

```
<x-flowed>
Keith and Phil,
```

In the meantime, here is an email (copied below) to Mike Mann from McIntyre, requesting data and programs (and making other criticisms). I do wish Mike had not rushed around sending out preliminary and incorrect early responses - the waters are really muddled now. He would have done better to have taken things slowly and worked out a final response before publicising this stuff. Excel files, other files being created early or now deleted is really confusing things!

So it's just the second bit, that we review part 2 of this response, that needs to be answered.

Tim

```
>From: "Steve McIntyre" <smcintyre@cgxenergy.com>
>To: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@virginia.edu>
>Cc: "Tim Osborn" <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>,
>      "Ross McKittrick" <rmckitri@uoguelph.ca>
>Subject: MBH98
>Date: Tue, 11 Nov 2003 23:39:46 -0500
>
>November 11, 2003
>
>
>
>Professor Michael E. Mann
>
>School of Earth Sciences
>
>University of Virginia
>
>
>
>
>
>
>Dear Professor Mann,
>
>
>
>We apologize for not sending you a copy of our recent paper ("MM") in
>Energy and Environment for comment, as we understood from your email of
>September 25, 2003 that time constraints prevented you from considering
>our material. We notice that you seem to have subsequently changed your
>mind and hope that you will both be able to clarify some points for us and
>to rectify the public record on other points.
>
>
>
```

>1) You have claimed that we used the wrong data and the wrong
>computational methodology. We would like to reconcile our results to
>actual data and methodology used in MBH98. We would therefore appreciate
>copies of the computer programs you actually used to read in data (the 159
>data series referred to in your recent comments) and construct the
>temperature index shown in Nature (1998) ("MBH98"), either through email
>or, preferably through public FTP or web posting.

>
>
>

>2) In some recent comments, you are reported as stating that we requested
>an Excel file and that you instead directed us to an FTP site for the
>MBH98 data. You are also reported as saying that despite having pointed us
>to the FTP site, you and your colleague took trouble to prepare an Excel
>spreadsheet, but inadvertently introduced some collation errors at that
>time. In fact, as you no doubt recall, we did not request an Excel
>spreadsheet, but specifically asked for an FTP location, which you were
>unable or unwilling to provide. Nor was an Excel spreadsheet ever supplied
>to us; instead we were given a text file, pcproxy.txt. Nor was this file
>created in April 2003. After we learned on October 29, 2003 that the
>pertinent data was reported to be located on your FTP site
><ftp://holocene.evsc.virginia.edu/pub>ftp://holocene.evsc.virginia.edu/pub
>(and that we were being faulted for not getting it from there), we
>examined this site and found it contains the exact same file (pcproxy.txt)
>as the one we received, bearing a date of creation of August 8, 2002. On
>October 29, 2003, your FTP site also contained the file pcproxy.mat, a
>Matlab file, the header to which read: "MATLAB 5.0 MAT-file, Platform:
>SOL2, Created on: Thu Aug 8 10:18:19 2002." Both files contain identical
>data to the file pcproxy.txt emailed to one of us (McIntyre) in April
>2003, including all collation errors, fills and other problems identified
>in MM. It is therefore clear that the file pcproxy.txt as sent to us was
>not prepared in April 2003 in response to our requests, nor was it
>prepared as an Excel spreadsheet, but in fact it was prepared many months
>earlier with Matlab. It is also clear that, had we gone to your FTP site
>earlier, we would simply have found the same data collation as we received
>from Scott Rutherford. Would you please forthwith issue a statement
>withdrawing and correcting your earlier comments.

>
>
>

>3) In reported comments, you also claimed that we overlooked the collation
>errors in pcproxy.txt and "slid" the incorrect data into our calculations,
>a statement which is untrue and made without a reasonable basis. In MM, we
>described numerous errors including, but not limited to, the collation
>errors, indicating quite obviously that we noticed the data problems. We
>then describe how we "firewalled" our data from the errors contained in
>the data you provided us, by re-collating tree ring proxy data from
>original sources and carrying out fresh principal component calculations.
>We request that you forthwith withdraw the claim that we deliberately used
>data we knew to be in error.

>
>
>

>4) On November 8, 2003, when we re-visited your FTP site, we noticed the
>following changes since October 29, 2003: (1) the file pcproxy.mat had
>been deleted from your FTP site; (2) the file pcproxy.txt no longer was
>displayed under the /sdr directory, where it had previously been located,
>although it could still be retrieved through an exact call if one
>previously knew the exact file name; (3) without any notice, a new file
>named "mbhfilled.mat" prepared on November 4, 2003 had been inserted into
>the directory. Obviously, the files pcproxy.mat and pcproxy.txt are
>pertinent to the comments referred to above and we view the deletion of
>pcproxy.mat from the archival record under the current circumstances as
>unjustifiable. Would you please restore these files to your FTP site,
>together with an annotated text file documenting the dates of their
>deletion and restoration.

>
>
>

>5) We note that the new file mbhfilled.mat is an array of dimension
>381x2016. Could you state whether this file has any connection to MBH98,
>and, if so, please explain the purpose of this file, why it has been
>posted now and why it was not previously available at the FTP site.
>
>
>
>6) Can you advise us whether the directory MBH98 has been a subdirectory
>within the folder "pub" since July 30, 2002 or whether it was transferred
>from another (possibly private) directory at a date after July 30, 2002?
>If the latter, could you advise on the date of such transfer.
>
>
>
>
>
>We have prepared a 3-part response to your reply to MM. The first, which
>we have released publicly, goes over some of the matters raised in points
>#2-#5 above. The second is undergoing review. It deals with additional
>issues of data quality and disclosure, resulting from inspection of your
>FTP site since October 29, 2003. The third part will consider the points
>made in your response, both in terms of data and methodology, and will
>attempt a careful reconciliation of our calculation methods, hence the
>necessity of our request in point #1. Thank you for your attention.
>
>
>
>
>
>Yours truly,
>
>
>
>Stephen McIntyre Ross McKittrick
>
>
>
>
>cc: Timothy Osborn

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>