

Northampton, UK  
Tuesday 10 June 2008

Mr Lee Shailer  
Information Services Directorate  
Room 103, Whiteknights House  
The University of Reading  
PO Box 217, Reading RG6 6AH  
By email [imps@reading.ac.uk](mailto:imps@reading.ac.uk)

Dear Mr Shailer,

**IMPS Request IMPS#00200**  
**Request for Information concerning**  
**the IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 3 Assessment Process**

Thank you for your email of 2 June 2008 and its attachments. As I pointed out in my letter of 5 May 2008, the internationally agreed Principles Governing IPCC Work for which I gave you the URL, define the IPCC assessment process as **open and transparent**. It clearly cannot be, if any of its participants are able to claim any of its documents or deliberations pertaining to it are confidential or contain personal information. Accordingly, I do not accept your grounds for not releasing all the information that I have requested. The information, for which I seek disclosure, is of the greatest public interest, as one document, only recently revealed, demonstrates. I will refer to this as the Manning document. While I still wish, ultimately, to see all the working papers of all the WGI Review Editors I am particularly interested now in those concerned with the Manning document.

The document is entitled '**Guidelines for inclusion of recent scientific literature in the Working Group I Fourth Assessment Report**' and was created by Dr Martin Manning, the Head of WGI TSU on 1 July 2006 and distributed soon after that. The text is reproduced below.

We are very grateful to the many reviewers of the second draft of the Working Group I contribution to the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report for suggestions received on issues of balance and citation of additional scientific literature. To ensure clarity and transparency in determining how such material might be included in the final Working Group I report, the following guidelines will be used by Lead Authors in considering such suggestions.

In preparing the final draft of the IPCC Working Group I report, Lead Authors may include scientific papers published in 2006 where, in their judgment, doing so would advance the goal of achieving a balance of scientific views in addressing reviewer comments. However, new issues beyond those covered in the second order draft will not be introduced at this stage in the preparation of the report.

Reviewers are invited to submit copies of additional papers that are either in-press or published in 2006, along with the chapter and section number to which this material could pertain, via email to [ipcc-wg1@al.noaa.gov](mailto:ipcc-wg1@al.noaa.gov), not later than July 24, 2006. In the case of in-press papers a copy of the final acceptance letter from the journal is requested for our records. All submissions must be received by the TSU not later than July 24, 2006 and incomplete submissions can not be accepted.

The above describes a very significant, unpublished and *prima facie* improper, departure from the procedures described in Appendix A to the internationally agreed Principles Governing IPCC Work, and from the schedule of the published IPCC timetable. It appears to be in breach of the Principles themselves, as it introduced an additional unpublished assessment stage that would not be subject to any peer review, which Clause 3 declares to be "**essential**" to the assessment process. While, in theory, government and expert reviewers could make suggestions of additional citations as well as the lead authors, they were not to have the opportunity to peer review the choice,

applicability and balance in the final text. The peer reviewing of the text by independent experts is the process many politicians claim gives credibility to the IPCC Assessment reports.

While WGI Co Chairperson Susan Solomon claimed in an email dated 14 March 2008, “All of the comments and all of the authors responses have been made available”, I can not find any that relate to the time after the Manning document, although I am aware that at least one expert comment meeting the criteria of the Manning document was made.

There are numerous additional citations of literature in the published text of the WGI report, which did not meet the originally published deadlines, but I have not been able to associate any of them with suggestions in the published comments of the expert and government reviewers, prior to the Manning document. Many, if not all, seem to have obvious associations with the chapter’s writing team as, for instance, in Chapter 3, page 316 Bissolli, P., J. Grieser, N. Dotzek, and M. Welsch, 2007: Tornadoes in Germany 1950-2003 and their relation to particular weather conditions.

For these reasons I am asking Professor Hoskins:

1. to confirm that he did receive the Manning document, the text of which is shown above, and provide a copy of the email to which it was attached.
2. to provide me with copies of any emails, minutes or other documents discussing or suggesting the need for the Manning document or expressing concerns as to its probity, including but not limited to any to, or from, other Review Editors, Working Group One Administration and the IPCC or WMO secretariat.
3. to indicate by reference to the comment number on the published comments, which if any on the second draft of Chapter 3, were making the suggestions referred to in the first paragraph of the Manning document. The comments are at: [http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Comments/comments/AR4WG1\\_Ch3\\_SOR\\_CommentResponses\\_EDist.pdf](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Comments/comments/AR4WG1_Ch3_SOR_CommentResponses_EDist.pdf)
4. If the request for the change in procedure, described in the Manning document, was not made by the Lead Authors of Chapter 3, from which Chapter or Chapters did the request come?
5. to provide me with copies of any emails or other documents which pursuant to the second paragraph of the Manning document resulted in additional citations at the Lead Authors’ own choosing.
6. to provide me with copies of any emails or other documents with government or expert reviewers’ comments and authors’ responses that resulted from the third paragraph of the Manning document.
7. to provide me with copies of the editors’ final acceptance letters referred to in the Manning document or documents from other IPCC participants confirming that they have them in their possession.
8. why is there no mention of the important change of procedure announced by the Manning document in his, or for that matter any WGI Review Editors’ reports or other IPCC published documents?
9. to provide me with copies of any emails or other correspondence discussing my requests for information on the IPCC assessment process with other IPCC participants.
10. if in response to any these points you are claiming exemption under the FOIA or EIA, please indicate to which of the above points, by number, you have such information for and which grounds you intend to rely upon in refusing to disclose it.

Yours sincerely,  
David Holland

d.holland@theiet.org