

PART A - CLINTEL RESPONSE

Adaptation strategy questionnaire: suggested answers

Q1. What is your overall view of the Adaptation Strategy?

Check the second item, “I don’t support the strategy”.

In the “Please tell us why” box, make the following points:

It is over-bureaucratic, over-expensive, incapable of making any difference to global climate and, in any event, entirely unnecessary.

Q2. Your comments on the climate-change risks and opportunities?

In the box, make the following points:

The “strategy” assumes that there is a “climate emergency”. There is none.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 1990) predicted 0.3 [0.2 to 0.5] C global warming every ten years from 1990-2090, and predicted (and IPCC 2020 still predicts) about 3 [2 to 5] C final or equilibrium warming in response to doubled CO₂.

In fully one-third of a century since that absurdly exaggerated prediction, the real-world warming rate has been only 0.14 C/decade (UAH 2023), suggesting just 1.4 C doubled-CO₂ warming or 1.4 C warming from 1990-2090, of which more than 0.4 C has already occurred, leaving less than 1 C to come by 1990, by which time reserves of oil and gas will be substantially depleted.

IPCC’s mistake in 1990 was to overestimate by a very large margin the amount of extra CO₂ that would end up resident in the atmosphere following emissions by us. Yet IPCC has failed to correct its predictions to take account of its large error.

Deaths worldwide from all climate-related causes have fallen by 96% in the past 100 years (US Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance). The reason is that in all regions of the world deaths from cold greatly outstrip deaths from heat. Therefore, the mild further warming we can expect before oil and gas are depleted will be likely to continue to save lives (Research for EU Commission, 2017).

Likewise, warmer weather will continue to reduce the weather-related risks to transport networks, telecoms and sea defences, as well as to homes, businesses, public services and the wider environment. In Britain, for instance, the unusually hot summer of 2022 saw 3271 excess deaths, a mere 6% above the five-year average. Yet the average death rate from cold *every year* in Britain is 9700 deaths (Office for National Statistics).

In particular, IPCC has been forced to reduce its original and wildly-exaggerated forecasts of sea-level rise in each of its six *Assessment Reports*. After allowing for isostatic adjustment,

which varies from place to place, sea level is rising at just 0.1 mm per year, equivalent to 10 cm (4 inches) per century (Professor Nils-Axel Mörner). All of the Pacific atolls that were predicted to go underwater are not doing so. High-tide benchmarks etched into rocks a century and a half ago are still not being overtopped today.

A historical precedent: Global sea level was 20 cm (8 inches) above today's level in the mediaeval warm period, which was warmer than the present. It was 20 cm below today's level in the Little Ice Age in the late 17th century, when the Thames used to freeze over every winter (it has not done this since).

On balance, it is very likely that warmer weather will be strongly net-beneficial to Devon and Cornwall, as to the rest of the world.

Taking a "proactive approach" to adaptation, based on forecasts of doom and disaster that have repeatedly been proven false, would merely expose taxpayers in Devon and Cornwall to wasted expenditure on a significant scale, as well as to serious interferences in their liberty to go about their daily business.

Finally, official climatological estimates of the amount of global warming that unabated emissions of greenhouse gases might cause were based on what is now known to have been a grave error of physics, which arose when climate scientists borrowed feedback mathematics from control theory, a branch of engineering physics, with which they were and are unfamiliar. After correction, one would expect the current slow, small, harmless and net-beneficial warming trend to continue till 2100, by which time reserves of coal, oil and gas will have been largely exhausted.

Q3. Your comments on the strategic adaptation options identified?

In the box, make the following points:

However fashionable the current official global-warming narrative may be, it is the people's money that national and local government are spending. Therefore, there is no excuse for abandoning – as Devon and Cornwall have abandoned – the iron requirement to conduct a proper benefit-cost analysis before throwing bad money after worse.

The following simple analysis will demonstrate that, even if the whole world were to attain net zero emissions by 2050, the current policy of the unelected United Nations and of the elected governments subservient thereto, less than 0.1 C global warming that would otherwise have occurred by 2050 would be prevented.

Since IPCC's *First Assessment Report* in 1990, the trillions spent (in Western democracies only) on attempting to abate CO₂-equivalent emissions and consequent radiative forcing have had no discernible effect whatsoever. The chief reason is that Communist-led nations such as China and Russia, India and Pakistan are not merely failing to abate their emissions: they are very rapidly increasing them, not least so as to provide power for the manufacturing industries and jobs being driven out of the UK by imprudent net-zero policies not merely at national and corporate level but also by regional and local authorities such as Devon and Cornwall.

As a direct result of imprudent and insufficiently-costed net-zero policies throughout the UK, the industrial and household costs of electricity here are close to the highest in the world, and they exceed the equivalent unit electricity costs in China and India by 400%, making it impossible for manufacturers in this country to compete.

The Annual Greenhouse-Gas Index maintained by the United States' National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration shows a near-linear annual increase in anthropogenic greenhouse-gas forcing of climate at a rate of $1/30^{\text{th}}$ of a unit per year. The trillions spent on abatement have had no effect whatsoever on this trend.

If, therefore, the whole world were to move in a straight line from here to net zero emissions by 2050, half of the next $27/30^{\text{ths}}$ of a unit – i.e., just 0.45 units – would be abated. To convert those units to global warming prevented, use IPCC's 1.8 C medium-term warming and 3.93 units' forcing in response to doubled CO₂. Thus, 0.45 units times 1.8 divided by 3.93 gives 0.2 C warming abated if the whole world moved together in a straight line from here to net zero by 2050.

However, IPCC's global-warming predictions have proven exaggerated by more than double. In 1990, IPCC predicted 0.3 C warming every ten years from 1990-2090. A third of a century has passed since then, but the measured warming rate is only 0.14 C every ten years. Therefore, the true global warming abated by worldwide net zero would be $0.2 \times 0.14 / 0.3$, or less than 0.1 C.

Since worldwide net zero (even if it were to happen, which it will not) would reduce global temperature by less than a tenth of a degree, net zero emissions by 2050 in the UK alone, which accounts for just 1% of global emissions, would reduce global temperature by less than a thousandth of a degree.

Devon and Cornwall, with populations of about 800,000 and 600,000 respectively, account for just 2% of the UK's 69 million. Therefore, even if Devon and Cornwall were to attain net zero emissions by 2050, which they will not, their sacrifices of jobs and industries and profits to China, Russia and other Communist-led countries – the very nations whose agents have been pushing the climate-change narrative and funding and training “environmental” groups in the UK and other Western countries, would reduce global warming by less than $1/50,000^{\text{th}}$ of a degree.

Given that implementation of the “strategic adaptation options” would have no measurable effect on global temperature, the entire plan should be forthwith abandoned.

Q4. Your comments on the proposed governance strategy?

In the box, make the following points:

Climate change, as an issue, is like a honey-pot for bureaucrats, who see and seize the opportunity to intrude ever more obsessively in ever more minute and petty detail into the lives of the hard-pressed voters who pay their inflated wages and pensions, and to create new and

costly empires at taxpayers' expense, such as that which the "proposed governance strategy" constitutes.

The entire "governance strategy", with its grossly prejudiced presumptions and its absurd layers upon layers of utterly pointless bureaucracy, should be swept away altogether.

Instead, Devon and Cornwall should commission a properly-costed and scientifically-impartial benefit-cost analysis, taking explicit account of the following facts –

1. That even if Devon and Cornwall attained net zero emissions by 2050, the effect would be to reduce global temperature by less than 1/50,000th of a degree, and at vastly disproportionate cost.
2. That the principal measure being taken throughout the UK to abate emissions – namely, the replacement of clean and affordable coal-fired and eventually gas-fired power stations with solar panels and with windmills (14th-century technology to fail to address a 21st-century non-problem expensively) – cannot reduce emissions any further. The reason is that so much wind and solar capacity has already been installed on the UK grid that it exceeds the entire mean hourly demand on the grid by one-sixth and counting. Installing any more wind and solar will be a complete waste of money.
3. The Devon and Cornwall strategy fails to make the necessary point that, as coal, oil and gas become scarcer and costlier, the only realistic major source of static power generation is nuclear power. France, thanks to its substantial network of nuclear stations, has electricity that is half the price of that in the UK.
4. That the next most significant measure – replacement of real cars with electric buggies – would increase the total energy consumption of the industrial and personal transport sectors by 30%, because the buggies' batteries are so heavy.
5. The cost of an electric buggy is up to double that of a real car, so that working people will no longer be able to afford transport.
6. The charging infrastructure will cost a fortune.
7. The infrastructure of roads and bridges will require considerable additional capital and current-account expenditure because of the extra weight of electric buggies.
8. The third most significant measure being taken – replacement of oil-fired, gas-fired and wood-fired home heating systems by ground-source or air-source heat pumps – does not work properly in Britain because in winter the weather is too cold. The cost of installation and operation thus comfortably outweighs the savings.
9. The fourth most significant measure – improvement of home insulation – can and should be left to the free market. If it is in a householder's interest to install insulation, he will take his own view, make his own assessment and decide whether investing his own money will be of net benefit to him. There is no need for the State to intervene; and, where there is no need for the State to intervene, there is a need for the State not to intervene.
10. As for some of the pettier and sillier measures proposed in this ridiculous "strategy", such as fitting fly-screens to back doors, that, too is a matter for householders to decide for themselves. In areas of high insect infestation, householders can and will fit their

own screens at their own expense. In areas of low infestation, they need not and will not bother. Either way, none of this is the business of local government.

The entire strategy should be abandoned. It is driven almost exclusively by the political far Left, who are anxious to assist the Communist countries in replacing the gentle Western hegemony with their own global tyranny. It is, therefore, a partisan policy calculated to cause grave economic, political and social harm to the people and businesses of Devon and Cornwall.

Q5. Would you like to give any other feedback?

In the box, make the following points:

If this nonsensical, costly and pointless strategy is pursued, it will be necessary for the suffering people of Devon and Cornwall to seek judicial review of the strategy on the ground that, bearing in mind the facts some of which have been briefly outlined here, no reasonable or rational public authority could, would or should proceed with this or any suchlike strategy at all.

Even if one were to set aside the fact that no modern instrument would be able to measure the 1/50,000th-degree reduction in global temperature that is the most that could be achieved even if Devon and Cornwall achieved net zero (and this ridiculous “strategy” will be entirely incapable of achieving net zero or anything like it), there is absolutely no need for this or any such “strategy” to abate emissions. The

following are among some of the many reasons why no such “strategy”, even if it could be achieved affordably (which it cannot) and even if it could be achieved at all (which it cannot), is entirely unnecessary:

1. As noted earlier, the global warming scare is rooted in an elementary error of control-theoretic physics. Climatologists had calculated that in 1850, before we had perturbed the climate, the natural warming effect of greenhouse gases was 28 C (or K). However, they had also calculated that the direct warming effect of the naturally-occurring, noncondensing greenhouse gases in 1850 was only 8 K. They had imagined, incorrectly, that the 20 K total feedback response, the difference between these two warming, was all driven by the 8 K direct warming by natural greenhouse gases. In fact, nearly all of it – some 97%, in fact – was caused by the 260 K emission temperature. Climatologists had forgotten the Sun was shining. So they vastly inflated the contribution of temperature feedback to greenhouse-gas warming. After correction, warming from now to 2100 will be only 1 degree at most. It was the error of physics that created the “climate emergency”. Yet Devon and Cornwall, not one of whose councillors or bureaucrats is in any way qualified to pronounce on matters of climate dynamics or control-theoretic physics, have fatuously issued a “me-too” declaration of “climate emergency”. The suffering people of these ancient and once-sensibly-governed counties are not prepared to tolerate the rapidly-growing costs and losses of freedom entailed by such costly, feeble-minded gesture politics.

2. In the past 100 years of global warming, global population has tripled. Yet global deaths from climate-related events have not increased. In fact, they have declined by 96% (United States' Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance and Centre for Research into the Epidemiology of Disasters).
3. Deaths from cold greatly exceed deaths from heat not only worldwide but in each region of the world (*The Lancet*, 2017). African citizens are 40 times more likely to die of cold than of heat: in the world as a whole, six or seven times. In the UK, the five heatwaves of 2022, one of which broke previous records thanks to a persistent southerly airflow bringing warmth from the Sahara, some 3000 excess deaths from heat were recorded. Yet in the average year, almost 10,000 excess deaths are recorded during spells of extreme cold.
4. Global annual mean deaths by famine in the global-warming era (from the 1970s on) are down by 90% on those recorded in the period from 1860-1970 (OurWorldInData.org).
5. Thanks to CO₂ fertilization, measured from space via the chlorophyll-flourescence monitors, the total green biomass of tree and plant life on Earth has increased by at least 15% in the past quarter of a century. This astonishing growth in what scientists call the net primary productivity of flora has been achieved notwithstanding considerable deforestation in the Amazon River basin and in some African countries.
6. The global population of polar bears, the poster-children for childish climate panic, has grown sevenfold since the 1940s – hardly the profile of a species at supposedly imminent threat of extinction.
7. Each successive IPCC report has had to reduce its sea-level predictions. Sea level, after correction for glacial isostatic adjustment, which varies from place to place, is rising at a rate equivalent to 4 inches per century (Wysmuller, 2021).
8. Global land area devoted to cereal crops has not changed in 60 years: yet the yield of that acreage has tripled in the same period. Part of the reason is CO₂ fertilization, which, on its own, increases the yield of staple crops of all kinds by 10-100% per CO₂ doubling (Idso, 2010).
9. Extreme weather, despite lurid reports to the contrary, has not increased. Most weather extremes have either shown no trend or declined (IPCC *Special Report on Extreme Weather*). The chief reasons why many think that extreme weather has increased is that such weather is now much more actively reported than it used to be, and that news media have been pushing only one side of the global warming agenda.
10. In Britain, the government of Tony Blair quietly enacted the Communications Act 2003, which abolished the obligation on TV and radio news broadcasters to provide impartial news coverage. The obligation of impartiality was replaced by an obligation of “due impartiality”, allowing broadcasters the freedom to decide to take only one side of a debate if they considered that there was no longer any political dispute on that matter. A few years later, Ofcom, the broadcasters' regulator, quietly promulgated guidelines stating that Ofcom regarded the climate question as “settled”. From the above facts, it is evident that the question is very far from settled: but that is how far-left broadcasters have been able to get away with giving only one side of the climate question.

Q6. In what ways would you like to be involved with the strategy in the future?

In the box, make the following points:

It is evident from the tone, tenor and content of the “Adaptation Strategy” that those behind it have very little knowledge of both sides of the climate question.

One of the two ancient principles of natural justice recognized in UK law is that both sides of a question should be fairly heard. In the interest of giving effect to that key principle of natural justice, we should be happy to arrange for expert representatives of the Strategic Threat Assessment Group and the Climate Intelligence Foundation to give high-level briefings to elected representatives and senior officials, so that a more mature and less costly approach can be adopted.

PART B - 7CC RESPONSE

Q1. What is your overall view of the Adaptation Strategy?

In terms of strategic planning the Adaption Strategy in its current form and context has the potential of being useful to serve as a baseline for a first stage scenario planning exercise.

For strategic balance, rigor, due diligence and creative insight that identifies the most effective solutions for the future resilience of this region then **contrasting scenarios** need to be developed and explored fully. Furthermore, the impact assessments of this scenario and other climate change scenarios on the regional Energy - Water - Food nexus seems to be underdeveloped and is perhaps a critical missed step before informing the risk spectrum assessed in this present strategy.

There seems to be a higher order strategic planning context missing from the approach.

There are other scenarios that would inform other solution options that are more community centric and truly coherent with regional resilience.

The single governing scenario presented in this adaption strategy underpinned by flawed strategic process and informed with bias will not inform best value or optimum solutions for the region.

Regarding bias, it appears that there is a **high influence of ‘pro-climate emergency’ alarmism and perceptual bias assessing, creating and proposing solutions that tend towards world views with problem and solution sets, that are likely to serve special interest groups, big corporations and global agendas.**

Q2. Your comments on the climate-change risks and opportunities?

There are risks and opportunities as well as significant problem and solution sets not identified under this single scenario. There are systemic level options that need to be identified that will inform a higher order level risk and opportunity analysis. **This is missing.**

With regard to the risk and opportunities identified: Taking a pragmatic perspective, the risk assessments appear inflated and alarmist. For example out of 62 risks: 18 score as severe & 28 Major impacts which raise concerns about the risk assessing world views and perspectives. In context of SW England and the real world expected impacts from the nature of the stated climate changes the risk assessment seems unrealistic and inflated.

This raises questions whether the assessing group is overly informed or influenced by conservative and typically risk adverse academic, scientific and public sector world views. If so, then an over cautious and inflated bias would be expected and the assessing group would need to be designed to include perspectives / world views that counter- balance the bias.

If this is not adjusted through professional, independent facilitation then there is an over-arching threat that the outputs from the strategic planning process will be weak and sub-optimal. Hence presenting significant lost opportunity to the regions future resilience and wellbeing of its communities, in essence the purpose of the endeavor.

Observing the current outputs and proposals this is a highly likely unless the approach is re-engineered.

Q3. Your comments on the strategic adaptation options identified?

The adaptation strategy process is flawed and partial. The regional & local energy - water - food nexus together with alternative contrasting scenarios are critical lenses to inform and identify the spectrum of 'systemic' options appropriate for this region.

e.g. Why do we have hosepipe bans in March ? A primary reason is a lack reservoirs and storage not keeping up with population expansion. There hasn't been a reservoir built since 1993 in the UK and the regulatory / private water system results in a lack of capital investment for large infrastructure projects with long term returns. This has not been identified.

e.g. There are huge systemically resilient benefits from a regional grow food at home programme. This has not been identified.

e.g. Specific to this region are the considerable opportunities for tourism from climate change. This has not been identified.

To re-iterate there appears to be a higher tier or context of strategic planning and consequently option identification missing.

Q4. Your comments on the proposed governance strategy?

There are clearly major gaps within the strategic process and questions about identifying and balancing the influence of bias. The outcomes will be a weak, ineffective and less than optimal strategy.

Governance and enterprise risk management related questions are :

- **Why was this not spotted earlier, course corrected and built into the strategic approach?**
- **Are there blind spots concerning strategic advisory, strategy making and the strategic insights?**

It will be necessary to address these in-order to establish the capability to develop the quality and rigor of adaption strategy that delivers effectively the greatest opportunities and benefits to the future resilience of this region.

The monitoring, evaluation and governance proposals offered are overshadowed by the higher order strategic process gaps.

Q5. Would you like to give any other feedback?

We recognize, applaud and support your endeavor of seeking to create a resilient and sustainable future for this region.

The strategic landscape has become increasingly volatile, complex, uncertain and ambiguous which necessitates changes in the way in which strategic planning is conducted.

The climate change adaption strategy has a potential to influence positive change towards a truly resilient and sustainable region. It would be a shame if that opportunity was compromised through a weak and ineffective strategic process design and development.

Q6. In what ways would you like to be involved with the strategy in the future?

We strongly believe that a climate change adaption strategy has the potential to contribute positive benefits in regard to future regional resilience.

We are a group of seven concerned citizens that represent the views of a growing, informed and highly networked 'awakening' movement. The movement is a self managing collective with many subject matter experts and unconventional insights.

Should the strategy process / approach be re-engineered to address the issues highlighted then we would be willing to offer our support and insights to help articulate, construct and explore contrasting scenarios, options, risk and opportunities.

www.sevenconcernedcitizens.co.uk

Email :information@sevenconcernedcitizens.co.uk