

From: Malcolm Roberts malcolmr@conscious.com.au
Subject: Fwd: Climate change
Date: 20 June 2014 5:16 pm
To: Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Graham Williamson's 2014 email exchange with Bureau of Meteorology executives including BOM Director, Rob Vertessy.
Private email addresses redacted.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Graham" <xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au>
Subject: RE: Climate change
Date: 20 June 2014 7:42:08 am AEST
To: <r.vertessy@bom.gov.au>
Cc: "Neil Plummer" <N.Plummer@bom.gov.au>, <Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au>, <tony.abbott.mp@aph.gov.au>, <Craig.Kelly.MP@aph.gov.au>, <Dennis.Jensen.MP@aph.gov.au>, <warren.truss@dpm.gov.au>, <Senator.Bernardi@aph.gov.au>, <lisa.cox@fairfaxmedia.com.au>, <maidens@newsitd.com.au>, <hudsonp@heraldsun.com.au>, <Bob.Katter.MP@aph.gov.au>, <senator.joyce@aph.gov.au>, "Chris Berg" <xxxxxx@ipa.org.au>, "Simon Breheny" <xxxxxx@ipa.org.au>

Dr Robert Vertessy
Bureau of Meteorology
GPO Box 1289
Melbourne, 3001
Australia

Dear Dr Vertessy,

Thank you for your below reply, dated 18th June.2014 , in response to my below communications of 10th June, 3rd June, and 27th May provided on your behalf by Neil Plummer.

Firstly, your claim that *"your queries on climate change have been responded to through a letter from The Environment Minister, 5 March, MC14-005862, a Letter from our acting Director, 6 May, MC14-007396 and through my letter of 6 June"*, is completely false, for the following reasons.

- The issues I discussed with you (see below) were NOT considered by the Minister in his correspondence with me. I have enclosed the Minister's response so recipients of this email can see the truth for themselves.
- Neither were these issues addressed in your correspondence of 6th June, which is also enclosed.
- I have never received any response from BOM dated 6th May. Could you kindly resend?

To date, BOM have been unable to offer any explanation or defence regarding the following issues raised in my correspondence below.

1. BOM scientists constantly readjust the definition of the term 'climate' to support their agenda. For instance, according to BOM, if weather data shows cooling and contradicts BOM's AGW agenda, then BOM claims it is necessary to have 30 years of such averaged data before it can be described as 'climate'. However, if there are above average temperatures which can be used to support BOM's political agenda, then according to BOM only one year, or even one season, of averaged weather data, then becomes 'climate'. Although you state *"There is a difference between short-term climate 'noise' and long-term climate signals"*, somehow when temperatures are above average for only one season, this suddenly changes from *'short term noise'* to *'climate'*. These facts are on the public record for all to see and it is hardly surprising that you were unable to offer any

explanation or defence. BOM is actively involved in corrupting science by fiddling with scientific definitions.

2. When it comes to evidence of droughts, and alleged human caused droughts, BOM contradict, cherry pick, and blatantly misrepresent, the IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 scientific report, even though this report was partly prepared by BOM scientists. BOM prefers to cite the IPCC AR5 report only after it has been politicised and presented as the Summary for Policymakers. Once again, these facts are on the public record for all to see and it is hardly surprising that you were unable to offer any explanation or defence.
3. When it comes to the 15 year 'hiatus' in warming and the complete failure of climate models to predict this hiatus, BOM once again contradict and blatantly misrepresent, the IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 scientific report, even though this report was partly prepared by BOM scientists. Once again, these facts are on the public record for all to see and it is hardly surprising that you were unable to offer any explanation or defence.
4. When it comes to the fact that so called global warming has been shown not only to NOT be global, but further, is based upon a fictitious global average which has no relevance in local areas, BOM once again contradict and blatantly misrepresent, the IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 scientific report, even though this report was partly prepared by BOM scientists. Although BOM support the use of northern hemisphere data as a basis for local climate policy, when I asked BOM to quantify the degree of AGW in local areas such as Sydney and Melbourne, BOM were unable to respond. Once again, these facts are on the public record for all to see and it is hardly surprising that you were unable to offer any explanation or defence.
5. When it comes to your alleged claim that *"We know (anthropogenic) carbon dioxide is the culprit. It's a lay-down misere. There's nothing to debate here"*, your only defence was to cite the politicised IPCC Summary for Policymakers. It is most notable, but hardly surprising, that you were apparently unable to defend this claim by utilising the IPCC science report which was partly prepared by BOM scientists. With scientific debate raging around the world about all aspects of alleged AGW your above claim has clearly nothing whatsoever to do with science but rather is motivated by something very much detached from the scientific reality. Once again, these facts are on the public record for all to see and it is hardly surprising that you were unable to offer any explanation or defence.

Under your leadership of BOM a once respected scientific institution is being consistently paraded as an advocacy organisation which corrupts science at will. What actions will you be taking to rectify this?

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Neil Plummer [<mailto:N.Plummer@bom.gov.au>]

Sent: Wednesday, 18 June 2014 2:56 PM

Sent: Wednesday, 10 June 2014 9:30 PM

To: 'Graham'

Subject: RE: Climate change [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Mr Williamson

Thank you for your email of 10 June (below).

I note that your queries on climate change have been responded to through a letter from The Environment Minister, 5 March, MC14-005862, a Letter from our acting Director, 6 May, MC14-007396 and through my letter of 6 June.

We have limited resources to address all individual queries and so we aim to publish our scientific work as widely as possible and engage with others, such as the IPCC, to ensure that our science is considered within a global context.

We wish you well in your own investigations and also encourage you to follow up on the published research we have referred to in our previous correspondence.

Yours sincerely,
Neil

Neil Plummer,

Assistant Director Climate Information Services, Bureau of Meteorology

From: Graham [<mailto:xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.com.au>]

Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2014 7:34 AM

To: Rob Vertessy

Cc: Neil Plummer; tony.abbott.mp@aph.gov.au; Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au; warren.truss@dpm.gov.au; Dennis.Jensen.MP@aph.gov.au; Jennifer Marohasy xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.com

Subject: Climate change

Dr Robert Vertessy
Bureau of Meteorology
GPO Box 1289
Melbourne, 3001
Australia

Dear Dr Vertessy,

Thank you for your enclosed reply, dated 6th June.2014 , to my below communications of 3rd June and 27th May provided on your behalf by Neil Plummer.

I will consider my previous points and your responses sequentially.

POINT 1

First I drew attention to your report which BOM described as "*the Annual Climate Statement*" which "*is to describe the climate of the past year*" and your official BOM definitions of the term "*climate*". As I stated previously:

BOM Climate Definitions Contradict BOM Report

Your report <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/current/annual/aus/> , and your claim that “the purpose of the Annual Climate Statement is to describe the climate of the past year”, contradicts your own definition of climate (1, 2). You provide two official definitions of ‘climate’, the first defining climate as weather averaged over a 30 year period, and the second stating that “**Climate is what you expect; Weather is what you get.**” How can you have an annual climate statement describing the ‘climate’ of the past year when you admit by your own definitions, that such short term weather data is ‘weather’, not ‘climate’? Your own definitions contradict your report and confirm that your report has no scientific basis.

You responded thus:

BOM Climate Definitions Contradict BOM Report

Climate is the statistical analysis of weather over a given time period. This analysis produces many different climate variables, such as annual-mean temperature or the statistical characteristics (for example a probability density function) of rainfall over some period. Climate can be defined over weeks, months or years.

Climatology is a reference or baseline period for climate statistics. Climatology and climate are two separate terms with different meanings. A climatology is generally defined over at least 30 years in the scientific literature. For example, annual climate anomalies are departures from normal, calculated by

comparing the climate over 12 months with the climate from a climatological reference period.

Firstly, your point that “**Climate can be defined over weeks, months or years**” directly contradicts your own official definition of “**climate**” which I quote above. Are you now redefining “**climate**” and contradicting the official BOM definition of this term? If so, this discussion should be preceded by your new definition of the term “climate”. The term “climatology” is completely irrelevant for this discussion since your Annual Climate Statement is about “**climate**” not “climatology”. How is it possible to reconcile your two official definitions of “**climate**”, weather averaged over a 30 year period, and “**Climate is what you expect; Weather is what you get**” with your “Annual Climate Statement” which was produced “to describe the climate of the past year”?

You point out that “Climate is the statistical analysis of weather over a given time period” (official BOM definition is 30 years) and “This analysis produces many different climate variables, such as annual-mean temperature.” In other words, according to BOM, 30 years of annual input data is required to produce the annual average climate data. But this directly contradicts your Annual Climate Statement which averages weather data for one year or even one season and describes this data derived from less than one year duration as “climate”. We need to be very clear about this. Are you contradicting virtually all other climate scientists and suggesting average weather data derived from 1 calendar year or even less is “climate” data and therefore can be compared to other longer term (30 year or more) official climate data? In other words, if we have one very cold season and unusually cool year, is that “climate” or “weather”?

You have completely sidestepped this first question and made no serious attempt to address the issues I raised. It is vitally important, for the clarity of our discussion, that these terms are clearly defined at the outset. To contradict previous official BOM definitions, and still refuse to supply a precise new definition, merely creates the perception that BOM is deliberately indulging in obfuscation. I can see no reason for this so I hope this will be rectified in your response.

POINT 2

In my second query I stated as follows.

BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding Droughts

Recently, in their much heralded [AR5 Scientific Report](#), the IPCC very clearly concluded that global droughts are NOT increasing, there is no reliable evidence humans are causing droughts, droughts were much worse before the industrial revolution, and previous IPCC drought predictions were exaggerated or alarmist (3). Yet, in spite of these very clear conclusions, alarmists and government funded scientific institutions, including BOM and CSIRO (4, 5, 6, 7), have a history of catastrophic predictions regarding human caused climate change and increasing droughts (3). In fact, in spite of the very clear conclusions of IPCC scientists, BOM has yet to officially announce the good news that humans are not causing droughts and global droughts are not increasing. Why? When will BOM cease contradicting IPCC scientists and advise government of the scientific truth concerning droughts?

You responded thus:

BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding Droughts

“The Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO report on trends in drought and rainfall in the Australian region. Trends in mean rainfall are different to trends in episodic drought. The climate record shows that Southern Australia has experienced cool season rainfall declines and climate models project rainfall to decrease, on average, over much of southern and eastern Australia through the decades ahead. The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report states that there is low confidence in detecting changes in drought when drought is assessed at the global scale. This assessment arises in part from the difficulty in defining a global drought index. This is because the definition of drought changes from one climate zone to another. However, the IPCC noted that there were likely changes in drought, including an increase in the frequency and duration of drought, at regional scales. The IPCC SREX report assessed that anthropogenic influence had contributed to some changes in the drought patterns observed in the second half of the Twentieth Century, with varying confidence dependent on regional scale and location. A general conclusion of climate change science, highlighted in IPCC and Bureau of Meteorology reports, is that global warming results in intensification of the hydrological cycle, meaning that we can expect more serious droughts and floods in various places at various times.”

Although I made the point that the IPCC, in their [AR5 Scientific Report](#), very clearly concluded that global droughts are NOT increasing, there is no reliable evidence humans are causing droughts, droughts were much worse before the industrial revolution, and previous IPCC drought predictions were exaggerated or alarmist. Your response was to point out that “*The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report states that there is low confidence in detecting changes in drought when drought is assessed at the global scale and the IPCC noted that there were likely changes in drought, including an increase in the frequency and duration of drought, at regional scales*”. And although you claim “*The IPCC SREX report assessed that anthropogenic influence had contributed to some changes in the drought patterns observed in the second half of the Twentieth Century, with varying confidence dependent on regional scale and location*”, in fact the [IPCC SREX report](#) states there is “***Low confidence in attribution of changes in drought at the level of single regions due to inconsistent or insufficient evidence.***”

You have very conveniently cherry picked the IPCC report and for some reason you have omitted the following vitally important IPCC data which I referred to previously and which you failed to respond to.

In [Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis](#). Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC are very clear about droughts, admitting in the [Technical Summary](#) that their previous AR4 report was wrong:

“The most recent and most comprehensive analyses of river runoff do not support the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) conclusion that global runoff has increased during the 20th century. New results also indicate that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported.”

In [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) the IPCC confirm again that they had previously exaggerated:

“Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated.....Based on evidence since AR4, SREX concluded that there were not enough direct observations of dryness to suggest high confidence in observed trends globally, although there was medium confidence that since the 1950s some regions of the world have experienced more intense and longer droughts.”

So the IPCC have confirmed allegations of so called ‘sceptics’, at least in regard to droughts, that they have been responsible for promoting untrue, exaggerated, or alarmist claims. OK, so what is the official view of the IPCC now in regard to droughts?

According to the IPCC in their AR5 [Technical Summary](#):

“There is low confidence in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall), owing to lack of direct observations, dependencies of inferred trends on the index choice and geographical inconsistencies in the trends. However, this masks important regional changes and, for example, the frequency and intensity of drought have likely increased in the Mediterranean and West Africa and likely decreased in central North America and northwest Australia since 1950. “

And in [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) the IPCC state:

“Confidence is low for a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, methodological uncertainties and geographical inconsistencies in the trends.”

The IPCC summarise in [Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report](#):

“In summary, assessment of new observational evidence, in conjunction with updated simulations of natural and forced climate variability indicates that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s should be tempered. There is not enough evidence to support medium or high confidence of attribution of increasing trends to anthropogenic forcings as a result of observational uncertainties and variable results from region to region (Section 2.6.2.3). Combined with difficulties described above in distinguishing decadal scale variability in drought from long-term climate change we conclude consistent with SREX that there is low confidence in detection and attribution of changes in drought over global land areas since the mid-20th century.”

But most alarming, and incriminating, is the admission by the IPCC in the AR5 [Technical Summary](#), that droughts during the “last millennium”, before the industrial revolution and rise

of atmospheric CO₂, were much worse than today:

“There is high confidence for droughts during the last millennium of greater magnitude and longer duration than those observed since the beginning of the 20th century in many regions.”

IPCC have very clearly stated **There is not enough evidence to support medium or high confidence of attribution of increasing trends to anthropogenic forcings as a result of observational uncertainties** and they clearly state the evidence indicates **droughts were much worse BEFORE the industrial revolution, before the rise in CO₂.**

The huge contradiction between BOM and the IPCC with respect to droughts creates the very clear perception that BOM is acting as an advocacy organisation and is concealing the scientific facts. Why?

Given these facts extremely serious questions arise.

- **Why have BOM cherry picked the data?**
- **Why is BOM misrepresenting the IPCC AR5 scientific report?**
- **Has BOM advised government of the above facts or is BOM actively involved in selectively using data to mislead the government?**
- **Has BOM publicised the good news that AR4 got it wrong with regards to droughts and now there is diminished evidence of worsening droughts and diminished evidence humans are causing droughts?**

In responding to my second query regarding droughts, you have not just sidestepped the issues I raised, you have completely misrepresented the IPCC AR5 scientific report. Why?

POINT 3

In my 3rd query of my previous correspondence I stated:

BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding 15 Year Hiatus & Failure of Climate Models

Recently, in the [AR5 Scientific Report](#), the IPCC finally agreed with ‘sceptics’ that there had been a 15 year ‘hiatus’ in global warming in spite of increasing emissions (8). IPCC further agreed that the failure to predict this hiatus was due to the unreliability of climate models (8). In spite of these revelations in the science report, BOM has yet to officially concur with these findings of IPCC scientists. Does BOM officially acknowledge the 15 year ‘hiatus’ confirmed by the IPCC? And does BOM also agree that this demonstrates a fundamental failure of climate models which completely failed to predict the hiatus? Of course the bottom line in this regard, as a result of the findings of the [AR5 Scientific Report](#), is that climate models have been scientifically shown to be extremely unreliable, and certainly no basis for determining climate and economic policies decades into the future. Do you agree?

You responded thus:

BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding 15 Year Hiatus & Failure of Climate Models

“There is clear evidence that the global climate system continues to warm in response to

anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. This is borne out by a wide array of measurements

anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. This is borne out by a wide array of measurements performed by many agencies, including the Bureau of Meteorology. The IPCC reference to a hiatus in recent warming relates to a slowdown in the rate of warming of global mean surface temperature trend during 1998–2012, relative to the trend observed during 1951–2012. This reduced rate of warming in this single variable is attributable in roughly equal measure to a surface cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing. Global mean surface temperature is one of many different measures of heat in the climate system, each with their own short-term climate 'noise', or internal climate variability. By looking across multiple variables, in particular ocean heat content and sea-level rise, it is clear that the climate system has continued to accumulate heat in recent decades. The internal variability component of reduced rates of warming in the 2000s compared with the 1990s has been linked to decadal variability in global mean surface temperature associated with the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), which controls the exchange of heat between the atmosphere and oceans. Climate model forcing experiments are not weather forecasts. Climate models are therefore not expected to reproduce the timing of observed internal decadal variability, but rather to reproduce the response to external forcing while simulating the statistical properties of intrinsic variability. For example, the climate models reproduce the ENSO cycle, but they do not reproduce the observed timing of El Niño events. This is not a flaw in the models per se, but the difference between an initial condition issue, such as numerical weather prediction, and a boundary condition issue, such as understanding the mean impact of changes in atmospheric chemistry.”

My fundamental point here is, based upon the contents of the [AR5 Scientific Report](#), *“climate models have been scientifically shown to be extremely unreliable, and certainly no basis for determining climate and economic policies decades into the future.”*

This analysis was based directly upon the [AR5 Technical Summary](#) which states:

“In summary, the observed recent warming hiatus, defined as the reduction in GMST trend during 1998–2012 as compared to the trend during 1951–2012, is attributable in roughly equal measure to a cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing (expert judgement, medium confidence)..... Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus. There is medium confidence that the GMST trend difference between models and observations during 1998–2012 is to a substantial degree caused by internal variability, with possible contributions from forcing error and some CMIP5 models overestimating the response to increasing GHG forcing.”

In other words, the official verdict from the IPCC is that the predictions of climate models, upon which they have been so eager to base the future of global politics and the expenditure of trillions of dollars, are wrong. Alarmingly, the IPCC admit that they, and their models, forgot to allow for natural climate variability.

According to IPCC *“Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus”*. In other words, the models failed.

Can you please provide documentary evidence that BOM has accurately publicised and provided this information to government? To date, it appears BOM is attempting to conceal or downplay this assessment and even contradict the IPCC. As is the case in point 3 above, I can see no evidence that BOM has sought to accurately convey these IPCC conclusions to the public and to government. And your above response also contradicts your response to point 1 above where you

claim that averaged weather data derived from 1 year or even 1 season is actually "climate". Obfuscation, and failure to clarify these issues, merely confirms the criticisms of those who claim BOM is acting as an advocacy organisation rather than a scientific organisation.

POINT 4

In my fourth point I stated as follows.

IPCC Claims Global Warming is NOT Global & is NOT Local

According to the IPCC AR5 Scientific Report, global warming is not global at all since the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans defied model predictions and actually cooled when they should have been warming (9). This is yet another example of real world climate refusing to obey the climate models but yet it seems BOM has not drawn attention to this issue. According to Cobb, it is the entire Southern Hemisphere that has failed to warm as predicted by computer models, due to the fact that the models have been based almost exclusively upon Northern Hemisphere data (9). Now, new Southern Hemisphere data has revealed the inaccuracies which have resulted from using Northern Hemisphere data (9). As Cobb explains: "Given the new information now available from the Southern Hemisphere, climate scientists must consider a larger role for natural climate variability in contributing to global temperature changes over the past millennium." What is the official position of BOM in regard to unpredicted hemispheric differences and cooling of the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans? BOM, like organisations advocating political change rather than scientific accuracy, has not been seen to be leading the way forward in detecting and correcting problems with climate models.

But according to the IPCC, not only is warming not global, it is not local either (9). IPCC point out, since local areas do not show any detectable warming trend, the only way a warming trend can be detected is to average the data from local areas and then reapply this global average to every region on earth (9). In other words, a significant human caused warming trend cannot be detected in local regions around the world (9). Does BOM agree with this? Or can BOM clearly state the amount of human caused warming in local regions such as Sydney and Melbourne?

You responded thus:

IPCC Claims Global Warming is NOT Global & is NOT Local

Climate models do not simulate warming across every part of the climate system in response to a 40% increase in greenhouse gases. Nevertheless, observations show that the entire climate system has, on average, warmed. There is a difference between short-term climate 'noise' and long-term climate signals. Many of the observations referenced in this question refer to short-term 'noise', or internal climate variability as outlined above, and are not especially relevant to predicted future climate change. As discussed previously, the climate model forcing experiments do not include

observational data assimilation (where observed climate changes are used to constrain the model simulations). Rather, they only contain the external forcing changes, such as observed changes in greenhouse gases.

Three points need to be made here.

Firstly, IPCC point out that global warming can only be reliably detected in local areas by producing a hypothetical global average and then applying this hypothetical figure to every local

region on earth. In response I specifically asked you to quantify the human caused global warming in Sydney and Melbourne: *“In other words, a significant human caused warming trend cannot be detected in local regions around the world (9). Does BOM agree with this? Or can BOM clearly state the amount of human caused warming in local regions such as Sydney and Melbourne?”*

Your complete failure to respond to these questions further confirms allegations BOM is acting as an advocacy organisation rather than a scientific organisation. If BOM cannot supply scientific evidence to confirm **the amount of human caused warming in local regions such as Sydney and Melbourne then the government should be immediately advised local global warming policies cannot be justified.** If there is any scientific justification for the suggestion that local climate policies should be based upon a fictitious global average derived predominantly from northern hemisphere data then please supply this evidence as a matter of urgency. Otherwise advise the government accordingly.

Secondly, according to IPCC scientists so called global warming is not global since some areas are cooling when they should be warming:

While the IPCC is confident they can accurately predict warming at the global level, not the local level, they point out that in the real world, according to the [IPCC WG1 Technical Summary](#), the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans were defying model predictions and actually cooling when they should have been warming.

“Over the period 1979–2010 most observed regions exhibited warming (Figure 10.2d), but much of the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans cooled. These regions of cooling are not seen in the simulated trends over this period in response to anthropogenic and natural forcing (Figure 10.2h), which show significantly more warming in much of these regions (Jones et al., 2013; Knutson et al., 2013). This cooling and reduced warming in observations over the Southern Hemisphere mid-latitudes over the 1979–2010 period can also be seen in the zonal mean trends (Figure 10.3d), which also shows that the models tend to warm too much in this region over this period.”

Once again, as above, I can see no evidence BOM has accurately publicised these conclusions of IPCC scientists.

Thirdly, you refer above to what you describe as **“short term climate noise”**: *“There is a difference between short-term climate ‘noise’ and long-term climate signals. Many of the observations referenced in this question refer to short-term ‘noise’”*

Please define ‘short term climate noise’.

- **Is the short term data of 1 year or even 1 season, referred to in your [Annual Climate Statement](#) in point 1 above, actually short term “noise” or a “long term climate signal”?**
- **If in fact it is only short term “noise” then why is this fact not publicised in the [Annual Climate Statement](#)?**

YOUR CLAIM THAT THERE IS NO DEBATE

In my previous correspondence (below) I referred to the following alleged comments of Dr Vertessy:

You have been cited as saying *“We know (anthropogenic) carbon dioxide is the culprit. It’s a lay-*

down misere. There's nothing to debate here". Is this correct?

It is indeed interesting, that while IPCC scientists are increasingly agreeing with the views of so called sceptics regarding the hiatus and the failure of climate models, BOM seem content to trail behind the science and adopt a more politicised view.

You responded thus:

"Dr Vertessy's remarks in relation to the causes of climate change (ie. anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide) accord with the IPCC's Fifth Scientific Assessment that emphasises the extreme likelihood (or greater than 95% probability) that the observed global warming is due to increases in carbon dioxide. The IPCC Summary for Policymakers concludes:

'Human influence has been detected in warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, in changes in the global water cycle, in reductions in snow and ice, in global mean sea level rise, and in changes in some climate extremes (see Figure SPM.6 and Table SPM.1). This evidence for human influence has grown since AR4. It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century.

It is extremely likely that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in greenhouse gas concentrations and other anthropogenic forcings together. The best estimate of the human-induced contribution to warming is similar to the observed warming over this period. Over every continental region except Antarctica, anthropogenic forcings have likely made a substantial contribution to surface temperature increases since the mid-20th century (see Figure SPM.6). For Antarctica, large observational uncertainties result in low confidence that anthropogenic forcings have contributed to the observed warming averaged over available stations. It is likely that there has been an anthropogenic contribution to the very substantial Arctic warming since the mid-20th century.'"

The first point to be made here is that unless BOM can show the science is beyond dispute and *"There's nothing to debate here"*, then Dr Vertessy's alleged comment, if correctly cited, represents a clear political advocacy statement that renders his current position with BOM as untenable.

Secondly, in an attempt to defend Dr Vertessy you have apparently felt compelled to cite the politicised Summary for Policymakers rather than the IPCC scientific report. Why? Is the SPM superior to the IPCC scientific report which has been compiled by scientists, including BOM scientists?

The fact that the SPM is politicised, and often exaggerated or sensationalised, has been well documented ([11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#)).

According to the [AR5 Scientific Report](#) compiled by IPCC scientists, including BOM scientists, for instance, the IPCC very clearly concluded that global droughts are NOT increasing, there is no reliable evidence humans are causing droughts, droughts were much worse before the industrial revolution, and previous IPCC drought predictions were exaggerated or alarmist (the direct IPCC citations upon which these claims are based are cited above; or see [11](#)). Although the SPM did concede that there is "low confidence" in increasing global droughts, the SPM failed to mention other facts such as droughts were much worse before the industrial revolution, and previous IPCC drought predictions were exaggerated or alarmist.. Similarly, all references to a temperature "hiatus" which models failed to predict were deleted from the SPM though present in the scientific report prepared by scientists. including BOM scientists ([12](#)). We have also seen how the

IPCC has invented fears of conflict caused by human caused climate change in their SPM (14).

- **If there is disagreement between the IPCC scientific report and the SPM which version does BOM support?**
- **After contributing to the IPCC scientific report why does BOM prefer to cite the SPM and avoid the scientific report?**

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

I thank you for the audit information and will further examine that aspect.

In recent years there has been a widespread perception that government aligned scientific organisations such as BOM are increasingly acting as political organisations, endorsing policies and going beyond science. Climate science and climate scientists have suffered a severe loss of credibility with frequent extreme statements and failed predictions repeatedly made by those pushing an alarmist or political view of climate change. As a result, an increasing number of scientists, including former IPCC authors, have openly criticised the IPCC and its unscientific conclusions, especially in the SPM. While many scientists, through their criticisms and suggestions, have sought to improve IPCC scientific methodology, BOM on the other hand have not been seen to be actively involved in the process. The very clear perception is that BOM have chosen to align themselves with those on the alarmist or political side of the debate. Your response to the issues I raised above has only confirmed this perception.

I have cited, using direct reference to IPCC and BOM data, numerous inconsistencies and contradictions in your various statements. You have responded by contradicting BOM's official definition of 'climate'. But you do not just contradict BOM, you contradict the IPCC also, and you frequently cherry pick or misrepresent the IPCC AR5 scientific report, although it must be noted that you do seem to prefer to cite the politicised SPM rather than the scientific report, which was partly written by BOM and CSIRO scientists.

All of these various contradictions and misrepresentations can be seen to have a singular direction or purpose. They all occur in a direction which supports the political climate change agenda. Equally, they all occur in a direction which discredits science and scientists..

Sir, science and scientists have suffered more than enough humiliation. And more than enough public money has been wasted and diverted away from helping real people with real problems.

Instead of placing BOM in the situation where they may become the last 'scientific' organisation in Australia to admit the truth, if you are unable to repudiate the various issues I have raised then I urge you to take appropriate action NOW, for the good of all Australians.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Graham [<mailto:xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au>]
Sent: Tuesday, 3 June 2014 6:54 AM
To: r.vertessy@bom.gov.au
Cc: 'Jennifer Marohasy xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au'; bolta@heraldsun.com.au;
bcubby@fairfaxmedia.com.au; Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au;
'tony.abbott.mp@aph.gov.au'; Dennis.Jensen.MP@aph.gov.au; lisa.cox@fairfaxmedia.com.au
Subject: FW: Climate change

Dr Robert Vertessy
Bureau of Meteorology
GPO Box 1289
Melbourne, 3001
Australia

Dear Dr Vertessy,

I have yet to receive any response to the issues raised in my previous communication below. Could you please advise your time frame for a response.

I note the increasing concerns about corruption of climate data by BOM and the refusal of BOM to explain or participate in any independent audit of BOM data ([1](#), [2](#)). As noted below, an exciting opportunity has been presented to BOM to enable it to clear the air and end these disputes by enthusiastically participating in an independent audit and answering the various issues raised.

Is BOM a proud and open scientific organisation which is proud of its record and stands behind its data? Or, on the other hand, is BOM a politicised organisation whose data must be shielded from scientific or public scrutiny?

In the interest of resolving these disputes and restoring some credibility to BOM as a scientific organisation I am sure you will welcome a full independent audit, and a resolution of the raised issues, most enthusiastically.

I look forward to your positive response.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Graham [<mailto:xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au>]
Sent: Tuesday, 27 May 2014 4:34 PM
To: 'r.vertessy@bom.gov.au'
Subject: Climate change

Dr Robert Vertessy
Bureau of Meteorology
GPO Box 1289
Melbourne, 3001
Australia

Dear Dr Vertessy,

Previously I have attempted unsuccessfully to obtain answers to the following issues from Dr Scott Power. Given the importance of these issues, and Dr Power's inability to answer, I repeat them

again here and offer BOM a further opportunity to respond.

1. BOM Climate Definitions Contradict BOM Report

Your report <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/current/annual/aus/>, and your claim that *“the purpose of the Annual Climate Statement is to describe the climate of the past year”*, contradicts your own definition of climate (1, 2). You provide two official definitions of ‘climate’, the first defining climate as weather averaged over a 30 year period, and the second stating that *“Climate is what you expect; Weather is what you get.”* How can you have an annual climate statement describing the ‘climate’ of the past year when you admit by your own definitions, that such short term weather data is ‘weather’, not ‘climate’? Your own definitions contradict your report and confirm that your report has no scientific basis.

2. BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding Droughts

Recently, in their much heralded [AR5 Scientific Report](#), the IPCC very clearly concluded that global droughts are NOT increasing, there is no reliable evidence humans are causing droughts, droughts were much worse before the industrial revolution, and previous IPCC drought predictions were exaggerated or alarmist (3). Yet, in spite of these very clear conclusions, alarmists and government funded scientific institutions, including BOM and CSIRO (4, 5, 6, 7), have a history of catastrophic predictions regarding human caused climate change and increasing droughts (3). In fact, in spite of the very clear conclusions of IPCC scientists, BOM has yet to officially announce the good news that humans are not causing droughts and global droughts are not increasing. Why? When will BOM cease contradicting IPCC scientists and advise government of the scientific truth concerning droughts?

3. BOM Contradicts IPCC Regarding 15 Year Hiatus & Failure of Climate Models

Recently, in the [AR5 Scientific Report](#), the IPCC finally agreed with ‘sceptics’ that there had been a 15 year ‘hiatus’ in global warming in spite of increasing emissions (8). IPCC further agreed that the failure to predict this hiatus was due to the unreliability of climate models (8). In spite of these revelations in the science report, BOM has yet to officially concur with these findings of IPCC scientists. Does BOM officially acknowledge the 15 year ‘hiatus’ confirmed by the IPCC? And does BOM also agree that this demonstrates a fundamental failure of climate models which completely failed to predict the hiatus? Of course the bottom line in this regard, as a result of the findings of the [AR5 Scientific Report](#), is that climate models have been scientifically shown to be extremely unreliable, and certainly no basis for determining climate and economic policies decades into the future. Do you agree?

4. IPCC Claims Global Warming is NOT Global & is NOT Local

According to the IPCC [AR5 Scientific Report](#), global warming is not global at all since the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans defied model predictions and actually cooled when they should have been warming (9). This is yet another example of real world climate refusing to obey the climate models but yet it seems BOM has not drawn attention to this issue. According to Cobb, it is the entire Southern Hemisphere that has failed to warm as predicted by computer models, due to the fact that the models have been based almost exclusively upon Northern Hemisphere data (9). Now, new Southern Hemisphere data has revealed the inaccuracies which have resulted from using Northern Hemisphere data (9). As Cobb explains: “Given the new information now available from the Southern Hemisphere, climate scientists must consider a larger role for natural climate variability in contributing to global temperature changes over the past millennium.” What is the official position of BOM in regard to unpredicted hemispheric differences and cooling of the

eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans? BOM, like organisations advocating political change rather than scientific accuracy, has not been seen to be leading the way forward in detecting and correcting problems with climate models.
But according to the IPCC, not only is warming not global, it is not local either (9). IPCC point out, since local areas do not show any detectable warming trend, the only way a warming trend can be detected is to average the data from local areas and then reapply this global average to every region on earth (9). In other words, a significant human caused warming trend cannot be detected in local regions around the world (9). Does BOM agree with this? Or can BOM clearly state the amount of human caused warming in local regions such as Sydney and Melbourne?

Recently, in addition to the above matters, serious claims have been made that BOM has falsified temperature records (10, 11). These serious allegations require a full explanation or enquiry. If records have been falsified then clearly urgent action must be taken against those responsible. Will you be taking action in this regard?

You can see from recent media reports that CAGW supporters are looking increasingly ridiculous and isolated (12, 13, 14). And now, even though IPCC scientists have confirmed that climate models are much too unreliable as a basis for future climate and economic policies, BOM, instead of leading the scientific world, lags well behind still clinging to the hope that the next climate model will be the perfect model. In fact, you have been cited as saying “*We know (anthropogenic) carbon dioxide is the culprit. It’s a lay-down misere. There’s nothing to debate here*”. Is this correct?

It is indeed interesting, that while IPCC scientists are increasingly agreeing with the views of so called sceptics regarding the hiatus and the failure of climate models, BOM seem content to trail behind the science and adopt a more politicised view.

Interestingly, Liberal MP Dennis Jensen has suggested an independent full audit of BOM records as a very practical way of moving forward and clearing the air as far as BOM are concerned (15, 16, 17). Such an audit would provide an exciting opportunity to enhance the credibility of BOM and resolve some of these long running disputes. Would you support such an audit?

Regards

Graham Williamson

Text inserted by PIS for Netbooks:

This message has NOT been classified as spam. If it is unsolicited mail (spam), click on the following link to reclassify it: [It is spam!](#)



MC14-005862 Graham
Williamson.pdf



