

Dear Review Panel,

You will no doubt have been aware from discussion on the blogosphere that public confidence in the Review has been unsettled by the handling of the presence of Prof Boulton on the Review panel and the handling of the disclosure of his relevant biographical details.

First, his 18 years as an employee of UEA was omitted from his biography on your website.

Second, at the press briefing on 11th February Prof Boulton's disclosure of the period of his employment at UEA was misleading, in that he omitted his part time employment at between 1980 and 1986, and he then went on to claim that he last worked for UEA 30 years ago.

Third, when it became public that he had worked for UEA until 1986 an account was published on your website, purporting to quote Prof Boulton, which was in itself misleading in that it reports that he disclosed his employment at UAE up to 1986 at the 11th Feb briefing.

Fourth, the error on your website became apparent to the public on 16th Feb when a transcript of the briefing became publically available and was confirmed by the voice recording of the briefing you linked to the website on 17th Feb. As of today, 18th Feb, no attempt has been made to remove or correct the assertion that Prof Boulton made a full disclosure of his employment history with UEA on 11th Feb.

You will be further aware that Prof Boulton's lack of candour on this matter has invited speculation as to reasons for his reluctant disclosure and further scrutiny of his public statements.

So far as speculation on his reluctance to acknowledge his employment at UAE you will be aware that it is in the public domain that he was a departmental colleague of Prof Jones for 10 years and the speculation is that they are known to one another and have worked together professionally, as departmental and faculty members, and have engaged socially, as is typically between departmental colleagues on campus universities. Only a unambiguous statement by Prof Boulton can resolve this issue.

You will be aware that his CV contains the following:

9. CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCIENCE & RESEARCH POLICY

...

As contributor to G8 Preparatory Groups and Intergovernmental Panels on climate change

Clarification is required of the meaning of this passage as the Review holds out that he has no connection with the IPCC while his CV suggest otherwise, and he has been accepting the kudos of such an association on occasions when he has acted professionally.

You will further be aware he has campaigned for action on climate change and has invoked the "GlacierGate" error in support, notwithstanding that he has a special interest in Himalayan Glacier retreat and at the press briefing confirmed that he was "very familiar with the evidence that underlies the IPCC". This raises an issue of pliability, whether he is careless in marshalling facts towards a desired outcome, in much the same way the staff at CRU are said to have done.

You will also be aware that at the press briefing he resiled from the statement he had signed, along with 1500 other scientist, reaffirming a belief that:

"Most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations"

This evidences carelessness in putting his signature to matters of considerable scientific import, but which he does not support. This also requires explanation.

May I suggest that the Review adopt the standard test for appearance of bias as set out in the Courts - that links between the arbitrator and a witness to the arbitration gives rise to a reasonable apprehension or suspicion on the part of a fair minded and informed member of the public that the arbitrator might have been biased.

As a first step this would require Prof Boulton to:

1. make full and candid disclosure of his professional and personal connections with Prof Jones and other correspondents in the emails under examination
2. Give an account of the series of omissions and misrepresentations in respect of his CV.
3. Give an an account how he, as an expert on Himalayan Glaciers, came to be using the "GlacierGate" error in support of his campaigning for action on climate change.
4. Explain the passage in his CV relating to "Intergovernmental Panels on climate change" and what if any connection he has with the IPCC.
5. Explain why he signed an open letter although it does not accurately reflect his view on anthropogenic glosal warming.

This could be done at a press conference so he could immediately deal with any matters arising.

Following this, rather than sitting in a room wondering what effect this all will have on the mind of a fair minded and informed member of the public I suggest you invite submissions and comments to you website to enable you to gauge where public opinion draws the line.

Finally, in the light of Prof Boulton's full disclosure and public feedback you should be in a position to make an open, transparent and evidence based decision as to whether the presence of Prof Boulton on the Review panel does give rise to reasonable apprehension of bias in the mind of a fair minded and informed member of the public.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Denton