John Ibbotson 24 Rosella Road Gulmarrad NSW 2463 02-6645-5554 Johnibbo@mira.net 21<sup>st</sup> February 2010

The Honourable Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600 www.pm.gov.au

Dear Kevin,

## **Changes to the Climate Change Communication Team**

From press reports it appears that there is a new team being set up by Dr. Martin Parkinson to provide communication support for the Department of Climate Change.

During the last three months there has been a flood of information released and confirmed that the IPCC documents and the science behind them contain large numbers of errors. These errors are so significant that it effectively destroys the validity of the climate data published by the IPCC and negates the theory that anthropogenic carbon emissions have caused Global Warming.

This started out with the release of the East Anglia University, Climate Research Unit (CRU) emails, now referred to as Climategate. These emails included information that showed that data was cherry-picked and manipulated; standover tactics were used; data was destroyed or "lost"; RFI requests were refused the list goes on and on. The head of the CRU, Phil Jones, has since admitted that temperature increases since 1995 have been insignificant and that the temperature has been dropping since 2002.

But the release of these emails has turned out to be only the tip of the iceberg.

It has now been confirmed that the NASA GISS data has also been manipulated (Climategate 2) and it is likely that the third main supplier of weather data to the IPCC (NOAA) is also implicated. Added to this is the temperature data from Russia, New Zealand, Australia and other countries has also been manipulated.

Then there is Sea-levelgate, where fear mongering has indicated that sea levels will rise by meters. Peer reviewed papers put the rise over the last 100 years at steady17mm per decade (17cm in 100years) and since about 2004 sea levels have been dropping.

There has also been Glaciergate, Amazongate, Africagate; Hurricanegate; Chinagate; Peer-Reviewgate; Russiagate; Icegate; Reefgate; Conflict-of-interestgate and many more.

Without going into complexities here are just a couple of examples of how the temperature data has been compromised:

• Up until 1990 about 6,000 temperature stations were being used to determine earth's average temperature. This has dropped to 1,500. Those stations removed were in rural areas, those above 1,000m in elevation (eg Bolivia) and those at higher latitudes, such as Siberia and Canada. In Canada's case 565 of their 600 weather stations data was removed. Not surprisingly after 1990 the earth's temperature started to rise rapidly.

• When processing say 30 years of data the temperatures for the first 15 years were dropped a little and those for the latter 15 years raised a little, giving the impression of an ever increasing temperature. This has been found for sites in Australia, NZ and the USA. In the US, which has the worlds "best" temperature reporting system (?) it has been found (with photographic evidence) that over 85% of the US weather stations are in locations that create warmth (on parking lots; beside air-con exhaust ducts etc). One in Rome Italy is at the end of a runway in line with jet exhausts!

Expanded information is now available; much of it has been written by highly respected scientists. It is strongly suggested that you have this information researched.

## Why am I telling you this?

I suspect that one of the functions of the expanded communication group will be to provide scaremongering information that will help with meeting your objective of delivering the CPRS and ETS.

If this includes the exaggerated, non-factual fear mongering statements, like those currently being used by Penny Wong and Tim Flannery, about the effect of this supposed AGW, (such as 700,000 sea front homes will be washed away; droughts and storms will be more severe; that mosquito borne diseases are spreading due to warming; that CO2 is a pollutant and showing photos of water vapour emissions with the implication that it is CO2; etc), without independent verification (which does not receive its funding from the government (and includes most universities and the CSIRO) could leave you liable for misrepresenting the known facts and destroying the value of private property.

It would be better if you followed J. M. Keynes advice:

"If the facts change, I'll change my opinion. What do you do, sir?

Kindest regards,

 $\overline{\Lambda}$ 

John Ibbotson

cc: Dr. Martin Parkinson martin.parkinson@climatechange.gov.au