
From: Baxter, Jenny (Executive, Dutton Park)

Sent: Wednesday, 8 April 2015 9:51 AM

To: Keating, Brian (Executive, Dutton Park); Wonhas, Alex (Executive, North Ryde); Brown, Sue (Executive, Campbell); Torok, Simon (Comms, Aspendale); Battaglia, Michael (Agriculture, Sandy Bay); Hatfield-Dodds, Steve (L&W, Black Mountain); Williams, John (Executive, North Ryde); [REDACTED]

Cc: MPLO

Subject: Post-2020 target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions - no submission

Dear all,

After a series of email exchanges and discussions a decision has been made not to provide a written submission to the current PM&C process around setting Australia's post-2020 target for greenhouse gas emissions in the context of UNFCCC negotiations (<https://www.pm.gov.au/media/2015-03-28/post-2020-greenhouse-gas-emissions-reduction-target>). There are a couple of reasons for this:

- The questions posed in the discussion paper are very policy focussed and difficult for CSIRO to answer directly as a trusted advisor. Thus we would need to put effort into a general submission with unclear impact.
- CSIRO is already well connected into various relevant government agencies and processes and can likely achieve greater impact via these channels through targeted discussion and provision of information/advice.

I am happy to discuss this decision if you have any queries about it. I have sent this to the people I am aware have an interest in this process – please forward as appropriate.

Regards

Jen

Jen Baxter

Executive Officer Environment

CSIRO

E [REDACTED]

T [REDACTED]

M [REDACTED]

Ecosciences Precinct, 41 Boggo Rd, Dutton Park, QLD 4102, Australia

<http://www.csiro.au>

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 April 2015 10:00 AM

[REDACTED]
Subject: Post-2020 target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions - no CSIRO submission

Hi John,

You might be interested in this decision.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship

Postal address:
Private Bag 1
Aspendale 3195
Victoria
Australia

+ [REDACTED]

From: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Sent: Wednesday, 8 April 2015 10:30 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Post-2020 target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions - no CSIRO submission

Dear [REDACTED]

Disappointing, but hardly surprising that CSIRO has decided not to stand up for science.

Are you planning on doing anything?

Regards
John

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 April 2015 1:16 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Church, John (O&A, Hobart); [REDACTED]
Subject: Post-2020 target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions - no CSIRO submission

Hi [REDACTED],

I share John Church's disappointment about this decision. Climate science is critically relevant to this issue. We are told that our science should generate impact (see attached slides). Sure, there are a number of ways in which impact can be achieved, and we don't need to make a submission to every government inquiry. However, given our leadership in climate science, and our position as trusted advisors, I think our key stakeholders should expect us to make a submission rather than operating behind closed doors.

CSIRO was missing in action in submissions to the Senate Inquiry into the CPRS in 2009 http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Economics/Completed_inquiries/2008-10/cprs_2_09/index and submissions to the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy in 2009 http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Former_Committees/climate/index. Mike Raupach, John Church and Pep Canadell made a personal submission to the Select Committee http://www.aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/committee/climate_ctte/submissions/sub579_pdf.ashx, which I thought was policy relevant without being policy prescriptive.

Even though I'm sure the decision will not be reversed, I think we should consider providing some feedback to Jen Baxter.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship

Postal address:
Private Bag 1
Aspendale 3195
Victoria
Australia

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Wednesday, 8 April 2015 16:29
To: "Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington)" <Ken.Lee@csiro.au>
Cc: "Church, John (O&A, Hobart)" <John.Church@csiro.au>, "[REDACTED]"
[REDACTED], "[REDACTED]"
[REDACTED], "[REDACTED]"
Subject: FW: Post-2020 target for Greenhouse Gas Emissions - no CSIRO submission

Ken,

You might have received the original email sent by Jen Baxter at the bottom of this email trail via [REDACTED]. Sorry for sending this email trail but it highlights serious concerns by some of our most senior climate researchers about the CSIRO decision not to provide a written submission to the current PM&C process around setting Australia's post-2020 target for greenhouse gas emissions which I think you need to be aware of.

Some background information for you in case this topic is raised in your conversations with Andrew or other executives.

Best,
[REDACTED]

>From: John Church [mailto:church.johna@gmail.com]

>Sent: Thursday, 23 April 2015 12:24 PM

>To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

>

>Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

>Subject: FW: emissions target submission

>

>

>Dear [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED],

>

>Here is a virtually final submission that we, with other colleagues,
>have prepared in response to the government call for submissions on
>Australia's greenhouse gas emissions after 2020.

>

>This may be submitted as a Australian Academy of Science submission, or
>if there is not time for that to occur, it will be a personal
>submission by the authors.

>

>You may wish to advise your supervisors of this submission.

>

>Thank you

>Regards

>John

From: [REDACTED] >

Date: Thursday, 23 April 2015 7:57 pm

To: "Church, John (O&A, Hobart)" <John.Church@csiro.au>, "[REDACTED]"

Cc: [REDACTED], Ken Lee <Ken.Lee@csiro.au>

Subject: Submission

Dear John, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] –

With regard to my phone calls to each of you, I wanted to clarify the CSIRO policy (see <http://my.csiro.au/Policy-Portal/Procedures/Publications.aspx>). I have extracted the relevant section, the yellow highlighting is the relevant text.

You were right to advise your Supervisors as you did. Advice was sought from Ken and Andrew today, after having seen the submission and reflecting on the policy direction below. Andrew's advice is as I explained to you on the phone.

Thanks, [REDACTED]

1. CSIRO Affiliation

CSIRO has a recognised role in science communication and as a trusted advisor to government, industry and the community on matters of science and other research issues. As such it is important that all staff fulfill their duties in an apolitical, impartial and professional manner.

All publications that are written by CSIRO staff, in their area of professional expertise and reputation as an employee of CSIRO, shall have a CSIRO affiliation listed on the publication. This is required for both scientific publications that have authorship recorded (e.g. scholarly journal articles) and other forms of publication output that may not have an authorship stated (e.g. Reports and Chapters describing CSIRO output).

As of 1 July 2014, CSIRO Authors must include an affiliation containing the word "CSIRO" in the address line of scholarly articles in the open literature. This should be simply "CSIRO" or the name of the lead Author's CSIRO Flagship, National Facility or other entity. In ePublish, the full CSIRO affiliation must be recorded for all publication types. The name used should be the name of the Flagship, Division, National Facility or other CSIRO entity at the time the work was completed for purposes of publication.

CSIRO staff must not use their CSIRO affiliation on personal publications, whether or not the publication is related to their area of professional expertise and reputation, without prior approval.

Publications must comply with the CSIRO [Code of Conduct](#), including specific provisions on avoiding real or perceived [Conflicts of Interest](#), and the [Public Comment by CSIRO Staff](#) procedure.

The CSIRO [Code of Conduct](#) notes:

"In engaging in public communication and publishing, you will:

- base your comments on expert opinion arising from independent, peer reviewed research;
- consult widely within the Organisation, and where diversity of scientific views exists, make reference to the range of scientific perspectives held within CSIRO;

- ensure public statements made on behalf of the Organisation or using CSIRO as an affiliation are approved by CSIRO;
- ensure all publications are properly peer reviewed and approved by CSIRO;
- if representing a private view, state clearly that your comments represent your personal view as a private citizen, and do not represent the views of CSIRO; and
- consult your manager if you are intending to publish or comment in a private capacity on a subject related to your area of professional expertise, reputation and employment with CSIRO.”

The [Public Comment by CSIRO Staff](#) procedure states: “If a staff member is commenting in a private capacity, he or she should state clearly that it is a personal opinion rather than an official view of CSIRO”.

Where publication or comment is made in a private capacity that relates to a staff member’s area of professional expertise, reputation and employment with CSIRO, it is not appropriate for CSIRO staff to author a publication in a private capacity that could potentially be perceived as:

- compromising their capacity, as employees, to fulfill their duties in an unbiased manner
- compromising public confidence in CSIRO as a trusted advisor.

Where such a perception might arise, it is the responsibility of the staff member to discuss it with his or her supervisor and where appropriate to effectively manage risks associated with this perception.

 CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere Flagship
<http://www.csiro.au/oanda>


PLEASE NOTE

The information contained in this email may be confidential or privileged. Any unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained or that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Sent: Thursday, 23 April 2015 10:24 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Submission

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for the phone call, text and email, following my advice to CSIRO of the submission, and my earlier advice that a personal submission was likely given CSIRO's decision not to make a submission.

Like [REDACTED], I think this is a critically important issue for the world and that it is important that my voice as an expert in this field be heard. This is a critical time in the future evolution of the Earth's climate and I cannot stand by and be silent.

I am very happy to add the words

"John Church states that this is a personal opinion only and not an official view of his employer, the CSIRO".

Or similar words you might prefer.

On reading the policy, I note that it does not bar me from publication or comment in my private capacity. It does state:

it is not appropriate for CSIRO staff to author a publication in a private capacity that could potentially be perceived as:

- compromising their capacity, as employees, to fulfill their duties in an unbiased manner
- compromising public confidence in CSIRO as a trusted advisor.

I do not believe authoring this submission in any way compromises my capacity to fulfil my duties in an unbiased manner.

I also do not believe that by being true to the science, my values and the importance of this issue to the world, that authoring the submission compromises public confidence in CSIRO as a trusted advisor. Indeed, if CSIRO did not allow me to author such a submission, then public confidence in the CSIRO would be diminished.

It goes on to say:

Where such a perception might arise, it is the responsibility of the staff member to discuss it with his or her supervisor and where appropriate to effectively manage risks associated with this perception.

I do not believe there is any such perception. However, I gather it is your perception that such a risk exists. Having advised you of the submission, can you please advise me how to effectively manage the risks associated with your perception, as required by the policy.

Regards
John

John Church, FAA, FTSE, FAMS
CSIRO Fellow

CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship

GPO Box 1538
Hobart
Tasmania 7001
Australia

Ph [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Web Site: <http://www.cmar.csiro.au/sealevel/>

Street Address:
CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship
1 Castray Esplanade
Hobart
Tasmania 7000
Australia

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 23 April 2015 10:54 PM
To: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Cc: [REDACTED] Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Submission

Thanks John for your reply, and questions.

I sought clarification from Andrew earlier this evening on the Publications policy, and the issue comes down to the risk aspect; i.e. whilst in theory we can say that our views are as a private individual, the clear link back to CSIRO as a CSIRO employee poses a risk to our trusted advisor status with government. The management aspect mentioned in the policy in this case refers to the request/directive I received from Andrew. Ken was in meetings at the time of my discussions with Andrew, but I have since made him aware in the event that you wish to seek further advice from Ken.

As a colleague, I understand your desire to be heard on this important issue, but the advice I have received is clear. In this current submission process, the important action I think is to ensure that the relevant information is provided; an Academy submission is one way to do that. And this other PM&C activity that I mentioned may be another. And of course as IPCC author, you have contributed science that demonstrates both the way the climate is changing and the future consequences of a range of emissions scenarios.

Best regards - [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere Flagship

[REDACTED] | <http://www.csiro.au/oanda>

PLEASE NOTE

The information contained in this email may be confidential or privileged. Any unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained or that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Date: Friday, 24 April 2015 09:20

To: "[REDACTED]"
Cc: "[REDACTED]" <Ken.Lee@csiro.au>, "[REDACTED]"
"Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington)"

Subject: RE: Submission

Dear [REDACTED]

Sorry, I do not fully understand your response. Also, it does not provide a satisfactory response to my questions or give me guidance in terms of risk management, other than a blanket NO. My individual responses are below, highlighted in yellow to allow you to identify them.

In particular, in the event this submission goes ahead with my name included, how would CSIRO like the disclaimer written

I am very happy to add the words

"John Church states that this is a personal opinion only and not an official view of his employer, the CSIRO".

Or similar words you might prefer.

I understand the importance of a trusted advisor status. This role implies frank, fearless and open advice – otherwise the public has no basis for confidence.

regards
John

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 23 April 2015 10:54 PM
To: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Cc: [REDACTED]; Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington); [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Submission

Thanks John for your reply, and questions.

I sought clarification from Andrew earlier this evening on the Publications policy, and the issue comes down to the risk aspect; i.e. whilst in theory we can say that our views are as a private individual, the clear link back to CSIRO as a CSIRO employee poses a risk to our trusted advisor status with government.

Can you please explain how? It is certainly not clear to me how "public confidence", as in the policy statement, is affected by my making a submission. On the other hand, not allowing me to make a personal submission would certainly affect public confidence.

The management aspect mentioned in the policy in this case refers to the request/directive I received from Andrew. Ken was in meetings at the time of my discussions with Andrew, but I have since made him aware in the event that you wish to seek further advice from Ken.

The policy mentions advice to manage the risk. I have not yet received such advice. I am looking forward to receiving that advice.

As a colleague, I understand your desire to be heard on this important issue, but the advice I have received is clear. In this current submission process, the important action I think is to ensure that the relevant information is provided; an Academy submission is one way to do that. And this other PM&C activity that I mentioned may be another.

If the facts alone were enough we would have implemented major mitigation policy more than a decade ago. You and I know that there is much more to this than just stating the facts. As CSIRO knows, the credibility of experts is important and thus my participation in this submission is important.

And of course as IPCC author, you have contributed science that demonstrates both the way the climate is changing and the future consequences of a range of emissions scenarios.

Yes, I am very pleased and proud of the science I have done. However, I have learnt from years at CSIRO that our science is not just for publication but is for having an impact to make the world a better place – a laudable goal I and many others support. I hope my efforts and CSIRO's investment will have the maximum impact possible.

Best regards - [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere Flagship
[REDACTED] | <http://www.csiro.au/oanda>

PLEASE NOTE

The information contained in this email may be confidential or privileged. Any unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained or that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Sent: Tuesday, 28 April 2015 9:47 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] Lee, Ken (O&A, Kensington [REDACTED])
Subject: RE: Submission

Dear [REDACTED]

Following my last email to you requesting advice, the state of the submission regarding mitigation targets for Australia has moved on.

It will now be an Australian Academy of Science submission, rather than a submission from a group of climate scientists. The AASc have had the draft reviewed and they are strongly behind the submission. The submission is currently being revised in response to the reviewers comments.

The submission is expected to have an Acknowledgment section. I do not know the exact wording of the Acknowledgement but I would expect it would be of the form
"The AASc acknowledges the following climate scientists who contributed to the preparation of this report:

...

Dr John A Church, FAA, FTSE, FAMS

.... "

Since this is now an Australian Academy of Science submission, as you indicated was preferable, I fully expect CSIRO has no further concerns. Could you please confirm that this is the case.

Regards
John

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 30 April 2015 11:21 AM
To: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Submission

Hi John,

A quick note to let you know that Ken, Andrew, and others are happy with the new approach you've outlined towards contributing to the Academy paper below. Further to this CSIRO are willing for your name to be in the Acknowledgements as a private individual. This would be on the following understanding:

- a) The Acknowledgement wording is as you indicated; with no disclaimer
- b) This Acknowledgment occurs at the end of the Academy submission
- c) That you cooperates with CSIRO in our planned media strategy for managing any response from the media (Simon, Ben and Annie will be involved in developing this plan)
- d) That CSIRO are advised about the Academy's media plans (if any) around this submission

Let me know if you need any further info.

Best,

[REDACTED]

Date: Thursday, 30 April 2015 11:49
To: Matthew England <m.england@unsw.edu.au>
Subject: FW: Submission

Dear Matt

I had a long conversation with [REDACTED] last night. At that stage she and the others were still opposed to me being listed. But a new day has brought a complete backdown – see below.

Can you please ensure that the acknowledgements are as we discussed and find out about any media strategy. I guess they are planning to limit what I can say through the CSIRO media strategy.

Regards
John

On 30 Apr 2015, at 2:45 pm, "Church, John (O&A, Hobart)" <John.Church@csiro.au> wrote:

██████

We need an answer on this soon – time is running out. Surely the rule that is good for me must be good for others as well.

Give me a call on ██████████ if necessary.

Thank you

John

Dear ████████ et al.

So I presume that ████████ and ████████ should also be included in the acknowledgement if they wish. Is that correct?

Regards
John

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 30 April 2015 4:50 PM
To: Church, John (O&A, Hobart)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Submission

Hi John,

I just caught Ken in between talks. His feeling is that if contributors are also members of the academy, include them.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Date: Thursday, 30 April 2015 16:58

To: "

Cc: "

Subject: RE: Submission

Thanks [REDACTED].

This is rather unfortunate – we now effectively have two classes of people in CSIRO.

Regards

John