

The following allegation was made, with the support of a narrative submitted by a third party to the Muir-Russell review:

The allegation is not whether or not detailed IPCC procedures were followed, that is a matter for the IPCC, but whether IPCC procedures were misused to favour one particular view of climate change to the detriment of a credible countervailing view.

This specifically relates to your role as lead author for chapter 6 in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), where is alleged:

- a) that notwithstanding clear IPCC rules about the status of papers that could be used as a basis for assessment, that excessive effort, involving distortion of contemporary IPCC rules, was made to include a paper by Wahl and Amman that claimed to disprove the results of McIntyre and McKittrick (2003), and that the motive for doing so was your desire to ensure that the latter paper's conclusions could be dismissed in the AR4 document rather than represented as a credible alternative view.
- b) that further evidence of this intent is the fact that the Wahl and Amman paper did not contain the results that were used in the AR4 rebuttal of M&M2003, but in a paper the definitive version of which did not appear in 2007, which had only been accepted as "in press" long after the IPCC deadline had passed.

Because some aspects of this were ambiguous (e.g. in (b), should it say "which did not appear UNTIL 2007", meaning Ammann and Wahl, 2007?) we requested clarification. The following was provided:

A paper by McIntyre and McKittrick (2003) argued that the so called "hockey stick" plot (Mann, Bradley and Hughes, 1998) contained both simple errors and serious statistical errors. The allegation is that in your role as lead author for Chapter 3 in Working Group 1, and as the member of the writing team with the most relevant expertise, that you were involved in exceptional attempts to ensure that a paper in preparation by Wahl and Amman, which purported to discredit the work of McIntyre and McKittrick (2003), was included in AR4, to the extent that you were prepared to break IPCC rules about the citation and use of scientific publications. The paper was ultimately published as Wahl and Amman (2007; this version records its acceptance date as 1 March 2006, post-dating a relevant IPCC deadline).

Moreover the calculations that were claimed to support the conclusions of Wahl and Amman (2007), were not made available in an online supplement until August 2008.

The relevant paragraph on p.466 of the AR4 Final Report leaves the last word to Wahl and Amman, and the reader the clear impression that the M&M03 criticisms have been rebutted, although the work claimed to be the basis of this rebuttal had missed or was long after IPCC deadlines.

The allegation is that this was part of a pattern of behaviour by members of CRU that was calculated to favour one particular view of climate change and its causes, and to discredit or ignore opposing views, without, at the time, an adequate scientific reason for doing so. It therefore represents a failure to discharge a scientist's responsibility to represent impartially current scientific understanding at the vital interface between science and policy.

The annex to my earlier letter contains a detailed account of events that have been presented to us to support the above allegations.