



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
College of Management and Economics
University of Guelph
Guelph Ontario, Canada N1G 2M5
(519) 824-4120 Ext. 52532
<http://www.uoguelph.ca/~rmckitri/ross.html>
rmckitri@uoguelph.ca

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D.
Professor

April 13, 2010

Sir Muir Russell,
Chairman, Independent Climate Change Email Review

Re: Supplement to Evidence

Dear Sir Muir

I submitted evidence to the ICCER on February 26 2010. Since that time, the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee under Mr. Phil Willis has released its report. The Committee Report declined to investigate or make findings on some important issues arising from, *inter alia*, evidence I submitted, and instead expressed the desire that your Review would do so. I draw particular attention to the information I supplied in paragraphs [63] to [90] of my submission. These paragraphs explain the problem of temperature data contamination, the fact that the CRU provides insufficient documentation to support their claim that they have solved the problem, and that Professor Jones, acting in his capacity as IPCC lead author, suppressed published evidence of problems in the CRU data by keeping the material out of the reviewed drafts of the IPCC Report, then inserting unsubstantiated material into Chapter 3 of the final published IPCC Report.

Referring to this controversy, the Science and Technology Committee stated (paragraph 73 of its Report):

The evidence that we have seen does not suggest that Professor Jones was trying to subvert the peer review process. Academics should not be criticised for making informal comments on academic papers. The Independent Climate Change Email Review should look in detail at all of these claims.

The second sentence ignores the fact that Professor Jones was not merely making informal comments to a colleague, but, at the time of the email in question, was serving as IPCC Lead Author and was expressing an intention to suppress information harmful to his conclusions from appearing in the IPCC Report. Moreover, his subsequent actions showed that he did, apparently, act upon these intentions.

Andrew Montford contacted Mr Phil Willis after the publication of the Inquiry and, at Mr Willis' invitation, put some follow-up questions to him. Two of the questions were:

7. Professor McKittrick argues that Professor Jones used his position in the IPCC to suppress evidence that called the quality of his data sets into question (Ev 140, para [13]-[15]).

The Committee accepted Professor Jones' claim (paragraphs 72, 73) that he was merely making "informal comments" and expressing his views to a colleague about some papers. Did the Committee not consider it relevant that Jones was, at the time, not merely acting in a private capacity, but was a Lead Author of the IPCC Report, and that he was therefore not merely expressing an opinion about the papers, but was in fact expressing an intent to manipulate IPCC guidelines in order to prevent disclosure of peer-reviewed evidence that went against his views?

8. In defence of this claim that he tried to keep sceptic findings out of the IPCC reports, Professor Jones defends himself by stating that the papers were already in the scientific literature, an explanation that is accepted by the committee. Since the accusation is one of keeping the findings out of the IPCC reports, the fact that they were already in the scientific literature is irrelevant. Professor McKittrick states that Professor Jones did keep the papers out of the drafts of the IPCC reports, only including them in the final draft after protests from sceptics and then inserting unsubstantiated statements into the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (para 15) in order to bypass their conclusions. Professor McKittrick lists (para 19) the evidence that the committee would need to obtain in order to disprove an allegation of fabrication of evidence. How has the committee discounted Professor McKittrick's allegation? Did the Committee ask Professor Jones to supply the information alluded to by Professor McKittrick? If not, is the Committee prepared to ask him for it now?

Mr. Willis declined to answer any of the questions, replying instead:

Your questions raised detailed points about the Committee's deliberations and how it weighted the evidence that was presented to it in this inquiry. I am sorry, but these are matters on which I am unable to enter into detailed correspondence. I can, however, make two general points. First, as the Report makes clear, the Committee received in addition to the oral evidence taken on 1 March a substantial number of written submissions which were carefully considered. Second, the report sets out the reasons that led the Committee to reach conclusions and recommendations that it did.

As Montford explained (<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/4/7/a-letter-from-phil-willis.html>), Mr Willis also suggested that these issues be referred to the ICCER.

Mr. Montford then had a telephone conversation with Graham Stringer about these same matters. He reports (<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/4/10/a-chat-with-graham-stringer.html>):

I particularly raised the question of Ross McKittrick's allegation that Phil Jones had inserted into the IPCC report some statements that had no basis in the scientific literature. I came away with the impression that the committee had not specifically examined this issue, and that their exoneration of Jones was presumably therefore limited to the specific questions that they *had* looked at. It appears to have been a case of "if in doubt find him innocent".

In light of this outcome I write to emphasize that the House of Commons Inquiry narrowed its remit quite sharply and they have handed you the responsibility to provide a proper treatment of these matters.

In my submission of evidence I have explained the basis for my claim that Professor Jones fabricated evidence, and I outlined the specific items of evidence (see paragraph [89]) that your Review can easily request that will uphold or disprove the allegation. I repeat it herewith for your convenience.

[89] I submit that evidence sufficient to disprove a claim of fabrication would consist of the p value supporting the claim of statistical insignificance made on page 244 of IPCC Working Group I, the peer-reviewed journal article in which it was presented, and the page number where the study is cited in the IPCC Report. **I request that the Inquiry ask Dr. Jones to produce these things.** An inability on his part to do so would, I submit, establish that the insertion of the paragraph quoted above at paragraph [83] amounted to fabrication of evidence, with the effect of concealing problems in the CRU temperature data upon which some of the core conclusions of the IPCC were based.

As the House of Commons Committee failed to investigate this matter, and instead referred it to the ICCER, I respectfully request that you give the matter your attention.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. McKittrick', written in a cursive style.

Ross McKittrick
Professor of Economics