

I hope this answers your enquiry.

John Mitchell

From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@tesco.net]

Sent: 31 January 2008 18:04

To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)

Subject: Re: IPCC Review Editors report.

Dear Dr Mitchell,

WGI TSU have now kindly sent me a copy of your Review Editor's Report and I attach a copy.

Clair Hanson from your office, on behalf of WGII TSU has kindly sent me all the WGII reports and many of them provide substantial additional information.

Can you confirm that the attached is the complete report or let me have a copy of any supplemental information?

Thanking you in advance,

David Holland

10/04/2008

John

Professor John Mitchell OBE FRS Chief Scientist,
Met Office FitzRoy Road Exeter EX1 3PB United Kingdom
Tel. +44(0)1392884604 Fax: +44 (0) 870 9005050
E-mail: john.f.mitchell@metoffice.gov.uk <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk>

From: David Holland [<mailto:d.holland@tesco.net>]
Sent: 22 February 2008 15:50
To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Subject: Re: IPCC Review Editors report.

Dear Dr Mitchell,

Thank you for your reply. In the light of it I hope you might be able to answer the more detailed questions in the attached letter.

David Holland

----- Original Message -----

From: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
To: David Holland
Cc: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2008 6:34 PM
Subject: RE: IPCC Review Editors report.

Dear Mr Holland

I can confirm that you have had the complete Review Editors report and that there was no supplemental information submitted with the Review Editors report

10/04/2008

Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)

From: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Sent: 14 March 2008 12:23
To: 'wg1-ar4'; 'Susan Solomon';
Cc: 'k.briffa@'; 'jean.jouzel@';
Subject: FW: IPCC Review Editors report.
Attachments: CH6RevQs.pdf

Susan

I have received the following letter from David Holland, who has links with Stephen McIntyre and his Climate Audit website, on the review process for chapter 6 of AR4. I have discussed this briefly with Jean and we do not think there is an issue. However, given the wider nature of the questions, I think it would be more appropriate for any response to come through IPCC rather than me as an individual. I will wait to hear from IPCC before I respond. I am in Exeter for the first three days of next week (+44 1392 884604) if you want to discuss this further.

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

John

Professor John Mitchell OBE FRS Chief Scientist,
Met Office FitzRoy Road Exeter EX1 3PB United Kingdom
Tel. +44(0)1392884604 Fax: +44 (0) 870 9005050
E-mail: john.f.mitchell@metoffice.gov.uk <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk>

From: David Holland [<mailto:d.holland@tesco.net>]
Sent: 22 February 2008 15:50
To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Subject: Re: IPCC Review Editors report.

Dear Dr Mitchell,

Thank you for your reply. In the light of it I hope you might be able to answer the more detailed questions in the attached letter.

David Holland

----- Original Message -----
From: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
To: David Holland
Cc: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2008 6:34 PM
Subject: RE: IPCC Review Editors report.

Dear Mr Holland

I can confirm that you have had the complete Review Editors report and that there was no supplemental information submitted with the Review Editors report

10/04/2008

Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)

From: Susan Solomon [Susan.Solomon@wmo.int; ipcc-wg1@wmo.int]
Sent: 14 March 2008 17:52
To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist);
Cc: k.briffa@jean.jouzel@
Subject: Re: FW: IPCC Review Editors report.

John

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

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

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

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

best regards,
Susan

Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)

From: Jean Jouzel [jean.jouzel@cea.fr]
Sent: 31 March 2008 10:29
To: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Subject: Re: Holland response
Follow Up Flag: Filed
Flag Status: Red

Thanks John ; your answer looks fine for me.

With my best regards Jean

For info- my response to David Holland

John

Dear Mr Holland,

Thank you for your letter of 22 February 2008. I apologise again for the delay in replying, I have been away from my office much of the intervening time and also, in view of the width of your questions, I have also consulted IPCC.

You raise two main points in your letter.

Your first question concerns the grounds for one of the citations in chapter 6 of the Working Group I Report. The IPCC process assesses the published scientific and technical literature, and in some cases 'gray literature', based on the judgement of the authors. Gray literature is used very seldom in Working Group I (but more frequently in Working Group III, for example in the form of technical reports from industry). Unpublished draft papers or technical reports referenced in chapters are made available to the reviewers for the purpose of review. This does not include the underlying datasets used as IPCC has neither the mandate nor the resources to operate for a clearing house for the massive amounts of data used in the referenced papers. Note IPCC's role does not include the governance of research, or the requirements of scientific literature.

Your second question concerns the conduct of review editors. You should note that the review editors do not determine the final content of the chapters. It is the authors that are responsible for the content of their chapters and responding to comments, not the review editors. All of the comments and all of the authors' responses have been made available, and are the proper source for anyone wishing to understand what comments were made and how the authors dealt with them. It would be inappropriate to provide more information beyond the web pages already freely provided.

For my own part, I have not kept any working papers. There is no requirement to do so, given the extensive documentation already available for IPCC. The crux of the review editors' work is carried out at the lead authors meetings going through the chapters comment by comment with the lead authors.

I hope this answers your two main concerns.

10/04/2008

Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)

From: Keith Briffa [k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]
Sent: 01 April 2008 16:28
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Mitchell, John FB (Chief Scientist)
Subject: Fwd: Questions re. IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 CONFIDENTIAL

Attachments: Briffa01.pdf



Briffa01.pdf (72 KB)

Hi Peck Eystein John (and Phil as Head of CRU) just to keep you in the loop, I have received the attached letter . I am not asking for any input as regards a response -which I shall keep brief - when I get round to it. Just thought it appropriate to let you know what was happening. I will forward my response in due course.

Cheers
Keith

>From: "David Holland" <d.holland@tesco.net>
>To: "Keith Briffa" <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>
>Cc: "Nigel Lawson" <lawson@random.net>,
> "Tim Boswell" <boswellte@davcons.freemove.co.uk>
>Subject: Questions re. IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6
>Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 18:24:11 +0100
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.3138
>X-Canit-CHI2: 0.43
>X-Bayes-Prob: 0.0091 (Score 0, tokens from: @@RPTN)
>X-Spam-Score: 0.00 () [Tag at 5.00] HTML_MESSAGE,MIME_HTML_MAINLY
>X-CanitPRO-Stream: UEA:f023 (inherits from
>UEA:10 Tag Only,UEA:default,base:default)
>X-Canit-Stats-ID: 175908 - 257c56a64421
>X-Antispam-Training-Forget:
>https://canit.uea.ac.uk/b.php?i=175908&m=257c56a64421&c=f
>X-Antispam-Training-Nonspam:
>https://canit.uea.ac.uk/b.php?i=175908&m=257c56a64421&c=n
>X-Antispam-Training-Spam:
>https://canit.uea.ac.uk/b.php?i=175908&m=257c56a64421&c=s
>X-Scanned-By: CanIt (www . roaringpenguin . com) on 139.222.131.184
>X-UEA-Spam-Score: 2.5
>X-UEA-Spam-Level: ++
>X-UEA-Spam-Flag: NO

--
Professor Keith Briffa,
Climatic Research Unit
University of East Anglia
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

Phone: +44-1603-593909
Fax: +44-1603-507784

<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>