

From: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Re: Acknowledgment  
Date: April 30, 2017 at 8:21 AM  
To: Noah Suresh Diffenbaugh [diffenbaugh@stanford.edu](mailto:diffenbaugh@stanford.edu)

Noah

Was trying not to put too much of this in writing, but the concern here is avoiding the impression that BER is supporting research directly focused on policy evaluation especially SCC, CPP and Paris.

In [REDACTED] we had two projects on uncertainty methods for [REDACTED] both of which used the SCC as one example. One of those groups wrote a paper on uncertainty in the SCC (I think you and I would probably agree that the aggregate damage function approach used is in itself woefully inadequate) citing the [REDACTED] grant as a source of support. It would have been more policy neutral from the BER perspective for that paper to cite the grant as being focused on methods development only or not citing it at all as being methods which might well have policy implications but not directly on evaluating a specific policy. I do not think one can use the work on uncertainty to strongly support the SCC as the way it is calculated presently has a lot of deep problems. Personally this leads me to conclude that the things that are left out are more important than those considered which is what we are now focusing on.

Thanks

[REDACTED]