Northampton, UK
Friday, 04 April 2008

Marion Archer
FOI/Data Protection Manager
Met Office Alexandria 1
Fitzroy Road
Exeter
Devon EX1 3PB

By Email: marion.archer@metoffice.gov.uk

Dear Ms Archer,

cc Lord Lawson of Blaby, Tim Boswell MP

Request for Information concerning
the IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment Process

You may recall writing to me in connections with information that I had received from Dr Palutikof on Working Group II of the IPCC, 2007 Assessment Report under your reference 22-01-2008-113949-005. This proved most valuable and I am hoping you will be able to supply important information concerning what was the most contentious issue in the entire IPCC, 2007 assessment, namely the Historic Temperature Reconstructions in IPCC, 2007 Working Group I Chapter 6 Palaeoclimate. I am hereby asking for the release of all documents concerning the IPCC assessment of this matter held by the Met Office.

I am asking for this information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and under The Environmental Information Regulations 2004. I also believe it is relevant to mention that, under the internationally agreed Principles Governing IPCC Work, to which the United Kingdom is a signatory, Clause 2 states that "The role of the IPCC is to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change." On this basis I am presuming that all documents relating the IPCC assessment process should be in the public domain. Significant duties are placed upon Review Editors to ensure that the assessment is carried out in strict accordance with the Principles.

One of the duties of Review Editors, clearly defined in Principles Governing IPCC Work, is to provide a written report on the assessment and is the only assurance that we have that the assessment was carried out as it was supposed to be. I have attached to this letter the report Dr. John Mitchell, the Met Office Chief Scientist,

which is just a few lines long and provides no insight into the critical decisions made by the Chapter 6 authors or reports on what actions were taken to ensure the Principles were followed or any detailed concerns that Dr Mitchell must have had. In comparison, and by way of explanation as to why I am seeking further information, you might look at the 5-page Working Group II Chapter 19 Review Editor's Report of Dr John Zillman, which is held by the Met Office and which provides substantial detail on a far less controversial chapter. Dr Mitchell has advised me by email that he has retained no working papers. However it seems inevitable to me that some editorial issues would have been dealt with by email and I am therefore asking initially to see all emails to and from Dr Mitchell in connection with his work as an IPCC Review Editor.

To assist you in this matter I would suggest information that I am seeking would likely be found in correspondence between Dr Mitchell and the following individuals involved in the assessment: Drs Susan Solomon, Jean Jouzel, Eystein Jansen, Jonathan Overpeck, Keith R. Briffa, Jean-Claude Duplessy, Fortunat Joos, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Daniel Olago (Kenya), Bette Otto-Bliesner, W. Richard Peltier, Stefan Rahmstorf, Rengaswamy Ramesh, Dominique Raynaud, David Rind, Olga Solomina, Ricardo Villalba, De'er Zhang, and Timothy Osborn.

Relevant information may also be found in correspondence between Dr Mitchell and the IPCC Panel, DEFRA, CRU and the IPCC Working Group II Technical Support Unit.

The specific areas of context that I am interested in seeing include references to studies by Briffa; Mann Bradley and Hughes e.g. MBH98/99, the "hockey stick"; Rutherford *et al*.; Wahl and Ammann; McIntyre and McKitrick e.g. M&M 2003, M&M 2005; NRC, 2006; Wegman et al., 2006. I am also interested in any discussion of Expert Reviewer's Comments or the proposed or actual responses to them. I am particularly interested in any discussion of Expert Reviewers' Comments from Susan Solomon, Ross McKitrick, Steve McIntyre and the Reviewer for the Government of the United States of America. I would obviously wish to see any drafts of text to be included or proposed to be included in the official drafts of Chapter 6.

Yours sincerely,

David Holland
d.holland@theiet.org

To: Dr. Dahe Qin and Dr. Susan Solomon
Co-Chairs of Working Group I of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
c/o Technical Support Unit
DSRC R/CSD/8
325 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80305, USA
fax. +1 303 497 5628

From: Dr. John Mitchell
Met Office
Fitzroy Rd
Exeter EX1 3PB
UNITED KINGDOM

Dear Dr. Dahe Qin and Dr. Susan Solomon,

As Review Editor of Chapter 6 *Paleoclimate* of the Working Group I contribution to the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, "Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis", I can confirm that the authors have in my view dealt with reviewers comments to the extent that can be reasonably expected. There will inevitably remain some disagreement on how they have dealt with the reconstructions of the last 1000 years, and there is further work to be done here in the future, but in my judgement, the authors have made a reasonable assessment of the evidence they have to hand. The other possible area of contention (within the author team) is on some aspects of sea-level rise - this has gone some way towards reconciliation but I sense not everyone is entirely happy.

With these caveats I am happy to sign off the chapter, to thank the lead author team for their co-operation, and congratulate them on the chapter

Signed: ..J.F.B. Mitchell Date: 8/12/06

Name: John Mitchell