

From: Mbx_FOI <FOI@bom.gov.au>
Subject: RE: FOI Application 30/5693 - Changes to scope of FOI Request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: 18 March 2013 4:00:12 PM AEST
To: 'Malcolm Roberts' <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
▶ 1 Attachment, 6.2 KB

Hi Malcolm

Thanks for this confirmation the changes to your FOI request in writing, and the granting of an additional 30 days processing to the Bureau.

I will let Vicki Middleton know so that she can satisfy herself as the decision-maker that the grounds for practical refusal no longer exist.

Kind regards

Patrick

Patrick Ferry | FOI Coordinator



Australian Government

Bureau of Meteorology

Bureau of Meteorology
GPO Box 1289 Melbourne VIC 3001
Level 7, 700 Collins Street, Docklands VIC 3008
Tel: +61 3 9669 4319 | p.ferry@bom.gov.au
www.bom.gov.au

Disclaimer

This email is sent by the Bureau of Meteorology (ABN 92 637 533 532). The information in this email message may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email message in error, please delete all copies and attachments and notify the Bureau immediately.

From: Malcolm Roberts [mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 18 March 2013 4:34 PM
To: Mbx_FOI
Subject: Re: FOI Application 30/5693 - Changes to scope of FOI Request [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Patrick:

Thank you for your email and for our discussions earlier today.

I confirm my decision to make a revised request under FOI legislation.

Your helpfulness is appreciated in explaining the practical realities encountered by the BOM if it were to fulfil my request as originally stated.

Fulfilling my request as originally stated would have been needlessly onerous. I'm pleased to modify the scope of my request to meet my needs and BOM's needs. I'm encouraged that BOM is approaching my request diligently.

Notwithstanding my deep concerns about BOM's work on global warming (aka climate change), I recognise BOM's vital service on weather and do not want to disrupt that service by needlessly distracting BOM's operations people.

Your understanding below of our discussion's conclusions are largely accurate. Minor changes to details are incorporated below. Please confirm.

I am willing to change the scope of my request made under FOI provisions to the following:

1. Copies of BoM advice, briefings, analysis and reports regarding global warming (aka climate change) to: the Howard Government from 2005 to 2007; Penny Wong when Climate Change Minister from 2007 to 2010 and Greg Combet when Climate change minister from 2010 to present.
2. Copies of internal BoM advice, briefs, reports and analysis to BoM Executives on global warming (aka climate change) from 2005 onwards.

I am happy to specifically exclude the following from the scope of my request:

- empirical observational data and output from computerised numerical models*;
- material already published and available to the public;
- third party material.

* Note that output from computerised numerical models are not required since they are not empirical scientific evidence. Observational data is not required since I do not wish to cause BOM to do particular analysis to meet my request.

I no longer require that the Bureau establish that the material to be released to me proves causation of global warming (climate change) by human CO2 production. I understand that endeavouring to meet that requirement would require BOM to conduct extensive analysis and searches. As discussed, I understand that that FOI work is largely administrative and consequently do not require BOM to conduct any technical analysis. That was never my intent although understand now that complying with my request as initially stated would have required BOM to conduct such analysis.

It's surprising that on such a significant topic as global warming documentation of causation is not readily available. Nonetheless, internal reports to BOM executives should suffice.

I understand that where BOM relies on reports from third parties, those reports will be identified within the respective BOM documents you provide.

I am pleased to grant the Bureau a 30 day extension in processing time under section 15AA of the Freedom of Information Act 1982. Speed of response is of not as important as accuracy.

During our conversation we discussed making allowance for extending the consultation period. That was raised in Vicki Middleton's letter and is entirely understandable, reasonable and agreeable.

Do I need to advise Vicki Middleton of my decision to make a revised request?

Following my disappointment that BOM executives have repeatedly failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning as proof of human CO2 causing global warming I am reassured by our conversation, Patrick. Your advice will greatly reduce the work needed by both BOM and me than would otherwise have been the case with literal interpretation of my original request. Thank you.

Malcolm Roberts

04 1964 2379

On 18/03/2013, at 2:01 PM, Mbx_FOI wrote:

30/5693

Hi Malcolm,

Thank you for this morning's discussion, and your willingness to revise the scope of your request.

Based on our conversation, my understanding is that you are willing to change the scope of your request to the following:

1. Copies of BoM advice and reports regarding climate change (global warming) to: the Howard Government from 2005 to 2007; Penny Wong when Climate Change Minister from 2007 to 2010 and Greg Combet when Climate change minister from 2010 to present.
2. Copies of internal BoM briefs, reports and analysis to BoM Executives on climate change and global warming from 2005 onwards.

You are also happy to specifically exclude the following from the scope of your request:

- data and models
- already published material
- third party material.

There is also no longer a requirement that the Bureau establish that the material to be released to you proves causation of global warning (climate change) by human CO2 production.

If you can please confirm that the above is correct, I can resume processing your request as amended.

As also discussed, can you please indicate that you will grant the Bureau a 30 day extension in processing time under s.15AA. The relevant provision of the Act is attached for your attention. Once I have received written confirmation, I will advise you of a new processing due date, as I have to also add the elapsed consultation period to date (as the original 30 day processing clocks stopped during the consultation period).

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Kind regards

Patrick

Patrick Ferry | FOI Coordinator

<image001.jpg>

Bureau of Meteorology

GPO Box 1289 Melbourne VIC 3001

Level 7, 700 Collins Street, Docklands VIC 3008

Tel: +61 3 9669 4319 | p.ferry@bom.gov.au

www.bom.gov.au

Disclaimer

This email is sent by the Bureau of Meteorology (ABN 92 637 533 532). The information in this email message may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email message in error, please delete all copies and attachments and notify the Bureau immediately.

From: Malcolm Roberts [mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au]

Sent: Sunday, 17 March 2013 8:39 PM

To: Mbx_FOI

Subject: Preparation for our discussion on Monday 18.03.13

Dear Patrick.

Reading Vicki Middleton's letter again I find it to be clear and well constructed. Our discussion tomorrow should be

straight-forward.

This email provides an initial list of BOM's needs as perceived by me. Included are my needs. The aim is to ensure understanding of needs so that the needs of both BOM and I are met.

Based on my reading of Vicki Middleton's email I expect that we can quickly and greatly reduce the amount of resources needed for BOM's FOI unit to fulfil my request and meet BOM's needs and my needs. I expect that our discussion will enable me and BOM to continue processing my request made under FOI legislation.

Draft aims for our discussion tomorrow:

- Confirm and clarify BOM's needs as expressed by Vicki Middleton;
- Clarify my needs with a view to greatly reducing BOM's resources, time and work in fulfilling my request;
- Identify specifically ways to make it easy for BOM to fulfil my needs and BOM's needs;
- Explore and develop alternatives for me to modify my request to meet BOM's needs while meeting my needs.

Let's clarify our aims at the start of our discussion.

BOM's needs as perceived by me:

- Reduce BOM's workload in fulfilling my request;
- Clarity my request;
- Make my request more specific;
- Freedom from needing to seek permission from allied organisations outside BOM;

What primary needs have I missed?

My needs:

- Identify any reports from BOM upon which the government relies for its claim that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused global warming (aka climate change). This is reflected in my first FOI request;
- Identify whether or not BOM has any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the claim that human CO₂ caused global warming or global climate change. And if so, to provide it so that I can check the accuracy and logic of BOM's claims;
- Ensure my request is balanced and reasonable. BOM provides a valuable service in weather forecasting. That service is vital to the nation, communities and individual businesses and personal safety and disruption needs to be avoided. Given the serious nature of the global warming (climate change) issue it should be easy to fulfil the core of my request.

Some initial questions:

- Is my request typical? I sense it is unusual and quite the opposite of most requests made under FOI;
- The admission by Vicki Middleton in her email's Item 2, first bullet point is of concern given the significance of the global warming (climate change) issue;
- I do not seek masses of data. I envisage receiving BOM reports and/or where BOM relies upon reports from other agencies/bodies, I envisage receiving reference to those organisations' reports.

From what I've seen, BOM's reports and CSIRO's reports rely on implied claims and broad generalities not on scientific evidence and reasoning proving causation. In written advice to me BOM and CSIRO executives have repeatedly claimed they rely on empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning yet always fail to provide any such evidence or reasoning.

There is no such basis within the UN IPCC or Australian Academy of Science or Climate Commission. Indeed, all those bodies named by Vicki contradict empirical scientific evidence.

In my experience dealing with government ministers and executives of BOM, CSIRO and other agencies and bodies, I conclude that the government, BOM, CSIRO, UN IPCC and other agencies and their reports lack any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving the claim that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka global climate change).

Yet this is a serious issue that is and/or will be costing me and my family and our country serious disruption economically, socially and constitutionally. It is a serious threat to our nation's governance, sovereignty and constitution and a serious threat to personal freedoms.

Any failure by BOM to easily provide such reports will lead me, others and the public and politicians to conclude that BOM has no such evidence.

My recent request of CSIRO under FOI legislation initially raised similar though much lesser concerns to those raised in Vicki Middleton's letter. Discussions with CSIRO though quickly led to an amicable narrowing of the scope of my requests.

Based on Vicki Middleton's letter I envisage a similar fruitful outcome tomorrow and look forward to your assistance in clarifying BOM's needs and perspectives and in developing solutions to meet my needs and BOM's needs.

I'll be expecting your call as agreed at 9:30am Brisbane time tomorrow morning.

Regards,

Malcolm

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom

<FOI Act s15AA extract.pdf>

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom