

The Hon Greg Combet MP
Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency
Minister for Industry and Innovation
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

13 February 2013

CC The Hon Greg Hunt MP
Mr Scott Morrison MP

Dear Minister Combet MP,

Thank you for your response last month to the letter I sent to my local Member, Mr Scott Morrison MP in November (see http://www.dannavale.com/ministerial_correspondence_33.html to read copies of all letters).

I note your advice that you have now ceased correspondence, without answering my questions, and your observation that your colleague the Hon Chris Evans also ceased correspondence, without answering my questions.

As I point out later in this letter, by not answering my questions you and your colleague and the CSIRO have effectively answered my questions anyway.

Regrettably, the way in which you have answered my questions is likely to cause great reputational damage to the CSIRO, the Labor Party and to a lesser extent the Federal Public Service.

The 'reference' in Point 1 below is not a new request. Commencing with my May 2009 letter to the Hon Penny Wong, I have for almost four years been requesting this reference from Ministers for Science and for Climate Change in successive Labor Federal Governments, either directly or in collaboration with the Hon Danna Vale.

The major policy implications to be drawn from our correspondence are as follows:-

1. To prudently discharge its responsibilities to the Australian people, the Government must insist that the CSIRO gives a reference(s) to a credible, published, peer reviewed research paper(s), in which the authors analyse observational data that provides compelling evidence evaporative cooling increases by substantially less than 7% per degree of global warming.
2. Once given the reference to such a crucial research paper(s), the Government must then institute a robust, public and transparent inquiry process whereby this cited research paper(s) is publicised and scrutinised by not just an anonymous panel of peer review scientists, but by the wider scientific community.
3. To ensure that its findings are robust, the public inquiry should be presided over by a person holding dual qualifications in law and science. Ideally the person would have extensive experience dealing

with nuanced expert scientific evidence in scientifically complex patent litigation and perhaps hearing and passing judgement in such cases. In this way established rules of evidence would be applied in an unbiased way to evidence given by experts in the relevant areas of science and this expert evidence regarding the scientific credibility of key research papers would be fairly weighed and judged.

4. The Government should postpone implementing any expensive or disruptive climate change policies based on the CSIRO's simulations of future climate change, until such time as the credibility of the research paper(s) cited by the CSIRO to validate its global climate model(s) is tested in a robust, public and transparent process of scientific evaluation.

I now discuss aspects of your January letter in more detail.

In my September letter and again in my November letter I asked a procedural question, namely "*...whether the CSIRO has done some global climate model simulations or other estimates for the case where the virtual E-P response is around 8% per degree...*").

I note that in your October letter and again in your January letter, neither you nor the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (the Department) have confirmed or denied that the CSIRO has undertaken such modelling or estimates.

In your October letter, you noted my question and directed the Department to provide not an answer, but instead some "*...information...*". In your January letter it was the Department that noted my procedural question, but again merely reiterated some of the information previously provided in your October letter, instead of giving me an answer.

I note that the Prime Minister has nominated 14th September as the date for the next Federal election.

Should there be a change from the present Labor – Green coalition to a Liberal – Nationals coalition at the next election it is clear, from the very strong support that I have received from Mr Morrison and Mr Hunt, that they will be insisting on answers from the CSIRO.

Further, it is clear from a reading of the extensive exchange of letters, dating back to May 2009, with you, your predecessor the Hon Penny Wong, your colleague, the Hon Chris Evans and his predecessor the Hon Kim Carr, that had the Liberal – Nationals coalition won either of the last two Federal elections, a Liberal – Nationals coalition government would have insisted on the CSIRO providing answers, exposed the truth and thereby brought an end to the Global Warming Scare Campaign.

A reasonable person reading the correspondence is likely to conclude that the CSIRO knew from the start and knows now that raising the predicted rate of increase of evaporative cooling from less than 3.5% to 7% or more per degree of global warming will greatly mitigate the predicted warming effect of man-made carbon dioxide, and thereby reduce the predicted increase in global surface temperature, due to a say doubling of carbon dioxide, from say 4° C to considerably less than 1°C.

Having regard to the refusal, by successive Ministers of science and climate change, to provide answers to my and the Hon Danna Vale's questions, a reasonable person reading the correspondence is likely to conclude that some or all of these Ministers were likewise well aware that if they gave correct authoritative answers to our questions, it would most likely lead to the end of the Global Warming Scare Campaign.

I refer now to the attachment to your letter.

In your August letter the Department supported the conclusion by Durack et al. (2012) that 50-year trends in ocean salinity confirmed the 20-years of satellite records of evaporation and precipitation, which show that evaporative cooling increases by 7% or more per degree of global warming.

In your two subsequent letters the Department has argued strongly that Durack et al. were mistaken.

The Department's unexplained backflip gives further confirmation that in order to predict potentially dangerous global warming, the CSIRO's global climate models have to predict a very low rate of increase in evaporative cooling of less than 3.5%, as the climate warms.

I note that in your October letter the Department and its then expert advisors relied on the research paper by Li et al. (2011) "The recycling rate of atmospheric moisture over the past two decades (1988 – 2009)" to validate the Government's acceptance of counter intuitive and scientifically speculative rates of less than half of 7% for the predicted increase in evaporative cooling, when predicting potentially catastrophic global warming.

I note that in your January letter the Department, in response to the concerns I expressed regarding the credibility of the paper by Lie et al., belatedly sought additional advice from researchers at the Australian Climate Change Science Program (ACCSP). I further note that having received advice from these research scientists the Department has also dismissed Li et al. (2011).

This flip-flop by the Department in respect of essential, but still missing credible observation based research, indicates that the Government cannot rely on Departmental advice, even when bolstered by outside experts, as a basis for Government policy on climate change. The Government needs to put in place a much more robust process.

I note the Department's advice in your January letter that the global climate models predict a rate of increase in evaporative cooling of at most 3.5% per degree of global warming and more commonly around 2.2%. Unless and until the CSIRO is able to validate this speculative prediction by reference to some credible observation based research as defined in Point 1 above, this prediction by the models remains counter intuitive and scientifically speculative.

I note that the Department now relies on Arkin et al. (2010) "The observed sensitivity of the global hydrological cycle to changes in surface temperature", to validate the predicted counter intuitive sub-3.5% rates of increase in evaporative cooling.

Regarding the credibility of the paper by Arkin et al., I have some concerns, which include the issue discussed below.

In the first of their two main conclusions, Arkin et al. state that the observational data shows the global hydrological cycle accelerates as the climate warms, which means of course that evaporative cooling increases by more than 7% per degree. Arkin et al. continue by stating that this is consistent with model results, which indicates that Arkin et al. are abysmally ignorant or confused in their thinking, or both.

Therefore, analysis of your October and January responses shows that the Government does not yet have and insofar as this has been a critical policy issue since 2007, appears unlikely to ever have, the published and peer reviewed observation based research needed to provide a credible scientific basis for its still scientifically speculative and counter intuitive climate change policies.

I note that once again the Department has **not** provided an answer to my question “...*what was the predicted increase in global temperature for a say doubling of virtual CO₂.*” for “...*the case where the virtual E-P response is around 8% per degree...*”.

I note that instead the Department has provided more “...*information...*”. However, there is loads of information on climate science on the web! What I have been asking for and what has **not** been forthcoming is expert and authoritative answers to my questions.

Summary of key facts

The following key facts have been set out in previous correspondence:-

- A. As a result of their training, scientists expect that as the climate warms and more energy is fed into the global water cycle it will accelerate. Indeed we all expect that as more energy is fed into any cyclic process, be it a car engine or the global water cycle, it will accelerate. This means that as the climate warms, the wider scientific community expects that evaporative cooling will increase by 7% or more per degree of global warming.
- B. If the assumed or predicted rate of increase in evaporative cooling, as the climate warms, is as a scientist would expect 7% or more, then calculations or simulations will show that man-made carbon dioxide will cause benign global warming.
- C. However, if the assumed or predicted rate of increase in evaporative cooling, as the climate warms, is 3.5% or less, then calculations or simulations will show that man-made carbon dioxide might cause potentially catastrophic global warming
- D. In the CSIRO’s global climate model ‘base case’ simulations, virtual evaporation on the virtual planet earth is predicted to increase by less than 3.5% per degree of global warming, which is a counter intuitive prediction and scientifically speculative in that it has yet to be validated by credible observational data.

- E. This low and counter-intuitive predicted rate of increase in evaporative cooling indicates that the CSIRO's global climate models most likely have a very serious problem.
- F. The Climate Commission has advised the government that there is considerable evidence showing the global water cycle accelerates as the climate warms and therefore evaporative cooling increases by more than 7% per degree of global warming.
- G. The CSIRO has given advice to your colleague the Hon Kim Carr that the CSIRO is unable to give me a reference to any research paper as described in Point 1 above.
- H. My request for such a reference was not new. I first made this request in May 2009 (see my May 2009 letter to the Hon Penny Wong).

I respectfully suggest the Department fixes firmly in its corporate mind the fact that the proposition that the global water cycle slows down as substantially more energy is fed into it is scientifically counter intuitive to the point of being bizarre.

The Department will then be motivated to make a critical evaluation of papers such as those by Li et al. and now Arkin et al. before citing them as the crucial, but still missing credible observation based science needed to transform the Government's current climate change policies from being imprudently based on counter intuitive and speculative scientific theories to being scientifically validated.

Before these papers could be accepted as validating the counter intuitive and speculative science that forms the basis for the Government's past and current climate policies, they must be scrutinised in a robust, public and transparent evaluation process.

It seems most unlikely that either of the Li et al. (2011) or Arkin et al. (2010) papers would be found to be credible science by a robust, public and transparent evaluation process as suggested in Point 2 above.

This more policy focussed letter is getting lengthy. Accordingly, I will provide more detailed comments on the technical information provided by the Department, including the papers by Li et al. (2011) and Arkin et al. (2010) in my next letter.

Yours sincerely



Mr. L. B. Cummings MBA (UNSW), BE (UNSW)