>> all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a  
>> proper look at it this weekend).

>>

>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he



>> wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period  
>> for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be  
>> considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting  
>> back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would  
>> also serve some purpose.

>>

>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another,  
>> and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions  
>> around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

>>

>> Best wishes,

>> Tas

>>

>>

---

>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia

>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you  
>> are not the

>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>> communication is

>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>> transmission in error,

>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3  
>> 6232 3209 and

>> DELETE the message.

>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

>>

>>

>>

>> ----- End of Forwarded Message

>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:56 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Excellent, thanks Kathy.

For McIntyre's purposes I will provide 1921-1990 in a file with the calibration correlations and lodge with the JOC paper's data files on NOAA.

Rosanne and Matt have both agreed to their full length processed chronologies being released.

That way we can include it in the Aus2K collection being compiled here:

[http://hurricane.ncdc.noaa.gov/pls/paleox/f?p=519:7:3516930148315244:::P1\\_STUDY\\_ID,P1\\_SCIENCE\\_KEYWORD\\_ID:12718,83](http://hurricane.ncdc.noaa.gov/pls/paleox/f?p=519:7:3516930148315244:::P1_STUDY_ID,P1_SCIENCE_KEYWORD_ID:12718,83):

That way we can all avoid endless data requests (unless they want raws).

Hope this seems sensible to you, just let me know if not!

Joelle

On 4/06/12 11:48 AM, "Kathryn Allen" <kathryn.allen@monash.edu> wrote:

> Hi Joelle,  
>  
> Yes, pls. provide the 1921 - 1990 portion of the record. I don't have  
> any objections to providing the full (processed) record either. If  
> the majority of others in the Aus2k group want to provide their full  
> records, then pls. also do so for my west ctp also. If however, the  
> general consensus is just to provide the shorter period, then I'll go  
> along with this.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> kathy  
>  
>  
> On 04/06/2012, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:  
>> Dear Kathy  
>>  
>> Thanks very much for your support on this.  
>>  
>> Just to be clear you are happy for me to post the 1921-1990 portion of the  
>> processed CTP west record with NOAA but not the full processed data set like  
>> CTP east:  
>>  
>>  
>> ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/contributions\_by\_author/gergis2012/ger  
>> gis2012australasia.txt  
>>  
>> While I hope that the strategy of proving all records for the calibration  
>> period only, I anticipate he will still try and demand the full record.

>>  
>> Please let me know how you'd like me to proceed.  
>>  
>> Hope all is well with you  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> On 3/06/12 11:36 AM, "Kathryn Allen" <kathryn.allen@monash.edu> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Hi Joelle et al.,  
>>>  
>>> More than happy for you to send the west coast CTP 1921 - 1990 as Tas  
>>> suggested. i think it would probably be clearer, and force greater  
>>> transparency on McIntyre's behalf (and better comparison with the  
>>> original reconstruction), to send on the processed version of the  
>>> record for this time period.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> Kathy  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 02/06/2012, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:  
>>>> Hi everyone  
>>>>  
>>>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>>>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>>>  
>>>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>>>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used  
>>>> in  
>>>> this study publically available.  
>>>>  
>>>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate  
>>>> change  
>>>> sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for  
>>>> discussion on his blog:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> [http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#mo](http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more)  
>>>> re  
>>>> -16194  
>>>>  
>>>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>>>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
>>>> he  
>>>> was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of  
>>>> FOI,  
>>>> begun an online smear campaign etc

>>>>  
>>>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
>>>> to  
>>>> proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation  
>>>> any  
>>>> further.  
>>>>  
>>>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>>>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
>>>> the  
>>>> calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>>>  
>>>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
>>>> seek permission to use:  
>>>>  
>>>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
>>>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>>>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
>>>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>>>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>>>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>>>  
>>>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
>>>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>>>  
>>>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
>>>> full  
>>>> record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that  
>>>> is  
>>>> currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>>>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>>>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>>>  
>>>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
>>>> width  
>>>> measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our  
>>>> study  
>>>> is only made available.  
>>>>  
>>>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
>>>> Tonga  
>>>> records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am  
>>>> aware  
>>>> that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a  
>>>> while  
>>>> since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>>>  
>>>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
>>>> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations.  
>>>> Clearly  
>>>> this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising  
>>>> anyone's research effort.  
>>>>

>>>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

>>>>

>>>> Thanks in advance for your help with this

>>>>

>>>> Joelle

>>>>

>>>> --

>>>> Dr Joelle Gergis

>>>> Climate Research Fellow

>>>> School of Earth Sciences

>>>> University of Melbourne,

>>>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>>>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868

>>>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761

>>>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> ----- Forwarded Message

>>>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>

>>>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000

>>>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Joelle Gergis

>>>> <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

>>>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran

>>>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>

>>>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

>>>>

>>>> UNCLASSIFIED

>>>>

>>>> Hi Guys,

>>>>

>>>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the

>>>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the

>>>> Law

>>>> Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had....he

>>>> didn't

>>>> let on what was behind it.

>>>>

>>>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that

>>>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were

>>>> up

>>>> to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back

>>>> his

>>>> request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of

>>>> his

>>>> commentary.

>>>>

>>>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening

>>>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an

>>>> email.

>>>> This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is

>>>> the

>>>> same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider

>>>> and

>>>> Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

>>>>

>>>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude

>>>> is  
>>>> that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all  
>>>> likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a  
>>>> proper  
>>>> look at it this weekend).  
>>>>  
>>>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he  
>>>> wants  
>>>> now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for  
>>>> correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered  
>>>> for  
>>>> the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual  
>>>> correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some  
>>>> purpose.  
>>>>  
>>>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another,  
>>>> and  
>>>> not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions  
>>>> around  
>>>> his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.  
>>>>  
>>>> Best wishes,  
>>>> Tas  
>>>>

---

>>>>  
>>>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
>>>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you  
>>>> are  
>>>> not the  
>>>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>>>> communication is  
>>>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>>>> transmission in error,  
>>>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3  
>>>> 6232  
>>>> 3209 and  
>>>> DELETE the message.  
>>>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>  
>>>>

---

>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ----- End of Forwarded Message  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 12:03 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Great thanks Mark

On 4/06/12 12:00 PM, "Mark Curran" <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au> wrote:

Hi,

The Law Dome 700 year monthly chemistry data is available on the AADC. Anyone can average May June and July to reproduce the Goodwin series, however I agree with Tas that we make it a straightforward so I have requested the attached data be added to the AADC.

Once it appears I will give you the link.

Cheers

Mark

\*\*\*\*\*

Dr Mark A J Curran  
Senior ice core chemist  
Australian Antarctic Division and Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC  
Private Bag 80 Hobart, Tasmania 7001 Australia

Phone 03 6226 1876 Int +61 3 6226 1876  
Fax 03 6226 2902 Int +61 3 6226 2902

Email: mark.curran@utas.edu.au

Web: www.aad.gov.au <http://www.aad.gov.au/> & www.acecrc.org.au  
<http://www.acecrc.org.au/>

\*\*\*\*\*

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]  
Sent: Monday, 4 June 2012 11:15 AM  
To: Tas van Ommen; Andrew Moy; Ian Goodwin; Mark Curran  
Cc: Raphael Neukom  
Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Thanks for this Tas

I will wait to hear from Mark and Ian to see if it is ok to release the attached record published in Goodwin 2004.

Please let me know if you are happy with partial (1921-1990) or full release of the record on NOAA.

All the best

Joelle

On 2/06/12 7:43 PM, "Tas van Ommen" <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au> wrote:

> Hi All,

>

> To be clear - the only data used in the screening for rejected series is  
> 1921-1990.

>

> Ironically, in the Law Dome d18O case, this time slice is already archived  
> from some years back (1800-2000AD), and I've already passed a copy to McIntyre  
> today.

>

> Data outside this time window have had no involvement in the Aus2k  
> reconstruction and for LD, I want to have this data subject to peer review  
> before public release. This is imminent anyway.

>

> I believe this is a sensible approach and hard to criticize (surely review of  
> data sets prior to release makes sense). If common sense appears not to be  
> defensible then I will reconsider, but I think this is a reasonable position.

>

> For LD sodium, a 700 year series is already publicly archived with The  
> Australian Antarctic Data Centre. It is probably identical to the series Ian  
> Goodwin provided. In recent times there have been a few tiny dating  
> improvements, but none I know of in the calibration/screening period. I would  
> support release of the 1921-90 sodium data, with a note to point out that a  
> longer series is archived at AADC, BUT Mark Curran and Ian Goodwin should be  
> the final advisors on this.

>

> Regards,

>

> Tas

>

>

>

>

> Sent from mobile

>

> On 02/06/2012, at 19:08, "Joelle Gergis" <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

>

>> Hi everyone

>>

>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction  
>> for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

>>

>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

>>

>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the



>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>  
>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in  
>> this study publically available.  
>>  
>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change  
>> sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for  
>> discussion on his blog:  
>>  
>>  
>> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>  
>>  
>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he  
>> was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI,  
>> begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>  
>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to  
>> proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any  
>> further.  
>>  
>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the  
>> calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>  
>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek  
>> permission to use:  
>>  
>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>  
>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your  
>> record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>  
>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full  
>> record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is  
>> currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>  
>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined  
>> in the attached Word document).  
>>  
>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width  
>> measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study  
>> is only made available.  
>>  
>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga  
>> records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware

>> that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while  
>> since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>  
>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data  
>> access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this  
>> is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's  
>> research effort.  
>>  
>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>>  
>> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>> --  
>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Joelle Gergis  
>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
>>  
>> UNCLASSIFIED  
>>  
>> Hi Guys,  
>>  
>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law  
>> Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he didn't  
>> let on what was behind it.  
>>  
>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't  
>> mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date  
>> with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request  
>> to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his  
>> commentary.  
>>  
>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email.  
>> This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the  
>> same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by Schneider and  
>> Steig 2006, and which he has access to.  
>>  
>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is

>> that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all  
>> likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper  
>> look at it this weekend).

>>

>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants  
>> now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for  
>> correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for  
>> the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual  
>> correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.

>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not  
>> necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his  
>> approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

>>

>> Best wishes,

>> Tas

>>

>>

---

>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia

>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are  
>> not the

>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>> communication is

>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>> transmission in error,

>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232  
>> 3209 and

>> DELETE the message.

>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

>>

>>

>>

>> ----- End of Forwarded Message

>> <Neukom\_and\_Gergis\_Holocene\_2012.pdf>

>> <NOAA\_PAGES 2k Data Availability for Reviewers of 2k T Consortium Paper.doc>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

---

Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia

IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not  
the

intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this

communication is  
strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this transmission  
in error,  
please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232 3209  
and  
DELETE the message.

Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

Subject: FW: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 2:43 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

----- Forwarded Message  
From: Matthew Brookhouse <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Organization: Australian National University  
Reply-To: <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Date: Mon, 4 Jun 2012 10:58:20 +1000  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Joelle

Don't apologise - I'm sorry to see you pursued in this way. Asides, it seems that the headache is all yours not ours.

As we discussed, the snow gum record was under development at the time. I have since accessed a larger set of dead/fallen trees to enrich the dataset. I am happy to have the data I provided made more openly accessible. I can only re-iterate that at the time the dataset was under development (and has subsequently been added to) and was unpublished at the time.

Before you do make my data publicly available, I wish to seek advice from the HoS here to see whether there is paperwork for me to handle prior to releasing data.

m

On 2/06/2012 7:04 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

> Hi everyone  
>  
> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>  
> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>  
> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>  
> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>  
> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used  
> in this study publically available.  
>  
> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate  
> change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database  
> for discussion on his blog:  
>  
>  
<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

>  
> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
> he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of  
> FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc  
>  
> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
> to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this  
> situation any further.  
>  
> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
> the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>  
> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
> seek permission to use:  
>  
> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>  
> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>  
> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
> full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection  
> that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>  
> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>  
> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>  
> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
> width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in  
> our study is only made available.  
>  
> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
> Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I  
> am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has  
> been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>  
> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations.  
> Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without  
> jeopardising anyone's research effort.  
>  
> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>  
> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>  
> Joelle  
>

> --

> Dr Joelle Gergis  
> Climate Research Fellow  
> School of Earth Sciences  
> University of Melbourne,  
> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
> <http://climatehistory.com.au>

>

>

>

> ----- Forwarded Message

> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]; Joelle Gergis  
> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

>

> UNCLASSIFIED

>

> Hi Guys,

>

> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the  
> Law Dome d18O data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he  
> didn't let on what was behind it.

>

> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were  
> up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got  
> back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the  
> purpose of his commentary.

>

> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an  
> email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the  
> data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d18O that was used by  
> Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

>

> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude  
> is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in  
> all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a  
> proper look at it this weekend).

>

> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he  
> wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period  
> for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be  
> considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting  
> back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would  
> also serve some purpose.

>

> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another,  
> and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions  
> around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

>  
> Best wishes,  
> Tas  
>  
-----  
> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you  
> are not the  
> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
> communication is  
> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
> transmission in error,  
> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3  
> 6232 3209 and  
> DELETE the message.  
> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>  
>  
-----  
>  
>  
> ----- End of Forwarded Message

--  
Dr Matthew Brookhouse  
Post-doctoral research fellow  
  
Division of Plant Sciences  
Research School of Biology, ANU

----- End of Forwarded Message



18

Subject: FW: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 2:45 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

This is Rosanne's response....does this mean the processed chronology?

----- Forwarded Message

From: Rosanne D'arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 09:58:53 -0400  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Joelle I think crn only

On Jun 2, 2012, at 7:50 AM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Thanks Rosanne, can I please just confirm if this is an ok to partial or full release?

Hope all's well with you

Joelle

On 02/06/2012, at 9:03 PM, "Rosanne D'Arrigo" <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu> wrote:

Joelle - ok  
cheers  
Rosanne

On Jun 2, 2012, at 5:04 AM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in *The Holocene*, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d18O, Tonga\_TNI2\_d18O  
Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow

School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Guys,

No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law Dome d18O data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he didn't let on what was behind it.

Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his commentary.

I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d18O that was used by Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper look at it this weekend).

Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.

He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

Best wishes,  
Tas

---

Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia

IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232 3209 and DELETE the message.  
Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

----- End of Forwarded Message

<Neukom\_and\_Gergis\_Holocene\_2012.pdf><NOAA\_PAGES 2k Data Availability for Reviewers of 2k T Consortium Paper.doc>

Rosanne D'Arrigo  
Associate Director, Biology and Paleoenvironment Division  
Lamont Research Professor, Tree-Ring Lab  
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University

rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu  
TEL 845-365-8617  
FAX 845-365-8152

----- End of Forwarded Message

19

Subject: Re: Climate audit post and paleo data  
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 2:46 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Climate audit post and paleo data

Thanks for checking this David, much appreciated

On 3/06/12 8:00 AM, "David Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Joelle and Raphi,

I sent an email to Myles Allen seeking clarification on what he meant by his "name and shame" comments that are being used by Steve McIntyre. Response is below. He is saying that the journals data policy and the decisions by the editor should determine the specific data access and archive policies for all papers submitted to that journal, not requests from individuals.

I hope this clarifies what Myles meant and how it is being misused by McIntyre.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Myles Allen [myles.allen@ouce.ox.ac.uk]  
Sent: 02 June 2012 18:23  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Climate audit post and paleo data

Hi David,

What I said was that disclosure should be up to journal editors, not FoI lawyers. If the editor thinks that a dataset is relevant and a challenge is serious, then he or she should be in a position to require disclosure of the relevant data or code or demand a paper's retraction. Journals that consistently fail to do so can be named and shamed (but not banned Ñ banning journals is always a bad idea). I'm not suggesting anything radical here: I think this is just a statement of the way things have been since the 17th century, and the way things work in most other branches of science.

I realise I shouldn't have put it the way I did in the post, and I'm sorry to have caused you unnecessary trouble.

Myles

From: David John Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Date: Friday, 1 June 2012 22:26

To: Myles Allen <allen@atm.ox.ac.uk>  
Subject: Climate audit post and paleo data

Hi Myles,

Steve M is using a post by you to criticise a recent study on which I am a coauthor.  
<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

Please have a look at the post and let me know what you meant by the post of yours that Steven is referring to.

In particular, can you look at the response from Joelle Gergis and see if our approach to making the proxy data available meets your expectations for data availability.

All proxy data used in the reconstruction are available on the NOAA palaeoclimate web site. All of the proxy data that were screened to identify the records that showed the strongest relationship to interannual temperature variations in the region are described in an accompanying paper in The Holocene. The specific data sites, proxy series, publications describing those data and the sources of the data are listed in the Supp Material of the paper in the Holocene. Some of those screened records are not publicly available but were obtained from the scientists who originally obtained the data. They are still working on the data and have not made it publicly available on a web site yet, but they are willing to make it available to any researcher who requests it. All the data used in our reconstruction are publicly available.

Does your view express in the post on the M&M site indicate that you would not support the publication of our paper because some data that were not used in the reconstruction are not publicly available. That is what Steven M is arguing? This requirement would, if applied to model simulations, mean that all failed model runs, which were rejected due to errors or poor agreement with observational data, would need to be made publicly available before a paper could be published, even though those data were not used in the analysis, because such data were used in the development of the model? Is that what you mean?

It would be good to get a clearer understanding of your views and what you meant about journal publication policy and open data access.

By the way, we have compared the millenium temp reconstruction for Australasia with climate model simulations to evaluate temp variability on decadal and multi-decadal time scales (but not multi-century timescales) in the paper.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

20

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Tuesday, 5 June 2012 1:00 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi Matt

Any luck with this?

Can you please confirm that partial (1921-1990) or full release of your record in raw or processed format?

Hope to hear from you when you get a moment

Thanks

Joelle

On 4/06/12 10:58 AM, "Matthew Brookhouse" <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:

> Joelle  
>  
> Don't apologise - I'm sorry to see you pursued in this way. Asides, it  
> seems that the headache is all yours not ours.  
>  
> As we discussed, the snow gum record was under development at the time.  
> I have since accessed a larger set of dead/fallen trees to enrich the  
> dataset. I am happy to have the data I provided made more openly  
> accessible. I can only re-iterate that at the time the dataset was under  
> development (and has subsequently been added to) and was unpublished at  
> the time.  
>  
> Before you do make my data publicly available, I wish to seek advice  
> from the HoS here to see whether there is paperwork for me to handle  
> prior to releasing data.  
>  
> m  
>  
>  
> On 2/06/2012 7:04 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>> Hi everyone  
>>  
>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>  
>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>  
>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>  
>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used  
>> in this study publically available.

>>  
>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate  
>> change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database  
>> for discussion on his blog:  
>>  
>>  
<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more>  
>> -16194  
>>  
>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
>> he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of  
>> FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>  
>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
>> to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this  
>> situation any further.  
>>  
>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
>> the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.  
>>  
>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
>> seek permission to use:  
>>  
>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d18O, Tonga\_TNI2\_d18O  
>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>  
>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>  
>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
>> full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection  
>> that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>  
>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>  
>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>  
>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
>> width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in  
>> our study is only made available.  
>>  
>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
>> Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I  
>> am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has  
>> been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>  
>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
>> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations.  
>> Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without



>> jeopardising anyone's research effort.  
>>  
>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>>  
>> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>> --  
>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>>  
>>  
>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Joelle Gergis  
>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
>>  
>> UNCLASSIFIED  
>>  
>> Hi Guys,  
>>  
>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the  
>> Law Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he  
>> didn't let on what was behind it.  
>>  
>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were  
>> up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got  
>> back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the  
>> purpose of his commentary.  
>>  
>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an  
>> email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the  
>> data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by  
>> Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.  
>>  
>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude  
>> is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in  
>> all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a  
>> proper look at it this weekend).  
>>  
>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he  
>> wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period

>> for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be  
>> considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting  
>> back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would  
>> also serve some purpose.

>>

>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another,  
>> and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions  
>> around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

>>

>> Best wishes,

>> Tas

>>

>>

---

>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia

>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you  
>> are not the

>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>> communication is

>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>> transmission in error,

>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3  
>> 6232 3209 and

>> DELETE the message..

>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

>>

>>

>>

>> ----- End of Forwarded Message

>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Tuesday, 5 June 2012 1:13 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Thanks for the quick response, much appreciated!

I would like to release the processed versions as these are the ones we used in the study.

Just so you know, we considered the 1818-2002 part of your record. Ideally we would like to release the full length so that we aren't accused of "hiding" the rest (we are dealing with very aggressive, unreasonable people here)

Please let me know what your HOS thinks

Thanks again for your help with this

Joelle

On 5/06/12 1:04 PM, "Matthew Brookhouse" <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:

> Joelle  
>  
> I'm between two appointments at the moment and am at Fenner tomorrow.  
> I'll let you know of the HOS's comments then. In the interim, yes,  
> 1921-1990 (that seems to be the span at issue) and I'm happy to take  
> your advice on whether raw or processed would be appropriate.  
>  
> m  
>  
> On 5/06/2012 1:00 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>> Hi Matt  
>>  
>> Any luck with this?  
>>  
>> Can you please confirm that partial (1921-1990) or full release of your  
>> record in raw or processed format?  
>>  
>> Hope to hear from you when you get a moment  
>>  
>> Thanks  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>>  
>> On 4/06/12 10:58 AM, "Matthew Brookhouse"  
>> <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Joelle  
>>>  
>>> Don't apologise - I'm sorry to see you pursued in this way. Asides, it

>>> seems that the headache is all yours not ours.  
>>>  
>>> As we discussed, the snow gum record was under development at the time.  
>>> I have since accessed a larger set of dead/fallen trees to enrich the  
>>> dataset. I am happy to have the data I provided made more openly  
>>> accessible. I can only re-iterate that at the time the dataset was under  
>>> development (and has subsequently been added to) and was unpublished at  
>>> the time.  
>>>  
>>> Before you do make my data publicly available, I wish to seek advice  
>>> from the HoS here to see whether there is paperwork for me to handle  
>>> prior to releasing data.  
>>>  
>>> m  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On 2/06/2012 7:04 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>>>> Hi everyone  
>>>>  
>>>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>>>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>>>  
>>>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the  
>>>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used  
>>>> in this study publically available.  
>>>>  
>>>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate  
>>>> change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database  
>>>> for discussion on his blog:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>  
>>>> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>  
>>>>  
>>>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>>>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
>>>> he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of  
>>>> FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>>>  
>>>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
>>>> to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this  
>>>> situation any further.  
>>>>  
>>>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see  
>>>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
>>>> the calibration process so that they can validate our screening  
>> procedure.  
>>>>  
>>>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to  
>>>> seek permission to use:

>>>>  
>>>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
>>>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>>>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
>>>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>>>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>>>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>>>  
>>>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of  
>>>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>>>  
>>>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
>>>> full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection  
>>>> that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>>>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>>>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>>>  
>>>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
>>>> width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in  
>>>> our study is only made available.  
>>>>  
>>>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
>>>> Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I  
>>>> am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has  
>>>> been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.  
>>>>  
>>>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that  
>>>> data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations.  
>>>> Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without  
>>>> jeopardising anyone's research effort.  
>>>>  
>>>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>>>>  
>>>> Joelle  
>>>>  
>>>> --  
>>>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>>>> Climate Research Fellow  
>>>> School of Earth Sciences  
>>>> University of Melbourne,  
>>>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>>>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>>>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>>>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>>>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>>>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>>>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis

>>>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>>>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>>>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>>>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
>>>>  
>>>> UNCLASSIFIED  
>>>>  
>>>> Hi Guys,  
>>>>  
>>>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>>>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the  
>>>> Law Dome d180 data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he  
>>>> didn't let on what was behind it.  
>>>>  
>>>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
>>>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were  
>>>> up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got  
>>>> back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the  
>>>> purpose of his commentary.  
>>>>  
>>>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>>>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an  
>>>> email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the  
>>>> data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d180 that was used by  
>>>> Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.  
>>>>  
>>>> I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude  
>>>> is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in  
>>>> all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a  
>>>> proper look at it this weekend).  
>>>>  
>>>> Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he  
>>>> wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period  
>>>> for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be  
>>>> considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting  
>>>> back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would  
>>>> also serve some purpose.  
>>>>  
>>>> He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another,  
>>>> and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions  
>>>> around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.  
>>>>  
>>>> Best wishes,  
>>>> Tas  
>>>>  
>>>>  

---

  
>>>> Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
>>>> IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you  
>>>> are not the  
>>>> intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this  
>>>> communication is  
>>>> strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this  
>>>> transmission in error,  
>>>> please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3  
>>>> 6232 3209 and  
>>>> DELETE the message.

>>>> Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

>>>>

>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

>>>>

>

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Tuesday, 5 June 2012 3:04 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Thanks very much for this Matt, please know I really appreciate this!

On 5/06/12 2:35 PM, "Matthew Brookhouse" <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:

> Joelle  
>  
> I managed to hunt down the HoS during lunch. There are no limits at an  
> institutional level other than to ensure my original ownership of the  
> data. Based on your advice, I'm happy for the 1818-2002 processed data  
> to be released.  
>  
> Good luck.  
>  
> m  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> On 5/06/2012 1:13 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>> Thanks for the quick response, much appreciated!  
>>  
>> I would like to release the processed versions as these are the ones we  
>> used in the study.  
>>  
>> Just so you know, we considered the 1818-2002 part of your record.  
>> Ideally we would like to release the full length so that we aren't  
>> accused of "hiding" the rest (we are dealing with very aggressive,  
>> unreasonable people here)  
>>  
>> Please let me know what your HOS thinks  
>>  
>> Thanks again for your help with this  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> On 5/06/12 1:04 PM, "Matthew Brookhouse" <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Joelle  
>>>  
>>> I'm between two appointments at the moment and am at Fenner tomorrow.  
>>> I'll let you know of the HOS's comments then. In the interim, yes,  
>>> 1921-1990 (that seems to be the span at issue) and I'm happy to take  
>>> your advice on whether raw or processed would be appropriate.  
>>>  
>>> m



>>>  
>>> On 5/06/2012 1:00 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>>>> Hi Matt  
>>>>  
>>>> Any luck with this?  
>>>>  
>>>> Can you please confirm that partial (1921-1990) or full release of your  
>>>> record in raw or processed format?  
>>>>  
>>>> Hope to hear from you when you get a moment  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks  
>>>>  
>>>> Joelle  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On 4/06/12 10:58 AM, "Matthew Brookhouse"  
>>>> <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Joelle  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Don't apologise - I'm sorry to see you pursued in this way. Asides, it  
>>>>> seems that the headache is all yours not ours.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> As we discussed, the snow gum record was under development at the time.  
>>>>> I have since accessed a larger set of dead/fallen trees to enrich the  
>>>>> dataset. I am happy to have the data I provided made more openly  
>>>>> accessible. I can only re-iterate that at the time the dataset was under  
>>>>> development (and has subsequently been added to) and was unpublished at  
>>>>> the time.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Before you do make my data publicly available, I wish to seek advice  
>>>>> from the HoS here to see whether there is paperwork for me to handle  
>>>>> prior to releasing data.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> m  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On 2/06/2012 7:04 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>>>>>> Hi everyone  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature  
>>>>>> reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used  
>> in the  
>>>>>> study are now archived with NOAA:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used  
>>>>>> in this study publically available.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate

>>>>> change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database  
>>>>> for discussion on his blog:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>  
http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more  
>>>>> -16194  
>>>>>  
>>>>> My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking  
>>>>> permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly  
>>>>> he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with  
>> threats of  
>>>>> FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way  
>>>>> to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this  
>>>>> situation any further.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request  
>> (see  
>>>>> below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in  
>>>>> the calibration process so that they can validate our screening  
>>> procedure.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we  
>> need to  
>>>>> seek permission to use:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
>>>>> Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
>>>>> Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
>>>>> Kathy Allen's CTP west  
>>>>> Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
>>>>> Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990  
>> portion of  
>>>>> your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the  
>>>>> full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection  
>>>>> that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> (note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K  
>>>>> network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe  
>>>>> outlined in the attached Word document).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring  
>>>>> width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version  
>> used in  
>>>>> our study is only made available.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your  
>>>>> Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I

>>>>> am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has  
>>>>> been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an  
>> update.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate  
>> that  
>>>>> data access lies at the heart of their cherry picking accusations.  
>>>>> Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without  
>>>>> jeopardising anyone's research effort.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Thanks in advance for your help with this  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Joelle  
>>>>>  
>>>>> --  
>>>>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>>>>> Climate Research Fellow  
>>>>> School of Earth Sciences  
>>>>> University of Melbourne,  
>>>>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>>>>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>>>>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>>>>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ----- Forwarded Message  
>>>>> From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
>>>>> Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
>>>>> To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
>>>>> <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
>>>>> Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran  
>>>>> <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
>>>>> Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
>>>>>  
>>>>> UNCLASSIFIED  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Hi Guys,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the  
>>>>> moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the  
>>>>> Law Dome d18O data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he  
>>>>> didn't let on what was behind it.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that  
>>>>> didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives  
>> were  
>>>>> up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got  
>>>>> back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the  
>>>>> purpose of his commentary.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening  
>>>>> correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an  
>>>>> email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the  
>>>>> data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d18O that was



23

Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 9:46 AM  
From: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, David Karoly  
<dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi Joelle and David,

As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper in journal of climate today.

It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did not use detrended data.

The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and was very negligent not to check this carefully.

Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these words may cause troubles.

Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that we can find a good way to correct it.

David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

Thanks a lot and best regards  
Raphi

24

Subject: FW: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 10:32 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi Brad

Any luck thinking this through?

I have had positive responses from the others in this group so am just waiting to hear back from you.

No doubt you are busy, but if you get a moment, it would be great to hear from you.

All the best  
Joelle

----- Forwarded Message

From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 19:03:34 +1000  
To: Rosanne D'arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>, <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>, Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Subject: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear

campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in *The Holocene*, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180  
Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 12:29:47 +1000  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Mark Curran <Mark.Curran@aad.gov.au>, Andrew Moy <Andrew.Moy@aad.gov.au>  
Subject: ClimateAudit [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Guys,

No news to you I'm sure that Steve M is on the Aus2k paper trail at the moment. I was alerted this morning when he wrote to me asking where the Law Dome d18O data was at and citing a 4 year old exchange we had...he didn't let on what was behind it.

Anyway, I've looked at the blog and made an initial neutral reply that didn't mention Gergis et al, in which I stated that public archives were up to date with what had been published for LD. I then immediately got back his request to have the data I provided for Gergis et al. for the purpose of his commentary.

I've taken the approach that if he really wants to check the screening correlation he can have the 1921-90 data, which I then provided in an email. This was particularly smooth to do, because that portion of the data is the same as the publicly archived Law Dome d18O that was used by Schneider and Steig 2006, and which he has access to.

I am not going to provide any of the rest of the LD data, as my attitude is that it needs first to be in a reviewed publication (which will in all likelihood be the SH reconstruction ... Raphi: I'm going to take a proper look at it this weekend).

Anyway, just so you know - Steve M can replicate the screening if he wants now (as far as LD is concerned). Providing just the 1921-90 period for correlation "checking" might be an alternative that could be considered for the other screened-out series. Mind you, simply quoting back the actual correlation values for the screened out series would also serve some purpose.

He can be a bit tricky in terms of playing one group against another, and not necessarily telling the whole story. If you have any questions around his approach, or this issue, please come back to me.

Best wishes,  
Tas

---

Australian Antarctic Division - Commonwealth of Australia  
IMPORTANT: This transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that use or dissemination of this



communication is  
strictly prohibited by Commonwealth law. If you have received this transmission  
in error,  
please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephoning +61 3 6232 3209  
and  
DELETE the message.  
Visit our web site at <http://www.antarctica.gov.au/>

---

----- End of Forwarded Message

----- End of Forwarded Message

25

Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 11:12 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi David

We should discuss this via a 3-person Skype call this afternoon (morning in Zurich) if possible.

Raphi got to bed at 2am going through all of this so I'm not sure if he will be up and at work at his usual time of 3:30-4pm Melbourne time.

Can you please provide a range of times that suits this afternoon/evening?

Thanks

Joelle

On 6/06/12 9:58 AM, "David Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

> Oops, let me think about this a little and then get back to you. We will need  
> to have a skype call, agree on what to do in terms of analysis, probably new  
> analysis, and then how to minimise the damage.

>

> There is one good point: the results and the paper can be improved through  
> this correction.

>

> Best wishes, David

>

> ~~~~~

> Prof David Karoly

> School of Earth Sciences

> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

> ~~~~~

>

>

> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

> Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46

> To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly

> Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>

> Hi Joelle and David,

>

> As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper  
> in journal of climate today.

>

> It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the  
> paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening  
> based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did  
> not use detrended data.

>  
> The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the  
> paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy  
> selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore  
> had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and  
> was very negligent not to check this carefully.  
>  
> Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would  
> not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically  
> justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these  
> words may cause troubles.  
>  
> Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to  
> write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to  
> correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.  
>  
> I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that  
> we can find a good way to correct it.  
>  
> David your advice on this would be very much appreciated  
>  
> Thanks a lot and best regards  
> Raphi  
>  
>  
>

26

Subject: Correction to Real Climate post  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 12:07 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <steig@u.washington.edu>  
Conversation: Correction to Real Climate post

Hi Eric

Thanks for posting a story on the release of our new Australasian temperature paper on RealClimate:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2012/05/fresh-hockey-sticks-from-the-southern-hemisphere/#more-11894>

I just noticed there is a technical error in your assessment of our work. You say:

The conclusion reached is that summer temperatures in the post-1950 period were warmer than anything else in the last 1000 years at high confidence, and in the last ~400 years at very high confidence.

In fact we have high confidence in our results back to 1430 so that ~580 years is the correct time period to cite not ~400 years

Since many people access RealClimate for reliable information, are you able to correct this to read:

The conclusion reached is that summer temperatures in the post-1950 period were warmer than anything else in the last 1000 years at high confidence, and in the last ~580 years at very high confidence.

Please let me know if this is possible.

Thanks

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

27

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 12:11 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi Brad

Thanks for your quick response. I agree that Steve is a complete time waster but there isn't much we can do about it unfortunately. Others watching want to know why we aren't releasing data, leading to accusations of "something to hide" "cherry picking" etc

So judging from your response, what I will do is provide the 1921-1990 portion of your work and say the remainder is available on request.

Is that ok with you?

Thanks again for your help with this

Joelle

On 6/06/12 12:04 PM, "Brad Linsley" <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu> wrote:

Hi,

I am not sure how I feel. People like Steve McIntyre need a job or something else to occupy their time....

I am undecided, so if you want to give him the 1921-1990 data that is OK by me. I was actually hoping he would write me directly to ask.....

We are continuing to work on our Fiji-Tonga-Rarotonga coral data and have some new records. The dl80 trends are clearly not all temperature and probably mostly due to salinity changes, but it is hard to specifically determine the mix of temp and salinity in the trend since the area is so complex oceanographically.

Best,

Brad

On 6/5/12 8:33 PM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Brad

Any luck thinking this through?

I have had positive responses from the others in this group so am just waiting to hear back from you.

No doubt you are busy, but if you get a moment, it would be great to hear from you.

All the best  
Joelle

----- Forwarded Message

From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 19:03:34 +1000  
To: Rosanne D'arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>, <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>, Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Allie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Subject: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d180, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsley's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180

Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

Subject: Re: Responding to a Climate Audit data request  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 12:29 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>  
Conversation: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi Brad

Just to clarify, we released the full length of the records used in the final R27 network that were not publically available.

These were: annually averaged Fiji\_AB d180 and Fiji\_1F records

They can now be found as part of the final Australasian network here:

[ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/contributions\\_by\\_author/gergis2012/gergis2012australasia.txt](ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/paleo/contributions_by_author/gergis2012/gergis2012australasia.txt)

The current request comes about from the records NOT used in the final analysis i.e. your Tonga\_TH1\_d180, Tonga\_TNI2\_d180 records

With your permission we will now release the 1921-1990 part of these records, and mention that the rest available on request.

Thanks again, I hope all is well with you

Joelle

On 6/06/12 12:19 PM, "Brad Linsley" <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu> wrote:

I thought you had released the data on the NOAA NGDC web site ? Or was this just the composite?

OK to release 1921-1990.

Brad

On 6/5/12 10:11 PM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Brad

Thanks for your quick response. I agree that Steve is a complete time waster but there isn't much we can do about it unfortunately. Others watching want to know why we aren't releasing data, leading to accusations of "something to hide" "cherry picking" etc

So judging from your response, what I will do is provide the 1921-1990 portion of your work and say the remainder is available on request.

Is that ok with you?

Thanks again for your help with this



Joelle

On 6/06/12 12:04 PM, "Brad Linsley" <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu> wrote:

Hi,

I am not sure how I feel. People like Steve McIntyre need a job or something else to occupy their time....

I am undecided, so if you want to give him the 1921-1990 data that is OK by me. I was actually hoping he would write me directly to ask.....

We are continuing to work on our Fiji-Tonga-Rarotonga coral data and have some new records. The d18O trends are clearly not all temperature and probably mostly due to salinity changes, but it is hard to specifically determine the mix of temp and salinity in the trend since the area is so complex oceanographically.

Best,

Brad

On 6/5/12 8:33 PM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Brad

Any luck thinking this through?

I have had positive responses from the others in this group so am just waiting to hear back from you.

No doubt you are busy, but if you get a moment, it would be great to hear from you.

All the best

Joelle

----- Forwarded Message

From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

Date: Sat, 2 Jun 2012 19:03:34 +1000

To: Rosanne D'arrigo <rdd@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Kathryn Allen <kathryn.allen@monash.edu>, <matthew.brookhouse@anu.edu.au>, Brad Linsley <blinsley@ldeo.columbia.edu>, Tas van Ommen <Tas.Van.ommen@aad.gov.au>, Ian Goodwin <ian.goodwin@mq.edu.au>

Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>

Subject: Responding to a Climate Audit data request

Hi everyone

As you may know, recently we published a 1000 year temperature reconstruction for

the Australasian region in the Journal of Climate:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

After seeking permission from data contributors, all records used in the study are now archived with NOAA:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pubs/gergis2012/gergis2012.html>

Thanks to Rosanne, Brad and Kathy for allowing us to make the data used in this study publically available.

Nonetheless, we have received a data request from notorious climate change sceptic Steve McIntyre to release the full Australasian database for discussion on his blog:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/05/31/myles-allen-calls-for-name-and-shame/#more-16194>

My response was that we could not pass on some records without seeking permission, and encouraged him to contact researchers directly. Clearly he was not satisfied with my suggestion so has proceeded with threats of FOI, begun an online smear campaign etc

I have been advised by a US colleague (Gavin Schmidt) that the best way to proceed is to provide them with data to avoid inflaming this situation any further.

Tas Van Ommen has provided a very sensible solution to this request (see below). That is, to provide the 1921-1990 portion of the record used in the calibration process so that they can validate our screening procedure.

As mentioned in the attached paper published in The Holocene, we need to seek permission to use:

Tas van Ommen's Law Dome d18O, accumulation  
Ian Goodwin's Law Dome Na  
Brad Linsely's coral Tonga\_TH1\_d18O, Tonga\_TNI2\_d18O  
Kathy Allen's CTP west  
Rosanne's teak record, Northern Territory Callitris  
Matthew Brookhouse's Baw Baw record

Can you please let me know if you are happy for the 1921-1990 portion of your record (listed above) to be released for this exercise?

If circumstances have recently changed and you are now happy for the full record to be release for inclusion on the NOAA PAGES 2K collection that is currently being compiled, please do let me know:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/pages2k/pages-2k-network.html>

(note that these web pages are still a work in progress, the global 2K network is aiming to have each region populated within the timeframe outlined in the attached Word document).

For tree ring records, please let us know if we can pass on raw ring width measurements or if you'd prefer just the processed version used in our study is only made available.

Brad, I know that it is unlikely that that you want to release your Tonga records as your student is still publishing her results. Matt, I am aware that you are still developing your snow gum chronology. It has been a while since we've caught up so it would be good to get an update.

I apologise for any headaches caused, but I hope you can appreciate that data access lies at the heart of their 'cherry picking' accusations. Clearly this is something we want to be very transparent on without jeopardising anyone's research effort.

Your timely response to this email would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

Subject: Re: Correction to Real Climate post  
Date: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 12:31 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Eric Steig <steig@uw.edu>  
Cc: "steig@u.washington.edu" <steig@u.washington.edu>  
Conversation: Correction to Real Climate post

Thanks Eric, much appreciated.

Glad you are enjoying having Ailie around, she is great...remember that she is only on loan, we want her back!

All the best

Joelle

On 6/06/12 12:26 PM, "Eric Steig" <steig@uw.edu> wrote:

> Joelle  
>  
> No problem. I will correct it this evening.  
>  
> Very nice having your colleague Ailie Gallant here for a postdoc!  
>  
> Eric  
>  
>  
> On 6/5/12 7:07 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:  
>> Hi Eric  
>>  
>> Thanks for posting a story on the release of our new Australasian  
>> temperature paper on RealClimate:  
>>  
>>  
>> <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2012/05/fresh-hockey-sticks-fro>  
>> [m-the-southern-hemisphere/#more-11894](http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2012/05/fresh-hockey-sticks-fro)  
>>  
>> I just noticed there is a technical error in your assessment of our  
>> work. You say:  
>> /  
>> The conclusion reached is that summer temperatures in the post-1950  
>> period were warmer than anything else in the last 1000 years at high  
>> confidence, and in the last ~400 years at very high confidence.  
>> /  
>> In fact we have high confidence in our results back to 1430 so that ~580  
>> years is the correct time period to cite not ~400 years  
>>  
>> Since many people access RealClimate for reliable information, are you  
>> able to correct this to read:  
>>  
>> The conclusion reached is that summer temperatures in the post-1950  
>> period were warmer than anything else in the last 1000 years at high  
>> confidence, and in the last ~580 years at very high confidence.  
>>  
>> Please let me know if this is possible.  
>>

>> Thanks  
>>  
>> Joelle  
>>  
>> --  
>> Dr Joelle Gergis  
>> Climate Research Fellow  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne,  
>> VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
>> Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
>> <http://climatehistory.com.au>  
>

Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Thursday, 7 June 2012 8:03 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi Raphi are you 250% sure we did not use the detrended correlations for proxy selection?

On 06/06/2012, at 9:46 AM, "Raphael Neukom" <neukom@giub.unibe.ch> wrote:

- > Hi Joelle and David,
- >
- > As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper in journal of climate today.
- >
- > It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did not use detrended data.
- >
- > The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and was very negligent not to check this carefully.
- >
- > Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these words may cause troubles.
- >
- > Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.
- >
- > I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that we can find a good way to correct it.
- >
- > David your advice on this would be very much appreciated
- >
- > Thanks a lot and best regards
- > Raphi
- >
- >

Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Thursday, 7 June 2012 8:12 AM  
From: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

we did not. below the instr vs mount read data that were correlated to each other.

Am 07.06.2012 00:03, schrieb Joelle Gergis:

Hi Raphi are you 250% sure we did not use the detrended correlations for proxy selection?

On 06/06/2012, at 9:46 AM, "Raphael Neukom" <neukom@giub.unibe.ch> <mailto:neukom@giub.unibe.ch> wrote:

Hi Joelle and David,

As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper in journal of climate today.

It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did not use detrended data.

The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and was very negligent not to check this carefully.

Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these words may cause troubles.

Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that we can find a good way to correct it.

David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

Thanks a lot and best regards  
Raphi

Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Thursday, 7 June 2012 8:21 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

: (

On 07/06/2012, at 8:13 AM, "Raphael Neukom" <neukom@giub.unibe.ch> wrote:  
we did not. below the instr vs mount read data that were correlated to each other.  
<bjggdibc.png>

Am 07.06.2012 00:03, schrieb Joelle Gergis:  
Hi Raphi are you 250% sure we did not use the detrended correlations for proxy selection?

On 06/06/2012, at 9:46 AM, "Raphael Neukom" <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
<mailto:neukom@giub.unibe.ch> wrote:

Hi Joelle and David,

As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper in journal of climate today.

It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did not use detrended data.

The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and was very negligent not to check this carefully.

Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these words may cause troubles.

Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that we can find a good way to correct it.

David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

Thanks a lot and best regards  
Raphi



Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Thursday, 7 June 2012 8:55 AM  
From: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi David,

I agree, but we don't have enough strong proxy data with significant correlations after detrending to get a reasonable reconstruction. I also see the point that the selection process forces a hockey stick result but:

- We also performed the reconstruction using noise proxies with the same ARI properties as the real proxies.
- And these are of course resulting in a noise-hockey stick. But they are not able to reconstruct the full amount of 20th century warming and basically lose all interannual variability (and decadal before the calibration period). (attached figure, solid is proxy reconstruction, dashed is noise reconstruction, dotted instrumental)
- The noise recons have no skill (negative REs all the way through; second plot attached).

So it is truly easy to reconstruct a hockey stick with our screening but not one with reasonable variability back in time. and the REs show that we can get some skill also at interannual timescales with our proxies (and not with noise), also evident by the correlation of 0.75 of our reconstruction with the target after detrending.

I can also run a reconstruction using the proxies that were excluded. This reconstruction will most probably also show a hockey stick, but again bad skill. This will show that the hockey stick does not depend on the proxy screening. I think if you calibrate with non detrended data (as we always do) you will always get a hockey stick with predictors that have such a high autocorrelation as proxies typically do (average of 0.37 over all proxies, 0.42 over the selected ones in our case).

I apologize for the bad quality of the figures but it is lam now...

talk soon and best regards  
Raphi

Am 06.06.2012 22:48, schrieb David John Karoly:

> Hi Raphi,  
>

> Thanks for the info on the correlations for the SH reconstructions during the 1911-90 period for detrended and full data. I think that it is much better to use the detrended data for the selection of proxies, as you can then say that you have identified the proxies that are responding to the temperature variations on interannual time scales, ie temp-sensitive proxies, without any influence from the trend over the 20th century. This is very important to be able to rebut the criticism is that you only selected proxies that show a large increase over the 20th century ie a hockey stick.

>

> The same argument applies for the Australasian proxy selection. If the selection is done on the proxies without detrending ie the full proxy records over the 20th

century, then records with strong trends will be selected and that will effectively force a hockey stick result. Then Stephen McIntyre criticism is valid. I think that it is really important to use detrended proxy data for the selection, and then choose proxies that exceed a threshold for correlations over the calibration period for either interannual variability or decadal variability for detrended data. I would be happy for the proxy selection to be based on decadal correlations, rather than interannual correlations, but it needs to be with detrended data, in my opinion. The criticism that the selection process forces a hockey stick result will be valid if the trend is not excluded in the proxy selection step.

>  
> Hope this makes sense. Looking forward to talking more at 4pm (8am), David

> PS Joelle, will you be at home or in the building??

> ~~~~~  
> Prof David Karoly  
> School of Earth Sciences  
> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
> http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/

> ~~~~~  
>  
> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
> Sent: 07 June 2012 05:56  
> To: David John Karoly  
> Cc: Joelle Gergis  
> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

> Hi David,

>  
> I used detrended data for the screening procedure in the SH recon. I  
> just ran it again using non detrended data. The number of selected  
> proxies increased from 111 to 134.  
> I am now running a new reconstruction over night using these 134 records  
> to see how the results compare.

>  
> Attached a table showing the correlations of the instrumental target  
> with the reconstructions for the 1911-1990 overlap period, which  
> includes calibration and verification years for each ensemble member  
> (interannual, decadal, detrended and non-detrended). The included plot  
> shows these correlations for the ensemble mean selecting verification  
> (red, dashed) and calibration (black solid) years only and also back in  
> time for the individual proxy nests.

>  
> I am looking forward to talk to you tomorrow  
> Thanks  
> Raphi

>  
> Am 06.06.2012 02:03, schrieb David John Karoly:

>> PS Are you absolutely sure that you used detrended data for the SH  
reconstruction?

>> What is the range of correlations for the interannual variability of detrended  
SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95%

confid int) for the calibration period?

>>

>> What is the range of correlations for the decadal variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

>>

>> Thanks, David

>>

>>

>> ~~~~~  
>> Prof David Karoly

>> School of Earth Sciences

>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

>> ~~~~~

>>

>>

>> 

---

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

>> Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46

>> To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly

>> Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>>

>> Hi Joelle and David,

>>

>> As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper  
>> in journal of climate today.

>>

>> It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the  
>> paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening  
>> based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did  
>> not use detrended data.

>>

>> The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the  
>> paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy  
>> selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore  
>> had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and  
>> was very negligent not to check this carefully.

>>

>> Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would  
>> not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically  
>> justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these  
>> words may cause troubles.

>>

>> Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to  
>> write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to  
>> correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

>>

>> I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that  
>> we can find a good way to correct it.

>>

>> David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

>>

>> Thanks a lot and best regards

>> Raphi

>>

Subject: RE: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 6:47 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Someone has now tried to reproduce the screening of the 27 selected proxies against the target Australasian temp series and is unable to reproduce the claimed results in the paper.

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance/>

I suggest that you look at this Stephen McIntyre post. Given that the error is now identified in the blogosphere, we need to notify the journal of the error and put the manuscript on hold.

Raphi, can you provide a table or plot of the correlation of the 27 proxies, or their p values, against the target series for detrended data, as in the McIntyre post, and including the trend, as you actually did? It would be good to get this as well for the decadal variations.

You should ignore the hate mail, but you should not ignore the science.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
~~~~~

---

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
Sent: 07 June 2012 08:55  
To: David John Karoly  
Cc: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi David,

I agree, but we don't have enough strong proxy data with significant correlations after detrending to get a reasonable reconstruction. I also see the point that the selection process forces a hockey stick result but:

- We also performed the reconstruction using noise proxies with the same AR1 properties as the real proxies.
- And these are of course resulting in a noise-hockey stick. But they are not able to reconstruct the full amount of 20th century warming and basically lose all interannual variability (and decadal before the calibration period). (attached figure, solid is proxy reconstruction, dashed is noise reconstruction, dotted instrumental)

- The noise reconstructions have no skill (negative REs all the way through; second plot attached).

So it is truly easy to reconstruct a hockey stick with our screening but not one with reasonable variability back in time. and the REs show that we can get some skill also at interannual timescales with our proxies (and not with noise), also evident by the correlation of 0.75 of our reconstruction with the target after detrending.

I can also run a reconstruction using the proxies that were excluded. This reconstruction will most probably also show a hockey stick, but again bad skill. This will show that the hockey stick does not depend on the proxy screening. I think if you calibrate with non detrended data (as we always do) you will always get a hockey stick with predictors that have such a high autocorrelation as proxies typically do (average of 0.37 over all proxies, 0.42 over the selected ones in our case).

I apologize for the bad quality of the figures but it is late now...

talk soon and best regards  
Raphi

Am 06.06.2012 22:48, schrieb David John Karoly:

> Hi Raphi,

>

> Thanks for the info on the correlations for the SH reconstructions during the 1911-90 period for detrended and full data. I think that it is much better to use the detrended data for the selection of proxies, as you can then say that you have identified the proxies that are responding to the temperature variations on interannual time scales, ie temp-sensitive proxies, without any influence from the trend over the 20th century. This is very important to be able to rebut the criticism is that you only selected proxies that show a large increase over the 20th century ie a hockey stick.

>

> The same argument applies for the Australasian proxy selection. If the selection is done on the proxies without detrending ie the full proxy records over the 20th century, then records with strong trends will be selected and that will effectively force a hockey stick result. Then Stephen McIntyre criticism is valid. I think that it is really important to use detrended proxy data for the selection, and then choose proxies that exceed a threshold for correlations over the calibration period for either interannual variability or decadal variability for detrended data. I would be happy for the proxy selection to be based on decadal correlations, rather than interannual correlations, but it needs to be with detrended data, in my opinion. The criticism that the selection process forces a hockey stick result will be valid if the trend is not excluded in the proxy selection step.

>

> Hope this makes sense. Looking forward to talking more at 4pm (8am), David

>

> PS Joelle, will you be at home or in the building??

>

> ~~~~~

> Prof David Karoly

> School of Earth Sciences

> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
> http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/  
> ~~~~~  
>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
> Sent: 07 June 2012 05:56  
> To: David John Karoly  
> Cc: Joelle Gergis  
> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
>  
> Hi David,  
>  
> I used detrended data for the screening procedure in the SH recon. I  
> just ran it again using non detrended data. The number of selected  
> proxies increased from 111 to 134.  
> I am now running a new reconstruction over night using these 134 records  
> to see how the results compare.  
>  
> Attached a table showing the correlations of the instrumental target  
> with the reconstructions for the 1911-1990 overlap period, which  
> includes calibration and verification years for each ensemble member  
> (interannual, decadal, detrended and non-detrended). The included plot  
> shows these correlations for the ensemble mean selecting verification  
> (red, dashed) and calibration (black solid) years only and also back in  
> time for the individual proxy nests.  
>  
> I am looking forward to talk to you tomorrow  
> Thanks  
> Raphi  
>  
>  
> Am 06.06.2012 02:03, schrieb David John Karoly:  
>> PS Are you absolutely sure that you used detrended data for the SH  
reconstruction?  
>> What is the range of correlations for the interannual variability of detrended  
SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95%  
confid int) for the calibration period?  
>>  
>> What is the range of correlations for the decadal variability of detrended SH  
average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95%  
confid int) for the calibration period?  
>>  
>> Thanks, David  
>>  
>> ~~~~~  
>> Prof David Karoly  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
>> http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/  
>> ~~~~~  
>>  
>>  
>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

>> Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46  
>> To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly  
>> Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
>>  
>> Hi Joelle and David,  
>>  
>> As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper  
>> in journal of climate today.  
>>  
>> It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the  
>> paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening  
>> based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did  
>> not use detrended data.  
>>  
>> The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the  
>> paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy  
>> selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore  
>> had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and  
>> was very negligent not to check this carefully.  
>>  
>> Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would  
>> not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically  
>> justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these  
>> words may cause troubles.  
>>  
>> Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to  
>> write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to  
>> correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.  
>>  
>> I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that  
>> we can find a good way to correct it.  
>>  
>> David your advice on this would be very much appreciated  
>>  
>> Thanks a lot and best regards  
>> Raphi  
>>  
>>  
>>

Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 7:26 AM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Thanks for letting us know David.

I will write an email to the journal editor today. Perhaps I could run the draft past you first...

On 08/06/2012, at 6:47 AM, "David John Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

> Hi Raphi and Joelle,  
>  
> Someone has now tried to reproduce the screening of the 27 selected proxies  
against the target Australasian temp series and is unable to reproduce the claimed  
results in the paper.  
> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance/>  
>  
> I suggest that you look at this Stephen McIntyre post.  
> Given that the error is now identified in the blogosphere, we need to notify  
the journal of the error and put the manuscript on hold.  
>  
> Raphi, can you provide a table or plot of the correlation of the 27 proxies,  
or their p values, against the target series for detrended data, as in the McIntyre  
post, and including the trend, as you actually did?  
> It would be good to get this as well for the decadal variations.  
>  
> You should ignore the hate mail, but you should not ignore the science.  
>  
> Best wishes, David  
>  
> ~~~~~  
> Prof David Karoly  
> School of Earth Sciences  
> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
> ~~~~~  
>  
>  
> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
> Sent: 07 June 2012 08:55  
> To: David John Karoly  
> Cc: Joelle Gergis  
> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
>  
> Hi David,  
>  
> I agree, but we don't have enough strong proxy data with significant  
> correlations after detrending to get a reasonable reconstruction.  
> I also see the point that the selection process forces a hockey stick



> result but:  
> - We also performed the reconstruction using noise proxies with the same  
> ARI properties as the real proxies.  
> - And these are of course resulting in a noise-hockey stick. But they  
> are not able to reconstruct the full amount of 20th century warming and  
> basically lose all interannual variability (and decadal before the  
> calibration period). (attached figure, solid is proxy reconstruction,  
> dashed is noise reconstruction, dotted instrumental)  
> - The noise reconstructions have no skill (negative REs all the way through;  
> second plot attached).  
>  
> So it is truly easy to reconstruct a hockey stick with our screening but  
> not one with reasonable variability back in time. and the REs show that  
> we can get some skill also at interannual timescales with our proxies  
> (and not with noise), also evident by the correlation of 0.75 of our  
> reconstruction with the target after detrending.  
>  
> I can also run a reconstruction using the proxies that were excluded.  
> This reconstruction will most probably also show a hockey stick, but  
> again bad skill. This will show that the hockey stick does not depend on  
> the proxy screening. I think if you calibrate with non detrended data  
> (as we always do) you will always get a hockey stick with predictors  
> that have such a high autocorrelation as proxies typically do (average  
> of 0.37 over all proxies, 0.42 over the selected ones in our case).  
>  
> I apologize for the bad quality of the figures but it is late now...  
>  
> talk soon and best regards  
> Raphi  
>  
>  
> Am 06.06.2012 22:48, schrieb David John Karoly:  
>> Hi Raphi,  
>>  
>> Thanks for the info on the correlations for the SH reconstructions during the  
>> 1911-90 period for detrended and full data. I think that it is much better to use  
>> the detrended data for the selection of proxies, as you can then say that you have  
>> identified the proxies that are responding to the temperature variations on  
>> interannual time scales, ie temp-sensitive proxies, without any influence from  
>> the trend over the 20th century. This is very important to be able to rebut the  
>> criticism is that you only selected proxies that show a large increase over the  
>> 20th century ie a hockey stick.  
>>  
>> The same argument applies for the Australasian proxy selection. If the selection  
>> is done on the proxies without detrending ie the full proxy records over the 20th  
>> century, then records with strong trends will be selected and that will effectively  
>> force a hockey stick result. Then Stephen McIntyre criticism is valid. I think  
>> that it is really important to use detrended proxy data for the selection, and  
>> then choose proxies that exceed a threshold for correlations over the calibration  
>> period for either interannual variability or decadal variability for detrended  
>> data. I would be happy for the proxy selection to be based on decadal correlations,  
>> rather than interannual correlations, but it needs to be with detrended data, in  
>> my opinion. The criticism that the selection process forces a hockey stick result  
>> will be valid if the trend is not excluded in the proxy selection step.  
>>  
>> Hope this makes sense. Looking forward to talking more at 4pm (8am), David  
>>

>> PS Joelle, will you be at home or in the building??

>>

>> ~~~~~

>> Prof David Karoly

>> School of Earth Sciences

>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

>> ~~~~~

>>

>>

>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

>> Sent: 07 June 2012 05:56

>> To: David John Karoly

>> Cc: Joelle Gergis

>> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>>

>> Hi David,

>>

>> I used detrended data for the screening procedure in the SH recon. I

>> just ran it again using non detrended data. The number of selected

>> proxies increased from 111 to 134.

>> I am now running a new reconstruction over night using these 134 records

>> to see how the results compare.

>>

>> Attached a table showing the correlations of the instrumental target

>> with the reconstructions for the 1911-1990 overlap period, which

>> includes calibration and verification years for each ensemble member

>> (interannual, decadal, detrended and non-detrended). The included plot

>> shows these correlations for the ensemble mean selecting verification

>> (red, dashed) and calibration (black solid) years only and also back in

>> time for the individual proxy nests.

>>

>> I am looking forward to talk to you tomorrow

>> Thanks

>> Raphi

>>

>>

>> Am 06.06.2012 02:03, schrieb David John Karoly:

>>> PS Are you absolutely sure that you used detrended data for the SH reconstruction?

>>> What is the range of correlations for the interannual variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

>>>

>>> What is the range of correlations for the decadal variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

>>>

>>> Thanks, David

>>>

>>> ~~~~~

>>> Prof David Karoly

>>> School of Earth Sciences

>>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
>>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
>>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
>>> http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/

>>> ~~~~~  
>>>  
>>>

>>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
>>> Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46  
>>> To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly  
>>> Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>>> Hi Joelle and David,

>>> As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper  
>>> in journal of climate today.

>>> It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the  
>>> paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening  
>>> based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did  
>>> not use detrended data.

>>> The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the  
>>> paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy  
>>> selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore  
>>> had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and  
>>> was very negligent not to check this carefully.

>>> Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would  
>>> not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically  
>>> justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these  
>>> words may cause troubles.

>>> Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to  
>>> write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to  
>>> correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

>>> I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that  
>>> we can find a good way to correct it.

>>> David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

>>> Thanks a lot and best regards  
>>> Raphi

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>

**Subject:** Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
**Date:** Friday, 8 June 2012 8:26 AM  
**From:** Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>  
**To:** Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
**Conversation:** Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

didn't include the decadal correlations in the pdf as they are never significant.

will have a look at the results of the detrended recon. don't expect them to be skillful.

cheers  
raphi

Am 08.06.2012 00:24, schrieb Joelle Gergis:

> Hi Raphi, we have emails that predate this latest blogpost that indicate we became aware of the issue as we contacted authors for permission to release their records.  
>

> What did the reconstruction results look like with the undetrended subset of 8/12?  
>

> I think we need to know the influence of this step on the results to see how much things change.  
>

> How many pages are there in the PDF you just sent? I could see one (but I'm on my ph) are the decadal correlations also included?  
>

> Sent from my iPhone  
>>

>> Am 07.06.2012 22:47, schrieb David John Karoly:

>>> Hi Raphi and Joelle,  
>>>

>>> Someone has now tried to reproduce the screening of the 27 selected proxies against the target Australasian temp series and is unable to reproduce the claimed results in the paper.

>>> <http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance/>  
>>>

>>> I suggest that you look at this Stephen McIntyre post.  
>>> Given that the error is now identified in the blogosphere, we need to notify the journal of the error and put the manuscript on hold.  
>>>

>>> Raphi, can you provide a table or plot of the correlation of the 27 proxies, or their p values, against the target series for detrended data, as in the McIntyre post, and including the trend, as you actually did?

>>> It would be good to get this as well for the decadal variations.  
>>>

>>> You should ignore the hate mail, but you should not ignore the science.  
>>>

>>> Best wishes, David  
>>>

>>> ~~~~~

>>> Prof David Karoly  
>>> School of Earth Sciences  
>>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
>>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
>>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
>>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

>>> ~~~~~  
>>>  
>>>

>>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
>>> Sent: 07 June 2012 08:55  
>>> To: David John Karoly  
>>> Cc: Joelle Gergis  
>>> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
>>>

>>> Hi David,  
>>>

>>> I agree, but we don't have enough strong proxy data with significant  
>>> correlations after detrending to get a reasonable reconstruction.  
>>> I also see the point that the selection process forces a hockey stick  
>>> result but:  
>>> - We also performed the reconstruction using noise proxies with the same  
>>> AR1 properties as the real proxies.  
>>> - And these are of course resulting in a noise-hockey stick. But they  
>>> are not able to reconstruct the full amount of 20th century warming and  
>>> basically lose all interannual variability (and decadal before the  
>>> calibration period). (attached figure, solid is proxy reconstruction,  
>>> dashed is noise reconstruction, dotted instrumental)  
>>> - The noise recons have no skill (negative REs all the way through;  
>>> second plot attached).  
>>>

>>> So it is truly easy to reconstruct a hockey stick with our screening but  
>>> not one with reasonable variability back in time. and the REs show that  
>>> we can get some skill also at interannual timescales with our proxies  
>>> (and not with noise), also evident by the correlation of 0.75 of our  
>>> reconstruction with the target after detrending.  
>>>

>>> I can also run a reconstruction using the proxies that were excluded.  
>>> This reconstruction will most probably also show a hockey stick, but  
>>> again bad skill. This will show that the hockey stick does not depend on  
>>> the proxy screening. I think if you calibrate with non detrended data  
>>> (as we always do) you will always get a hockey stick with predictors  
>>> that have such a high autocorrelation as proxies typically do (average  
>>> of 0.37 over all proxies, 0.42 over the selected ones in our case).  
>>>

>>> I apologize for the bad quality of the figures but it is 1am now...  
>>>

>>> talk soon and best regards  
>>> Raphi  
>>>

>>>  
>>>

>>> Am 06.06.2012 22:48, schrieb David John Karoly:

>>>> Hi Raphi,  
>>>>

>>>> Thanks for the info on the correlations for the SH reconstructions during the  
1911-90 period for detrended and full data. I think that it is much better to use the  
detrended data for the selection of proxies, as you can then say that you have identified  
the proxies that are responding to the temperature variations on interannual time  
scales, ie temp-sensitive proxies, without any influence from the trend over the 20th  
century. This is very important to be able to rebut the criticism is that you only  
selected proxies that show a large increase over the 20th century ie a hockey stick.  
>>>>

>>>> The same argument applies for the Australasian proxy selection. If the selection  
is done on the proxies without detrending ie the full proxy records over the 20th  
century, then records with strong trends will be selected and that will effectively

force a hockey stick result. Then Stephen McIntyre criticism is valid. I think that it is really important to use detrended proxy data for the selection, and then choose proxies that exceed a threshold for correlations over the calibration period for either interannual variability or decadal variability for detrended data. I would be happy for the proxy selection to be based on decadal correlations, rather than interannual correlations, but it needs to be with detrended data, in my opinion. The criticism that the selection process forces a hockey stick result will be valid if the trend is not excluded in the proxy selection step.

>>>>

>>>> Hope this makes sense. Looking forward to talking more at 4pm (8am), David

>>>>

>>>> PS Joelle, will you be at home or in the building??

>>>>

>>>> ~~~~~

>>>> Prof David Karoly

>>>> School of Earth Sciences

>>>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>>>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

>>>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

>>>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

>>>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

>>>> ~~~~~

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

>>>> Sent: 07 June 2012 05:56

>>>> To: David John Karoly

>>>> Cc: Joelle Gergis

>>>> Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>>>>

>>>> Hi David,

>>>>

>>>> I used detrended data for the screening procedure in the SH recon. I

>>>> just ran it again using non detrended data. The number of selected

>>>> proxies increased from 111 to 134.

>>>> I am now running a new reconstruction over night using these 134 records

>>>> to see how the results compare.

>>>>

>>>> Attached a table showing the correlations of the instrumental target

>>>> with the reconstructions for the 1911-1990 overlap period, which

>>>> includes calibration and verification years for each ensemble member

>>>> (interannual, decadal, detrended and non-detrended). The included plot

>>>> shows these correlations for the ensemble mean selecting verification

>>>> (red, dashed) and calibration (black solid) years only and also back in

>>>> time for the individual proxy nests.

>>>>

>>>> I am looking forward to talk to you tomorrow

>>>> Thanks

>>>> Raphi

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Am 06.06.2012 02:03, schrieb David John Karoly:

>>>>> PS Are you absolutely sure that you used detrended data for the SH reconstruction?

>>>>> What is the range of correlations for the interannual variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

>>>>>

>>>>> What is the range of correlations for the decadal variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid

int) for the calibration period?

>>>>

>>>> Thanks, David

>>>>

>>>> ~~~~~

>>>> Prof David Karoly

>>>> School of Earth Sciences

>>>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>>>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698

>>>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761

>>>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

>>>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

>>>> ~~~~~

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]

>>>> Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46

>>>> To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly

>>>> Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

>>>>

>>>> Hi Joelle and David,

>>>>

>>>> As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper

>>>> in journal of climate today.

>>>>

>>>> It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the

>>>> paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening

>>>> based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did

>>>> not use detrended data.

>>>>

>>>> The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the

>>>> paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy

>>>> selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore

>>>> had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and

>>>> was very negligent not to check this carefully.

>>>>

>>>> Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would

>>>> not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically

>>>> justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these

>>>> words may cause troubles.

>>>>

>>>> Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to

>>>> write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to

>>>> correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

>>>>

>>>> I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that

>>>> we can find a good way to correct it.

>>>>

>>>> David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

>>>>

>>>> Thanks a lot and best regards

>>>> Raphi

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>> <cors.pdf>

Subject: RE: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 8:54 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>, Joelle Gergis <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi Raphi,

I just looked at your table and there are a bunch of the detrended corrs that are around 0.19-0.22 that are not listed as significant, including Buckley's chance, Pink Pine and Kauri. I thought last night you had a correl of about 0.19 significant at 10%. Maybe use that.

Of even greater interest is the correlations which switch sign between the detrended and the full data, such as Oroko, Law Dome accum, and MANGAWE.

I assume that none of the correlations in the file cors.pdf are the decadal correlations. Can you send those too?

GO TO BED!!!

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
Sent: 08 June 2012 08:42  
To: Joelle Gergis  
Cc: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Dashed reconstruction below is using only the 8 proxies that pass detrended screening. solid is our original one.

Am 07.06.2012 23:26, schrieb Joelle Gergis:  
Thanks for letting us know David.

I will write an email to the journal editor today. Perhaps I could run the draft past you first...

On 08/06/2012, at 6:47 AM, "David John Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
<<mailto:dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>> wrote:

Hi Raphi and Joelle,



Someone has now tried to reproduce the screening of the 27 selected proxies against the target Australasian temp series and is unable to reproduce the claimed results in the paper.

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance/>

I suggest that you look at this Stephen McIntyre post. Given that the error is now identified in the blogosphere, we need to notify the journal of the error and put the manuscript on hold.

Raphi, can you provide a table or plot of the correlation of the 27 proxies, or their p values, against the target series for detrended data, as in the McIntyre post, and including the trend, as you actually did?

It would be good to get this as well for the decadal variations.

You should ignore the hate mail, but you should not ignore the science.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
~~~~~

---

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
Sent: 07 June 2012 08:55  
To: David John Karoly  
Cc: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi David,

I agree, but we don't have enough strong proxy data with significant correlations after detrending to get a reasonable reconstruction. I also see the point that the selection process forces a hockey stick result but:

- We also performed the reconstruction using noise proxies with the same AR1 properties as the real proxies.
- And these are of course resulting in a noise-hockey stick. But they are not able to reconstruct the full amount of 20th century warming and basically lose all interannual variability (and decadal before the calibration period). (attached figure, solid is proxy reconstruction, dashed is noise reconstruction, dotted instrumental)
- The noise recons have no skill (negative REs all the way through; second plot attached).

So it is truly easy to reconstruct a hockey stick with our screening but not one with reasonable variability back in time. and the REs show that we can get some skill also at interannual timescales with our proxies (and not with noise), also evident by the correlation of 0.75 of our reconstruction with the target after detrending.

I can also run a reconstruction using the proxies that were excluded. This reconstruction will most probably also show a hockey stick, but again bad skill. This will show that the hockey stick does not depend on the proxy screening. I think if you calibrate with non detrended data (as we always do) you will always get a hockey stick with predictors that have such a high autocorrelation as proxies typically do (average of 0.37 over all proxies, 0.42 over the selected ones in our case).

I apologize for the bad quality of the figures but it is lam now...

talk soon and best regards  
Raphi

Am 06.06.2012 22:48, schrieb David John Karoly:  
Hi Raphi,

Thanks for the info on the correlations for the SH reconstructions during the 1911-90 period for detrended and full data. I think that it is much better to use the detrended data for the selection of proxies, as you can then say that you have identified the proxies that are responding to the temperature variations on interannual time scales, ie temp-sensitive proxies, without any influence from the trend over the 20th century. This is very important to be able to rebut the criticism is that you only selected proxies that show a large increase over the 20th century ie a hockey stick.

The same argument applies for the Australasian proxy selection. If the selection is done on the proxies without detrending ie the full proxy records over the 20th century, then records with strong trends will be selected and that will effectively force a hockey stick result. Then Stephen McIntyre criticism is valid. I think that it is really important to use detrended proxy data for the selection, and then choose proxies that exceed a threshold for correlations over the calibration period for either interannual variability or decadal variability for detrended data. I would be happy for the proxy selection to be based on decadal correlations, rather than interannual correlations, but it needs to be with detrended data, in my opinion. The criticism that the selection process forces a hockey stick result will be valid if the trend is not excluded in the proxy selection step.

Hope this makes sense. Looking forward to talking more at 4pm (8am), David

PS Joelle, will you be at home or in the building??

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
~~~~~

---

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
Sent: 07 June 2012 05:56  
To: David John Karoly

Cc: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi David,

I used detrended data for the screening procedure in the SH recon. I just ran it again using non detrended data. The number of selected proxies increased from 111 to 134.  
I am now running a new reconstruction over night using these 134 records to see how the results compare.

Attached a table showing the correlations of the instrumental target with the reconstructions for the 1911-1990 overlap period, which includes calibration and verification years for each ensemble member (interannual, decadal, detrended and non-detrended). The included plot shows these correlations for the ensemble mean selecting verification (red, dashed) and calibration (black solid) years only and also back in time for the individual proxy nests.

I am looking forward to talk to you tomorrow  
Thanks  
Raphi

Am 06.06.2012 02:03, schrieb David John Karoly:  
PS Are you absolutely sure that you used detrended data for the SH reconstruction? What is the range of correlations for the interannual variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

What is the range of correlations for the decadal variability of detrended SH average temp between the observations and the ensemble of reconstructions (95% confid int) for the calibration period?

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
~~~~~

---

From: Raphael Neukom [neukom@giub.unibe.ch]  
Sent: 06 June 2012 09:46  
To: Joelle Gergis; David John Karoly  
Subject: Mistake in the Australasian TT paper

Hi Joelle and David,

As just discussed with joelle on skype, I found a mistake in our paper in journal of climate today.

It is related to the proxy screening, so it is a delicate issue. In the paper we write that we do the correlation analysis for the screening based on detrended (instrumental and proxy) data, but in reality we did not use detrended data.

The origin of the mistake is that at the stage when we were writing the paper my approaches have already evolved and I had made the proxy selection for the SH reconstruction based on detrended data. I therefore had in my mind that we had done the same for Australasia months ago and was very negligent not to check this carefully.

Using detrended data would only select very few proxy records that would not allow a reasonable reconstruction. I think it is basically justifiable to do the screening without detrending but changing these words may cause troubles.

Fortunately we have not received the proofs yet. So my suggestion is to write to the editor, explain the mistake and ask for permission to correct the error, if necessary via sending it out to review again.

I apologize for the mistake and the troubles it may cause and hope that we can find a good way to correct it.

David your advice on this would be very much appreciated

Thanks a lot and best regards  
Raphi

Subject: Mistake in the Aus2K JoC paper  
 Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 10:38 AM  
 From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
 To: "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
 Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
 Conversation: Mistake in the Aus2K JoC paper

Hi everyone

Following on from my attempt to gain permission to release non publically available records released and submitted online with NOAA over the weekend, on Wednesday morning Raphi discovered an error in the Aus2K temperature analysis.

In the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in the Southern Hemisphere temperature paper, so wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. Given everything that has been going on over the past few months (...birth of Raphi's son and his subsequent part time hours, my chronic poor health and recent hospital tests etc) in some ways it is unsurprising that something was missed. We are only human and were doing the best that we could.

Although it was a completely innocent mistake, it does have serious implications for the paper. As you'll see from the attached figure, solid line is R27 non detrended network, red dotted line is the detrended R9 network.

Raphi, David and I have been in discussion over the last 48 hours as to how to proceed and have decided that we need to alert the journal editor to this issue so they stop the production of the paper and we have a chance to fix the error.

Meanwhile, Stephen McIntyre and co have located the error overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work. Just thought you should be aware of this and the fact that we will now need to request the removal of the Aus2K reconstruction from the PAGES 2K consortium temperature paper etc until we correct things.

I hope you don't mind but I'm going to go ahead and write to John Chiang the editor from Journal of Climate who handled our submission.

If you have any advice or thoughts I'd be happy to hear them.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

Subject: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 12:35 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>, "Whittaker, Gwendolyn" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>, JCLI Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" JCLI-D-11-00649 which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <[chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto:chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org)> wrote:

> CC: [chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto:chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org)

>

> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649

> Journal of Climate

>

>

> Dear Dr. Gergis,

>

> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late  
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning  
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.

>

> Congratulations!

>

> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page  
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the  
> forms are below.

>

> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review  
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further  
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker  
> ([gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)).

>

> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Dr. John Chiang, editor

> Journal of Climate

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

> PRODUCTION INFORMATION



> \*\*\*\*\*  
> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane  
> (ckeane@ametsoc.org).  
>  
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1  
> May 2011, use:  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
>  
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or  
> after 1 May 2011, use:  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
>  
> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this  
> form:  
>  
>  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre\\_or\\_waiver\\_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
> d> f  
>  
> You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by  
> logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.  
>  
> Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS  
> Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.  
> This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production  
> or give you instructions for providing anything required.  
>  
> Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:  
> <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>  
>  
> If you need further information, please contact:  
> Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, [gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)  
>  
>

40

Subject: Aus2K contribution to the PAGES 2k consortium paper  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 2:18 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: <lucien.vongunten@pages.unibe.ch>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au"  
<s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Andrew Lorrey <Andrew.Lorrey@niwa.co.nz>, David Karoly  
<dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Aus2K contribution to the PAGES 2k consortium paper

Hi Lucien

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in the Aus2K study on NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our Journal of Climate paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the attached paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended during the proxy selection process, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was not picked up until now. Everybody makes mistakes.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We have alerted the editors at Journal of Climate to put the paper on hold while we run a range of analyses which may form part of a revised submission.

In terms of the consortium paper, please run with the current version of the Aus2K temperature reconstruction but please note that it may change in coming weeks.

I will be spending three weeks in Switzerland from 15 July-7 July so will try to have the revised reconstruction available at the end of this period.

Another thing you should be aware of is that our group has come under intense scrutiny from the climate change sceptic blogger Stephen McIntyre (Climate Audit) since the release of our paper online:

<http://climateaudit.org>

Since we mentioned that our 27-record temperature network was drawn from a broader pool of 62 proxy records, they have accused us of cherry picking our results to manufacture a hockey stick.

They are now demanding that the full network of records be made available. Over the past week I have been busy contacting authors of non-publicly available records that were not used in the final temperature reconstruction to attempt to

release their data. Everyone managed to agree on just the C20th portions used for calibration be released, but some still no not want to make their full records available.

This issue has implications for other 2K groups: ANY mention of proxy screening or selection criteria is likely to be heavily criticised. Although we attempted to be transparent about our methodology, this has backfired and caused a lot of trouble.

I just thought you should be aware that it may not be enough that only the records used in the final analysis are already available. It is possible that every record from every region (those rejected from the analysis and those used in final reconstructions) will need to be made available once the consortium paper is published.

Sorry to be the bearer of bad news but I hope our group's negative experience will somehow help benefit the broader group.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 7/06/12 7:44 PM, "lucien.vongunten@pages.unibe.ch"  
<lucien.vongunten@pages.unibe.ch> wrote:

> Dear PAGES 2k Network Leaders and Data Managers:  
>  
> The redaction team for the PAGES 2k Consortium has prepared a manuscript draft  
> for the 2k consortium paper building on the concept sent to you previously and  
> on the comments received from the regional groups. Note that this is a first  
> draft and nothing in the manuscript is final yet. The writing team is looking  
> forward to receive your comments, suggestions and revisions by June 18th (sent  
> to Lucien).  
> The regional groups may comment on every aspect of the manuscript. The support  
> of the regional group is especially needed to help focus the text in terms of  
> decadal variability within their region - for the 20th century and prior.  
>  
> Attached is also a first draft/concept for the Data and Methods description to  
> be added in the Supplementary Online Material (SOM) section. We think that  
> this section should be written with great care as parts of the reconstructions  
> have not been published before. The success of the manuscript might hinge on

> the strength of the SOM.  
>  
> Also attached is the Excel file " Fig2.xlsx". This contains the data for all  
> of the reconstructions on the original time scale and the uncertainties.  
> Please make sure that the values that were plotted are correct! Also feel free  
> to explore the data and test new approaches.  
>  
> Presently we have received final reconstructions from every region, except  
> from Europe and Asia. In both cases the regional groups have produced time  
> series, but there are still some open questions before the series can be  
> finalized. We hope that this should be the case in the coming days.  
>  
> Timeline:  
> - Reviews first draft back to PAGES IPO June 18th  
> - Second draft sent to all consortium members June 29th  
> - Reviews second draft back to PAGES IPO July 6th  
> - Final version sent for agreement to all consortium members July 13th  
> - Approval final version back to PAGES IPO July 17th  
> - Submission of the paper by PAGES IPO Before July 31st  
>  
>  
> Please forward this email to your group members (the group leaders who have  
> not updated their member list are kindly asked to do so asap).  
> If you have any suggestions or questions, please let us know.  
>  
> With best wishes,  
> Lucien, on behalf of the PAGES 2k Redaction Team  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> Dr. Lucien von Gunten  
> Science Officer  
> PAGES (Past Global Changes) International Project Office  
> Zaehringstrasse 25  
> 3012 Bern  
> Switzerland  
>  
> Phone: +41 31 631 5609  
> Fax: +41 31 631 5606  
> Email: lucien.vongunten@pages.unibe.ch  
> <mailto:lucien.vongunten@pages.unibe.ch>  
>  
> website: www.pages-igbp.org <http://www.pages-igbp.org/>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

44

Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 3:18 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: John Chiang <jch\_chiang@berkeley.edu>  
Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Thanks for your prompt response John

I look forward to hearing from you again soon.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 8/06/12 3:15 PM, "John Chiang" <jch\_chiang@berkeley.edu> wrote:

Dear Joelle:

Thanks for alerting us to the error. I am seeking advice from the Chief Editor on how to properly handle your request, and will get back to you shortly.

Best regards,  
John

On Jun 8, 2012, at 4:35 AM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" JCLI-D-11-00649 which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for

analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

Subject: Re: Statement in response  
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 4:17 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Statement in response

Publication of scientific study put on hold

Publication of a recent scientific study on temperature variations in Australasia over the last thousand years has been delayed. The study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate. An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, which may affect the results.

While the paper states that "both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period", it was discovered on Tuesday 5 June that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect. Although this is an unfortunate data processing issue, it is likely to have implications for the results reported in the study. The journal has been contacted and the publication of the study has been put on hold.

This is a normal part of science. The testing of scientific studies through independent analysis of data and methods strengthens the conclusions. In this study, an issue has been identified and the results are being re-checked.

On 8/06/12 3:57 PM, "David Karoly" <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Draft statement is attached, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

Subject: RE: Mistake in the Aus2K JoC paper  
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 1:45 AM  
From: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Mistake in the Aus2K JoC paper

Hi Jo,

Really sorry to hear about the mistake, BUT as you say, this stuff happens in science.

I think you've handled it well by contacting the Journal etc. Let me know if there's anything I can do from this end.

Cheers,  
Ailie

From: Joelle Gergis  
Sent: Friday, 8 June 2012 10:38 AM  
To: s.phipps@unsw.edu.au; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Cc: Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly  
Subject: Mistake in the Aus2K JoC paper

Hi everyone

Following on from my attempt to gain permission to release non publically available records released and submitted online with NOAA over the weekend, on Wednesday morning Raphi discovered an error in the Aus2K temperature analysis.

In the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in the Southern Hemisphere temperature paper, so wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. Given everything that has been going on over the past few months

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ in some ways it is unsurprising that something was missed. We are only human and were doing the best that we could.

Although it was a completely innocent mistake, it does have serious implications for the paper. As you'll see from the attached figure, solid line is R27 non detrended network, red dotted line is the detrended R9 network.

Raphi, David and I have been in discussion over the last 48 hours as to how to proceed and have decided that we need to alert the journal editor to this issue so they stop the production of the paper and we have a chance to fix the error.



Meanwhile, Stephen McIntyre and co have located the error overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work. Just thought you should be aware of this and the fact that we will now need to request the removal of the Aus2K reconstruction from the PAGES 2K consortium temperature paper etc until we correct things.

I hope you don't mind but I'm going to go ahead and write to John Chiang the editor from Journal of Climate who handled our submission.

If you have any advice or thoughts I'd be happy to hear them.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

44

Subject: RE: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 5:44 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: "Whittaker, Gwendolyn" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>, JCLI Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au> <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Thanks for advising us of this action. It is what we wanted.

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn [gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]  
Sent: 08 June 2012 22:05  
To: Joelle Gergis  
Cc: John Chiang; JCLI Chief Editor; Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang,

I have put a production HOLD on this paper - I will now await further word from Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang before any further production is done.

In cases where papers return to peer review (for another round of revision and new decision) after acceptance, we do remove the Early Online Release version from our site.

Gwendolyn

--  
Gwendolyn Whittaker  
Publications Coordinator &  
Peer Review Support Manager  
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929  
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street

Boston, MA 02108

On Thu, Jun 7, 2012 at 10:35 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:  
Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" JCLI-D-11-00649 which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper.

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <[chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto:chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org)> <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>> > wrote:

> CC: [chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto:chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org) <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>>  
>  
> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649  
> Journal of Climate  
>  
>  
> Dear Dr. Gergis,  
>  
> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late  
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning  
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.  
>  
> Congratulations!  
>  
> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page  
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the  
> forms are below.  
>  
> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review  
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further  
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker  
> ([gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org) <<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>> ).  
>  
> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate  
>  
> Sincerely,  
>  
> Dr. John Chiang, editor  
> Journal of Climate  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> PRODUCTION INFORMATION  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane  
> ([ckeane@ametsoc.org](mailto:ckeane@ametsoc.org) <<http://ckeane@ametsoc.org>> ).  
>  
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1

> May 2011, use:  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
>  
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or  
> after 1 May 2011, use:  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
>  
> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this  
> form:  
>  
>  
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre\\_or\\_waiver\\_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)  
> d> f  
>  
> You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by  
> logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.  
>  
> Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS  
> Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.  
> This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production  
> or give you instructions for providing anything required.  
>  
> Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:  
> <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>  
>  
> If you need further information, please contact:  
> Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, [gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)  
> <<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>>  
>  
>

--

Gwendolyn Whittaker  
Publications Coordinator &  
Peer Review Support Manager  
American Meteorological Society

[gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)

phone: 617.226.3929  
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street  
Boston, MA 02108

Subject: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 6:08 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED] Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>,  
"s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi,

I have just sent the email below to Stephen McIntyre. If you are asked about the study, please refer to the statement and stick to the following key messages.

Key points: We know there is an issue. The publication is on hold. We are reviewing the data and results. This is a normal part of science.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:02  
To: smcintyre25@yahoo.com  
Subject: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Dear Stephen,

I am contacting you on behalf of all the authors of the Gergis et al (2012) study "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium"

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, which may affect the results. While the paper states that "both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period", we discovered on Tuesday 5 June that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect. Although this is an unfortunate data processing issue, it is likely to have implications for the results reported in the study. The journal has been contacted and the publication of the study has been put on hold.

This is a normal part of science. The testing of scientific studies through independent analysis of data and methods strengthens the conclusions. In this study, an issue has been identified and the results are being re-checked.

We would be grateful if you would post the notice below on your ClimateAudit web site.

We would like to thank you and the participants at the ClimateAudit blog for your scrutiny of our study, which also identified this data processing issue.

Thanks, David Karoly

Print publication of scientific study put on hold

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

We are currently reviewing the data and results.

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

46

Subject: RE: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 6:14 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED] Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>,  
"s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Print production of scientific study put on hold

And the correct email address for Stephen McIntyre is

Steve McIntyre ?[smcintyre25@yahoo.ca]?

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:08  
To: Joelle Gergis; Raphael Neukom; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi,

I have just sent the email below to Stephen McIntyre. If you are asked about the study, please refer to the statement and stick to the following key messages.

Key points: We know there is an issue. The publication is on hold. We are reviewing the data and results. This is a normal part of science.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:02  
To: smcintyre25@yahoo.com  
Subject: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Dear Stephen,

I am contacting you on behalf of all the authors of the Gergis et al (2012) study



?Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium?

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, which may affect the results. While the paper states that "both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period", we discovered on Tuesday 5 June that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect. Although this is an unfortunate data processing issue, it is likely to have implications for the results reported in the study. The journal has been contacted and the publication of the study has been put on hold.

This is a normal part of science. The testing of scientific studies through independent analysis of data and methods strengthens the conclusions. In this study, an issue has been identified and the results are being re-checked.

We would be grateful if you would post the notice below on your ClimateAudit web site.

We would like to thank you and the participants at the ClimateAudit blog for your scrutiny of our study, which also identified this data processing issue.

Thanks, David Karoly

Print publication of scientific study put on hold

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

We are currently reviewing the data and results.

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

47

Subject: RE: J. Clim. paper  
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 8:33 AM  
From: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Eric Steig <steig@uw.edu>, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: J. Clim. paper

Hi Eric,

I believe Joelle and Raphi are re-running the analysis at the moment. I'm sure they'll have more in the next couple of weeks, but Joelle can confirm.

Cheers,  
Ailie

---

From: Eric Steig [steig@uw.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 7:36 AM  
To: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Subject: J. Clim. paper

Joelle (and Ailie),

Annoying about the issue with your paper, which unfortunately I heard about through the climate rumour mill.

Do let me know if we at RealClimate can help in any way with any of this (or if you want to do a guest post, or whatever). I feel compelled to say something brief on our web site since we did highlight the paper and people are asking us about it.

Privately, does it matter in the end (will your results stand, do you think)?

Eric

--

~~~~~

Eric Steig  
IsoLab & Quaternary Research Center  
Department of Earth and Space Sciences  
Box 351310, University of Washington  
Seattle WA 98195  
206-685-3715  
steig@uw.edu

48

**Subject:** Re: your recent paper  
**Date:** Friday, 1 June 2012 9:21 AM  
**From:** Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Conversation:** your recent paper

Dear [REDACTED]

You can access a range of our publications, including the 1000 year temperature reconstruction work from here:

<http://climatehistory.com.au/publications>

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 31/05/12 9:14 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear madam,  
I was referred to your recent paper about the unusual 20th century warming etc  
Could I have a PDF copy please  
thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Roma 4455

49

Subject: FW: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 4:01 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED] Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>,  
"s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

From: John Chiang [jch\_chiang@berkeley.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 9:04 AM  
To: Joelle Gergis  
Cc: John Chiang  
Subject: Fwd: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Joelle:

After consulting with the Chief Editor, I have decided to rescind acceptance of the paper - you'll receive an official email from J Climate to this effect as soon as we figure out how it should be properly done. I believe the EOR has already been taken down.

Also, since it appears that you will have to redo the entire analysis (and which may result in different conclusions), I will also be requesting that you withdraw the paper from consideration. Again, you'll hear officially from J Climate in due course. I invite you to resubmit once the necessary analyses and changes to the manuscript have been made.

I hope this will be acceptable to you. I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing it to my prompt attention.

Best regards,  
John

From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission  
Date: June 8, 2012 4:35:28 AM GMT+02:00  
To: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>, "Whittaker, Gwendolyn" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>, JCLI Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>  
Cc: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], David John Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>

Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" JCLI-D-11-00649 which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper. The two lead authors on the paper were undergoing challenging personal circumstances at the time so this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

Ph: +61 3 834 49868

Fax: +61 3 834 47761

<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org  
<UrlBlockedError.aspx> > wrote:

> CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx>

> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649

> Journal of Climate

> Dear Dr. Gergis,

> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late  
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning  
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.

> Congratulations!

> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page  
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the  
> forms are below.

> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review  
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further  
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker  
> (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx> ).

> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

> Sincerely,

> Dr. John Chiang, editor

> Journal of Climate

> \*\*\*\*\*

> PRODUCTION INFORMATION

> \*\*\*\*\*

> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane  
> (ckeane@ametsoc.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx> ).

> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1  
> May 2011, use:

> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/prelMay11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/prelMay11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)

> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or  
> after 1 May 2011, use:

> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11\\_pgcolorchgform.pdf](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf)

> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this  
> form:

> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre\\_or\\_waiver\\_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)

d> f

- > You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by
- > logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.
- >
- > Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS
- > Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.
- > This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production
- > or give you instructions for providing anything required.
- >
- > Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
- > <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>
- >
- > If you need further information, please contact:
- > Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, [gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)
- <UrlBlockedError.aspx>
- >
- >

Subject: FW: J. Clim. paper  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 4:04 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
"s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: J. Clim. paper

---

From: Eric Steig [steig@uw.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 8:48 AM  
To: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Cc: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: J. Clim. paper

Thanks

I should also have said: fee free to ignore me! The rest of the RC gang always assumes our help is needed; sometimes our 'help' doesn't wind up helping as it gives undue attention to minor issues.

Your guys call, entirely!

E

On 6/8/12 3:33 PM, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant wrote:

> Hi Eric,  
>  
> I believe Joelle and Raphi are re-running the analysis at the moment. I'm sure they'll have more in the next couple of weeks, but Joelle can confirm.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> Ailie

---

> From: Eric Steig [steig@uw.edu]  
> Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 7:36 AM  
> To: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
> Subject: J. Clim. paper

> Joelle (and Ailie),  
>  
> Annoying about the issue with your paper, which unfortunately I heard about through the climate rumour mill.  
>  
> Do let me know if we at RealClimate can help in any way with any of this (or if you want to do a guest post, or whatever). I feel compelled to say something brief on our web site since we did highlight the paper and people are asking us about it.  
>  
> Privately, does it matter in the end (will your results stand, do you think)?  
>  
> Eric  
>  
> --



> ~~~~~  
> Eric Steig  
> IsoLab & Quaternary Research Center  
> Department of Earth and Space Sciences  
> Box 351310, University of Washington  
> Seattle WA 98195  
> 206-685-3715  
> steig@uw.edu  
>  
>

--  
~~~~~  
Eric Steig  
IsoLab & Quaternary Research Center  
Department of Earth and Space Sciences  
Box 351310, University of Washington  
Seattle WA 98195  
206-685-3715  
steig@uw.edu

51

Subject: RE: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 4:09 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Stephen Benka <sbenka@aip.org>  
Conversation: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction

Hi Steve

We found a data processing error in the paper and have withdrawn it until we have reassessed the results.

Sorry about this

Joelle

From: Stephen Benka [sbenka@aip.org]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 4:09 AM  
To: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: RE: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction

Dear Joelle,  
The link to your paper (and the doi number) at the Journal of Climate no longer works. Do have any updated publication information?  
Thanks.  
--Steve

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]  
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2012 7:07 PM  
To: Stephen Benka  
Subject: Re: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
Importance: High

Hi Stephen

I hope the attached helps and reaches you in time.

Note that I also corrected the hyperlink to the PAGES Regional 2K website.

All the best

Joelle

On 19/05/12 4:33 AM, "Stephen Benka" <sbenka@aip.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx> > wrote:

> Thanks to my colleagues, this version reads much better ð but still requires  
> your careful vetting.  
>  
>  
> From: Stephen Benka  
> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2012 11:28 AM  
> To: jgergis@unimelb.edu.au <UrlBlockedError.aspx>  
> Subject: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction

>  
> Dear Dr. Gergis,  
>  
> I have written a brief Physics Update on your recent work, and attached it to  
> this message. Please read it carefully and make any corrections or alterations  
> that you think are necessary. I tried to be accurate but am not an expert. The  
> overall length cannot change.  
>  
> I need to hear from you very soon, as this will be posted on our website on  
> Monday. Later, it will appear in the July issue of Physics Today.  
>  
> Thank you for your assistance.  
>  
>  
> =====  
> Stephen G. Benka, PhD  
> Editor-in-Chief, Physics Today  
> American Institute of Physics  
> One Physics Ellipse  
> College Park, Maryland 20740-3842  
>  
> Phone: 301-209-3042  
> Fax: 301-209-0842  
> Email: sbenka@aip.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx>  
> <http://www.physicstoday.org>  
> =====  
>  
>  
>

Subject: RE: FW: J. Clim. paper  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 8:01 PM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Joelle Gergis  
<jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
<agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: FW: J. Clim. paper

Hi Raphi,

I had detailed email exchanges with Mike Mann on Sat morning early in Australia, Friday midday in the US, at the same time as I sent my email to Stephen McIntyre. He passed on the info to Gavin Schmidt and Eric Steig.

Eric did add a post at that time on RC to update their original posting about the paper.

I realise now that I should probably have copied you on my emails to Stephen McI over the weekend, but I wanted to protect you from some of the "... " that is flying around. I will send it to you now. There have been emails from Andy Revkin from teh New York Times and Adam Morton at The Age. Adam will have a short article in the Age tomorrow, to update his piece that covered the original paper at length 3 weeks ago.

There is also an official statement from the University of Melbourne. Please direct any media enquiries about the paper being put on hold to me or to the University of Melbourne media office, or use the statement that I am about to send you.

I strongly recommend against engaging with any blog sites or emails that you may receive, except by sending them the official statement.

Separately, I'll also send an email about possible steps to complete the revised paper.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Sent: 11 June 2012 16:49  
To: Joelle Gergis  
Cc: David John Karoly; Steven J Phipps  
Subject: Re: FW: J. Clim. paper

Maybe we should explain the RC guys what happened? Not for them to publish it, but so they are aware of what has happened and can be prepared to what is going to happen?

They have commented about the paper so it's also about their credibility  
cheers  
raphi

Am 11.06.2012 08:04, schrieb Joelle Gergis:

---

From: Eric Steig [steig@uw.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 8:48 AM  
To: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Cc: Joelle Gergis  
Subject: Re: J. Clim. paper

Thanks

I should also have said: fee free to ignore me! The rest of the RC gang  
always assumes our help is needed; sometimes our 'help' doesn't wind up  
helping as it gives undue attention to minor issues.

Your guys call, entirely!

E

On 6/8/12 3:33 PM, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant wrote:  
Hi Eric,

I believe Joelle and Raphi are re-running the analysis at the moment. I'm sure  
they'll have more in the next couple of weeks, but Joelle can confirm.

Cheers,  
Ailie

---

From: Eric Steig [steig@uw.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 7:36 AM  
To: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Subject: J. Clim. paper

Joelle (and Ailie),

Annoying about the issue with your paper, which unfortunately I heard  
about through the climate rumour mill.

Do let me know if we at RealClimate can help in any way with any of this  
(or if you want to do a guest post, or whatever). I feel compelled to  
say something brief on our web site since we did highlight the paper and  
people are asking us about it.

Privately, does it matter in the end (will your results stand, do you  
think)?

Eric

--

Eric Steig  
IsoLab& Quaternary Research Center

Department of Earth and Space Sciences  
Box 351310, University of Washington  
Seattle WA 98195  
206-685-3715  
steig@uw.edu

--

~~~~~

Eric Steig  
IsoLab & Quaternary Research Center  
Department of Earth and Space Sciences  
Box 351310, University of Washington  
Seattle WA 98195  
206-685-3715  
steig@uw.edu

--

Raphael Neukom  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne  
Victoria 3010, Australia

Subject: FW: Statement in response  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 8:06 PM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom

[REDACTED]

Conversation: Statement in response

Hi Ailie and Steven,

Apologies for not sending this to you over the weekend. This was sent to Raphi on Friday night, as Joelle was about to go away for the weekend, for a very well deserved break.

This has both the short, approved statement and a longer version, as well as some key points if you need to respond to direct questions.

Best wishes, David

PS Sorry, I should have sent this earlier. I got caught up in the events as they were happening.

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: 08 June 2012 17:56  
To: Raphael Neukom  
Subject: FW: Statement in response

Hi Raphi,

I hope you got some sleep. Joelle is away this weekend and not taking her computer. As you will have seen from various emails, we have contacted J Climate and asked them to put the paper on hold, and contacted the PAGES 2K group as well.

We have had advice from the media team here at the University, as well as an independent media advisor. We have prepared a short statement to be used in response to any questions and to be sent to Stephen McIntyre to go on the ClimateAudit web site. The longer version of the statement is in the email message below.

The short version is

Print publication of scientific study put on hold

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian

temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

We are currently reviewing the data and results.

Key points: We know there is an issue. The publication is on hold. We are reviewing the data and results. This is a normal part of science.

Hope you are happy with this, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Joelle Gergis  
Sent: 08 June 2012 16:17  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Statement in response

Print Publication of scientific study put on hold

Publication of a recent scientific study on temperature variations in Australasia over the last thousand years has been delayed. The study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate. An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, which may affect the results.

While the paper states that "both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period", it was discovered on Tuesday 5 June that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect. Although this is an unfortunate data processing issue, it is likely to have implications for the results reported in the study. The journal has been contacted and the publication of the study has been put on hold.

This is a normal part of science. The testing of scientific studies through independent analysis of data and methods strengthens the conclusions. In this study, an issue has been identified and the results are being re-checked.



54

**Subject:** FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

**Date:** Monday, 11 June 2012 9:33 PM

**From:** David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>

**To:** Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>

**Conversation:** Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection was done, based on correls that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correls and proxy selections for detrended correls. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correls are better.

Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correls, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400. Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to get the area average temperature. This approach is like what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.

My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

Now for some technical questions.

Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the correlations between the target and the individual proxies allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom, effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the

autocorrelation is different for each proxy?

In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the correlation, no.of degrees of freedom and sig level for the full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This will help us with proxy selection.

It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant correlations for the interannual variations and some are even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi, can you do a map using the modern temp data for the correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is that teh correlns will be much larger scale for the full data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection issues for interannual variations.

That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to use proxy selection based on teh full temp record, rather than the detrended data.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
**Prof David Karoly**

School of Earth Sciences

University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

ph: +61 3 8344 4698

fax: +61 3 8344 7761

email: [dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au)

<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

[<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>](http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/)

~~~~~

55

Subject: Re: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Monday, 11 June 2012 10:43 PM  
From: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank today and he has very similar suggestions.

If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

To the technical questions:

1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy set (calculated last week under time pressure).

2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the next few days).

3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only with the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data from the region.

Thanks and cheers  
Raphi

Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:

Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection was done, based on correls that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correls and proxy selections for detrended correls. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correls are better.

Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correls, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400. Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select

proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to get the area average temperature. This approach is like what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.

My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

Now for some technical questions.

Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the correlations between the target and the individual proxies allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom, effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the autocorrelation is different for each proxy?

In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the correlation, no.of degrees of freedom and sig level for the full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This will help us with proxy selection.

It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant correlations for the interannual variations and some are even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi, can you do a map using the modern temp data for the correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is that teh correlns will be much larger scale for the full data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection issues for interannual variations.

That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to use proxy selection based on teh full temp record, rather than the detrended data.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
To: David John Karoly

Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Well I'm afraid McIntyre has probably already leaked this anyway. I probably don't have to tell you this, but don't trust him to behave ethically or honestly here, and assume that anything you tell him will be cherry-picked in a way that maximally discredits the study and will be leaked as suits his purposes.

We have simply noted at RC in the comments that the paper does appear to have been retracted from the AMS website, and we have no further information as to why.

I will share this w/ Eric and Gavin so they know the status,

mike

p.s. just a side note. we have found in our own extensive pseudoproxy tests that detrending the data prior to calibration is *\*not\** actually a good idea. See abstract of the '07 JGR article also the attached Science comment by Wahl et al. So even if that does change the results, its not obvious that it would be for the better. Just my two cents.

[see attached file: WahletalScience06.pdf] [see attached file: MRWA-JGR07.pdf]

--

Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 6:55 AM  
From: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi Raphi,

Thanks for your email. There is no great urgency to get this done. I recommend that you and Joelle work on it when you are together when Joelle visits later this month.

Ailie, I think that you have looked at some of the teleconnection patterns in your own JCLim paper.  
Can you have a look at responding to item 3. in the technical questions below? I suggest that you use gridded HadCRUT3 or HadCRUT4 monthly temp data for the same period as the paper, 1920-90 (I think) Sept-Feb average, and calculate the correlations of each grid box with the Australasian region area average for detrended data and for the full data. The correlations should be for the larger region that includes the locations of all the proxies considered.

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Sent: 11 June 2012 22:43  
To: David John Karoly  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: Re: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank today and he has very similar suggestions.  
If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

To the technical questions:

1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy set (calculated last week under time pressure).
2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the next few days).
3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only with

the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data from the region.

Thanks and cheers  
Raphi

Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:  
Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection was done, based on correals that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correals and proxy selections for detrended correals. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correals are better.

Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correals, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400.

Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to get the area average temperature. This approach is like what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.

My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

Now for some technical questions.

Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the correlations between the target and the individual proxies allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom, effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the autocorrelation is different for each proxy?

In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the correlation, no. of degrees of freedom and sig level for the full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This will help us with proxy selection.

It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant correlations for the interannual variations and some are even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi, can you do a map using the modern temp data for the correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data with the target, area average

Australasian temps? Then redo the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is that the correlations will be much larger scale for the full data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection issues for interannual variations. That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to use proxy selection based on the full temp record, rather than the detrended data.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,  
Well I'm afraid McIntyre has probably already leaked this anyway. I probably don't have to tell you this, but don't trust him to behave ethically or honestly here, and assume that anything you tell him will be cherry-picked in a way that maximally discredits the study and will be leaked as suits his purposes.

We have simply noted at RC in the comments that the paper does appear to have been retracted from the AMS website, and we have no further information as to why. I will share this w/ Eric and Gavin so they know the status,  
mike

p.s. just a side note. we have found in our own extensive pseudoproxy tests that detrending the data prior to calibration is \*not\* actually a good idea. See abstract of the '07 JGR article also the attached Science comment by Wahl et al. So even if that does change the results, it's not obvious that it would be for the better. Just my two cents.

[see attached file: WahletalScience06.pdf] [see attached file: MRWA-JGR07.pdf]

--  
Michael E. Mann  
Professor  
Director, Earth System Science Center (ESSC)

Department of Meteorology                      Phone: (814) 863-4075  
503 Walker Building                              FAX: (814) 865-3663  
The Pennsylvania State University              email: mann@psu.edu  
University Park, PA 16802-5013                www.michaelmann.net  
<<http://www.michaelmann.net>>

"The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars": [www.thehockeystick.net](http://www.thehockeystick.net)



57

Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 7:58 AM  
From: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED]  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au"  
<s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi all,

David/Joelle, thanks for all the correspondence re the paper. I think you're all doing a fantastic job of dealing with everything (which ordinarily wouldn't be an issue I suspect, it's just the subject matter). So keep up the good work.

Raphi/David, I Can do on those maps. But, just to clarify:

You want two maps of the correlations between a) Australasian area-averaged temperature (land & ocean) b) Grid point temperatures within the Australian domain (using Sept-Feb data from 1920-1990 from the HadCRUT3 and/or HadCRUT4).

The first map will show these correlations between the raw anomalies (i.e. with variations of all time scales still included - in other words NO detrending).

The second map will show these correlations between linearly detrended anomalies (i.e. both the target - Aust area-average temps AND the grid points will be detrended using linear regression(??) -is this what you used in the paper, I can't remember).

If that's correct let me know and I'll make them tomorrow.

Just for the record I think David will be correct. Given the large trends in temp anomalies across much of the domain I think you'll see stronger and more consistent correlations across most of the domain using the raw anomalies. Detrending will be much more spatially variable and some areas will be quite different.

Raphi/Joelle - are the HadCRUT3 and/or HadCRUT4 still on Pandora?

Cheers,  
Ailie

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 6:55 AM  
To: Raphael Neukom  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi Raphi,

Thanks for your email. There is no great urgency to get this done. I recommend that you and Joelle work on it when you are together when Joelle visits later this month.

Ailie, I think that you have looked at some of the teleconnection patterns in your own JCLim paper.

Can you have a look at responding to item 3. in the technical questions below?

I suggest that you use gridded HadCRUT3 or HadCRUT4 monthly temp data for the same period as the paper, 1920-90 (I think) Sept-Feb average, and calculate the correlations of each grid box with the Australasian region area average for detrended data and for the full data. The correlations should be for the larger region that includes the locations of all the proxies considered.

Thanks, David

-----  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
-----

From: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Sent: 11 June 2012 22:43  
To: David John Karoly  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: Re: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank today and he has very similar suggestions.

If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

To the technical questions:

1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy set (calculated last week under time pressure).
2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the next few days).
3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only with the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data from the region.

Thanks and cheers  
Raphi

Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:  
Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection

was done, based on correals that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correals and proxy selections for detrended correals. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correals are better.

Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correals, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400.

Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to get the area average temperature. This approach is like what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.

My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

Now for some technical questions.

Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the correlations between the target and the individual proxies allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom, effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the autocorrelation is different for each proxy?

In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the correlation, no. of degrees of freedom and sig level for the full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This will help us with proxy selection.

It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant correlations for the interannual variations and some are even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi, can you do a map using the modern temp data for the correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is that teh correals will be much larger scale for the full data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection issues for interannual variations. That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to use proxy selection based on teh full temp record, rather than the detrended data.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au

<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>

~~~~~  
From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Well I'm afraid McIntyre has probably already leaked this anyway. I probably don't have to tell you this, but don't trust him to behave ethically or honestly here, and assume that anything you tell him will be cherry-picked in a way that maximally discredits the study and will be leaked as suits his purposes.

We have simply noted at RC in the comments that the paper does appear to have been retracted from the AMS website, and we have no further information as to why. I will share this w/ Eric and Gavin so they know the status,  
mike

p.s. just a side note. we have found in our own extensive pseudoproxy tests that detrending the data prior to calibration is \*not\* actually a good idea. See abstract of the '07 JGR article also the attached Science comment by Wahl et al. So even if that does change the results, its not obvious that it would be for the better. Just my two cents.

[see attached file: WahletalScience06.pdf] [see attached file: MRWA-JGR07.pdf]

--

Michael E. Mann  
Professor  
Director, Earth System Science Center (ESSC)

Department of Meteorology  
503 Walker Building  
The Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802-5013  
<<http://www.michaelmann.net>>

Phone: (814) 863-4075  
FAX: (814) 865-3663  
email: mann@psu.edu  
[www.michaelmann.net](http://www.michaelmann.net)

"The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars": [www.thehockeystick.net](http://www.thehockeystick.net)  
<<http://www.thehockeystick.net>>

"Dire Predictions": [www.direpredictions.com](http://www.direpredictions.com) <<http://www.direpredictions.com>>

Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 8:59 AM  
From: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom  
[REDACTED]  
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au"  
<s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
Conversation: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Ok great, thanks for the clarification.

Cheers,  
Ailie

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 8:57 AM  
To: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; Raphael Neukom  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi Ailie,

Yes, the correlation maps are just as you describe. Please check the manuscript for the exact start and end dates of the calibration period. I think that year 1 starts Sept 1920-Feb 1921 and year 70 is Sept 89- Feb 1990, but Raphi or Joelle could confirm that. Also, you are probably better to use HadCRUT3 temps, as that was what the paper used, I think. The HadCRUT4 temps have more SH data coverage, but won't make much difference.

Thanks for doing this, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant  
Sent: 12 June 2012 07:58  
To: David John Karoly; Raphael Neukom  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi all,

David/Joelle, thanks for all the correspondence re the paper. I think you're all doing a fantastic job of dealing with everything (which ordinarily wouldn't be an issue I suspect, it's just the subject matter). So keep up the good work.

Raphi/David, I Can do on those maps. But, just to clarify:

You want two maps of the correlations between a) Australasian area-averaged temperature (land & ocean) b) Grid point temperatures within the Australian domain (using Sept-Feb data from 1920-1990 from the HadCRUT3 and/or HadCRUT4).

The first map will show these correlations between the raw anomalies (i.e. with variations of all time scales still included - in other words NO detrending).

The second map will show these correlations between linearly detrended anomalies (i.e. both the target - Aust area-average temps AND the grid points will be detrended using linear regression(??) -is this what you used in the paper, I can't remember).

If that's correct let me know and I'll make them tomorrow.

Just for the record I think David will be correct. Given the large trends in temp anomalies across much of the domain I think you'll see stronger and more consistent correlations across most of the domain using the raw anomalies. Detrending will be much more spatially variable and some areas will be quite different.

Raphi/Joelle - are the HadCRUT3 and/or HadCRUT4 still on Pandora?

Cheers,  
Ailie

From: David John Karoly  
Sent: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 6:55 AM  
To: Raphael Neukom  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: RE: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi Raphi,

Thanks for your email. There is no great urgency to get this done. I recommend that you and Joelle work on it when you are together when Joelle visits later this month.

Ailie, I think that you have looked at some of the teleconnection patterns in your own JCLim paper.

Can you have a look at responding to item 3. in the technical questions below? I suggest that you use gridded HadCRUT3 or HadCRUT4 monthly temp data for the same period as the paper, 1920-90 (I think) Sept-Feb average, and calculate the correlations of each grid box with the Australasian region area average for detrended data and for the full data. The correlations should be for the larger region that includes the locations of all the proxies considered.

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>

<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>

From: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Sent: 11 June 2012 22:43  
To: David John Karoly  
Cc: Joelle Gergis; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant; s.phipps@unsw.edu.au  
Subject: Re: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank today and he has very similar suggestions.

If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

To the technical questions:

1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy set (calculated last week under time pressure).
2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the next few days).
3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only with the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data from the region.

Thanks and cheers  
Raphi

Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:  
Hi Raphi and Joelle,

Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection was done, based on correls that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correls and proxy selections for detrended correls. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correls are better.

Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correls, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400. Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to

get the area average temperature. This approach is like what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.

My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

Now for some technical questions.

Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the correlations between the target and the individual proxies allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom, effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the autocorrelation is different for each proxy?

In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the correlation, no. of degrees of freedom and sig level for the full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This will help us with proxy selection.

It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant correlations for the interannual variations and some are even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi, can you do a map using the modern temp data for the correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is that teh correlns will be much larger scale for the full data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection issues for interannual variations. That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to use proxy selection based on teh full temp record, rather than the detrended data.

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
To: David John Karoly  
Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi David,

Well I'm afraid McIntyre has probably already leaked this anyway. I probably don't have to tell you this, but don't trust him to behave ethically or honestly here, and assume that anything you tell him will be cherry-picked in a way that maximally discredits the study and will be leaked as suits his purposes.

We have simply noted at RC in the comments that the paper does appear to have been



retracted from the AMS website, and we have no further information as to why. I will share this w/ Eric and Gavin so they know the status,  
mike

p.s. just a side note. we have found in our own extensive pseudoproxy tests that detrending the data prior to calibration is \*not\* actually a good idea. See abstract of the '07 JGR article also the attached Science comment by Wahl et al. So even if that does change the results, its not obvious that it would be for the better. Just my two cents.

[see attached file: WahletalScience06.pdf] [see attached file: MRWA-JGR07.pdf]

--

Michael E. Mann  
Professor  
Director, Earth System Science Center (ESSC)

Department of Meteorology                      Phone: (814) 863-4075  
503 Walker Building                              FAX: (814) 865-3663  
The Pennsylvania State University            email: mann@psu.edu  
University Park, PA 16802-5013            www.michaelmann.net  
<<http://www.michaelmann.net>>

"The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars": [www.thehockeystick.net](http://www.thehockeystick.net)  
<<http://www.thehockeystick.net>>

"Dire Predictions": [www.direpredictions.com](http://www.direpredictions.com) <<http://www.direpredictions.com>>

--

Raphael Neukom  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne  
Victoria 3010, Australia

59

Subject: Re: Urgent FAVOR from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 12:20 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Stephen Benka <sbenka@aip.org>  
Conversation: Urgent FAVOR from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction

Hi Steve

Here is my comment:

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate. We are currently reviewing the data and results.

All the best

Joelle

--  
Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 11/06/12 10:37 PM, "Stephen Benka" <sbenka@aip.org> wrote:

> Hi Joelle,  
> Would you be kind enough to add a comment to our online story about the paper?  
> You can find it here:  
>  
> [http://www.physicstoday.org/daily\\_edition/physics\\_update/australasian\\_climate](http://www.physicstoday.org/daily_edition/physics_update/australasian_climate)  
>  
> 8212\_the\_1000-year\_view  
> We will then take it down, but of Google and other engines will have cached  
> it, so it will still be findable.  
> Many thanks!  
> --Steve  
>  
>  
> From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]  
> Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 2:09 AM  
> To: Stephen Benka  
> Subject: RE: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
>  
>  
> Hi Steve  
>

>  
>  
> We found a data processing error in the paper and have withdrawn it until we  
> have reassessed the results.  
>  
>  
>  
> Sorry about this  
>  
>  
>  
> Joelle  
>  
>  
> From: Stephen Benka [sbenka@aip.org]  
> Sent: Saturday, 9 June 2012 4:09 AM  
> To: Joelle Gergis  
> Subject: RE: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
>  
> Dear Joelle,  
> The link to your paper (and the doi number) at the Journal of Climate no  
> longer works. Do have any updated publication information?  
> Thanks.  
> --Steve  
>  
>  
> From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]  
> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2012 7:07 PM  
> To: Stephen Benka  
> Subject: Re: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
> Importance: High  
>  
> Hi Stephen  
>  
> I hope the attached helps and reaches you in time.  
>  
> Note that I also corrected the hyperlink to the PAGES Regional 2K website.  
>  
> All the best  
>  
> Joelle  
>  
>  
>  
> On 19/05/12 4:33 AM, "Stephen Benka" <sbenka@aip.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx> >  
> wrote:  
>  
>> Thanks to my colleagues, this version reads much better Ð but still requires  
>> your careful vetting.  
>>  
>>  
>> From: Stephen Benka  
>> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2012 11:28 AM  
>> To: jgergis@unimelb.edu.au <UrlBlockedError.aspx>  
>> Subject: Urgent request from Physics Today - Climate reconstruction  
>>

>> Dear Dr. Gergis,  
>>  
>> I have written a brief Physics Update on your recent work, and attached it to  
>> this message. Please read it carefully and make any corrections or  
>> alterations  
>> that you think are necessary. I tried to be accurate but am not an expert.  
>> The  
>> overall length cannot change.  
>>  
>> I need to hear from you very soon, as this will be posted on our website on  
>> Monday. Later, it will appear in the July issue of Physics Today.  
>>  
>> Thank you for your assistance.  
>>  
>>  
>> =====  
>> Stephen G. Benka, PhD  
>> Editor-in-Chief, Physics Today  
>> American Institute of Physics  
>> One Physics Ellipse  
>> College Park, Maryland 20740-3842  
>>  
>> Phone: 301-209-3042  
>> Fax: 301-209-0842  
>> Email: sbenka@aip.org <UrlBlockedError.aspx>  
>> <http://www.physicstoday.org>  
>> =====  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>

Subject: Re: FW: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 1:51 PM  
From: s.phipps@unsw.edu.au <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>  
To: Raphael Neukom [REDACTED]  
Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Joelle Gergis <jjgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Hi all,

I appreciate that my opinion wasn't being explicitly solicited on this, but I do have thoughts and so I hope you don't mind if I share them. I'm actually on leave this week, so you'll also have to forgive me if I raise issues without having fully reviewed the appropriate literature first.

On the issue of detrending: it strikes me that, on balance, it is preferable if this is NOT done. While I understand that anthropogenic trends will inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. That's fine if that's what we want to reconstruct, but in an exercise of this nature we are also interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to leave any trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

I realise that both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus I believe that either approach is entirely justifiable. Based on the various emails circulated over the past few days, it appears that we will not have a viable millennial-scale reconstruction if we pursue the detrended approach. I therefore feel that we should use the raw data to validate the proxies. From Raphi's email, this will leave 22 of the 27 proxies in the reconstruction once autocorrelation is taken into account. This should mean that the final reconstruction will not change significantly. To address debate over this issue, we should also present results for the detrended approach in the Supplementary Material.

My preference is therefore for David's Option 2, with Option 1 as my second choice. I dislike Option 3 as it will not leave us with a viable reconstruction. I also dislike Option 4 as it strikes me as essentially starting again from scratch - which seems unnecessary given how far this work has already progressed, and also seems out of proportion to what is only a matter of fixing a technical issue.

Thank you for cc'ing me in this, and I would appreciate it if I could continue to be cc'ed in all technical correspondence. As a co-author on this study, I naturally have a strong interest in this. These issues are also directly relevant to two other manuscripts that I am working on currently.

Also, one question: which is the single proxy prior to 1400 which survives under the detrended approach?

Good luck with your continuing efforts on this, and please don't be shy about asking me if there's anything I can do to help.

Steven

> Hi David,

>

> Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank today and he has very similar suggestions.

> If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

>

> To the technical questions:

> 1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy set (calculated last week under time pressure).

> 2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the next few days).

> 3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only with the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data from the region.

>

> Thanks and cheers

> Raphi

>

>

> Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:

> Hi Raphi and Joelle,

>

> Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several different approaches that we can take with revising the Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data analysis that might be needed.

>

> 1. Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that the proxy selection was done, based on correls that included trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration was also done using the full data variations, including trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data

> 2. Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions based on both proxy selections for full correls and proxy selections for detrended correls. Expand the paper to show both sets of results and explain why the full correls are better.

> 3. Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correls, which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400.

> 4. Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales, not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies to get the area average temperature. This approach is like

> what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.  
> My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

> Now for some technical questions.

- > 1. Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the  
> correlations between the target and the individual proxies  
> allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the  
> reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA  
> web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for  
> the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom,  
> effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different  
> values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the  
> autocorrelation is different for each proxy?
- > 2. In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give  
> for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the  
> correlation, no.of degrees of freedom and sig level for the  
> full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This  
> will help us with proxy selection.
- > 3. It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant  
> correlations for the interannual variations and some are  
> even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The  
> spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the  
> main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time  
> scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite  
> different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi,  
> can you do a map using the modern temp data for the  
> correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data  
> with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo  
> the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is  
> that teh correlns will be much larger scale for the full  
> data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection  
> issues for interannual variations.

> That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the  
> current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to  
> use proxy selection based on teh full temp record, rather than  
> the detrended data.

> Best wishes,Ê David

> ~~~~~  
> Prof David Karoly  
> School of Earth Sciences  
> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
> ph: Ê+61 3 8344 4698  
> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
> http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/  
> ~~~~~

---

> From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
> Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
> To: David John Karoly  
> Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold





61

Subject: Fwd: climate paper  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 1:59 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Rebecca Scott <rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>  
Conversation: climate paper

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]@theaustralian.com.au>  
Date: 12 June 2012 1:56:05 PM AEST  
To: <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
Subject: climate paper

climate paper

Dear Dr Gergis,

I'm writing for tomorrow's paper about the withdrawal of the reconstructed temperatures journal article on which you were lead author. I'd like to ask you about this.

regards,

[REDACTED]

The Australian  
Level 2, 2 Holt Street, Surry Hills, NSW, 2010  
T: +61 2 9288 2551  
E: [REDACTED]@theaustralian.com.au <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe>  
<<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe>> <http://twitter.com/#!/australian>  
<<http://twitter.com/#!/australian>>  
<http://pages.e.newsdigitalmedia.com.au/GPC?a=TheAustralian>  
<<http://pages.e.newsdigitalmedia.com.au/GPC?a=TheAustralian>>  
<<http://www.theaustralian.com.au>>  
<<http://www.1degree.com.au/>>

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee, you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments which does not relate to the official business of the sending company must be taken not to have been sent or endorsed by that company or any of its related entities. No warranty is made that the e-mail or attachments are free from computer virus or other defect.

62

Subject: Re: Seeking interview  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 2:09 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Seeking interview

HI [REDACTED]

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the study, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" by Joelle Gergis, Raphael Neukom, Stephen Phipps, Ailie Gallant and David Karoly, accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate. We are currently reviewing the data and results.

Best to hold off on your story.

Sorry about this

Joelle

On 7/06/12 9:56 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Joelle,

Sorry to hear there is an emergency. I've got a few weeks before I need to file. I realised Monday 11th is a public holiday, so next week I should be in on Tuesday 12th, if that works for you.

[REDACTED]

On 7/6/12 9:48 AM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Sorry [REDACTED], an emergency has come up so I can't do this interview

My apologies

Joelle

On 29/05/12 2:47 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

> Hi Joelle,

>

> We are monthly, and I only work here one day a week, so tomorrow doesn't  
> suit. How is next Thursday? We've got a while before the next edition needs  
> to be done, so if that doesn't work we can try the week after.

>

> In terms of what I'm after, I'm interested in finding out the geographic  
> area covered, whether this has been matched by similar measurements in  
> southern Africa and South America and how well or badly variations you

> observed lined up with changes in the northern hemisphere prior to the  
> anthropogenic warming.

>  
> Being monthly we're always behind on research that makes the daily media, so  
> I'm interested in putting that to use and finding out about responses you  
> have had, both from colleagues and from commentators.

>  
> [REDACTED]

> On 29/5/12 2:31 PM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

>> Hi [REDACTED]

>> I'm out of the office today, can we try for 11am tomorrow?

>> A good starting point would be to check the Australian Science Media Centre  
>> briefing page.

>> Let me know what you had in mind

>> Thanks

>> Joelle

>> Sent from my iPhone

>> On 29/05/2012, at 2:21 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

>>> Hi Joelle,

>>> I'm very keen to write an article for Australasian Science on your findings  
>>> on the Australian climate record and am hoping to ask you some questions. I  
>>> haven't been able to reach you by phone. Is there a time I can catch you?

>>> -----  
>>> [REDACTED]

>>> Australasian Science  
>>> (03) 9500 0015

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>

>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> [REDACTED]

>>> Australasian Science  
>>> (03) 9500 0015

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>

-----  
[REDACTED]  
Australasian Science

63

Subject: Re: australia reconstructions  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 2:52 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: Sandy Harrison <sandy.harrison@mq.edu.au>  
Conversation: australia reconstructions

Hi Sandy

An issue has been identified in the processing of the data used in the Australasian temperature reconstruction study (proxy screening based on non detrended vs detrended data).

We are currently reviewing the data and results. As such, we asked that our paper be removed from online while we check the influence on our results. While we don't think things will change drastically, it is likely to go through the review process again as we may add some further supplementary material to justify our approach.

I will be sure to pass on the paper once it has been rechecked.

Hope this is ok

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis  
Climate Research Fellow  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne,  
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
Ph: +61 3 834 49868  
Fax: +61 3 834 47761  
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 11/06/12 1:18 PM, "Sandy Harrison" <sandy.harrison@mq.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Joelle,

The article describing your temperature reconstructions does not seem to be available from the JCLIM website, presumably because its transferring from online to final version !! is there any chance that you could send me the paper electronically, so that I can see the details of what you did here ????? We are currently working on our PCMIIP comparisons, and it would be good to use the new reconstructions.

Cheers,  
Sandy

64

Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold  
Date: Tuesday, 12 June 2012 5:01 PM  
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>  
To: "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Raphael Neukom

Cc: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>

Conversation: Print production of scientific study put on hold

Thanks for thinking this through Steven, of course we appreciate your comments on this issue (you know I value your opinion greatly, so certainly don't apologise).

The issue of detrending has always been contentious in palaeoclimatology since, as you recognise, there are justifications for both cases depending on the aim of the study.

I agree that with Raphi's assessment of taking David's option 1 in the main manuscript but address points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the issue.

I'm leaving for Switzerland on Friday night, will be taking a few days off then working for a couple of weeks intensively with Raphi to get this done.

I will be sure to copy you in on any further technical discussions and update everyone on progress as it unfolds.

Thanks for your help with this

Joelle

On 12/06/12 1:51 PM, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au> wrote:

> Hi all,  
>  
> I appreciate that my opinion wasn't being explicitly solicited on this,  
> but I do have thoughts and so I hope you don't mind if I share them. I'm  
> actually on leave this week, so you'll also have to forgive me if I raise  
> issues without having fully reviewed the appropriate literature first.  
>  
> On the issue of detrending: it strikes me that, on balance, it is  
> preferable if this is NOT done. While I understand that anthropogenic  
> trends will inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by  
> allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear  
> trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation  
> exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to  
> reconstruct interannual variations. That's fine if that's what we want to  
> reconstruct, but in an exercise of this nature we are also interested in  
> reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable  
> to leave any trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability  
> of the proxies to reconstruct this information.  
>  
> I realise that both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that  
> both are supported in the literature. Thus I believe that either approach  
> is entirely justifiable. Based on the various emails circulated over the  
> past few days, it appears that we will not have a viable millennial-scale  
> reconstruction if we pursue the detrended approach. I therefore feel that

> we should use the raw data to validate the proxies. From Raphi's email,  
> this will leave 22 of the 27 proxies in the reconstruction once  
> autocorrelation is taking into account. This should mean that the final  
> reconstruction will not change significantly. To address debate over this  
> issue, we should also present results for the detrended approach in the  
> Supplementary Material.

>

> My preference is therefore for David's Option 2, with Option 1 as my  
> second choice. I dislike Option 3 as it will not leave us with a viable  
> reconstruction. I also dislike Option 4 as it strikes me as essentially  
> starting again from scratch - which seems unnecessary given how far this  
> work has already progressed, and also seems out of proportion to what is  
> only a matter of fixing a technical issue.

>

> Thank you for cc'ing me in this, and I would appreciate it if I could  
> continue to be cc'ed in all technical correspondence. As a co-author on  
> this study, I naturally have a strong interest in this. These issues are  
> also directly relevant to two other manuscripts that I am working on  
> currently.

>

> Also, one question: which is the single proxy prior to 1400 which survives  
> under the detrended approach?

>

> Good luck with your continuing efforts on this, and please don't be shy  
> about asking me if there's anything I can do to help.

>

> Steven

>

>> Hi David,

>>

>> Thanks for these suggestions. I've also discussed this with David Frank  
>> today and he has very similar suggestions.

>> If possible we should do point 1 below in the main manuscript and include  
>> points 2 and 4 in the supplementary section with a brief discussion of the  
>> issue.

>>

>> To the technical questions:

>> 1. We did not take autocorrelations into account for Australasia (but I did  
>> for the SH). If I do so for Australasia (using the formula of Stevens JoC  
>> manuscript) about 22 out of the 27 proxies that we used remain in the proxy  
>> set (calculated last week under time pressure).

>> 2. I will provide this table (but I am not sure whether I can make it in the  
>> next few days).

>> 3. This is a very good idea. Ailie can you do this? I can also try but only  
>> with the (target) grid as I don't have access to all the newest station data  
>> from the region.

>>

>> Thanks and cheers

>> Raphi

>>

>>

>> Am 11.06.2012 13:33, schrieb David John Karoly:

>> Hi Raphi and Joelle,

>>

>> Following some email discussions with Mike Mann and helpful  
>> discussions with you both last week, there appear to be several  
>> different approaches that we can take with revising the

>> Australasian temp recon paper. I am going to go through some of  
>> them briefly, and then raise some suggestions for further data  
>> analysis that might be needed.  
>>

- >> 1. Amend the manuscript so that it states the actual way that  
>> the proxy selection was done, based on correls that included  
>> trends and were significant at the 5% level. The calibration  
>> was also done using the full data variations, including  
>> trends, over the calibration period. As Mike Mann says below  
>> and in the attached papers, this is a common approach. Don't  
>> seriously address the proxy selection for detrended data
  - >> 2. Revise the manuscript to present results for reconstructions  
>> based on both proxy selections for full correls and proxy  
>> selections for detrended correls. Expand the paper to show  
>> both sets of results and explain why the full correls are  
>> better.
  - >> 3. Redo the analysis for proxy selection based on what the  
>> manuscript says, proxy selection based on detrended correls,  
>> which gives only about 9 selected proxies and only one prior  
>> to 1400. No reliable reconstruction prior to 1400.
  - >> 4. Redo the analysis based on proxy correlations with  
>> local/regional temps at interannual and decadal timescales,  
>> not the Australasian area average; select proxies that have  
>> strong local temperature signals, then average the proxies  
>> to get the area average temperature. This approach is like  
>> what Raphi is doing for the SH paper, I think.
- >> My preference is now for 1. or 2. above, and not for 3.

>> Now for some technical questions.

- >> 1. Raphi, did you estimate the significance level of the  
>> correlations between the target and the individual proxies  
>> allowing for the autocorrelation in the proxies and the  
>> reduced degrees of freedom? Some of the comments on the CA  
>> web site suggest that they can only get sig correlations for  
>> the 27 proxies if you assume 70 degrees of freedom,  
>> effectively ignoring autocorrelation. Do you have different  
>> values for the sig correlations for each proxy, because the  
>> autocorrelation is different for each proxy?
- >> 2. In a table like the one you provided last week, can you give  
>> for each proxy record, for the 1920-1990 period, the  
>> correlation, no. of degrees of freedom and sig level for the  
>> full data, detrended data and low pass filtered data. This  
>> will help us with proxy selection.
- >> 3. It is not surprising that there are many fewer significant  
>> correlations for the interannual variations and some are  
>> even of the opposite sign for the full correlations. The  
>> spatial pattern for the temp response to ENSO, which is the  
>> main contributor to Aust temp variations at interannual time  
>> scales, is not uniform over Australasia, being quite  
>> different in NZ or Law Dome than Australia. Ailie or Raphi,  
>> can you do a map using the modern temp data for the  
>> correlations of interannual variations of gridded temp data  
>> with teh target, area average Australasian temps? Then redo  
>> the map for the full data, including the trend. My guess is  
>> that teh correlns will be much larger scale for the full  
>> data. This will help to explain some of the proxy selection

>> issues for interannual variations.  
>> That's enough for now. I am coming around to the idea that the  
>> current analysis is fine, but we need to explain why it is ok to  
>> use proxy selection based on the full temp record, rather than  
>> the detrended data.

>> Best wishes, David

>> ~~~~~  
>> Prof David Karoly  
>> School of Earth Sciences  
>> University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
>> ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
>> fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
>> email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
>> <http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
>> ~~~~~

---

>> From: Michael Mann [mann@meteo.psu.edu]  
>> Sent: 09 June 2012 06:39  
>> To: David John Karoly  
>> Subject: Re: Print production of scientific study put on hold

>> Hi David, Well I'm afraid McIntyre has probably already leaked this  
>> anyway. I probably don't have to tell you this, but don't trust him to  
>> behave ethically or honestly here, and assume that anything you tell  
>> him will be cherry-picked in a way that maximally discredits the study  
>> and will be leaked as suits his purposes.

>> We have simply noted at RC in the comments that the paper does appear  
>> to have been retracted from the AMS website, and we have no further  
>> information as to why.

>> I will share this w/ Eric and Gavin so they know the status,  
>> mike

>> p.s. just a side note. we have found in our own extensive pseudoproxy  
>> tests that detrending the data prior to calibration is \*not\* actually  
>> a good idea. See abstract of the '07 JGR article also the attached  
>> Science comment by Wahl et al. So even if that does change the  
>> results, its not obvious that it would be for the better. Just my two  
>> cents.

>> [see attached file: WahletalScience06.pdf] [see attached file:  
>> MRWA-JGR07.pdf]

>> --

>> Michael E. Mann  
>> Professor  
>> Director, Earth System Science Center (ESSC)

>> Department of Meteorology Phone: (814) 863-4075  
>> 503 Walker Building FAX: (814) 865-3663  
>> The Pennsylvania State University email: mann@psu.edu  
>> University Park, PA 16802-5013 www.michaelmann.net

>>



