

Dear Professor Jones

Thank you for your response to my earlier follow-up request relating to the evidence that we took from you in Norwich last month. I would be grateful however for a little clarification on two points.

1. Given your awareness of the M&M2004 paper and your reaction to it as reflecting in the email that I quoted in my letter, I would presume that you (and your fellow CLA), would recall the circumstances under which this work was assessed, and how consensus was arrived by the writing team about the statement about M&M2004 (and de Laat and Maurellis) in Chapter 3 of AR4? It would be helpful if you could describe this.

Could you let me know as part of your response:

*Were there plenary meetings of the whole writing team to agree on the first, second and final drafts of Chapter 3, or only on the final draft?*

*How long were these meetings?*

*Was M&M2004 assessed by the team at one of these meetings, and if so when?*

*When was the decision made to include the AR4 Report's reference to M&M2004, and was this text seen by the whole writing team?*

2. I understand clearly the distinction between "review" and "assessment" of science, and the role of an experienced and expert group in exercising judgement in relation to the latter. *Could you let me know:*

*Of the reasons you give in your response to me for excluding M&M2004 from further considerations, which were ones that at the time led you to exclude it?*

*When was it excluded?*

It would of course be useful if there were written evidence of any of the above.

I would be grateful for a speedy response, as we are now working against a very tight schedule.

Regards

Geoffrey Boulton