

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 22 June 2011 10:46 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Fwd: Climate commission report [sec=unclassified]]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

=====
=

IMPORTANT NOTE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended addressee or an authorised recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately.

=====
=

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 June 2011 1:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Fwd: Climate commission report [sec=unclassified]]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2011 9:21 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [Fwd: Climate commission report [sec=unclassified]]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2011 5:58 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [Fwd: Climate commission report [sec=unclassified]]

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Climate commission report [sec=unclassified]
Date: Tue, 24 May 2011 14:56:19 +0930
From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Hello [REDACTED],

I have just finished reading your report and I must say I am quite disappointed in the end product, my reasons for being disappointed are simple. I was of the understanding that the sole purpose of the commission was to explain the science to the Australian public, help build and foster a consensus among the people as outlined in the link below. Therefore I was waiting with great anticipation for this report as I hoped it would clarify a few issues I have with AGW.

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/minister/greg-combet/2011/media-releases/February/mr20110210.aspx>

However after reading your report I do not believe this has happened, in fact not even attempted. One example which springs to mind is your statements regarding the hot spot, you stated on page 16 and I quote,

"An apparent inconsistency between observations with greenhouse theory was the alleged failure to find a so-called "tropical hot spot", a warming in the tropical atmosphere about 10-15 km above the Earth's surface. In reality, there was no inconsistency between observed and modeled changes in tropical upper troposphere temperatures, allowing for uncertainties in observations and large internal variability in temperature in the region. Furthermore, recent thermal wind calculations have indeed shown greater warming in the region (Allen and Sherwood 2008), confirming that there is no inconsistency and providing another fingerprint of enhanced greenhouse forcing."

We both know the hot spot is a central plank in the theory of AGW, the hot spot is an accumulation of hot air generated by a positive feedback to increasing greenhouse gases by water vapor. If this hot spot does not exist then the AGW theory is falsified. The problem I have here with this whole sorry saga is the scientific process that has unfolded, for example we have two independent sources of temperature data being satellite and radio sonde. Both these sources of data have been rejected on the grounds that the data is erroneous and have been replaced with GPS data from the very same radio sondes that supplied the thermometer data that was rejected.

Can any scientist seriously condone the actions of Allen, Sherwood and Santer? Can any scientist seriously expect the general public to believe thermometers with the capacity to measure temperature to one decimal place to be more erroneous than a cheap throw away GPS?

I would now like to turn your attention to the Allen and Sherwood 2008 paper, in your quote above you reference Allen and Sherwood 2008 as evidence that the hot spot has been found, have you read this paper Will? I only ask because not only did I find his methods disturbing but also his graphs, please take a close look at Fig 6, you will notice the top two graphs are the results of Sherwood's manipulation of the wind shear data and the bottom two are the expected model results.

Yes the graphs do look very similar to the IPCC graphs, the now obligatory big red blotch in the middle signifying to the reader how hot it is but what is interesting is the color scale on Sherwood's graph. It would appear that a 0C/Decade trend is of all colors.....RED, on closer inspection it seems that Sherwood has not found much at all.

Although to the untrained eye it appears that reality does indeed match the models prediction. Why would Sherwood use such a strange color code for his scaling?

There are other topics in this report that have been brushed over aside from the example I have offered, this highlights the true purpose of the report. I was hoping, no expecting this report to be subjective on these types of issues but it seems it is nothing more than another argument from authority.

Oh by the way if you want to be taken seriously from now on I suggest you remove the disclaimer from the inside cover, it does nothing for your credibility and gives the appearance that it is, to put bluntly an arse covering exercise. In fact the many people I have shown this to today now accept that this report is not worth the paper it is written on.

Yours Sincerely

██████

* *

T NOTICE - PLEASE READ

This document is produced for general information only and does not represent a statement of the policy of the Commonwealth of Australia. While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy, completeness and reliability of the material contained in this document, the Commonwealth of Australia and all persons acting for the Commonwealth preparing this report 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.

* *

IMPORTANT NOTICE - PLEASE READ

This document is produced for general information only and does not represent a statement of the policy of the Commonwealth of Australia. While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy, completeness and reliability of the material contained in this document, the Commonwealth of Australia and all persons acting

for the Commonwealth preparing this report 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.

* *

IMPORTANT NOTICE - PLEASE READ

This document is produced for general information only and does not represent a statement of the policy of the Commonwealth of Australia. While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy, completeness and reliability of the material contained in this document, the Commonwealth of Australia and all persons acting for the Commonwealth preparing this report 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.

--



