

## **ATTACHMENT B**

to

<http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/Wratt%20&%20RSNZ%20-%20compiled.rtf>

by Professor Bob Carter,  
James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

### **Inadequacies and criticisms of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**

The IPCC was established in 1988 jointly by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), with terms of reference which included:

*assessing the available evidence on climate change and its impacts;*

*assessing the options for adapting to or mitigating climate change; and*

*providing advice, both scientific and socio-economic, to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).*

Because the Framework Convention defines "climate change" as that change which is due to human activity, it is clear that from the outset that the IPCC's role has been to concentrate on presumed anthropogenic change rather than to comment on or prepare for natural variations in the climate system itself.

Governments, business, the media and environmental activists all assume that IPCC reports have provided conclusive evidence that human emissions of greenhouse gases are warming the climate.

The IPCC has provided nothing of the sort, but rather has a predisposition towards that conclusion built into its terms of reference. Indeed, despite the overwhelming public assumption regarding human causation, in its most recent report the IPCC stated (2001, p. 97) that:

*"The fact that the global mean temperature has increased since the late 19th century and that other trends have been observed does not necessarily mean that an anthropogenic effect on the climate has been identified. Climate has always varied on all time scales, so the observed change may be natural".*

This statement remains true today, in 2006.

Starting in the mid-1990s, during and after the publication of the Second Assessment Report (2AR), the IPCC began to be subjected to increasingly strident criticism.

Particular dissatisfaction at that time centred over the insistence of some bureaucrats, in the face of opposition from expert scientists, to include in the 2AR Summary for Policymakers the phrase “*discernible human influence on climate*”. Dr. Robert Stephenson, a distinguished oceanographer with the U.S. Office of Naval Research and NASA, and who from 1987-1995 was Secretary General of the International Association for the Physical Science of the Oceans, expressed his views thus:

*“Despite the opposition of many signatory countries and their scientists, the leaders of IPCC published (in their 1995 assessment Report) the phrase “the balance of the evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate.”*

*“Even when exposed, the IPCC leaders claimed it was their “right” to change scientific conclusions so that political leaders could better understand the report.”*

*“To the world’s geophysical community, these unethical practices and total lack of integrity by the leadership of the IPCC have been enough to reveal that their collective claims were - and are - fraudulent.”*

Later similar criticisms have come from both IPCC members (some of whom chose to resign over them) and by outsiders, and are summarized under appropriate sub-headings below.

### ***Peer review of IPCC findings***

IPCC claims authority for its policy advice by asserting that the advice rests only upon information which has been published in reputable, refereed journals. IPCC also claims to subject the work of its scientists to high standards of peer review.

In fact, the IPCC uses a concept of peer review that differs greatly from the commonly understood meaning of the term. The problem has been well summarised by von Storch (2005), who writes:

*“The IPCC has failed to ensure that the assessment reports, which shall review the existing published knowledge and knowledge claims, should have been prepared by scientists not significantly involved in the research themselves. Instead, the IPCC has chosen to invite scientists who dominate the debate about the considered issues to participate in the assessment. This was already in the Second Assessment Report a contested problem, and the IPCC would have done better in inviting other, considerably more independent scientists for this task. Instead, the IPCC has asked scientists like Professor Mann to review his own work. This does not represent an “independent” review.”*

Other scientists who have participated in IPCC review procedures have complained that it is corrupted by:

*a failure to incorporate valid critical comments made by some expert reviewers;*

*chaotic editorial techniques, which have included the preparation and release of a new draft report whilst its first draft was still being reviewed;*

*in the final stage of review of a Summary for Policymakers, incorporating changes desired by government bureaucrats without recourse to expert scientific assessment; and*

*an inadequate and dismissive attitude towards informed criticism.*

### **Resignations**

During and after the preparation of the 3AR, a number of meritorious scientists who were involved again began to express their dissatisfaction with the process. And, in particular, with what they saw as political interference with the preparation of IPCC reports.

In one such high profile case, on January 15, 2005, Dr. Chris Landsea, an acknowledged world expert on hurricanes/cyclones, withdrew his participation in IPCC. This decision was precipitated by the actions of IPCC Lead Author Dr. Kevin Trenberth (under whom Dr. Landsea worked), who participated in a press conference “*Experts to warn global warming likely to continue spurring more outbreaks of intense hurricane activity*”, despite having been expressly briefed to the contrary by Dr. Landsea. Worse, Dr. Trenberth’s statements were then supported by the IPCC leadership. In resigning, Dr. Landsea (2005) said:

*“I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound”.*

Another senior scientist who has withdrawn from participation in IPCC processes is Dr. Richard Lindzen, who wrote (2004) that “*My experiences over the past 16 years have led me to the discouraging conclusion that we are dealing with the almost insoluble interaction of an iron triangle with an iron rice bowl*”. Lindzen’s “triangle” comprises environmental activists who distort and misuse science, unchecked by the IPCC, in order to get the attention of the news media and politicians; and the “rice bowl” is the accompanying phenomenon whereby scientist’s exploit the activists alarmism in order to maintain or increase their research funding.

### **Availability of original data and computer codes: audit**

Some of the key statistics upon which the IPCC relies for its arguments do not have their original data or methods of calculation disclosed.

This matter first came to the light during the mid-1990s preparation of the 2AR. Then Dr. Pat Michaels, acting as an expert reviewer, requested that he be supplied with the data that

underpinned a graph of GAT which was included in his reviewing package. As recounted by Gelbspan (1998, p.212), Michaels received the following astonishing answer from Dr. Tom Wigley, senior author of the paper under review:

*“First, it is entirely unnecessary to have original “raw” data in order to review a scientific document. I know of no case at all in which such data were required by or provided to a referee .....*

*“Second, while the data in question (model output from the U.K. Hadley Centre’s climate model) were generated using taxpayer money, this was U.K. taxpayer money. U.S. scientists therefore have no a priori right to such data.”*

*“Furthermore, these data belong to individual scientists who produced them, not to the IPCC, and it is up to those scientists to decide who they give their data to.”*

Of two other important examples of the unaccountability of IPCC science, we have dealt with the inadequacies of the Mann et al. (1998, 1999) studies in our main commentary. The final release of data and code for this research - so that others could check it - was achieved in 2005, some 7 years after publication, and that only by the intervention of the U.S. Congress. Prior to this intervention, and despite formal requests, neither the publishers of the relevant journals, nor the public agencies that funded the research, were prepared to insist on full disclosure.

The second example is the global average temperature (GAT) statistic that the IPCC accepts as its preferred record of temperature change since 1860. This statistic is provided by the U.K. Hadley Centre’s Climate Research Unit (CRU), the version in IPCC (2001) being a slightly updated version of Jones et al. (1999). Despite requests from interested researchers, Dr. Jones refuses to release the full dataset, or disclose details of corrections made for urban heat island effects and other anomalies. In response to one such request, Dr. Jones wrote:

*“we have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?”*

In contrast, the equivalent US global surface temperature index, provided by NOAA’s National Climatic Data Center, has been subjected to a recent independent check that broadly confirms its accuracy (Smith et al., 2005).

The lack of full disclosure of data and computer code by these and probably other climate research groups is deeply troubling. It is likely that the IPCC will continue to tolerate the practice by reproducing again in 4AR conclusions from datasets and calculations that are not fully in the public domain. Two instances where such secrecy will probably continue are the time-series graphs of GAT (after the CRU), and the deterministic computer model outputs that predict temperature scenarios out to 2100.

The result of these practices is that research in these areas is unauditably. IPCC reports that accept research for which full disclosure has not been made are thereby reduced to the status of unchecked literature reviews.

### ***Inappropriateness of IPCC's economic scenarios***

After the publication of the 3AR in 2001, Ian Castles (a statistician) and David Henderson (an economist), amongst others, started expressing strong public concern regarding the soundness of IPCC's economic forecasting. They wrote independent letters to IPCC Chair, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, Castles saying:

*“I believe that it is important that governments be advised as soon as possible that the economic projections used in the IPCC emissions scenarios are technically unsound, having been derived by converting national GDPs in nominal values into a common currency using exchange rates. This procedure is not permissible under the internationally recognised System of National Accounts, and was recently rejected by an expert group in a report to the UN Statistical Commission. The practice of using exchange rate conversion is especially inappropriate in relation to projections of physical phenomena such as emissions of greenhouse gases and aerosols.”*

And Henderson following with:

*“Ian Castles has suggested that in the next IPCC Assessment national and international statistical agencies should be brought in and represented. I agree with him: it is high time that these agencies involved themselves in the process. But I would take the argument further. I think that the central economic departments of state---treasuries, ministries of finance, ministries of economics, and organisations such as the US Council of Economic Advisers---should likewise be taking an active part. Their expertise is pertinent, and the economic stakes are high enough to require their attention. They should not remain on the sidelines.”*

After exchanges of letters, meetings and much public commentary in the international press, the IPCC has failed to heed this criticism. Instead, the Panel has chosen to use the same econometric measures and socio-economic scenarios that are contained in 3AR in its preparation of the draft 4AR. And in this preparation, IPCC has again failed to avail itself of advice from major, independent financial agencies.

A more detailed account of the deficiencies in the IPCC's treatment of socioeconomic matters is available in House of Lords (2005) and Castles and Henderson (2006). The point of substance that emerges, however, is that the Assessment Reports of the IPCC are inadequate not only in their treatment of some science issues, but crucially also in the socioeconomic advice that they contain.

\* \* \* \* \*