

From: Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>
 To: "Phil Jones" <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>, "Keith Briffa" <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>
 Subject: Fwd: Re: McIntyre-McKittrick and Mann-Bradley-Hughes
 Date: Fri, 07 Nov 2003 16:12:53 +0000

<x-flowed>

>From: "Sonja.B-C" <Sonja.B-C@hull.ac.uk>
 >Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 15:58:06 +0000
 >To: Steve McIntyre <smcintyre@cgxenergy.com>
 >Subject: Re: McIntyre-McKittrick and Mann-Bradley-Hughes
 >Cc: L.A.Love@hull.ac.uk, Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>,
 > Ross McKittrick <rmckitri@uoguelph.ca>
 >Priority: NORMAL
 >X-Mailer: Execmail for Win32 5.1.1 Build (10)
 >
 >Dear Steve
 >Please send your material for comment direct to Tim, Osborne.I
 >would like to publish the whole debate early next year, but
 >'respectful' comments in the meantime can only help and the CRU people
 >seem genuinely interested and have integrity. I have never heard of
 >such bad behaviour here as appears to have been the case between
 >Sallie and Soon and the rest..the US adversarial system and too many
 >egos??
 >As you know ,the contact is Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk> and I take
 >the liberty to forward this to him now. You seem to suggest that this
 >is welcome and are making make direct comments on his remarks to me
 >concerning your paper.
 >
 >We shall get the printed proof, as a single electronic file today, and
 >shall look through it early next week. I am sure you do not want to see
 >your paper again? I think that adding anymore now (the exchanges
 >between you and Mann/Bradley and perhaps now Tim as well) is premature
 >and we shall wait until the next issue. Mann is said to be writing
 >something, but he has not yet contacted me, though I just hang up on
 >that journalist Appell who keeps on ringing. I told him that I will
 >deal only directly with Mann. What cheek, after threatening me with
 >litigation...Just keep me in the loop. Thanks.
 >
 >Sonja
 >PS .By the way The Economist has taken up a previous paper from E&E
 >(Castles and Henderson, the social science critique of teh emission
 >scenarios), and teh Australian and UK Treasuries have become involved.
 >I have not seen it yet. As you know, I have always argued that the real
 >'driver' of teh IPCC deception, if that is the right word, has been on
 >teh social /technology forcing side, with focus of WG III.
 >
 >In London I heard two days ago that the WTO might make ratification of
 >Kyoto conditional for something Russia wants. The source was speaker
 >from the Deutsche Bank, a Justin Mundy, former advisor to the EU
 >Commission on EU-Russia coordination and once senior advisor to the
 >European Centre for Nature Conservation, he also worked for the World
 >Bank.)
 >Sonja
 >
 >On Fri, 7 Nov 2003 09:50:33 -0500
 >Steve McIntyre <smcintyre@cgxenergy.com> wrote:
 >
 > > Dear Sonja,
 > >
 > > > The interesting thing about their preliminary response, however, is
 > > that it
 > > > indicates that the difference in results might be fully explained by a
 > > > simple error in not using many of the early tree-ring data. If
 > > this is
 > > > confirmed by their fuller response, then, even though there may be
 > > some
 > > > problems with the proxy data used by Mann et al., it implies that
 > > these

> > > problems do not actually make a lot of difference to the results -
> the main
> > > difference comes from omitting the early tree-ring data. A paper that
> > > identifies some problems with the proxy data used by Mann et al. would
> > > still be interesting, but if these problems made very little
> difference to
> > > the results obtained, then it would be of rather minor importance.
> > >
> > > (1) IMHO the data issues rise above "some problems". When you're
> doing a prospectus, audit or engineering-level feasibility study, there
> is a concerted effort to eliminate every error. I have never seen such
> sloppy data as MBH98. Perhaps from my business experience, I am used to
> a more demanding approach to data integrity than the above comment
> suggests about academic studies. Even the MBH response criticizes us for
> failing to use obsolete data. How silly is that. Bradley has also said
> that an "audit" should use original data and should not verify against
> source data and says that I should know better. I think that my
> experience with audits and engineering studies is more substantial than
> Bradley's and this is an extraordinarily silly thing for him to
> say. After the fact, one of the key mis-steps in the Bre-X fraud was
> the engineering report in which ore reserves were calculated using false
> data supplied to the consulting engineers by Bre-X, without any
> verification being carried out by the engineers.
> > > (2) There was not a "simple error" of simply not using many of the
> early tree-ring data. The early tree-ring data in question are principal
> components of North American tree ring sites and of Stahle/SWM (also
> North American) tree ring sites. MBH98 states that they used
> conventional principal components methods for temperature. They do not
> explicitly say that they used conventional principal components methods
> for tree ring regions, but, in the absence of disclosure otherwise, this
> is certainly the most reasonable interpretation of the public disclosure
> (leaving aside Mann's refusal to provide clarification in response to our
> inquiries on methods.) A "conventional" principal component calculation
> requires that there be no missing data. Accordingly this indicator became
> unavailable in the earlier years using conventional principal component
> calculations - it was not "left out". MBH now disclose for the very
> first time that they used a "stepwise principal components approach",
> although this is nowhere disclosed in MBH98 or in the SI thereto. They
> have still not disclosed the rosters of principal components involved. If
> this method is material to their results, as they now state, then it was
> a material omission in their prior disclosure. It seems like a very
> strange rebuttal for MBH to say: you're at fault because we made a
> material non-disclosure on methodology in our papers. If I were in MBH's
> shoes, I would be embarrassed at this non-disclosure and mitigating the
> situation by making full disclosure now. When you do a prospectus, you
> have to sign an affidavit that there are no material omissions. I have
> approached disclosure questions on the basis that prospectus-level
> disclosure is the minimum level of public disclosure in this matter,
> assuming that this level of disclosure would be exceeded.
> >
> > (3) I've redone calculations with a re-calculated US PC1 in and get
> results similar to those in E&E, rather than the MBH response. This is
> not a guarantee that I have fully replicated still undisclosed MBH
> methodology. However, MBH disclosure of their methodology is very
> inadequate and without full disclosure by MBH of their methods, it is
> possible to be somewhat at cross-purposes. This defective disclosure is
> entirely their responsibility. It should be remedied immediately through
> FTP disclosure of their computer programs and full description of their
> methodology.
> >
> > [snip]
> >
> > >
> > > >>It is quite obvious that if the opinion of these three people
> from the
> > > >>UK University of East Anglia concerning publication of the M&M paper
> > > >>had been sought and taken, there would not have been no publication.
> > > >
> > > > Then I suggest you read our commentary again, which does not state

> this at all.
> >
> >
> > Part 2 has been drafted and I would be delighted to obtain comments on
> it from UEA/CRU. Indeed, I think that it would be very constructive,
> since Part 2 is significantly more hard-edged than Part 1. Because we
> have stated that we would post up a reply to the MBH response, we would
> have to disclose something on our websites, but I'd be prepared to deal
> with this. Intuitively, full, true and plain disclosure would be to state
> that we have prepared a reply and submitted it to UEA/CRU for
> comments. I think that the many data errors will be self-evident to
> UEA/CRU; we have organized our materials to show this, as will be the
> material non-disclosures on methodology by MBH. However, if they are
> prepared to comment, this would have to be agreed on very quickly as we
> are very close to finalizing our reply.

> >
> > Regards,
> > Steve

>
>-----
>Dr.Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen
>Reader,Department of Geography,
>Editor, Energy & Environment
>(Multi-science,www.multi-science.co.uk)
>Faculty of Science
>University of Hull
>Hull HU6 7RX, UK
>Tel: (0)1482 465349/6341/5385
>Fax: (0)1482 466340
>Sonja.B-C@hull.ac.uk

Dr Timothy J Osborn
Climatic Research Unit
School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

e-mail: t.osborn@uea.ac.uk
phone: +44 1603 592089
fax: +44 1603 507784
web: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/
sunclock: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm

</x-flowed>