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**Subject:** Further fraud in the GPCC

Dear CLA’s and LA’s of the IPCC AR5 WG1 Chapter 2,

At 17th March 2011 I informed you about fraud in the GPCC and specifically that the so-called VASClimO dataset has not been produced by the GPCC, is not their intellectual property, that it is not based on deviations from a GPCC climatology, not interpolated by Ordinary Kriging and that the GPCC deliberately published wrong information about it (see

<http://www.juergen-grieser.de/Registered_Documents/2011.03.17_JG2IPCCAR5WG1Ch2_Authors.pdf> ).

Today I saw in the IPCC report that you used the Full-Data product of the GPCC instead of the VASClimO product and cite Becker et al. (2013). Given that no peer-reviewed publication about the VASClimO dataset exists this was a reasonable way to proceed although the GPCC itself published that their Full-Data product is not suitable for climate-change analysis due to the many inhomogeneities introduced by short records in their data base.

Now I feel obliged to inform you about further and ongoing fraud committed by the GPCC:

In Becker et al. (2013) the authors claim that the GPCC has altered Shepard’s interpolation method in order to neglect less data and by the same time avoid the double use of data. Please note that Shepard’s method does not neglect data if applied appropriately. Only if the grid-cell size of the interpolation mesh is very large compared to the station density and if at the same time the number of neighbouring stations used for the interpolation is limited then stations are eliminated from the interpolation. This is a) independent of the interpolation method used and b) a misuse of interpolation. As a research scientist within the GPCC, I therefore suggested to interpolate to a finer grid and later average to the resolution used by the GPCC. However, the head of the GPCC (Dr. Bruno Rudolf) did not allow this simple change and the problem exists until today.

In Becker et al. (2013) the authors state that their alteration of Shepard’s method avoids the double use of stations. Note that they interpolate from far less than 71000 stations to about 71000 grid points and therefore cannot avoid the double use of stations. All interpolation methods use station observations more than once to interpolate from k stations to n>k gridpoints. Even though they claimed to have done otherwise, the GPCC cannot avoid the double use. If Becker et al. (2013) knew what they are doing they would not try to prevent the double use of data. While Shepards method in its original version uses station observations of 3 to 10 neighbouring stations per gridpoint the GPCC searches for the 16 closest stations. They do, however, not say how many they actually use.

Also in Becker et al. (2013) the authors state that a maximum of 21.5% (i.e. 1-pi/4) of stations get neglected by their approach. However, their approach can neglect all stations within an individual grid cell if they are concentrated around the centre of the cell. In fact they neglect all stations within 21.5% of the grid cell area if certain conditions are fulfilled, which is the case in data-rich areas.

In Becker et al. (2012) the authors claimed that I have misused the ESSDD for my crusade against the GPCC, apologized for that and stated that I have not understood the terms of my contract with the DWD. I fully understood the terms of my contract: As I research scientist with the German Met Service (DWD) I had no right to do any research but was obliged to follow the instructions of my supervisor (whom Becker et al. (2012) wrongly called my mentor). When I realized that he was cheating I informed his supervisor and got threatened (by email) with legal actions if I refused to follow instructions regardless whether they are illegal or unethical.

In Schneider et al. (2014) the authors describe a quality control of which they claim that it is performed within the GPCC. Among the many wrong statements they published in this paper is the one that until 2009 the 4% highest observations got visually checked by a trained expert. It seems that the reviewers believed this. However, if this statement was true then more than 200,000 visual checks would have been performed on the data I got from the GPCC and used for the production of the so-called VASClimO dataset. My analysis of the data showed so many outliers that I need to conclude that this is not true. It is at least not true for the FAO database and the GHCN database which made up for the bulk of observations stored in the GPCC database for the period before 1986. These data were processed and quality-controlled solely by Dr. Christoph Beck and me and we know very exactly what we did.

Needless to say that the VASClimO dataset has not been updated since its first version was published in 2005 although the GPCC still claims on their web page ‘The gridded data set will be updated in periods of 3 to 4 years’; nor is HOMPRA, its replacement announced since 2010, published although Becker et al. (2013) provided features of this dataset (i.e. number of stations used). Also in 2012 they claimed that they have no DOI number for the VASClimO dataset since it was to be replaced by HOMPRA soon. In fact, they do not dare getting a DOI for something that is not their intellectual property.

I conclude that the staff of the GPCC is not even capable of lying professionally. Therefore I strongly suggest to not believing anything they manage to get published until they either withdraw (and apologize for) all the wrong statements they published (even in scientific journals) or the DWD exchanges the staff of the GPCC in order to regain credibility.

Please don’t hesitate to contact me in case you need further information or proof.

Sincerely yours,

Juergen Grieser.