

## ***Email exchange between Phil Jones and Kevin Trenberth: September 14-15, 2004***

The following is a reformatted version of an email exchange between Phil Jones of the University of East Anglia, and Kevin Trenberth of NCAR. The two were co-ordinating lead authors for IPCC AR4 WG1 Chapter 3. The email was one of thousands stolen from a UEA server in 2009 in the so-called “climategate” episode; this particular email was part of the second release (in 2011).

The exchange has been placed in order. Actual email headers have been replaced with demarcating headers (in blue, like this commentary) and “signature” contact information removed. The second email (from Trenberth) has been reformatted to distinguish between his comments (in normal font) and Phil Jones’s preceding email (in indented italics).

### **Trenberth to Jones, September 14, 2004**

Phil

I have attached the corrected and slightly modified outline, and separately the annotated one with a whole bunch of new possible names for CAs or contributions. Can you fill in some more: I hope we don't offend some of LAs: maybe we should put them in more places?

The idea is to populate this somehow. Maybe I should not have filled them in but kept them in reserve: can still do that of course.

I see this as the main working document in Trieste.

Kevin

### **Trenberth to Jones, September 15, 2004 (*with Jones to Trenberth, also September 15, in italics*)**

Hi Phil

I was supposed to be on jury duty this week but I was excused after 5 hours, thank goodness. Next week I am in Geneva at WCRP mtg and I go from there to Trieste. So this week is all I have to prepare further.

I have several possible presentations to consider. One was the one I sent you earlier based on the scoping material, although Susan may cover a lot of that. One is a paper I gave last week where I was tasked to review temperature trends: the known, the unknown and the unknowable. The question is whether these might help get us on the same wavelength or highlight disparate views. To the extent we can get on the same page, so much the better.

I also have some draft material, adapted from last time, on letters to CAs recruiting them to do the task required (to be sent by email). Question, should the LA send these or us? It may carry more weight if we send them. It may also give us more control.

Some thoughts follow.

*On Wed, 15 Sep 2004, Phil Jones wrote:*

*Kevin,  
Here's a few thoughts. Not added any of this to the annotated outline.*

*3.2 and 3.3. We should talk to Dave Easterling and Tom Peterson about who additionally might be involved from NCDC. I'm working with Russ Vose on a comparison of the NCDC/CRU/GISS land temperature datasets. Not sure how many more in Asheville can get involved.*

Tom is on another chapter I believe. Dave is one of our LAs and so I think

will bring a lot of NCDC along with him, just as you will UEA and me NCAR.  
I hope.

*I'll talk to Mike Hulme here, but he's changed his research areas a lot in the last few years, so is much more WGII now.*

*I'm at an Antarctic meeting tomorrow and Friday in Cambridge, so can ask John Turner or a colleague there. Might be useful re 3.6.5 or 3.9 but in all sections we are trying to get the large-scale picture, so bits on different continents are useful, but will need a lot of integration.*

*There will be a paper on the latest Antarctic temp trends, so this can be referred to in 3.2.*

*I'm involved in an EU project on the greater Alpine region. This has extensive analyses of many variables from the best observed mountaineous region. There are precip and temperature datasets going back to 1800. Also the Austrian group (Boehm, Auer at the NMS) have a paper on temp changes inferred from pressures at high and low elev sites in the region. It confirms the surface warming - could be a box in 3.2?*

*I've emailed Adrian Simmons on another issue and asked him how much he would like to get involved. Need to add Peter Thorne to 3.4.1.6. Co-ordination with the various US efforts essential. Tom Wigley tells me he's heavily involved in one of these.*

*Clouds in 3.4.3 are a problem.*

I have done a very preliminary review of literature on clouds. I can send to you if you like? Liepert might be better there. Rossow also? But I don't trust him. Norris has done a lot but I don't trust him either.

*For 3.5.3 I'm aware of an EU project which tried to look at this from pressure triangles. This could more likely go in 3.8.1. There is a lot of work on winds, to do with citing wind turbines, but hardly any of it looks at longer timescale changes (and certainly not on large scales).*

*I think we should probably merge 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 winds and waves.*

*For 3.6 is Jim recovering? He will be very useful, if he can give us some time. We will need something in 3.6.6, even if small - Dave Gutzler. Noting a continuing problem - all my names are US, UK, OZ/NZ or western European.*

Jim is now fine. He was knocked down for a few days. He had a seizure and is not allowed to drive for 3 months. After that he may be allowed. That is a major handicap as it takes him 1.5 hrs to commute each way by bus. In evening he often gets a ride (he lives in Denver). But he is acting CGD Director and has little free time.

Yes I am aware of the mostly western names.

*For 3.7, Neville Nicholls will be in Trieste for another chapter, He could suggest someone for Australia (Wasył Drozdowsky springs to mind, but there will be others).*

*For 3.8, there is the storm tracking work of Ian Simmonds. There is also some European work. Do we believe trends those based on Reanalyses? There is lots of much older work from Klein from the 1960s/1970s?*

We have had a project on this at NCAR for some time. We have a lot of the data, based on band passed stats. Needs to get written up. A fellow called Edmund Chang (SUNY Stony Brook) has done some really good work on storm tracks and spurious trends in NCEP.

*For 3.9 add Lisa Alexander for 3.9.2.1.*

*Aiguo's work on PDSI may be useful for 3.9.3.3.*

*For 3.9.3.4 there is Nikolai Dotzek who said he could do something on tornadoes and severe local weather events. No idea how good he is. Their web site ([1]<http://www.tordach.org>) has some links to work in Germanic countries. Tordach has a US page as well. Ever heard of this? Another person here is Rudolf Brazdil (Czech Rep.)*

*I'll add them for discussion.*

*Cheers*

*Phil*

## **Jones to Trenberth, September 15, 2004**

Kevin,

This will be my last email this week. I'll check again on Saturday, then maybe next week, but definitely Thurs/Fri next week.

Glad to hear that Jim is recovering well. Give me my best if you see him. Also good on the jury duty !

The temperature trends would seem to be best (to me at least) as the knowns/unknowns/unknowable will enable the others to see the thinking and how we have to get across uncertainties. Need to keep us all focussed.

I'd let Susan go through the scoping material and we/you can pick up on the CAs etc.

I haven't prepared anything by the way. I have a number of talks on the lap top, but not as appropriate as yours.

Getting people we know and trust is vital - hence my comment about the tornadoes group.

I still favour Steve Warren on clouds, but there are a whole range of aspects to consider there.

Merging wind and waves is fine with me - should be a small section anyway. I hope to get a few people involved within CRU (Tim Osborn, Malcolm Haylock), but some are already involved in other chapters and being courted by WGII.

Have another (!) good week in Geneva !. I should arrive in Trieste on the Sunday morning. Staying with 2 others from CRU in Venice on the Saturday night.

Cheers

Phil