

On 15 January 2014 03:30, Judy Ryan <judyryan@grapevine.com.au> wrote: to the Ombudsman with around 230 media, political and scientific entities openly copied in.

Dear Ombudsman,

As you can see from the Appendices the Department for the Environment (DOE) has not responded to our formal complaint no 2013- 502790 in a satisfactory manner. Our issues were very specific:-

(1) Over a period of years DCC now DOE has coloured the emissions from coal fired power stations as black in both its animated videos and its 'scientific' publication. This is incorrect and misleading.

(2) The then DCC now DOE has misinformed the Australian people by shortening the noun 'carbon-dioxide' to 'carbon' then coupling it with the words 'pollution' or 'missions' hence the terms 'carbon pollution' and 'carbon emissions'.

These maladroit policies have misled the Australian people into believing that emissions from coal fired power stations are 'black carbon' i.e. soot, which would be a pollutant if it were in the atmosphere. However, Australian power stations have scrubbers which remove the soot from the gas and it does not reach the atmosphere. What is emitted into the atmosphere from coal fired power stations is the gaseous state of carbon-dioxide. It would be impossible for a coal fired power station to emit the solid state of carbon-dioxide as it is Dry Ice.

As you can see from the first Appendix, DOE refuses to acknowledge that the term 'carbon pollution' is misleading. It maintains that the historical common usage of the term somehow justifies its use. This is not a satisfactory response to our complaint.

As you can see from the second Appendix, I have provided DOE with specific references to evidence that carbon-dioxide is not a pollutant, even at enormously higher levels than currently.

DOE/DCC also does not address the fact, that as it paid the salaries of the Climate Commissioners, it was/is responsible for the Climate Commission's consistent misleading graphical portrayal of carbon-dioxide as black. Just because the Climate Commission has been abolished does not mean that the misleading misrepresentation to the Australian people should not be investigated

As you can see from (Appendix three)DOE's response to my correspondence (Appendix 2) is as equally unhelpful as the first, and did not address the specific issues.

As you can see from (Appendix 4) I am very critical of DOE for referring me to the Working Group 1's contribution *IPCC Fifth Assessment Report – Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. www.ipcc.ch This document is an unapproved draft. Having looked at the draft, there is not one instance where the scientists of Working Group 1 have referred to carbon-dioxide as black. Nor is there one instance where they have labelled carbon-dioxide a pollutant.

All other issues that DOE raises in its correspondence with me are irrelevant to this complaint.

In closing the Ombudsman should be well equipped to investigate these two specific policies . The science that indicates they are fundamentally flawed is in the public domain and within the comprehension of a High School Science graduate. However, if the Ombudsman wants to seek independent advice then it should not use either the CSIRO or the Bureau of Meteorology. These two Government agencies will be the subject of formal complaints in the near future. For a balanced view I recommend the scientists of the NIPCC <http://nipccreport.com>

Regards

Dr Judy Ryan

Dr Marjorie Curtis, my cosigner is copied into this correspondence: