

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** John Shepherd <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 31 May 2007 22:52  
**Subject:** Re: Complaint

I have seen and reviewed the scientific content of a late draft of this complaint, on which I made 44 comments and suggestions. I have since seen several revised sections of the complaint, and have also commented on these. All of my comments and suggestions have been dealt with to my satisfaction. This complaint presents an extremely thorough and comprehensive analysis of the spoken and (to the extent possible) visual material in the programme. It is clearly written and well presented, and in my opinion, it presents a very accurate analysis of the misrepresentation of the science of climate change in the programme.

John

--

Professor John Shepherd FRS  
Deputy Director (External Science Coordination)  
Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research  
National Oceanography Centre  
University of Southampton  
European Way  
Southampton, SO14 3ZH, UK

31/05/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Bert Bolin <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 01 June 2007 22:42  
**Subject:** Re: Final sign-off of IPCC WG1 section

Dear Dave,

Herewith I "sign -off" and accept the modifications made because of per-review comments having been received.

Bert Bolin

01/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** James J. McCarthy <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 04 June 2007 02:17  
**Subject:** Peer Review standing

Dear Dave,

Thanks for the opportunity to see a draft of the Complaint Re: The Great Global Warming Swindle. The material I provided derives from my professional expertise and my experiences as an author, a reviewer and the head of a Working Group for the IPCC. I am entirely satisfied with the way in which you have used this information.

Regards, Jim

--

James J. McCarthy  
MCZ  
26 Oxford St.  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-495-2330 tel  
617-496-4079 fax

04/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Robert Marsh <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 04 June 2007 13:36  
**Subject:** Review of Ofcom Complaint by Rado et al.

Dear Dave,

Re. Reviewing Rado et al. Complaint to Ofcom about "The Great Global Warming Swindle".

I consider that the sections of the Complaint that I reviewed, and that fall within my area of professional competence, are accurate. I am further satisfied that all of my comments and suggestions have been dealt with to my satisfaction.

Best Regards,  
Bob Marsh.

04/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Joe Smith <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 04 June 2007 14:28  
**Subject:** Confirming my willingness to be named as peer reviewer

Dear Dave

Thank you for revising the document in line with my advice. I think that the document now accurately reflects both the state of academic knowledge about communication of climate change and the nature of representations of climate change in the media. I am happy for my name to be identified as peer reviewer of the media sections of the document, which I feel to be an important development in the considered assessment of the C4 Swindle programme.

Yours

Joe Smith

Dr Joe Smith  
Senior Lecturer in Environment  
Geography Discipline  
Social Sciences Faculty  
The Open University  
Walton Hall  
Milton Keynes  
MK7 6AA  
01908 659232  
01223 740135  
Skype name: joe-renata  
j.h.smith@open.ac.uk  
<http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/staff/jsmith/info.html>  
<http://www.interdependenceday.co.uk>

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Tony McMichael <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 05 June 2007 00:57  
**Subject:** RE: Well it's gone!

Dave,

Thank you for sending me the final version of this complaint. I confirm that the sections of this complaint that I have reviewed (and that fall within my professional competence) are accurate. All my comments and suggestions have been dealt with satisfactorily.

Tony McMichael

05/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** J.Doyle@[REDACTED] <J.Doyle@[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 05 June 2007 10:25  
**Subject:** RE: Environmentalist section of complaint to peer review

Dear Dave,

As a peer reviewer for the environmentalist section of this complaint, I believe that, within my professional competence, the complaint is accurate and that all of my comments and suggestions have been dealt with to my satisfaction.

Kind regards

Dr Julie Doyle  
Senior Lecturer in Media and Communication Studies  
University of Brighton, UK

05/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Jim Watson <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 05 June 2007 20:58  
**Subject:** Ofcom Complaint

Dear Dave

Just to confirm that the economics section of the complaint to Ofcom about the Channel 4 programme 'The Great Global Warming Swindle' that I reviewed and that fell within my professional competence are accurate, and that all of my comments and suggestions have been dealt with to my satisfaction.

Best wishes  
Jim Watson.

--

Dr. Jim Watson  
Senior Fellow, Sussex Energy Group  
Deputy Leader, Tyndall Centre Climate Change and Energy Programme  
SPRU, University of Sussex  
Brighton, BN1 9QE, UK  
T. +44 (0)1273 873539  
F. +44 (0)1273 685865  
W. <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sussexenergygroup>

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** William M Connolley <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 08 June 2007 09:45  
**Subject:** Re: Ofcom complaint peer review

I have reviewed the draft of the complaint that was submitted to Ofcom on June 4, 2007, as well as an earlier draft; and have made a number of suggestions, all of which have been dealt with to my satisfaction. I am now happy with the accuracy of those parts of the complaint that relate to climate science.

-W.

William M Connolley | wmc@bas.ac.uk | <http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/met/wmc/>  
Climate Modeller, British Antarctic Survey | 07985 935400

--

This message (and any attachments) is for the recipient only. NERC is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the contents of this email and any reply you make may be disclosed by NERC unless it is exempt from release under the Act. Any material supplied to NERC may be stored in an electronic

08/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Chris Curtis <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Dave Rado <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 08 June 2007 14:31  
**Subject:** Re: Sign-off email

All my comments about topics which fall within my area of professional competence were dealt with to my satisfaction.  
Chris Curtis

08/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Cindy Baxter <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** <dave.rado [REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 11 June 2007 22:27  
**Subject:** Peer reviewing on the Great Global Warming Swindle complaint

Dear Dave

After having read through the various appendices of the complaint to Ofcom that you asked me to (namely, A, B and D) and made my comments to you, I am satisfied that these sections are accurate.

You included my comments - accurately, and I'm happy with the final result.

I have to say that this document is extremely impressive - congratulations on the result of what was clearly an enormous amount of work.

best  
Cindy Baxter

Greenpeace  
Currently in Washington  
Cellphone +1 202 904 0916  
Desk: +1 202 319 2488

11/06/2007

**Dave Rado**

---

**From::** Andy Rowell <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** <dave.rado@[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 11 June 2007 09:39  
**Subject:** Re: Sign-off

Hi Dave

This is to confirm that I have read the section and that the changes I suggested have been made.

Yours

Andy Rowell

11/06/2007