

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

2321 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301
(202) 225-6371
www.science.house.gov

June 17, 2011

The Honorable Ban Ki-moon
Secretary-General
United Nations
760 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Dear Secretary-General:

I am writing to express my concern about the lack of progress in the implementation of the conflict of interest recommendation of the InterAcademy Council (IAC) Committee to Review the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).¹ Recent press reports have once again highlighted the need for the IPCC to address conflicts of interest. If these press reports are true, it would seem as though one of the lead authors of Chapter 10 of the IPCC "Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation"² was not only an employee of the advocacy group Greenpeace International, but also the co-author of one of the studies being reviewed in that Chapter.³ Despite my previous requests for the IPCC to adopt and enforce more stringent policies related to conflicts of interest and the use and citation of "gray literature," the IPCC has delayed action.⁴

As the IAC Committee noted last year, "the nature of the IPCC's task (i.e., in presenting a series of expert judgments on issues of great societal relevance) demands that the IPCC pay special attention to issues of independence and bias to maintain the integrity of, and public confidence in, its results."⁵

Consequently, the IAC recommended that the IPCC "should develop and adopt a rigorous conflict of interest policy that applies to all individuals directly involved in the preparation of

¹InterAcademy Council, "Climate change assessments. Review of the processes and procedures of the IPCC," October 2010.

² IPCC, 2011: IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation [O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stech (eds)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Available at http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de/report/IPCC_SRREN_Full_Report.

³ Derbyshire, David, "Leading climate change group used Greenpeace campaigner to write 'impartial' report on renewable energy," *Daily Mail*, June 16, 2011.

⁴ Letter from Rep. Paul Broun, Ranking Member, Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, February 2, 2010. (attached)

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 53.

The Honorable Ban

Page two

June 17, 2011

IPCC reports, including senior IPCC leadership (IPCC Chair and Vice Chairs), authors with responsibilities for report content (i.e., WG Co-Chairs, coordinating lead authors (CLAs), and lead authors (LAs), Review Editors (REs), and technical staff directly involved in report preparation (e.g., staff of the TSUs and the IPCC Secretariat).”⁶

At its 32nd Session, held 11-14 October 2010 in Busan, Republic of Korea, the IPCC: (1) “[a]greed with this IAC recommendation; (2) “[d]ecided to implement a rigorous conflict of interest policy, taking into consideration the specific circumstances related to participation in IPCC activities; and (3) “[e]stablished a Task Group on Conflict of Interest Policy to propose options for such a policy, consulting with relevant organizations, for its decision at the 33rd Session.”⁷

Pursuant to that decision, the Task Group developed a conflict of interest policy and invited the Panel to adopt it at the IPCC’s 33rd Session held 10-13 May 2011 in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.⁸ Unfortunately, the IPCC did not adopt the recommended policy, but instead decided to extend the Task Group’s mandate “in order to develop proposals for Annexes to the Policy covering Implementation and the Disclosure Form with a view to adopting a decision at the IPCC 34th Session,” and to “bring all those covered by the Policy within its remit as early as possible during the Fifth Assessment cycle and no later than the IPCC 35th Session.”⁹

Work on the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) is well underway, with the “Expert Review” of IPCC Working Group I’s First Order Draft (FOD) scheduled to take place December 16, 2011-February 10, 2012.¹⁰ It is, therefore, imperative for the IPCC to adopt a rigorous conflict of interest policy before its 34th Session, tentatively scheduled to take place in January 2012.¹¹

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷“DRAFT REPORT OF THE THIRTY-SECOND SESSION, Busan, 11-14 October 2010,” IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 8, p. 9, May 4, 2011.

⁸“REVIEW OF THE IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES, Proposal by the Task Group on Conflict of Interest Policy,” IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 11, April 12, 2011. A background note explaining in detail the Task Group’s consideration is contained in Addendum 1 to the document.

⁹IPCC 33rd SESSION, 10-13 May 2011, ABU DHABI, “DECISIONS TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE REVIEW OF IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY.”

¹⁰<https://www.ipcc-wg1.unibe.ch/AR5/AR5.html>.

¹¹http://ipcc.ch/scripts/calendar_template2.php?wg=8.

The Honorable Ban
Page three
June 17, 2011

I urge you to use your influence with IPCC member governments to encourage the adoption of such a decision at the IPCC's 34th Session to help ensure the integrity of the AR5 process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul C. Brown". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "P".

REP. PAUL BROUN, M.D.
Chairman
Subcommittee on Investigations
and Oversight

Attachment

cc: REP. DONNA F. EDWARDS
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight

AMBASSADOR SUSAN E. RICE
U.S. Permanent Representative
United Nations

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SUITE 2320 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301

(202) 225-6375

TTY: (202) 226-4410

<http://science.house.gov>

February 2, 2010

Ban Ki-Moon
Secretary-General
United Nations
405 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dear Secretary-General:

Recent events surrounding the United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) called into question the adequacy of IPCC processes, the implementation of existing IPCC policies, and the independence of its leadership. The totality of these events has unfortunately challenged the integrity and trust of the IPCC as a whole. Because nations depend on the IPCC to provide unbiased climate change expertise, this is clearly an untenable situation that requires your full and immediate attention in order to restore credibility to the process, the IPCC, and the UN.

Last November, thousands of emails and documents were leaked from the University of East Anglia's (UEA) Climate Research Unit (CRU), revealing a troubling trend of groupthink where data was manipulated and withheld, scientific journals intimidated, and reputations attacked for political expedience. In one email, a researcher commits himself to ensuring that no non-conforming science is mentioned in the IPCC's 4th Assessment Report (AR4) by stating, "Kevin and I will keep them out somehow – even if we have to redefine what the peer-reviewed literature is!"¹

In light of these revelations, in early December the IPCC announced the initiation of an investigation regarding the misconduct.² Unfortunately, that commitment was soon retracted when Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the IPCC, stated "I want to clarify that this is not an investigation."³ While the concept of the IPCC investigating itself without any independent overview was cause enough for concern, the clear disregard for the importance and magnitude of the implications at hand is baffling. The choices being made regarding climate change will have lasting effects on every nation and every person in the world. These decisions are based largely on the work conducted by the IPCC,

¹ Email from Phil Jones to Michael Mann dated July 8, 2004. Subject: HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (attached)

² Simon Cox, "UN body enters climate e-mail row," *BBC News*, December 4, 2009.

³ Alessandro Torello, "Hacked Emails Won't Undermine IPCC's Robust Work – Pachauri," *Wall Street Journal*, December 8, 2009.

Secretary-General Ban

Page Two

February 2, 2010

therefore it is imperative all allegations of wrongdoing are fully investigated. Anything less calls into question the ability of those involved to be dispassionate arbiters of science.

More recent reports indicated that erroneous non peer-reviewed literature was included in IPCC reports for the sole purpose of alarming and influencing policymakers. In one instance, a researcher working on Himalayan glaciers included non peer-reviewed literature from an advocacy group because, "We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action."⁴ The data contained in the non peer-reviewed article was subsequently found to be in error, although the goal of causing action had already been achieved. As a result of this unsubstantiated alarmism, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), a company which Dr. Pachauri serves as director general, secured over \$3 million in research grants associated with Himalayan glaciers.⁵

Additional reports highlighted the IPCC's use of "gray literature" to promote a particular objective. In order to argue for a relationship between anthropogenic climate change and the growing toll of disaster losses, the IPCC once again cited non peer-reviewed literature, only this time the authors actually retracted their findings after AR4 was released stating, "We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophe losses."⁶ Unfortunately, the damage had already been done. The non peer-reviewed work, arguing that temperature increases directly correlate with increased damages caused by natural disasters, was already in AR4.

Another case recently emerged where the IPCC failed again to follow its own policies - thus allowing non peer-reviewed literature (also proven false) to end up in a final report. In this case, a peer reviewed article on the effects of logging and forest fires was used by an advocacy group to make assumptions regarding climate change in a non peer-reviewed article. That paper was subsequently included in AR4 to exaggerate the effects of climate change on the Amazon region.

In addition to those previously stated, numerous other examples exist where the IPCC included non peer-reviewed gray literature into its final reports. One can certainly debate the merits of such a policy, as peer review does not guarantee certainty of findings, and

⁴ David Rose, "Glacier Scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified," *Daily Mail*, January 24, 2010.

⁵ Christopher Booker, "Pachauri: the real story behind the Glaciergate scandal," *Telegraph*, January 23, 2010.

⁶ Jonathan Leake, "UN wrongly linked global warming to natural disasters," *The Sunday Times*, January 24, 2010.

Secretary-General Ban
Page Three
February 2, 2010

unpublished work can often further inform the debate. What is troubling about these events is the overwhelming trend to include gray literature supportive of alarmist claims, while corresponding efforts are made to block and censor peer-reviewed literature that does not reach those extreme conclusions. Statements not based in fact, or derived from unsound scientific principles or processes, unfairly corrupted what policymakers trusted as policy-neutral assessments. Citations by the World Wildlife Fund, a special interest group, are featured prominently throughout IPCC reports and assessments – most, if not all, of which are not peer reviewed.

Viewed individually, each of these issues is cause enough for concern, but when viewed in their totality, I fear they reveal a troubling pattern that warrants immediate attention. The common denominator in all of the instances mentioned seems, after a cursory review, to be Dr. Pachauri himself. His indisputable financial conflicts of interest, his clear policy advocacy despite the IPCC's charter, and his lax oversight of the IPCC's review processes all contributed to the situation the IPCC finds itself in today. With its reputation tarnished, and credibility damaged, the IPCC and the UN must take proactive measures to reestablish its status as the world's unbiased arbiter of climate science.

In order to accomplish this, the UN should immediately initiate an independent investigation to 1) assess whether the IPCC has adequate processes in place to ensure that only unbiased information is provided in its assessments and reports; 2) determine if existing processes were violated and recommend actions for remediation; 3) evaluate the implications of the actions highlighted in the released CRU documents; and 4) review the financial and business interests of IPCC officials, including Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, to ascertain whether they used their position as arbiters of climate science for personal benefit (including associated organizations). In all instances, any independent investigation should provide recommended actions and specific protocols eliminating or preventing further conflicts, politicization, and manipulation.

I look forward to working with you to ensure that the UN IPCC provides only the highest caliber scientific advice, free from political bias and conflicts of interest.

Sincerely,



REP. PAUL BROUN, M.D.
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Investigations
And Oversight.

Attachment

cc: REP. BRAD MILLER
Chairman
Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight

AMBASSADOR SUSAN RICE
U.S. Permanent Representative
United Nations

From: Phil Jones <p.jones@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx>
To: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx>
Subject: HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
Date: Thu Jul 8 16:30:16 2004

Mike,

Only have it in the pdf form. FYI ONLY - don't pass on. Relevant paras are the last 2 in section 4 on p13. As I said it is worded carefully due to Adrian knowing Eugenia for years. He knows they're wrong, but he succumbed to her almost pleading with him to tone it down as it might affect her proposals in the future !

I didn't say any of this, so be careful how you use it - if at all. Keep quiet also that you have the pdf.

The attachment is a very good paper - I've been pushing Adrian over the last weeks to get it submitted to JGR or J. Climate. The main results are great for CRU and also for ERA-40. The basic message is clear - you have to put enough surface and sonde obs into a model to produce Reanalyses. The jumps when the data input change stand out so clearly. NCEP does many odd things also around sea ice and over snow and ice. The other paper by MM is just garbage - as you knew. De Freitas again. Pielke is also losing all credibility as well by replying to the mad Finn as well - frequently as I see it.

I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow - even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is !

Cheers

Phil

Mike,

For your interest, there is an ECMWF ERA-40 Report coming out soon, which shows that Kalnay and Cai are wrong. It isn't that strongly worded as the first author is a personal friend of Eugenia. The result is rather hidden in the middle of the report. It isn't peer review, but a slimmed down version will go to a journal. KC are wrong because

the difference between NCEP and real surface temps (CRU) over eastern N. America doesn't

happen with ERA-40. ERA-40 assimilates surface temps (which NCEP didn't) and doing this makes the agreement with CRU better. Also ERA-40's trends in the lower atmosphere

are all physically consistent where NCEP's are not - over eastern US.

I can send if you want, but it won't be out as a report for a couple of months.

Cheers

Phil

Prof. Phil Jones
Climatic Research Unit Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090
School of Environmental Sciences Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784
University of East Anglia

Norwich Email p.jones@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx
NR4 7TJ
UK