

Date published: Monday, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
Latest update:

## APPENDIX 7

### BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

Correspondence from the Bureau of Meteorology reveals that BOM has no empirical evidence of any unusual global atmospheric warming. BOM has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific rationale that human CO<sub>2</sub> causes global warming (aka climate change). The BOM repeatedly contradicts empirical science and implies false claims of human causation of global atmospheric warming.

My letter of February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to BOM's Director of Meteorology Dr. Greg Ayers was sent by email. A paper copy accompanied my letter of February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation.

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/71\\_EmailrequesttoDrGregAyers,BOM.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/71_EmailrequesttoDrGregAyers,BOM.pdf)

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/72\\_GregAyers,February2012.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/72_GregAyers,February2012.pdf)

I received a reply dated April 3, 2012 from Dr. Rob Vertessy, Acting Director of Meteorology.

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/73\\_12-0036Malcolm-IeuanRoberts.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/73_12-0036Malcolm-IeuanRoberts.pdf)

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/74\\_LetterfromActingDirectorofMeteorology\[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED\].pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/74_LetterfromActingDirectorofMeteorology[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED].pdf)

My letter inquired about the following items. Dr. Vertessy addressed only item No.7. He failed to address the other nine points highlighted in yellow:

1. Why does BOM cite and rely on UN IPCC reports?
2. Is BOM aware of the Inter Academy Council's damning report on UN IPCC processes and procedures?
3. Has the BOM conducted its own due diligence on UN IPCC reports? If so, please describe the due diligence processes used by BOM and provide names of BOM officers who conducted the due diligence. If not, why so?
4. Don't the BOM's role and responsibilities include conducting rigorous due diligence?

5. How did BOM fail to identify that the UN IPCC relies on unscientific processes?
6. Is the BOM aware of the significance of the claim of human causation to our nation and all Australians?
7. Why has BOM failed to provide scientific evidence in response to Bob Brock's request?
8. Why does BOM contradict the increasingly widely understood reality that Nature controls atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels and that CO<sub>2</sub> levels change after and as a result of changes in global temperature?
9. Why is BOM an advocate claiming or implying that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global climate change when there is no supporting empirical evidence?
10. Why did BOM remain silent when politicians and alarmist academics made false claims such as attributing Queensland's 2011 floods and other weather events to human CO<sub>2</sub> despite empirical evidence to the contrary and despite the threat to human lives and livelihoods from their false claims?

My letter inquired about the following items. Dr. Vertessy addressed only item No.6. He failed to address the other seven points highlighted in yellow:

1. Many independent analyses of the UN IPCC reveal unscientific, corrupt practices;
2. Was the BOM's reply to Bob Brock aimed at deterring him from holding BOM accountable?
3. CSIRO has no evidence that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming;
4. The Australian Academy of Science has no such evidence of human causation;
5. Ground-based temperature measurements relied upon by the UN IPCC are corrupted;
6. The BOM's manipulation of ground-based temperatures is cause for concern;
7. BOM fails to understand fundamentals governing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels;
8. The BOM's statement, quote "*The link between climate change and CO<sub>2</sub> is based on more than 100 years of scientific research*" is false.

My letter referred Dr. Ayers to the UN IPCC AR4 (2007) report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO<sub>2</sub> (chapter 9). It specifically requested that BOM identify the location within that chapter of empirical evidence of BOM's core claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused unusual global warming.

Dr. Vertessy failed to identify the location.

He failed also to answer my question as to whether BOM is aware of serious deficiencies identified in the body of the report by the Inter Academy Council's August, 2010 review of UN IPCC processes and procedures.

Both these issues are discussed separately elsewhere in the report to ABC-Radio's Steve Austin.

Devoid of citing any credible empirical evidence of human causation of global warming Dr. Vertessy falsely claimed, contrary to empirical evidence that, quote: "*The fundamental physical and chemical processes leading to climate change are now well*

*understood and very widely accepted. More than three decades of international research have led us to clear conclusions on this issue, in particular that:*

*(i) the Earth is warming;*

*(ii) warming over the last 60 years is due to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations from the burning of fossil fuels; and*

*(iii) the Earth will continue to warm into the future as a result of current and future increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide.”*

Appendix 2 reveals these merely parallel similar unsubstantiated and false assertions from the UN IPCC. His reply continued, quote: *“The Bureau of Meteorology’s own observations have provided compelling evidence that the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans are warming and that sea levels are rising.*

*Our findings accord with those published by virtually all of the world’s science institutions and learned societies.”*

He drew my attention to CSIRO’s document entitled ‘*State of the Climate 2012*’. Now we see the laughable yet deplorable state of affairs that Australia’s Bureau of Meteorology is relying on unscientific CSIRO documents that contain no empirical evidence or logical scientific rationale for human CO<sub>2</sub> causing warming.

Dr. Vertessy drew my attention to, quote *“the Bureau’s recent release of the Australian Climate Observations Reference Network – Surface Air Temperature (ACORN-SAT) dataset that has been developed for monitoring climate variability and change in Australia”*

### **Independently checking BOM’s database**

Ken Stewart has developed a respected reputation for his analyses of Bureau of Meteorology data. His assessment of the new ACORN Datasets is available here:

<http://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/2012/05/14/acorn-sat-a-preliminary-assessment/>

Ken McMurtrie’s summary of Ken Stewart’s meticulous analysis of BOM’s ACORN is, quote: *“Net inference is that the BOM data processing leaves something to be desired, contains suspicious manipulations with insufficient transparent justification which tend to bias the trend to a higher warming, and that they display a reluctance to respond to what could be termed “peer-review” by the panel.”*

Ken Stewart says, quote: *“The Bureau is trying very hard to improve its somewhat tarnished image, as they feel they have been unfairly criticised. Unfortunately they leave themselves open to criticism by not releasing the data and code and reasons for adjustments. Also the Acorn dataset has been rushed into publication without checking and is full of mistakes e.g. blank lines which make analysis tedious.”*

Science writer Jo Nova reveals serious shortcomings of BOM’s ACORN:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/07/boms-new-data-set-acorn-so-bad-it-should-be-withdrawn-954-min-temps-larger-than-the-max/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/06/threat-of-anao-audit-means-australias-bom-throws-out-temperature-set-starts-again-gets-same-results/>

There appears to be an error in ACORN's documentation regarding sanity checks for maximum and minimum temperatures on the same day. ie, the minimum can't be greater than the maximum on the same 24-hour period. Attention to detail is vital in analysing temperature data, particularly when driving climate and taxation policy.

Jo Nova reveals possible shortcomings exposed in BOM/CSIRO claims. BOM's adjustments exaggerate Earth's latest warming period by inflating temperature trends by 40%:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/07/australian-warming-trend-adjusted-up-by-40/>

In reality the period's temperature trend was very modest. Considering Earth's past, does the period qualify statistically as a true *warm* period?

Are these BOM's homogenisations on display?

<http://rcs-audit.blogspot.com.au/>

Although we cannot rely on science from government-funded BOM it seems citizens and taxpayers are attempting to fill the gap. For example, scientist Warwick Hughes is a pioneer in exposing UN IPCC falsities. His persistent challenges contributed to exposing the Climategate scandal. He has found many deficiencies in BOM methods and data:

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/>

Ken Stewart's analysis of Victorian temperatures provided by BOM lead to the following conclusions:

**“Conclusion:**

- *There is a distinct warming trend in Victoria since the 1960s, which has been especially marked in the last 15 years.*
- *The first half of the record shows a cooling trend. BOM's adjustments have attempted to remove this.*
- *2007, not 2009, was the warmest year in the past 100 years.*
- *Three stations identified as urban in 1996 have been included.*
- *Many stations' data have been arbitrarily adjusted to cool earlier years.*
- *Only one station has had its trend reduced. Two are essentially unchanged.*
- *Ten of Victoria's 13 stations have been adjusted to increase the warming trend, to the extent that there is a warming bias of at least 133%, more likely 143%.*
- *These adjustments, and the Australian temperature record to which they contribute, are plainly not to be trusted.*
- *Ned Kelly's not dead yet, and he works in the Bureau of Meteorology. 133%? I don't buy it.”*

<http://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/2010/06/29/the-australian-temperature-record-part-6-victoria/>

More of Ken's outstanding voluntary work is available here:

<http://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/?s=the+australian+temperature+record-+part+6+victoria>

John O'Sullivan presents a summary of significant concerns about BOM work and data:  
<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/29775>

Another reason causing BOM's temperature claims to misrepresent and exaggerate is their failure to allow for the proven Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect. This inflates regional, national and global temperatures with the distortion falsely and unscientifically blamed on human carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). See Appendix 2, UN IPCC and quotes from a study by Graham Dick presented here:

<http://www.climategate.com/urban-heat-island-effect-proven-to-corrupt-aussie-climate-data>

Quote: "**Conclusion**

*The claim, that UHI content has no effect on the national temperature record, is **not** supported by this study in which the national temperature trend is represented by long record temperature stations (LRTS). Warming since 1960 of recognised UHI, Sydney and Melbourne, is greater than national warming by a factor of 2 or more. Likewise, BoM's statement of annual mean temperature anomalies for Australia (MTAA) overstates warming by a factor of 2. That exaggeration of the national trend increases when a small sample of UHI are removed from the LRTS set. Further increase is expected when other suspect stations are confirmed as UHI and removed from consideration. (Quantitative estimates stated here are subject to statistical confirmation.)"*

And, quote: "This study is another indication that BoM's MTAA\* (Fig 1) lacks credibility and should not be used as a basis for reporting national temperature trends. Its value, if any, is to indicate trends of UHI like Melbourne."

Climate analyst John McLean analyses Melbourne's Urban Heat Island effect here:  
[http://mclean.ch/climate/Melbourne\\_UHI.htm](http://mclean.ch/climate/Melbourne_UHI.htm)

BOM statements and documents falsely claim unusual events. These fabricate unfounded climate alarm:

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2010-07-09/2010-on-track-to-be-hottest-year/898794>

The global atmospheric temperature for 2010 was below that of 1998. BOM's Dr. David Jones is quoted implying false claims about climate trends. His reported statements contradict long-term BOM data and global atmospheric temperature data. They present no scientific analysis of causation. His claims contradict empirical scientific data.

Willis Eschenbach analyses Darwin's temperature record to reveal how warming was fabricated by adjusting the data:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/12/08/the-smoking-gun-at-darwin-zero/>

Related work by Ken Stewart appears here:

<http://www.climategate.com/australiagate-now-nasa-caught-in-trick-over-aussie-climate-data>

## Why does BOM cite and endorse the corrupted UN IPCC?

In endorsing the UN IPCC, is BOM aware of the ‘*hopeless state*’ of the database relied upon by the UN IPCC and the verdict by that database’s programmer that Australian temperature records are apparently the worst? Meteorologist Joseph D’Aleo describes the database of ground-based temperatures relied upon by the UN IPCC and CSIRO, quote: “*Programmer Ian “Harry” Harris, in the Harry\_Read\_Me.txt file, commented about:*

*“[The] hopeless state of their (CRU) data base. No uniform data integrity, it’s just a catalogue of issues that continues to grow as they’re found...I am very sorry to report that the rest of the databases seem to be in nearly as poor a state as Australia was. There are hundreds if not thousands of pairs of dummy stations, one with no WMO and one with, usually overlapping and with the same station name and very similar coordinates. I know it could be old and new stations, but why such large overlaps if that’s the case? Aarrggghh! There truly is no end in sight.*

*This whole project is SUCH A MESS. No wonder I needed therapy!!”*

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/NOAAroleinclimategate.pdf>

Note the *adjustments* that seem to misrepresent Darwin’s temperature.

## Temperature data reveal no unusual trend

There is nothing unusual in recent temperatures or in any aspects of temperature. These are well within normal limits of variation:

<http://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/2010/03/20/political-science-101/>

BOM’s false and unfounded claims misrepresent science and climate. Despite lacking any empirical evidence and lacking any logical scientific reasoning, BOM assigns the word *likely* to describe human CO<sub>2</sub> as the cause of modest global *atmospheric* warming that *ended in 1998*.

Note the BOM-CSIRO reliance in some sections on unvalidated computer models.

Science-writer Jo Nova reveals that BOM omitted its own relevant data including data revealing that BOM misrepresents climate:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/03/the-bom-csiro-report-its-what-they-dont-say-that-matters/>

What is the point in collecting data if our nation’s taxpayer-funded weather and climate agency deliberately omits key data to seemingly misrepresent climate and in support of its political masters? Weather data forms the basis of our nation’s future security and policy decisions worth billions of dollars to industry and people. Making decisions on misrepresentative data is costly and risky. Isn’t BOM hurting Australia’s international competitiveness and risking the nation’s security and livelihood?

Please note the comments of CSIRO scientist Kevin Hennessy cited by Baa Humbug, March 27, 2010.

BOM claims on rainfall, maximum temperatures and minimum temperatures are wrong: <http://joannenova.com.au/2010/12/could-the-australian-bom-get-it-more-wrong/>  
What is the cost to farmers, fishermen and groups whose livelihood, welfare and/or safety rely on the weather?

Taken in isolation some of the above revelations may seem insignificant. Their significance is magnified enormously by the fact that errors and adjustments overwhelmingly exaggerate the warming, ie, they're almost entirely one-way.

## **BOM has failed an independent and objective market test**

Could it be that BOM already admits it has no evidence of human causation?

Quote: “\$10K Climate Challenge

*Peter Laux, Locomotive Engineman from Australia, “will pay \$10,000 (AUS) for a conclusive argument based on empirical facts that increasing atmospheric CO2 from fossil fuel burning drives global climate warming.”*

<http://climateguy.blogspot.com.au/2010/11/10k-climate-challenge.html>

Why has no one from BOM or CSIRO claimed this \$10,000? Given BOM's claims, it would be easy wouldn't it?

## **Joint CSIRO-BOM work and documents**

The BOM has produced documents jointly with CSIRO. These appear designed to trade on both organisations' formerly strong reputation. Analysis by computer systems expert and climate science researcher John McLean reveals that the CSIRO-BOM 2007 document entitled *The Climate Change Australia Report of 2007 - an Assertion-laden Sales Brochure* is nonsense. He explains here:

[http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/CCA\\_review.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/CCA_review.pdf)

John McLean says, quote: “In short it is little more than a sales brochure for the unproven claim that man-made emissions of carbon dioxide are the cause of climate changes.” He lists some of the documents grave errors and misrepresentations, quote:

- “1. It contains a prior assumption that carbon dioxide has caused warming
2. It ignores relevant climate factors
3. It changes its mind about the influence of the El Nino – Southern Oscillation (ENSO)
4. It relies on unproven climate models and raises
5. Questions of underlying credibility”

And, quote:

“If the 2007 CCA report makes any claims to be an impartial, thorough and accurate assessment of the recent and future Australian climate then it does so under false pretences.

*It is overwhelmingly biased towards greenhouse gases being the major cause of climate change since 1950 and yet produces absolutely no evidence for this assertion. Some natural forces are ignored and another that is first highlighted as being linked to historical climate variations is subsequently dismissed as being minor or irrelevant.*

*There is only one notion that matters to this report - that man-made emissions of carbon dioxide have a major impact on climate. Come hell or high water, this report tries to ram that unproven notion into its readers at every turn. Create climate models based on that assumption, never verify their accuracy and then wave a consensus of results as if it was proof, that's the process behind this report.*

*The report is, by and large, nothing more than a marketing document, one written by people with vested interests, never subjected to any independent review and gravely biased towards a particular claim.*

*We would never accept without independent and impartial review an evaluation of a drug written by its own researchers or an invitation to invest in shares that was written only by a company's sales department so why should we accept this CCA report without similar review?*

*It is an exceptionally sad reflection on Australian politicians, news media and the public that the report has been so readily accepted as credible and the predictions treated as near-certainties.”*

Over the years BOM reports spawn ABC broadcasts misrepresenting climate. eg, the *Catalyst* program entitled *The Drought Vortex* (September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2003) reportedly used information from Dr. David Jones of the Bureau of Meteorology, Dr James Risbey of Monash University, Melbourne, and Kevin Hennessy of the CSIRO Atmospheric Division.

<http://www.abc.net.au/catalyst/stories/s948858.htm>

Note the quiet downplaying of qualifiers such as *if* and *could* overpowered by strong yet false implied statements of human causation contradicting empirical science. Note the ending focusing on supposed *greenhouse gases* and contradicting empirical science. The message is subtle yet clear despite contradicting empirical science and lacking logical scientific causal reasoning: human CO<sub>2</sub> is loosely implied to have caused the drought, fires and other events that *will* supposedly plague our fearful guilt-ridden future.

It's not science. Instead, the ABC peddles conjecture and implied claims often based on unvalidated computerised numerical models and word-smithing giving the illusion of unfounded certainty and scientific credibility. It's pseudo-science. When peddled by the ABC it becomes taxpayer-funded advocacy and at times becomes propaganda.

BOM combined with CSIRO to produce their document entitled *State of the Climate 2010*.

<http://www.csiro.au/Outcomes/Climate/Understanding/State-of-the-Climate.aspx>

Many unscientific tricks are used to falsely imply human activity caused rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels and that such levels drove temperature and sea level. These tricks included dubious use of graphs with truncated axes, contradiction of empirical data, taking data out of context, falsely implying causality where non exists, making unfounded claims about natural phenomenon and false claims arbitrarily assigned 90% certainty levels falsely implying non-existent statistical validity.

The document ends with, quote: *“Climate change is real. Our observations clearly demonstrate that climate change is real. CSIRO and the Bureau of Meteorology will continue to provide observations and research so that Australia’s responses are underpinned by science of the highest quality.”*

Water is wet. Women have babies. Climate changes. Yet showing that climate does change is not evidence that the change was caused by humans.

Significantly, BOM’s true statement about inherent reality of climate change is made after statements and graphs implying human CO<sub>2</sub> as the cause of climate change. BOM is peddling misrepresentations not science and not empirical evidence of causation.

The BOM’s implied false claim is not based on reality. Instead, it’s based on output from computer models that fail to accurately or thoroughly include all natural climate factors, including the known most significant drivers of climate. The BOM’s claim misrepresents climate and science.

A successor to BOM’s 2010 document was published in 2012 under the same title. It is critiqued in Appendix 6, CSIRO. It falsely implies human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Climate researcher John McLean provides his critique here:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/04/ignoring-their-own-experts>

John McLean’s critique can be summarised thus: the track record of such BOM reports is that while the summary of observations is generally acceptable, their interpretation is sometimes questionable. Then, by using output from highly dubious and speculative climate models as a basis for predictions the documents are undermined. Further, the predictions contradict empirical scientific evidence. (This is discussed in Appendices 2, 4 and 4a to this report.)

### **BOM’s misrepresentations are spread by government-funded ABC network**

For detailed analysis of ABC TV and Radio treatment of global warming (aka climate change) please see Appendix 13, ABC.

False claims in BOM reports are spread by headlines in ABC networks.

BOM's Michael Vincent wrote the World Meteorological Organisation's 2011 world climate report. Yet, neither the BOM nor the WMO has any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 affects global temperature or climate.

<http://www.abc.net.au/am/content/2012/s3643348.htm>

On Th.29.11.12 he fomented unfounded fear using ABC-Radio's AM program. He stressed (natural) variations in Arctic ice yet failed to mention anything about growing Antarctic ice. Why did he omit such a significant fact?

Given the CSIRO's deep involvement in the UN IPCC's unscientific fabrication of unfounded climate alarm, what role have other Australian agencies played in fomenting unfounded politically driven alarm? To what extent have Australian taxpayers unwittingly funded global climate misrepresentations?

### **BOM investigation requested**

A request for the Auditor-General to audit BOM's work on climate was made by a group of concerned citizens including Senator Cory Bernardi. The team includes experts who have analysed BOM's climate data and found it sub-standard and produced by BOM practices and adjustments they see as questionable. Quote: *"The BOM claim their adjustments are "neutral" yet Ken Stewart showed that the trend in the raw figures for our whole continent has been adjusted up by 40%."*

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/announcing-a-formal-request-for-the-auditor-general-to-audit-the-australian-bom/>

And:

<http://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/>

And:

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific\\_untruths.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php)

The audit team identified serious issues in BOM's data including its identification of what it sees as a, quote *"suspicious problem"*:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/03/australian-temperature-records-shoddy-inaccurate-unreliable-surprise/>

### **David Karoly's association with BOM**

As revealed in Appendix 9 and other appendices many public documents reveal that David Karoly has a role in and across many *science* and *climate* bodies.

David Karoly is involved with BOM as Editor-In-Chief of its in-house journal. Quoting from Peter Bobroff's analysis: *"Publishing the research. The Bureau of Meteorology has its own in house journal: the Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal (previously Aust. Meteorol. Mag ). The editor-in-chief responsible for the defence of the scientific method, elimination of all types of bias, automatic release of all relevant data and code is none other than David Karoly - strident proponent of human causation of*

*future catastrophic global warming. The BOM itself has taken a strong partisan position on the subject.”*

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/40\\_CSIRO\\_CCSAS\\_2011-Alt-Notes.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/40_CSIRO_CCSAS_2011-Alt-Notes.pdf)

Yet David Karoly has repeatedly publicly contradicted empirical scientific evidence.

### **Are misrepresentations such as BOM’s typical globally?**

Given false implied claims about human causation of climate change BOM needs to be investigated. This is particularly so in context of information presented below and in appendices 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15 discussing corruption of government-funded weather and climate organisations in prominent western democracies.

Retired Canadian climate professor Tim Ball has publicly revealed how the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP and the UN’s World Meteorological Office, WMO have driven corruption of meteorological agencies in various nations. This was done as part of their campaign to fabricate the UN’s false claim of catastrophic global warming due to human CO<sub>2</sub>:

<http://drtimball.com/2011/bureaucracy-the-enemy-within/>

Maurice Strong was the inaugural Secretary-General for the corrupt United Nations Environmental program founded in 1972. UNEP was his vehicle for corrupting climate *science* by controlling the bureaucracy needed for his global campaign. Control was exercised over national meteorological agencies through the World Meteorological Organisation. Control of major national weather bureaux was achieved through access to funds. Maurice Strong proved that this made it easy for the UN’s global governance and control campaign to bypass all parliaments.

Separately, Maurice Strong cultivated non-government organisations to fabricate the media’s perception of a grass-roots organisation driving the UN’s 1992 Rio conference. It was pivotal in driving media and political perceptions of unfounded climate alarm. The interconnections make a massive global web. For example, Robert Napier the Chairman of the UK Met Office’s Board was previously CEO of WWF in Britain.

Please refer to Appendix 15, NGO’s (nongovernment organisations).

Just as BOM and CSIRO have intimate connections with activists so too do similar organisations overseas.

### **Is there disjoint between BOM’s weather forecasting and climate projection responsibilities?**

BOM provides a valuable service in meteorological observations and weather forecasting. These appear to be scientific.

Additionally in recent years BOM has been providing projections of climate change. From my research including correspondence with BOM executives I conclude that its

broad climate projections are based on BOM's unscientific, unfounded and unsupported claim that climate change is driven by human CO<sub>2</sub>. Its projections are thus unscientific and perceived by many in the community to be politicised.

BOM is held accountable in weather services by weather's short-term nature. Its forecasts are quickly found to be either accurate or not useful. Users decide based on BOM's results and usefulness in meeting users' needs. With experience using BOM's services users decide whether or not to continue relying on BOM for weather data and forecasts.

Climate change projections though involve time horizons measured in decades. Being politically vulnerable the projections could be protected from scrutiny. Indeed projections are open to the possibility of being subconsciously or otherwise influenced by political allocation of funding. Under such a combination BOM's climate projections can easily avoid accountability.

To the extent that the latter endures without accountability it will likely eventually harm BOM's reputation in weather services. Australia cannot afford that.

Earlier this year BOM got its El Nino forecast wrong. Yet El Nino is known to be a fundamental driver of global temperature. It seems that BOM doesn't understand this yet genuine climate scientists do. Could it be that genuine climate scientists are not distracted onto political agenda? Instead they focus on empirical scientific evidence.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-10-24/forecasters-surprised-by-el-nino-turnaround/4332260>

And:

<http://www.newsweek.com.au/article.php?id=5159&s=WGHRdB>

Is BOM's unscientific and unfounded advocacy of government climate policy affecting its vital role in forecasting weather? If so, can farmers and people in industries affected by weather trust BOM?

## **Possible solutions**

A possible remedy to protect BOM's weather forecasting services would be to separate the two arms into separate bodies with one responsible for weather services. The other would then separately be responsible for climate change projection. Climate change projections could then be made accountable using periodic independent external audit by reputable trained statisticians and scientists.

Based on BOM's record to date in climate change, it's essential that auditing be independent of funding to break the current dependence of climate change funding on political considerations.

Closer independent scrutiny would enable higher and clearer accountability.

A more effective solution would involve removing funding entirely from political control.