

**Excerpts from, and comments and questions prompted by, material publicly available at: <http://tome22.info/>**

**Clarification of terms:**

MPCCC is Multi-Party Climate Change Committee. Its members include Julia Gillard, Greg Combet, Christine Milne, Tony Windsor, ...

The MPCCC made the decision to implement a carbon dioxide tax.

It supposedly justified the carbon dioxide tax. The MPCCC is the basis for the legislation.

Read the concise briefing pasted below by Peter Bobroff, AM. It's entitled '*Incompetent Briefing of Multi Party Climate Change Committee*'.

It was written after Peter held Will Steffen accountable in public and in writing.

Secondly, reading Peter's summary on the Inter Academy Council's (IAC's) damning report below on the UN IPCC will give you a strong foundation and understanding.

Peter has diligently extracted many gems from the IAC report. It seems clear that alarmist academics tried to hide these from the public and government.

AAS is Australian Academy of Science.  
ANU is Australian National University.  
CCI is ANU's Climate Change Institute. Will Steffen is its Director.  
Former AAS President is Kurt Lambeck. He's in Steffen's ANU CCI.

## **Conclusions**

1. In arriving at its recommendation for a tax on carbon dioxide, it seems that the MPCCC was misled;
2. The basis of government's climate policy is the UN IPCC. It has been exposed by a prominent independent scientific body, the IAC as unscientific;
3. It raises serious questions about consequences of government funding & misrepresentations of science;
4. Rob Oakeshott has avoided answering Peter Bobroff's questions on this by seemingly implying it doesn't matter what the MPCCC's sole expert adviser on climate (Will Steffen) says. Rob Oakeshott seems to dismiss the concern that the MPCCC was misled.

## **Key points that emerge:**

1. Will Steffen misled the MPCCC—seemingly deliberately or negligently. He failed to know the IAC severely criticised the UN IPCC. Thus he could not have advised the MPCCC of that. Kurt Lambeck is past-President of the Australian Academy of Science (AAS) and wrote the introduction to the AAS' glossy booklet implying humans caused global warming. Kurt Lambeck is in the Australian National University's Climate Change Institute where Will Steffen is Director. It seems that a strongly adverse report (IAC) is being hidden by the AAS and by the Department of Climate Change while promoting a major cost be imposed on Australia's people. Yet the Department of Climate Change agreed in principle to all the IAC report's recommendations. It seems the department knows yet fails to disclose. If a financial adviser promoting a major investment of money by his/her clients was found to behave in this way he/she would be jailed for such non-disclosure.
2. IAC directly criticises the processes and procedures that produced the UN IPCC's report and statements on which the government relies. So critical is the Council's report, it's impossible for anyone to know which IPCC statements, if any, can be believed. There can be no confidence at all

in the IPCC's latest report, 2007.

3. The Department of Climate Change has funded the AAS and ANU CCI and the AAS' glossy unscientific booklet implying human causation of (non-existent) catastrophic global warming.
4. When questioned by Peter Bobroff, Rob Oakeshott ditches the MPCCC's sole expert adviser (Will Steffen) and claims he relies on the Chief Scientist's advice.  
Yet when Malcolm Roberts wrote (by Registered Mail with Delivery Confirmation) to the previous Chief Scientist (Penny Sackett) seeking advice of human causation of global warming she failed to provide any evidence.

<http://tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html>

## **Incompetent Briefing of Multi Party Committee on Climate Change?**

Peter Bobroff, AM 9 Sep 2011

The following summarises correspondence with Professor Will Steffen, Rob Oakeshott MP, an AAS Executive Committee member and the Chief Scientist. This correspondence suggests the Multi-Party Climate Change Committee has not been competently briefed; if so, the government has been misled and may be proceeding with the Carbon Pricing legislation based on misinformation.

At a public meeting in Cooma on Wednesday 20 July 2011, Professor Steffen confirmed that Australia's climate change policy was based primarily on the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the InterGovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2007. The IPCC commissioned the world's highest academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) to conduct an independent review of the processes and procedures of the IPCC that produced AR4. (Alan: This followed severe criticism of the IPCC following the Climategate scandal.)

The body of [IAC Report](#) contained many serious and [substantial criticisms](#) concerning: conflict of interest, political interference, bias, poor treatment of uncertainty, vague statements not supported by evidence, failure to respond to critical review comments, and various management problems. These matters are not merely academic quibbles but impact directly on the integrity of the science assessment. The statements on bias indicate that AR4 was written by people with conflicts of interest and obvious bias who examined only the papers that suited them and who rejected or ignored any critical review comments and published evidence in conflict with IPCC's view. The poor treatment of uncertainty brings into question every one of the 800 likelihood and confidence statements in Working Group 1 of AR4. This refutes the credibility of AR4.

Professor Will Steffen, Director of the ANU Institute of Climate Change and Climate Change Commissioner was asked.

*“How did he account for the critical statements in the body of the InterAcademy Council (IAC) Report into the policies and processes of the IPCC which produced AR4.”*

Professor Steffen replied:

*“the IAC came out and said the science is sound”.*

It was pointed out to Professor Steffen that this was NOT correct and the relevant text in the IAC review was quoted. In a [subsequent email](#) Professor Steffen states:

*“I take your point that the IAC didn't endorse the scientific assessment of the IPCC, but that it was not in their terms of reference. This was probably a good thing as they are a subsidiary body to their member Academies. I think an important point to make is that all of the national Academies of Science that have undertaken formal reviews of the IPCC (12 or 13 at last count, including the major ones - USA, UK, France, Russia, China, Japan, Australia) have found that the basic science of the IPCC AR4 WG1 report is sound.” (Alan: he seems to be saying anything to see whether Peter would cop it)*

Professor Steffen has been unable to provide links to any such formal reviews, but [replied](#):

*The link for the AAS report on climate change (in the form of a Q & A document) is indeed what I was referring to. It was not a formal review of the IPCC.*

The Department of Climate Change commissioned the Australian Academy of Science to produce this [Q&A document](#). It is relevant to note that the then President of the AAS was a member of the ANU Institute of Climate Change. The Secretary of the AAS Executive Committee has stated:

*“AAS imprimatur helps its credibility.”*

and

*“Needless to say, any adverse findings do great damage to the credibility of climate scientists as a whole, especially in the current*

*climate of almost religious opposition to the acceptance of climate change science as a whole.”*

The AAS Q&As were then used to support the Climate Commission’s document: [The Critical Decade](#) signed by Professor Steffen. (Alan: it provides no names of authors or reviewers)

It would seem that Professor Steffen was under the misapprehension that IAC and various national academies of science had undertaken formal reviews favourable to IPCC’s AR4 version of the science. On the contrary, the IAC Review was highly critical of IPCC’s processes and procedures and these criticisms remain unanswered. Hence Australian Government policy on climate change remains reliant on IPCC’s flawed assessment of the science.

In a [later email](#) Professor Steffen was asked:

*How can I be assured that the members of the MultiParty Committee on Climate Change, meeting in secret session, were adequately briefed on the IAC's statements concerning conflict of interest, political interference, bias, poor treatment of uncertainty and management shortcomings?*

Professor Steffen’s [unresponsive reply contained no assurance:](#)

(Alan: Steffen’s reply did not answer Peter’s question.)

*The MPCCC were fully briefed, in person, on the science of climate change, including levels of confidence in what we know and also the levels of uncertainties surrounding aspects of the science.*

(Alan: a strong criticism from the IAC is that the IPCC’s confidence levels were meaningless.)

Mr Oakeshott and Mr Windsor (members of the MPCCC) have been [asked](#)

*to confirm that you were properly briefed by Professor Steffen on the IAC’s serious and fundamental criticisms of the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC upon which Australia’s Climate Change policy is based.*

An [unresponsive reply](#) from Mr Qakeshott dated 30 August (but postmarked 7 September) failed to confirm that he had been briefed on the IAC Report:

*I confirm that I have been properly briefed.*

*I have relied on advice from the Chief Scientist of Australia who indicated the science needed a policy response.*

(Alan: when Malcolm requested the previous Chief Scientist failed to provide any evidence.)

There has been no reply from Mr Windsor; neither has the Chief Scientist responded to an [earlier related query](#).

A [further request](#) for confirmation has been sent to Mr Oakeshott and a [separate request](#) sent to the Chief Scientist, but no replies have yet been received.

The [legal view of expert advice](#) is that it must meet the requirements of fiduciary duty by considering the alternative evidence such as negative aspects and risks to qualify as competent. To date it would seem that briefing of the MPCCC has been incomplete as it has apparently not included details of the substantial criticisms documented by the IAC Review. More broadly, those deficiencies render this expert advice incompetent.

**Peter Bobroff AM**

(Contact details available at the web link preceding this summary)

# Background

Annotated IAC report available here: <http://tome22.info/IAC-Report/>

## Inter Academy Council (IAC)

In May 2000 all of the world's science academies created the IAC to mobilize the best scientists and engineers worldwide to provide high quality advice to international bodies - such as the United Nations and the World Bank - as well as to other institutions.

Following the Climategate scandal, in March 2010, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) was requested by the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to conduct an independent review of IPCC processes and procedures.

## Points from IAC Report:

### Bias

- "Most important are the absence of criteria for selecting key participants in the assessment process and the lack of documentation for selecting what scientific and technical information is assessed."
- "Having author teams with diverse viewpoints is the first step toward ensuring that a full range of thoughtful views are considered"
- "Review Editors do not fully use their authority to ensure that review comments receive appropriate consideration by Lead Authors and that controversial issues are reflected adequately in the report"
- "The Committee also recommends that Lead Authors document that they have considered the full range of thoughtful views, even if these views do not appear in the assessment report."
- "alternative views are not always cited in a chapter if the Lead Authors do not agree with them."

### Uncertainty

- "However, authors reported high confidence in some statements for which there is little evidence. Furthermore, by making vague statements that were difficult to refute, authors were able to attach 'high confidence' to the statements."



- "The use of the level-of-understanding scale (Table 3.1), rather than the confidence scale (Table 3.2), would have made clear the weak evidentiary basis for these statements."
- "In the Committee's view, assigning probabilities to imprecise statements is not an appropriate way to characterize uncertainty. If the confidence scale is used in this way, conclusions will likely be stated so vaguely as to make them impossible to refute, and therefore statements of 'very high confidence' will have little substantive value."
- "For example, authors reported high confidence in statements for which there is little evidence, ...Moreover, the guidance was often applied to statements that are so vague they cannot be disputed. In these cases the impression was often left, incorrectly, that a substantive finding was being presented."
- "However, it is unclear whose judgments are reflected in the ratings that appear in the Fourth Assessment Report or how the judgments were determined."
- "Scientists should not feel obligated to provide an assessment where no reliable information exists."
- "the many statements ...that are assigned high confidence but are based on little evidence. Moreover, the apparent need to include statements of 'high confidence' (i.e., an 8 out of 10 chance of being correct) in the Summary for Policymakers led authors to make many vaguely defined statements that are difficult to refute, therefore making them of 'high confidence.' Such statements have little value."

### **Conflict of Interest and Political Interference**

- "The IPCC does not have a conflict-of-interest or disclosure policy for its senior leadership, Working Group Co-chairs and authors, or the staff of the Technical Support Units."
- "A complication could arise when Lead Authors are sitting side by side with their government representative, which might put the Lead Authors in the difficult position of either supporting a government position at odds with the Working Group report or opposing their government's position. This may be most awkward when authors are also government employees."
- "Government representatives then negotiate and agree to the final wording line by line."

## **Biography—Will Steffen**

- originally from Florida, USA
- degree in Chemical Engineering, PhD in inorganic chemistry
- 1998 to mid-2004, Executive Director of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme based in Stockholm.
- 2005 he became the first Director of the Australian National University Fenner School of Environment & Society
- Since 2008 he has been the Executive Director of the ANU Climate Change Institute
- Contributing Author to UN IPCC AR4-WG1-CH07 Couplings Between Changes In The Climate System And Biogeochemistry  
That's the UN IPCC's 2007 report, the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report, Working Group 1 being the supposed climate science, Chapter 7.

## **Will Steffen's Australian Government Positions**

- Expert Advisor to the Multi-Party Climate Change Committee.  
The sole expert adviser on the climate science to the MPCCC
- Member of the government's Climate Commission chaired by Tim Flannery;
- Scientific Advisor to the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency;
- Chair of the Federal Government's Antarctic Science Advisory Committee.
- Director of ANU's Climate Change Institute that receives considerable government funding.

Reportedly the Executive Summary of the IAC report contradicts the body of the IAC report in both tone and content. The Executive Summary does not express the strong and serious criticism in the IAC report.

Kurt Lambeck is one of two monitors of the IAC report's Executive Summary. Reportedly, the Executive Summary contradicts the IAC's own guidelines for developing the Executive Summary. Why?

What is going on in climate science funded by government in Australia? Will any federal MP investigate? Will they fulfill their responsibility?

**Will Steffen is Co-author with Schellnhuber of this publication:**

Steffen, W., Sanderson, A., Tyson, P.D., Jäger, J., Matson, P., Moore III, B., Oldfield, F., Richardson, K., **Schellnhuber, H.-J.**, Turner II, B.L. and Wasson, R.J. (2004). *Global Change and the Earth System: A Planet Under Pressure*. The IGBP Book Series, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 336 pp.

**Schellnhuber, H.-J. is a German with a master plan for the transformation of society.**

[http://www.wbgu.de/fileadmin/templates/dateien/veroeffentlichungen/ha uptgutachten/jg2011/wbgu\\_jg2011\\_kurz\\_en.pdf](http://www.wbgu.de/fileadmin/templates/dateien/veroeffentlichungen/ha uptgutachten/jg2011/wbgu_jg2011_kurz_en.pdf)

From the booklet entitled 'World in Transition A Social Contract for Sustainability: Summary for Policy Makers' produced by the *German Advisory Council on Global Change*, page 8:

*The idea of a social contract takes the original concept found in the natural law theories of early modern history one step further, and today's revised edition must address four major challenges:*

- *1. Because of progressive economic and cultural globalisation, the nation state can no longer be considered the sole basis for the contractual relationship. Its inhabitants must responsibly take transnational risks and natural dangers, and the legitimate interests of 'third parties', i. e. other members of the world community, into account.*
  - *2. Traditional contract philosophy presupposed the fictitious belief that all members of a society are equal. Considering the disproportionate distribution of resources and capabilities in today's international community, we must have effective, fair global compensation mechanisms in place.*
  - *3. The natural environment should be given increased consideration when revising the social contract.*
- 4. The contract has to bring two important new protagonists into the equation: the self-organised civil society and the community of scientific experts.*

## **Questions to ask Professor Steffen:**

1. How does he justify his continuing support of the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report when the IAC Review was so critical of it?
2. Did he brief the MPCCC about the IAC criticisms of the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report on which Australian government climate policy is based? If so why did he publicly claim at Cooma that the IAC endorsed the IPCC's report?
3. Surely an incompetently briefed MPCCC would not be capable of coming to a correct decision?
4. If the Carbon Tax is introduced and successfully reduces Australia's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 5% by 2020, what consequential reduction in Australian temperatures did he advise the MPCCC would result? His Chief Climate Commissioner, Tim Flannery, publicly advised there would be little impact, if any, for hundreds of years, possibly a thousand.
5. As an "expert" giving advice to the public does he consider he has any fiduciary duty or duty of care to the public or does he believe he can neglect relevant evidence and still be considered "competent"?
6. Was it he or AAS past-President Professor Lambeck who had the idea of getting the Australian Academy of Science to take a public position on climate science so that the credibility of science in general could be used to bolster the flagging credibility of climate science?  
Was the timing just coincidental around the release of the IAC report?
7. He's on a lot of government bodies, paid by the government. Couldn't it be said he has a vested interest in preserving the government funding of the climate scare?
8. Given the IAC's damning report on the UN IPCC, how can he justify continued government funding of the UN IPCC?  
Wasn't he an author for the IPCC fourth Assessment Report?

## **Additional questions:**

9. He's a communicator on science. He'd understand the scientific process. Why does his document, 'The Critical Decade', not specify who reviewed it?  
Who did review it? Were there any reviewers without a vested interest in preserving their positions or their institutions' funding?
10. The AAS' publication 'Questions & Answers' and his own 'The Critical Decade' are described as populist documents for the general population. They're not credible unbiased assessments of the science. Most IAC's criticisms apply to these glossy populist documents. Why is policy relying on such documents? Why did the Climate Commission make such a fuss about its document? That's not science.
11. In his Critical Decade document, why did he, quote "*accept no liability for the accuracy of or inferences from the material contained in this publication, or for any action as a result of any person's or group's interpretations, deductions, conclusions or actions in relying on this material*"? Yet it is being used to justify government expenditure of potentially hundreds of billions of dollars.
12. He co-authored a book with Professor Schellnhuber. Does he agree with Schellnhuber's master plan for the transformation of society? In particular:
  - a. *Traditional contract philosophy presupposed the fictitious belief that all members of a society are equal.*
  - b. *The contract has to bring two important new protagonists into the equation: the self-organised civil society and the community of scientific experts.*
13. Does he not think all humans deserve to be treated equally? If not, why not? Is he implying that someone should oversee and control all humans?
14. Where do you go during Australia's summer?

The last question is prompted by this statement by Will Steffen during the Climate Commission's meeting in Canberra's Parliament House on May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011, quote: *"If we go to say a four degree world later this century, we have to remember that our bodies operate at 37 degrees Celsius. We're going to see temperatures in many of Australia's cities in the 40s and maybe even the 50s and a four degree temperature rise to (indistinct). It's going to be almost impossible for our bodies to give off the heat that we normally do to the atmosphere around us. So I think that the health challenges of a four degree world would be enormous and there's simply (indistinct) that we are not simply built to operate in a four degree world warmer than today"*.

Note that there is no evidence that Earth will incur a four-degree temperature rise. Reputable scientists around the world are predicting an imminent global cooling.

Does Will Steffen not know that the ancestors of all Earth's species of large complex animals, including humans, developed 3-6 million years ago when temperatures were at least 3 degrees warmer than current? (*Climate: The Counter Consensus*, by palaeoclimatologist Professor bob Carter, Figure 1, page 40)

Does he not know that during Earth's warmer periods the environment, animal and plant species and human civilisation thrived? Does he not know that humans experience a higher death toll from cool events than warm events? What is the aim of his unsupported and unfounded statement that contradicts reality and science?