

## Submission by Donna Laframboise, February 2014

1. Bob Ward has made a supplementary submission to this committee regarding my oral testimony on January 28, 2014. The first two pages are a covering letter displaying a total of seven institutional logos. We are informed that the three pages of remarks that follow are a formal "policy paper" that has received internal peer review.

2. Mr. Ward makes two allegations that involve me. First, he insists that

Each witness made **a number of inaccurate and misleading statements** during their testimony... [bold added]

3. If that is the case, why does he cite only one example from my testimony, only one from Nic Lewis', and only two from Richard Lindzen's? Even if all four of these allegations were true, Mr. Ward would still have failed to demonstrate that the testimony of each of us contained "a number" of errors.

4. His specific remarks with respect to my testimony are as follows:

2. Donna Laframboise was asked by Mr Stringer why she thought the organisation should be abolished. **Her reply was extremely misleading: "When the IAC [InterAcademy Council] reported in 2010, it said that there were significant shortcomings in every major step of the IPCC process.** That is not a mild criticism. That suggests that there are serious reasons to be very careful about the conclusions of the IPCC process." In fact, the IAC was commissioned by the IPCC to conduct a review and to make recommendations about how its processes and procedures could be strengthened in order to ensure the ongoing quality of its reports. Rather than delivering the scathing critique that Ms Laframboise suggested, the IAC's report concluded that "the IPCC assessment process has been successful overall and has served society well", while also recommending some fundamental changes to ensure its future success. [bold added]

5. [Chapter 2](#) of the IAC report is titled *Evaluation of IPCC's assessment process*. Its first paragraph includes this sentence:

This chapter identifies and recommends ways to address the most **significant shortcomings in each major step of the IPCC's assessment process**, based on the Committee's analysis of current IPCC practices, of the literature on assessments, and community input. [bold added, p. 13]

6. Even though Chapter 2 begins with a discussion of how to address the most

*significant shortcomings in each major step of the IPCC's assessment process...*

Mr. Ward says it was "extremely misleading" for me to claim that the IAC said there were:

*significant shortcomings in every major step of the IPCC process*

Since I quoted the report essentially verbatim, my remarks were not inaccurate. Nor were they misleading.

7. He also disputes my characterization of the IAC report:

**Rather than delivering the scathing critique that Ms Laframboise suggested,** the IAC's report concluded that "the IPCC assessment process has been successful overall and has served society well", while also recommending some fundamental changes to ensure its future success. [bold added]

8. Mr. Ward may sincerely believe the IAC report was not a "scathing critique," but others beg to differ. The *New Scientist* magazine considered it so devastating it called for the resignation of the IPCC's chairman in an article titled [Time for Rajendra Pachauri to go](#). The *Financial Times* also ran an [editorial](#) that urged Mr. Pachauri "to move on."
9. Geoffrey Lean, "Britain's [longest-serving](#) environmental correspondent," [said](#) the report reveals the IPCC to be an "amateurish, ramshackle operation."
10. Louise Gray, another environment correspondent, began her [account](#) with these words: "In a damning report out earlier this week..."
11. The subtitle on a [news story](#) in the *Daily Express* similarly described this as a "damning report." Over at the *Daily Mail*, writer Fiona Macrae [called](#) it a "scathing report."
12. Environmental studies professor Roger Pielke Jr. [thought](#) the report "remarkably hard hitting" - and was [quoted](#) by the Associated Press saying the IPCC might be redeemed via this sort of "tough love."
13. A headline in the *London Times* declared: [This discredited science body must be purged](#). Two others - in [India](#) and [America](#) - used the word "slams" to characterize what the IAC said about the IPCC.
14. Statistician William Briggs [said](#) the IPCC had received a dressing down in this "brutal report." In his view, some of the most interesting material is contained in the Appendix: "this appendix is hot stuff. Rarely have I seen so strong a rebuke."

15. As a journalist, it is my job to sort wheat from chaff, to identify the most significant findings in lengthy documents. The IAC report was released in 2010. Upon reflection, and with the passage of time, it is my professional judgment that one idea deserves special emphasis:

**The first time an independent body looked closely at how the IPCC conducts its affairs, it identified "significant shortcomings" in each "major step" of the process.**

16. Reasonable people can read the same 100-page document and arrive at different conclusions. Mr. Ward could have marshalled evidence demonstrating that not everyone thinks the IAC report is damning, scathing, and brutal.

17. Instead, he wrongfully accused me of misleading this committee. That he went to the trouble of draping his false allegations in the garb of a peer-reviewed policy paper is bizarre.