



13 August 2010

Ms Danna Vale  
PO Box 443  
GYMEA NSW 2227

Dear Ms Vale

Thank you for your letters of 15 and 19 July 2010, to Senator the Hon Kim Carr, Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, concerning CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) global climate models (GCMs). The Minister has asked me to reply on his behalf as the Government is now in a caretaker role pending the outcome of the election on 21 August 2010.

I would like to reaffirm the previous statements by the CSIRO and the Minister in earlier correspondence to you that the empirical observations cited in the papers by Paltridge *et al* (2009) and Wentz *et al* (2007) do not, alone, disprove the underlying theories on which the global climate models (GCMs) are based and nor do they invalidate the outputs from GCMs.

CSIRO has considered both papers and examined other scientific literature scrutinising these papers and I reaffirm all of the content in the CSIRO response provided to you in the Minister's previous correspondence with you on this topic.

Your letter of 15 July 2010 asks why CSIRO made some statements about the responsibility for, and development of, the CSIRO GCMs and I would like to clarify this with you.

In your correspondence since 26 October 2009 you have often made reference to the CSIRO/BoM GCMs. While CSIRO and BoM commenced joint development of a GCM in 2007, this ten year project is still in the development and testing phase. This model is not being used for routine climate simulations, nor has it contributed to IPCC processes and aside from one module used by BoM for weather prediction, the model's output is not in the public domain.

The matters raised in your correspondence refer to CSIRO's series of GCMs which have been developed over 25 years, not the joint CSIRO/BoM GCMs currently under development. (For example the GCM used to produce climate simulations for the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report and the Garnaut Report were from the CSIRO Mk 3 model series, not the CSIRO/BoM model). The purpose in outlining the relative contributions to the development of GCMs by CSIRO and BoM prior to 2007, is to clarify this misunderstanding for you.

The science questions you raise and the critiques of scientific findings you present are matters usually addressed through the scientific process. That is through robust and objective science enquiry with the results reported in the peer-reviewed climate science literature where they can be assessed by the science community. This is the most appropriate way for such debate to be prosecuted.

CSIRO scientists keep abreast of the peer-reviewed scientific literature. If substantiated implications for GCMs are raised with regard to the findings of both Paltridge *et al* (2009) and Wentz *et al* (2007), or for that matter any advancement in our understanding of climate science, then these will be taken into consideration at that time, as part of the systematic development of future climate models.

This is the appropriate and responsible method by which CSIRO progresses its activities in the context of the best available science of the day. Further critique of the CSIRO or other climate models should be progressed via this well proven scientific process to ensure appropriate rigour, transparency and due diligence.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'MJC', is positioned above the printed name.

Dr Megan Clark