

Climate Change E-mails Review
Box 18
196 Rose Street
Edinburgh
EH2 4AT

28 February 2010

Sirs

The Independent Climate Change Email Review

1. My name is David Andrew Cockroft, a British Citizen currently resident in New Zealand
2. I studied Mathematics, Computer Science and Geology at the University of Bristol in the late 60's early 70's, with a special emphasis on Numerical Analysis and Stochastic Processing (these latter terms have been rebranded over the years but remain fundamental to today's computer-based prediction and modelling techniques)
3. I have remained employed from then till now in the IT industry with very specific hands-on capacity. All my skills are current with many post-graduate qualifications and awards.
4. I declare my interest to be that of concerned citizen, with IT professional and personal pseudo-academic interest in Climate Modelling
5. I find your website contains various headings along the lines of "...hacked emails...". It seems to be that this phrase is quite hackneyed and unnecessarily emotive. To my knowledge, the source of the 160Mb of CRU data has not yet been established. It could just as easily be an "inside" whistleblower with authority to access the data as opposed to some external malicious "Russians under the beds" hacker.
6. The inclusion of Professor Boulton in the Panel is creating much interest, and whilst I mean absolutely no disrespect to him, perhaps it would be prudent that he step back and allow someone with proven independence to ensure the stated objectives of absolute impartiality.
7. There is much being discussed about the CRU emails in both pro and anti AGM camps. On both sides there is much unnecessary rhetoric bringing personalities (and personal abuse) in to play.
8. Nonetheless, it seems evident that CRU (as a group and as its several members) did conspire to prevent publication of its raw data and code in direct contradiction with good scientific practice.
9. A peer-review process alone will not check results of any calculations etc. That is for other scientists at other locations to do if they wish to challenge any particular work. And it is only by allowing such direct challenge to take place that science can ever be "settled". It appears CRU chose to subvert this process.
10. In finding ways to evade FOI request, CRU seems to have become masters of their own misfortune. Refusal led to frustration by some, so more FOI requests were launched. However, a total of 58 requests for a topic so absolutely vital to mankind's understanding a future direction seems awfully trivial. Simply responding would have given CRU's critics nothing to do but confirm or challenge CRU results.

11. If a challenge were launched, for the world governments to invest a couple of billion pounds in further research would be negligible by comparison to hurtling headlong committing to trillions of pounds expenditure on suspect methodologies.
12. Quite distastefully, there are also accusations of scientific fraud against Prof Jones (the so-called Keenan affair), that again requires investigation by CRU. Specifically I could refer you to Parliamentary Memoranda (a) Douglas J. Keenan <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climate/uc4602.htm> and (b) Dr Benny Peiser <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climate/uc3802.htm>
13. All above points 5 thru 12 (esp 12) require thorough investigation by the Review to determine if CRU has behaved at all times in keeping with good scientific practice.
14. Distance prevents me from requesting an Oral Presentation

Thank You

D A Cockroft.