

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 11:29 a.m.
To: 'terry.dunleavy@nzclimatescience.org.nz'
Subject: Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Terry,

I am preparing an article on the current dispute your coalition has with NIWA scientists. It will be discussing the science of the "adjustment" issue. I need clarification on some comments on your report "Are we warmer yet?" To ensure I treat the issue fairly I need some clarification of some issues.

Your report says: "*First, the station histories are unremarkable. There are no reasons for any large correction.*"

This is a key point, I hope you agree, so I wish to find out what evidence your coalition used to make this conclusion.

Specifically:

1: Was any statistical analysis (e.g. ANOVA) done on the raw data to test for the effect of station site?

2: If so could you please send me a copy of the output?

3: What scientific input did you have (names and scientific experience of authors) for the report?

4: Was there any review process for the report – and if so can you describe it and say who your reviewers were and their qualifications?

Thank you for your help.

Hopefully, as these questions are straightforward, you can get back to me fairly quickly. I intend to write the article at the end of this week.

Look forward to hearing from you.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Terry Dunleavy [terry.dunleavy@nzclimatescience.org.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 11:36 a.m.
To: Bob Dedekind; Richard Treadgold
Cc: Ken Perrott
Subject: Re: Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Bob and Richard,

Can you please answer this?

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 1:59 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Cc: Terry Dunleavy; Bob Dedekind
Subject: Re:2 Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Ken,

Thanks for your enquiry to the NZ Climate Science Coalition about the joint study with the Climate Conversation Group. We appreciate very much that you're prepared to make such enquiries; not all commentators are. Terry Dunleavy has asked me to respond.

We examined NIWA's material from their web site. There is no evidence in that material supporting the need for large adjustments, or any adjustments. They do not discuss the types of adjustments required, give a list of such adjustments or even mention adjustments. They do not say that adjustments should be made or that any were made. They give no reason at all to suspect that the graph published there does not come from the raw data they make available. We noticed for ourselves that their raw data does not produce the graph they publish.

This gives reason for suspicion, in some people, that adjustments might have been made for political rather than for scientific reasons. We have however raised some reasonable questions for NIWA in one of our media releases. To summarise, we are asking NIWA to tell us what precise adjustments were made, when, and what exactly were they for. Also, what gives them confidence that these seven stations alone properly represent the whole country? So far they have not answered these reasonable and simple questions.

If NIWA wish to allay suspicions over their graph, they have only to immediately publish the adjustments, their reasons and why they chose these seven stations.

In answer to your questions:

1. No.

3. and 4. We cannot avoid noticing that these questions are not directed to the statements in our study. Instead they ask about the authors. But our qualifications are not relevant to our study or the questions arising from it, because scientific expertise was neither claimed nor required. Anybody could have done this study, we were just the first to do so. We are asking as citizens for details of public records and we need no other qualification than that of citizen to do that. The membership of the NZCSC includes several well-known climate scientists, some of whom have read our study, but that is of only slight interest in an informal study such as ours. Of course, when the adjustments are released, qualified scientists will examine them immediately.

If you have any further questions about the contents of our study, please don't hesitate to get in touch again.

We hope this response helps with your balanced article, which we look forward to reading.

Regards,
Richard Treadgold,
Convenor,
Climate Conversation Group.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 2:10 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Thanks for your quick response Richard. It was much faster than I expected.

Re questions 3 and 4. They were aimed at assessing the degree of normal scientific checking put into the report. I will take from your answer that you didn't use a procedure of requesting scientists, either in your organisation or external independent researchers, to read and comment on the report before finalising it. Similar to the institutional refereeing that is normally used in scientific and commercial reports.

Thanks again for this. I think it gives me the background to do a proper analysis of the adjustment question.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 2:46 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE:1 Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
Hi Ken,

Ken Perrott wrote:
<...snip>

Thanks for your quick response Richard. It was much faster than I expected.

Re questions 3 and 4. They were aimed at assessing the degree of normal scientific checking put into the report. I will take from your answer that you didn't use a procedure of requesting scientists, either in your organisation or external independent researchers, to read and comment on the report before finalising it. Similar to the institutional refereeing that is normally used in scientific and commercial reports.

Your initial comments here trouble me. You take from the answer what you wish to take, but that is not our answer.

Please note our comment "Anybody could have done this study, we were just the first to do so. We are asking as citizens for details of public records and we need no other qualification than that of citizen to do that." We would observe that our study did not need any "normal scientific checking" -- just as the report you are writing needs no "scientific" checking. Certainly, the lack of "scientific" checking does not invalidate any of the statements we make.

But we still look forward to your article!

Regards,

Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 3:07 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Could you please clarify, Richard.

It is important for me to know what degree of scientific input and review went into this report. (I am familiar with this side of things having written many papers and reports in my career).

So I get from you current reply:

This is not a “scientific” report – more a laypersons, citizen’s report. “Anybody could have done this study”;

You don’t believe it needed any checking – comparing it to a blog post or newspaper article/report;

You don’t think a scientific review would invalidate any of the statements in the report.

I hope I have this correctly as I do not want to misrepresent the facts or attitudes here.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 December 2009 3:30 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE: Request for information of report "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
 Well, you're certainly being thorough, Ken.

We didn't compare it to a blog post or newspaper article/report, though you, of course, are free to compare anything with anything.
 We hope it proves equally "important" for you to examine our study's contents, too.
 Your other statements echo ours.

Thank you,
 Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Sunday, 20 December 2009 3:29 p.m.
To: 'vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz'
Subject: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Vincent

As you are connected to the Climate Science Coalition you may be able to help me with a query.

There has been an ongoing blog debate around the coalitions "research paper "[Are we feeling warmer yet?](#)". Unfortunately, coalition people don't seem to be participating.

I got some information from Richard Treadgold for my post [They are New Zealand's denier-gate](#). This get's stuck into the coalition for the lack of scientific input into this little piece of "research" and the lack of any scientific review of the resulting report. The "paper" is also criticised by David winter in [Peer Review for the Climate "Science" Coalition](#).

Richard told me "*The membership of the NZCSC includes several well-known climate scientists, some of whom have read our study.*"

However, I am surprised that any scientifically competent people would have let this report through as it is.

I am wondering if Richard was just being evasive (and that no one reviewed the report) or if it did get to any scientist.

Did you get a chance to review the report? Or do you know of any scientist who did?

Can you comment on the scientific credibility of this "research paper?"

Look forward to hearing from you.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Vincent Gray [vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 9:55 a.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Cc: terry dunleavy
Subject: Re: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
Dear Ken

I am a member of the New Zealand Climate Science coalition and the paper "Are we Feeling Warmer Yet" was circulated for approval to myself, and to several other well-qualified scientists. The material in it is genuine, and it confirms some of my own long-expressed suspicions about the quality of the claims for "warming" made by the New Zealand National Institute for Water and Air Research. The data presented are publicly available to anybody who cares to check them.

I am myself involved currently in a further investigation of this affair.

We are currently awaiting an answer from NIWA to a request under the Official Information Act for details of the "corrections" they have made to their measured temperature records which appear to show a warming trend which is not evident in the original records

Cheers

Vincent Gray
 75 Silverstream Road
 Crofton Downs
 Wellington 6035
 Phone/Fax 064 4 9735939
 "To kill an error is as good a service
 as, and sometimes better than, the
 establishing of a new truth or fact"
 Charles Darwin"

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 11:21 a.m.
To: 'Vincent Gray'
Subject: RE: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Thanks for the quick reply Vincent.

And for confirming that the paper in question was approved by you and several others. As I said Richard seemed to be vague about this.

My concern is about the scientific input and mistakes in this paper so I am interested in your take as a reviewer/approver of it.

Both my and David Winter's blogs assessing this paper point to the lack of statistical, or indeed, any checking on the possibility of site effects in the raw data. Our point is that this should have been checked before combining the data from different stations and certainly before making the statement:

*"the station histories are unremarkable. **There are no reasons for any large corrections.**"* (my emphasis).

Even the limited look I and David had at the data shows that statement to be unwarranted. So I would like to know what your reason was for not advising this and similar statements be removed from the paper – and indeed not advising that the figure derived from combining the data be removed.

Your answer to this question would help me with an article I am currently preparing to write on this issue. I certainly want to make sure that I don't present this question of the degree of scientific reviewing wrongly.

Also, could you let me know who the other scientific reviewers were as I would also like to check with them their reasons for allowing this mistake to stay in the paper?

Thanks you for your help.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Vincent Gray [vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:41 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Cc: terry dunleavy
Subject: Re: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
Dear Ken

I must admit I should have questioned the statement *There are no reasons for any large corrections*, but I understand that NIWA have assured the authors of this paper that no such adjustments have been made. We are awaiting a reply to our request for information on the subject.

I suggest that you take up any other matters that worry you with the authors.

The combination of the raw data seems to have been done satisfactorily and you could confirm this yourself if you wish.

I am surprised anybody nowadays has any confidence in the "peer review" process as currently practiced..The climategate scandal shows that it is biased. I have found repeatedly that any paper critical of the global warming establishment is routinely rejected, or rewritten to suit the enthusiasts. As a result most of my papers are now published somewhere on the web.

Cheers

Vincent Gray
75 Silverstream Road
Crofton Downs
Wellington 6035
Phone/Fax 064 4 9735939
"To kill an error is as good a service
as, and sometimes better than, the
establishing of a new truth or fact"
Charles Darwin"

From: Vincent Gray [vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 December 2009 1:44 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: Re: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
Dear Ken

Just another second take.

Please understand that all of us are thrashing around in the dark, picking up clues about what might be going on and making mistakes in the process.

Those running the show have superb facilities in terms of money, staff, institutions and public approbation and they sit on most of most of their knowledge and only release what they choose.

I have had a long career in science and have published well over 100 papers in respectable scientific journals, I have been working on the greenhouse thing for 20 years for no fee, dependent only on what they are prepared to release to the public. The internet has been a godsend, but I have only recently realised that much of the data and of its interpretation has been slanted or even cooked.

I have been at it so long that I am becoming streetwise. At the start I was almost a lone voice. Now many people are joining up to question the whole concept being promoted by the climate change people and they have to go through a similar learning process to try and avoid the traps they set us.

I gather that you are an honest scientist who is beginning to doubt what we have for so long been told about the greenhouse effect. I would particularly refer you to my many publications on the subject, most of which are somewhere on the internet as I have given up trying to penetrate the peer review mafia.

I have been sending out an irregular Email newsletter on this subject for this many years and if you wish I can add you to my list.

The whole issue is scientifically stimulating quite apart from its crucial economic and philosophical importance.

Cheers

Vincent Gray
75 Silverstream Road
Crofton Downs
Wellington 6035
Phone/Fax 064 4 9735939
"To kill an error is as good a service
as, and sometimes better than, the
establishing of a new truth or fact"
Charles Darwin"

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 December 2009 2:13 p.m.
To: 'Vincent Gray'
Subject: RE: Scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Sure, Vincent – put me on the list. As I am currently blogging in this and similar issues I need to know what the main players are saying.

I hear what you are saying about how easy it is to make mistakes. However, in this case the mistake has caused a lot of confusion, misunderstanding – and dishonest propaganda for some. I have been shocked at the way NZ has been portrayed by conspiracy theorists like Wishart – and the resulting headlines in overseas publications.

To me it is basic that a scientist should be honest when these mistakes are made. In this case I think your organisation, or the individuals responsible for that paper (Richard claims that his "scientific team" requires anonymity) should "bite the bullet" and admit their mistake. (While I can accept an admission of a mistake in a private email to be genuine it really has to be as public as the original paper was).

Not to do so conveys the impression that it was not a mistake but a deliberate attempt to convey incorrect information – and to slander honest scientists.

It is the later issue which concerns me. I have no investment in the climate change issue – one way or the other. I will accept the science as I understand it.

But I am concerned about scientific integrity. In this case the coalition has shown a lack of integrity. They are in no position to make any demands on others.

Unless of course, they admit their mistake, apologise for it, clean the slate. Then they might get back some of their credibility. Only then can they honestly make requests of others.

Certainly, as an honest scientist this sort of behaviour means I have to classify the coalition and its members as "deniers" rather than sceptics on the global warming issue (and I still have respect for genuine sceptics).

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 12:01 p.m.
 To: 'Richard Treadgold'
 Subject: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Richard.

Just after some clarification.

I have been pursuing the question of the degree of scientific review/approval used for this paper as it is still being actively discussed in the blogosphere.
 In a previous email you said:

“The membership of the NZCSC includes several well-known climate scientists, some of whom have read our study.”

I have interpreted this to mean that this was not an approval process. Nevertheless I have been communicating with some of the scientists in your groups to check on their assessment of the lack of statistical analysis of the raw data to determine if site effect existed. I see this as a major flaw in the paper and it has been commented in articles by David Winter (Peer Review for the Climate “Science” Coalition) as well as me (New Zealand’s denier-gate). It is central to this whole argument and I intend to write about it in more detail in a future article.

Vincent Gray’s take on the scientific review is that it was an approval process. He says: “the paper "Are we Feeling Warmer Yet" was circulated for approval to myself, and to several other well-qualified scientists.”

I would like to find out what the other scientific readers/reviewers/approvers of this paper considered their role was. Could you please let me know the names of all the scientifically qualified people who read/reviewed/approved this paper before its release?

Thank you for your help.

Regards.

Ken

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 1:35 p.m.
 To: Ken Perrott
 Subject: Re: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
 Hi Ken,

Thank you for your references, which I was unaware of. "Peer review for the Climate & Science Coalition" contains some interesting statistical information; I might ask one of the scientists what it means. You have clearly made a considerable effort in your analysis; it's a pity you didn't seem to notice that we made a simple comparison of two sets of material presented by NIWA on their web site which don't match each other: the graph and the so-called "raw" data. I would correct you on one point: you are mistaken that our study mentions the word "fraud" in any of its forms.

"New Zealand's denier-gate", which I presume is <http://openparachute.wordpress.com/2009/12/10/new-zealands-denier-gate/>, is certainly comprehensive; I suggest you consider the possibility that, though the facts we state in the study are incontrovertibly true, the opinions expressed are not scientific conclusions.

The authenticity of our study rests on its contents and not on its provenance. Please pay attention to the contents and stop wasting time on the authors. What difference does it make who wrote it? Listen to what it says. It doesn't present any new data, the methodology was transparent and the conclusion it reaches is "tell us the adjustments". It's not complicated. You ask about our peer review process; while we are asking NIWA to engage in a peer review process.

You say the lack of statistical analysis is central to "this whole argument". I'm not aware of the argument to which you refer. Please be more specific.

If Dr Gray says the paper was circulated in the manner he describes, then it's true. I cannot tell you who reviewed the study.

We are asking NIWA for the adjustments they made; they have refused to give them; they still refuse, even after questions in the Parliament -- what part of that don't you understand? Do you commend their performance?

You might be interested to know that today the CSC sent a formal request to NIWA's CEO under the Official Information Act to disclose the adjustments to the official NZ temperature record, the reasons for them and the calculations. I'm sure you're as disappointed as we are to learn that such a request would be necessary of a public body to obtain access to what is, by any measure, public information.

Thank you for your interest.

Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:17 p.m.
 To: 'Richard Treadgold'
 Cc: 'Terry Dunleavy'; 'Bob Dedekind'; 'doug.edmeades@agknowledge.co.nz'; 'Vincent Gray'
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Richard.

I am sorry if I have the wrong person. It's just that my original request to Terry as the Secretary of the Coalition was passed on to you.

Perhaps it's just a situation of a relatively informal group where the left hand doesn't necessarily know what the right hand is doing – which I can understand.

However, the question about site effects in the raw data used, and whether any checking was done for this, is fundamental. This is the argument I refer to. The paper itself combined data without correcting for site effects – and in fact declared correction unnecessary (with the statement “the station histories are unremarkable. There are no reasons for any large corrections.” (My emphasis).) Several of its other unsupported, but key, statements derive from that. And both David Winter's and my analyses indicate that this statement was incorrect. Your original reply to me indicated that no check was made for site effects. If true, it is a key flaw in the paper and invalidates other statements.

You can presumably see that this is important because serious charges are made on the basis of the (apparently) unsubstantiated claim. While I think the point is obvious, even to non-scientifically trained observers, it concerns me that the scientifically qualified members of your organisations who approved the paper either did not pick it up, or believed it was OK.

I really want to get their side of the story before commenting in my article.

Currently I am waiting to hear back from Vincent about follow-up questions and have also contacted Doug Edmeades. I would appreciate knowing of any other scientist whose opinion I should seek on this question.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:23 p.m.
 To: 'Richard Treadgold'
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Sorry, Richard – a PS after re-reading your reply.

I actually haven't been asking about authors – just reviewers. However, now that you have raised that issue:

Can you tell me who the authors are?

They will be the best people to ask about the statement in this paper which I, and David Winter, believe (and show with our analyses) to be incorrect.

It would only be sensible, and respectful, for me to communicate with them before commenting further.

Regards.

Ken Perrott

From: Terry Dunleavy [terry.dunleavy@nzclimatescience.org.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:26 p.m.
 To: Ken Perrott
 Cc: 'Richard Treadgold'; 'Terry Dunleavy'; 'Bob Dedekind';
 doug.edmeades@agknowledge.co.nz; 'Vincent Gray'
 Subject: Re: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Ken,

My left hand knew exactly what the right hand (Richard) was doing, that's why your request was passed to him.

Terry D

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:42 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Cc: 'Terry Dunleavy'; 'Bob Dedekind'; doug.edmeades@agknowledge.co.nz; 'Vincent Gray'
Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
 Hi Ken,

You have the right person and his reply. To reiterate: we graphed the raw data. We pointed out the result was different from the official graph. We asked why this was so. Niwa have yet to tell us. There is no flaw.

Richard.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 2:52 p.m.
 To: Ken Perrott
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
 Ken,

As the paper states, I collated the study. The scientific team wish to remain anonymous. The study makes no statement which is incorrect.

Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 3:02 p.m.
 To: 'Richard Treadgold'
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

OK, Thanks Richard.

Probably as far as I can go with you at the moment. I'll just work with what I have.

Highly unusual for scientists to wish anonymity though – a first in my experience!

Vincent has admitted that he should have questioned the controversial statement in the paper – so I guess the other reviewers may now feel the same way.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 3:22 p.m.
 To: Ken Perrott
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"
 Ken,

Please note that we request anonymity for the scientists, but not for the data, unlike the climate scientists in NIWA (and overseas), who hide their reasoning behind secret data. The data are more significant than any scientist.

Cheers,
 Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 4:07 p.m.
 To: 'Richard Treadgold'
 Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

I note your comment, Richard. And thanks for the idea.

Till now I have been concerned with the Coalition's paper. And specifically with the lack of checking before making its claim that there were no site effects. I currently think this is an important question to pursue.

However, in the New Year I think I will follow up on your suggestion about NIWA. Get their inside view of the issue, the nature of their data and its analysis and treatment, and their reaction to your coalition's paper.

It would help fill out the picture and should provide some human interest aspects.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [mailto:richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2009 4:23 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Ken,

I made no suggestion. Good luck finding out "the nature of their data and its analysis and treatment". Our scientists have been asking those same legitimate questions for about 20 years. You haven't remarked on it yet -- which is a bit odd, since you're attentive enough to pick up on a suggestion I didn't make -- but I think I mentioned their persistent, unexplained refusal. Please remember that when you speak to them.

Cheers,
Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 22 December 2009 1:26 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Sorry to pester you, Richard.

I just want to be absolutely clear that your organisations still stand behind the statements made in your paper.

I only ask this because of Vincent's response where he now admits he should have questioned the statement that corrections to the data were unnecessary. This implies he may well not have approved the paper in this form if he had looked more closely.

I have not seen anything else indicating a wish to back away from the content of that paper but it would be wrong for me to suggest you still had confidence in these statements after Vincent's admission.

The specific statements which concern me are:

"The station histories are unremarkable. There are no reasons for any large corrections."

That scientists "created a warming effect where none existed."

That "the shocking truth is that the oldest readings were cranked way down and later readings artificially lifted to give a false impression of warming.

And "we have discovered that the warming in New Zealand over the past 156 years was indeed man-made, but it had nothing to do with emission of CO₂ – it was created by man-made adjustments of the temperature. It's a disgrace."

Also, I guess, the very act of combining the data without adjustment (as in the figure) when no check had been made for site effects.

So – a simple yes or no – Do you still stand by these statements.

Or if not, which ones are you withdrawing?

Thanks for your help.

Ken Perrott

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]

Sent: Tuesday, 22 December 2009 2:01 p.m.

To: Ken Perrott

Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Ken,

Yes, I noticed that Vincent had said that. Do you want me to change something? You seem to want that. Perhaps I could make obvious what is true but not explicitly stated? We might have said: "there seem to be no reasons for any large adjustments." But then, would that be a change? Any assertion I make is how I see things, and seeing is seeming. "It seems the sun is rising" is not different in fact from "the sun is rising", don't you agree? "It seems you want me to change something" is actually the same as "you want me to change something." But you muddle along in your own merry way, Ken. I'm not changing a thing.

We want NIWA to release the adjustments they made. That's all we want. We don't care what you write in your blog or anywhere else. Refute our paper to your heart's content, that's why we published it. If we hadn't wanted you to read it, it would have been easy. Say what you like, assume whatever you want, interpret as you choose. We only want the adjustments to the temperature readings. If you agree with us, and you think that they are under a duty to release these public data, then please clearly say so and leave no doubt. If you disagree with us, please explain your reasons to the people of New Zealand. If you say nothing about this duty of theirs, you will be exposed as a sycophant.

You are, in my opinion, persisting with an analysis of the public temperature record in the absence of data. How you think you might arrive at any useful conclusion is a mystery.

Please don't worry, you're not pestering me. I relish every opportunity to describe the obfuscation and obstruction practised by NIWA in evading their statutory responsibilities, even in the Parliament -- and you can quote me on that.

Cheers,
Richard Treadgold.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]

Sent: Tuesday, 22 December 2009 3:55 p.m.

To: Ken Perrott

Subject: RE: Degree of scientific review of "Are we feeling warmer yet?"

Hi Ken,

Someone who knows you has gently pointed out to me (though not in these precise words!) that you probably bear us no ill will. I apologise for my rudeness in my reply earlier today. In my eagerness to resist being refuted I let my tone run over into sarcasm and in my desire not to appear weak I descended to insults (calling you a sycophant). I'm sorry.

My substantive comments stand without change, though, and I make a strong plea to you to echo our demand that NIWA release the adjustments and the reasons for them. That, and only that, is our objective.

Thank you for your questions.

Regards,
Richard Treadgold.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 February 2010 4:13 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: Query about fig 2 in your report?

Hi Richard

I am currently sifting through data from the NIWA site that you presumably used in your report "Are we warmer yet?"

One of the things I wish to do is replicate your figure 2.

I have been able to recreate NIWA's figure from their description. However there is no explanation of the technique you used to create your figure.

Could you please send me a description of the technique? Particularly:

- What data you used to establish a 1970-2000 average?
- How do you handle the fact that there is no data for all that period from some of the stations?
- Did you just use the 1970-200 averages calculated by NIWA?
- Did you calculate the 1970-2000 Data after combining all the sites?
- How did you combine data for all the sites? Did you just take a simple average of available data or did you reconstruct data for times they were not available?
- If you used the reconstruction method, could you describe how this was done?
- If you used the averaging method how did you compensate for missing sites at earlier times?

Actually, a copy of your spreadsheet would probably clarify your procedures for me.

As you can guess, I love playing with data. However, I do want to make sure I have we are on the same track with this.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 February 2010 4:34 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: Re: Query about fig 2 in your report?
Hi Ken,

Thank you for your continuing interest in our study!

How curious you should write to me at this precise moment and in this courteous style! It has had the effect of quieting my feelings towards you. I was turning my attention, finally, after a busy day talking with reporters and scientists and reviewing a pile of written material that has descended on me recently, to answering the many fiery and adverse comments on the CCG blog. There was no pleasure in my anticipation of it. I note with appreciation that you have replied here to the apology I sent you. This is the first acknowledgement (such as it is) you have given to what I considered an important statement, so thank you. I must confess that since I sent that message I have been several times of a mind to rescind the sentiments in it, considering the bitterness of many of the comments you have made against us and me. Still, the important objective remains the truth of the matter, and we are making progress.

I'm about to construct a substantive reply that might turn into a separate post that takes the matter forward another step. I sound like an advertisement!

On this matter: To answer your questions I will have to make enquiries of the science team. For what it's worth, I remember hearing that we had to construct monthly averages before doing anything else, and that NIWA's data was in a different form from some other organisation's. Does that make sense? I know there's a spreadsheet involved; I'll see if it would answer your questions. Whatever, I'll get back to you.

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 February 2010 5:00 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Query about fig 2 in your report?

Richard,

You must realise that sharp discussion is the normal procedure on blogs. It's what attracts readers! I encourage and enjoy sharp debate on my blog for that very reason.

NIWA's data is available as yearly averages – so it's not necessary to go through amalgamating monthly data. My problem is working how you got to an overall average/reconstruction and how you determined the 1971-2000 averages to produce the final anomaly.

Thanks for your help.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 9:33 a.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: Re: Query about fig 2 in your report?
Dear Ken,

I'm assured that our spreadsheet would, indeed, satisfy your enquiries and we will be pleased to give it to you. Our science team are intrigued by your claim to have "recreated NIWA's figure from their description". We would very much like to examine your workings or spreadsheet, and as soon as we receive it we will send you our spreadsheet in return.

Now, back to battle blog.

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 9:48 a.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Query about fig 2 in your report?

Attachments: NIWA data.xls

Thanks Richard,

I have attached the spreadsheet I was using. It is basically the one which can be downloaded from NIWA using their adjusted data. I have explored various ways of working out the anomalies – mainly in an attempt to replicate what No Minister had produced. This raises the question of how he worked out a baseline.

I definitely couldn't replicate his figure legitimately and couldn't get from him how he worked out a baseline when data was not available over much of the period he used.

However, the graph NIWA produced is legitimate for their data and the actual data enabled me to develop an understanding of the procedures used.

To spreadsheet is of course messy, but it will make clear what I have meant.

Look forward to receiving your spreadsheet.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

PS – would it be possible to discuss these directly with one of your scientists involved in the work? It would be a lot easier.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 10:07 a.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: Sharing spreadsheets
That was quick! I thought you were keen, but that's ridiculous! ;-)

I'll pass it on, thanks. If they have any comments I'll pass them back to you.

Talk to a scientist??!! Ring the Make A Wish Foundation! No, it would be easier (for me, too!) -- but so far they don't wish to be known. But I'll talk to them. I can only ask.

Oh, but you'll have to say something nice now and again on the blog, because, reading your comments, I think they're all convinced you're a no-good-rootin-tootin-bad-ass kind of a guy and they don't want anything to do with you! Apart from that, you'd probably get on fine if you met each other.

I'll come back to you with our spreadsheet in due course.

Regards,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 10:49 a.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets

I thought my comment to Al was nice. It's because he did answer the question.

Problem is that people are trying to have it both ways on this – and that is why they equivocate, refuse to answer questions and then accuse me of being the problem! (Mind you I find that a common problem in blogging comments. Like driving this seems to bring out the worst in people's personalities.

This sort of experience really brings home to me that while we are an intelligent species, we are not a rational one. More a rationalising one. We make decisions instinctively, based on emotion. Then we try to justify those decisions (and we can get nasty in the process). It's a real problem and I think only a scientific approach can work against that because we are forced to map our ideas against reality.

All I am doing is trying to get people to deal with reality.

Either there are site effects or there aren't. Straightforward.

If one says there are then your report has a huge mistake in claiming no site effects and your graph is completely wrong. Once that is admitted one can then debate each adjustment case by case (doesn't interest me one bit – I trust the experts on that one)

If one says that there are no site effects then one can't go any further. One can't discuss adjustments when one side say adjustments are not necessary in principle.

If people would just say yes or no we could either move on, or recognise the problem is not a scientific one.

Look forward to receiving the spreadsheet – pity scientist to scientist communication is not possible. Really strange!

Regards.

Ken Perrott

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]

Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 11:41 a.m.

To: Ken Perrott

Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets

Yes, you were nice to Al. Your comments are perceptive. Scientists work hard to remain objective but even they struggle with raw and unpleasant emotions when they are "taken to heart". Precisely because they are taken to heart.

Emotions/reasoning -- they are both at work, each overshadows the other in different situations, as they must. It is wisdom that chooses appropriately and it is self-control that keeps to our choice.

I've just asked you on the blog to reference the assertion you accuse me of. I think we're about to move on, which would be a relief for us all. There are other things we must discuss, such as accuracy and even relevance of the temperature record.

I'll pass the spreadsheet on when I get it.

Sorry about the comms with scientists -- it's unsatisfactory. But we're a hobby club, really, on this matter, we're not aiming, yet, at publication. I think what we publish here can be judged on its merits without reference to our qualifications or experience. I know that, given professional bona fides, there are certain things one starts to take for granted, which makes assessment easier.

But, that said, who would have thought scientists from CRU, IPCC, GISS, etc., were capable of conniving, data dodginess, cherry-picking Yamal trees, pressure on editors, etc.? It was precisely that everybody was taking certain things for granted that they took advantage of to advance their agenda.

Anything else? Happy? I'm ready to move on.

Best regards,

Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]

Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 12:01 p.m.

To: 'Richard Treadgold'

Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets

Scientists are of course human, Richard, but it's highly unusual for them to refuse communication with other scientists. A more open attitude would help you guys make your point. (Confidentially, at this stage I know the guy who runs Poneke has been offered the opportunity for a post or three on Sciblogs NZ – which really ranks very high at the moment and has all sorts of media links. His comments on climate change have been extremely silly and I would have thought if you guys were more open you could have got the offer instead).

I am judging the report's claims on its merits and will be in an even better position to do so when I have the spreadsheet. But the comments made by me and by Dave Winter were based on a scientific assessment. By looking at the data. Not on the basis of personalities or conspiracy theories.

Every one is capable of conniving, etc. The scientific process is the best way of getting around that, although it might take time.

However, don't be fooled by the climategate hysteria. Look for instance at the inquiry report into Mann's work at Penn State University (I comment and link to it at [Spinning exoneration of Dr. Michael Mann Into "Whitewash"](#)). Once the dust settles and the inquiry reports come in I am sure there will be no questions about the veracity of climate change science – just the behaviour of individuals on FIO requests, etc.). Really, the denier groups should then look very silly – but we know now it works. Mud sticks and “lies get half way around the world before truth can get its boots on.”

I believe that underneath all this hysteria is a psychological issue which would be interesting to analyses. Maybe it's an ego thing, or a fear thing, a denial of problems we don't think we can fix. Although I think it's much wider than climate science – e.g. Alternative medicine, creationism, etc. and conspiracy theorism in general.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
 Sent: Friday, 12 February 2010 12:14 p.m.
 To: Ken Perrott
 Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets
 You wrote:

Scientists are of course human, Richard, but it's highly unusual for them to refuse communication with other scientists.

Unusual, yes, but not unlawful and not unexplained. Salinger, on the other hand, never explained why we couldn't have his adjustments.

A more open attitude would help you guys make your point. (Confidentially, at this stage I know the guy who runs Poneke has been offered the opportunity for a post or three on Sciblogs NZ – which really ranks very high at the moment and has all sorts of media links. His comments on climate change have been extremely silly and I would have thought if you guys were more open you could have got the offer instead).

Hmm, now that is surprising (that he got an offer). Maybe they think we are reasonable so we see the truth?!

I am judging the report's claims on its merits and will be in an even better position to do so when I have the spreadsheet. But the comments made by me and by Dave Winter were based on a scientific assessment. By looking at the data. Not on the basis of personalities or conspiracy theories.

Sorry, I don't remember Dave Winter. On my blog? I'll search.

Every one is capable of conniving, etc. The scientific process is the best way of getting around that, although it might take time.

However, don't be fooled by the climategate hysteria. Look for instance at the inquiry report into Mann's work at Penn State University (I comment and link to it at [Spinning exoneration](#)

of Dr. Michael Mann into “Whitewash”). Once the dust settles and the inquiry reports come in I am sure there will be no questions about the veracity of climate change science – just the behaviour of individuals on FIO requests, etc.). Really, the denier groups should then look very silly – but we know now it works. Mud sticks and “lies get half way around the world before truth can get its boots on.”

I believe that underneath all this hysteria is a psychological issue which would be interesting to analyse. Maybe it’s an ego thing, or a fear thing, a denial of problems we don’t think we can fix. Although I think it’s much wider than climate science – e.g. Alternative medicine, creationism, etc. and conspiracy theorism in general.

Look, you're making interesting points. But right now the focus is on NIWA and the time series.

Crikey, your posts are coming through thick and fast. I can't keep up with you, man!

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 February 2010 4:03 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets

Hi Richard,

Just want to make progress on my request for information about the data you used in the report.

In my email of February 10 I requested information along the lines:

“Could you please send me a description of the technique? Particularly:

What data you used to establish a 1970-2000 average?

- *How do you handle the fact that there is no data for all that period from some of the stations?*
- *Did you just use the 1970-200 averages calculated by NIWA?*
- *Did you calculate the 1970-2000 Data after combining all the sites?*
- *How did you combine data for all the sites? Did you just take a simple average of available data or did you reconstruct data for times they were not available?*
- *If you used the reconstruction method, could you describe how this was done?*
- *If you used the averaging method how did you compensate for missing sites at earlier times?*

Actually, a copy of your spreadsheet would probably clarify your procedures for me.”

You offered to send me the spreadsheet (which would have been simplest, avoiding communicating about abstract details along a chain of people unfamiliar with the methodology). This was on February 12. Later that day you appeared to make extra conditions in a comment on your blog (*“If you’re criticising us in public for the justified desire of our part-time experts to comment anonymously, you will not again be privy to special information in offline conversations”*). Later you said on your blog: *“Of*

course it's a threat. But don't worry about any commitments I made, I'll keep them. I meant that you won't get any more information concerning our science team."

However the next day (Feb 14) in another comment you appeared to withdraw your commitments saying: *"We no longer wish to show you our spreadsheet."*

So, it's a bit confusing. Blog comments are hardly a good way of communicating important decisions.

Could you clarify – will you send me this spreadsheet?

If not will you provide me the information I originally requested?

I have made some progress in playing with the data in an attempt to replicate your figure. However, the way the anomalies were calculated is not at all obvious and I would really like this clarified before commenting on the possible procedure used.

Regards,

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]

Sent: Tuesday, 16 February 2010 4:22 p.m.

To: Ken Perrott

Subject: RE: Sharing spreadsheets

Hi Ken,

Busy just now. Have to check with science team. I must say it is confusing to deal with your two personas.

Richard

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]

Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 10:48 a.m.

To: 'Richard Treadgold'

Subject: Response to my request for information.

Hi Richard.

I am getting mixed messages on this from your blog.

Can you please confirm here what the situation is?

Will you be sending me the information and/or spreadsheet I requested and that you agreed to send?

Whatever the situation I intend to get back to my analysis of the data you used. If I don't have your information on methodology I will have to make my own assumptions about the procedures you used. So I will still go ahead.

So please. Can you finalise this issue one way or other with a simple answer?

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 11:18 a.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: Re: Response to my request for information.
Hi Ken,

How can you say mixed messages? We're not sending you our spreadsheet, because the scientists changed their minds when they saw yours. Please do all the analysis you like, and please look at the individual station graphs, because they show the properly interesting data. However we've done our combined graph, it's just one way of doing it and not that important. What has happened at each station is important.

By the way, I like the more moderate tone from you and the attention to material issues. Please don't go back to the slanging matches, thanks.

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 11:23 a.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.

Thanks for the confirmation that you will not send me the spreadsheet you promised.

I assume it also applies to my general request for information on methodology used.

I'll do my best to second guess the methodology in my analysis. At least no-one can say I made no attempt to get the information.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 11:30 a.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.
Hi Ken,

Thanks for the confirmation that you will not send me the spreadsheet you promised.

You deliberately ignore the reason for our change of heart. You, sir, are culpable for it.

I assume it also applies to my general request for information on methodology used.

Yes, of course it does. We're not going to help you if you're not doing any work.

I will do my best to second guess the methodology in my analysis. At least no-one can say I made no attempt to get the information.

Have you asked NIWA for any information, or why Salinger refused access to the adjustments for 30 years, or why they are reconstructing the schedule of adjustments? Don't be dishonest about this, Ken. Or do you think we made it all up?

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 11:46 a.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.

Hi Richard.

Yes, I have all the information I need from NIWA.

And thanks for your note about the original station graphs in your report. I think this will provide a more useful method of determining the methodology you used as I can test possible scenarios on seven sets of data.

I appreciate that you will put different spins on your unwillingness to provide the information I requested. For the record I have never misrepresented my intentions for this request, or the analysis I did on No Minister's claims (which also proved to be mistaken – as he acknowledged in the end).

The work I do on your methodology will of course be obvious when I make my conclusions public. Your denial of information has nothing to do with the amount of work I will do – except to require me to do more work than originally intended.

It does, though, indicate a lack of confidence in the report on your own part.

Anyway. I think there is no need for us to discuss my request any further at this stage. I will be posting something in due course.

Regards.

Ken Perrott.

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 12:06 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.

Hi Ken,

You refer repeatedly to some ridiculous "No Minister" without definition. Who are you talking about?

By the way, I don't "put spin" on the facts. You have not done what you said you had done. You have not recreated NIWA's graph "from their description". Which is proven, actually, by the fact that they haven't finished "reconstructing" their (scientific) description of it. All you did was download their adjusted data and graph it.

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 12:24 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.

Richard

Have a look at [Warming in NZ, if you want](#). It's a post at the No Minister site. My analysis was a response to that.

I can appreciate you may not understand what this analysis involved – but have a read of the comments there where I explain the mistake they made.

It is this sort of methodology I am checking in your data.

Regards.

Ken Perrott

From: Richard Treadgold [richard@wordshine.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 2:33 p.m.
To: Ken Perrott
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.
Hi Ken,

That's a lot of bad-tempered waffle to wade through! I see what you mean about 'No Minister' and I get a flavour of the analysis he did.

I hope you haven't overlooked an explanatory paper we posted on 30 Nov 2009. You can find it [here](#). It contains supplementary information about Hokitika (which might be thought prescient, considering it was the first station for which NIWA reconstructed a schedule of adjustments), including all the history we could find and general discussion of the issues. You might find it useful, especially (which we haven't completed yet) for a comparison with NIWA's recently-published SOA and notes.

Cheers,
Richard.

From: Ken Perrott [perrottk@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 22 February 2010 4:06 p.m.
To: 'Richard Treadgold'
Subject: RE: Response to my request for information.

Thanks Richard for the link

It doesn't actually contain any information on anomalies. But it will probably help me work out if you guys reconstructed missing data or just took averages inappropriately.

Regards.

Ken.
