


**From:** Malcolm Roberts malcolmr@conscious.com.au   
**Subject:** Fwd: BOM Corrupts climate science 3  
**Date:** 21 July 2014 6:20 pm  
**To:** Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

---

Redacting Graham Williamson's email address. All other email addresses are publicly available.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Graham" <xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au>  
**Subject:** BOM Corrupts climate science 3  
**Date:** 30 June 2014 7:10:24 am AEST  
**To:** <Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au>, <tony.abbott.mp@aph.gov.au>, <r.vertessy@bom.gov.au>, <Senator.Bernardi@aph.gov.au>, <senator.joyce@aph.gov.au>, <Dennis.Jensen.MP@aph.gov.au>, <warren.truss@dpm.gov.au>, <Craig.Kelly.MP@aph.gov.au>, <maidens@newsld.com.au>, <hudsonp@heraldsun.com.au>, <hopkinsn@theaustralian.com.au>, <bolta@heraldsun.com.au>

## BOM CORRUPTS CLIMATE SCIENCE IN PURSUIT OF THEIR AGENDA

### Issue 3: The 'Hiatus', Failure of Climate Models, & BOM's Misrepresentation of the IPCC AR5 WG1 Science Report

Recently, in the Working Group 1 [AR5 Scientific Report](#), the IPCC very clearly concluded that there has been a 15 year (continuing) 'hiatus' or cessation in global warming (in spite of increasing CO<sub>2</sub>), this cessation has been caused primarily by natural climate variability, and the climate models relied upon by BOM and IPCC scientists have totally failed to predict this natural variability (1). **The essential point here is that the climate models have been totally discredited by IPCC scientists and shown to provide no basis for reliable climate predictions, and certainly no reliable basis for global climate policies costing trillions of dollars. The IPCC have therefore, verified the long held claims of 'sceptics' regarding the unreliability of climate models.**

Although these conclusions of the IPCC are perfectly clear, BOM have refused to accurately publicise these official IPCC conclusions, preferring instead to misrepresent or cherry pick the report and conceal the truth. BOM have apparently also refused to officially advise the government regarding the unreliability of climate models, apparently preferring to pretend the next generation of climate models will be 'perfect'.

BOM frequently seem to prefer to completely avoid citing the science report they contributed to and instead, cite the AAR5 report only after it has been politicised and re-presented as the Summary for Policymakers. BOM continues to create the very clear perception that they will ignore, or conceal, any evidence which could be seen to contradict their political agenda. Yet they claim to be a scientific organisation.

### Environment Minister Greg Hunt approves of BOM Corruption of Science and Misleading of the Australian People

Though this matter was brought to the attention of the Minister he has so far declined to respond or take action.

**ISSUES UNANSWERED IN CORRESPONDENCE SENT TO BOM**

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

### POINT 3

In my 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 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. Alarming, 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.

