

<https://dailysceptic.org/2024/11/05/science-shock-u-k-met-office-is-inventing-temperature-data-from-100-non-existent-stations/>

Science Shock: U.K. Met Office is “Inventing” Temperature Data from 100 Non-Existent Stations

BY **CHRIS MORRISON**

5 NOVEMBER 2024 9:00 AM



Shocking evidence has emerged that points to the U.K. Met Office inventing temperature data from over 100 non-existent weather stations. The **explosive allegations** have been made by citizen journalist Ray Sanders and sent to the new Labour Science Minister Peter Kyle MP. Following a number of Freedom of Information requests to the Met Office and diligent field work visiting individuals stations, Sanders has discovered that 103 stations out of 302 sites supplying temperature averages do not exist. “How would any reasonable observer know that the data was not real and simply ‘made up’ by a Government agency,” asks Sanders. He calls for an “open declaration” of likely inaccuracy of existing published data, “to avoid other institutions and researchers using unreliable data and reaching erroneous conclusions”.

In his home county of Kent, Sanders charges that four of the eight sites identified by the Met Office, namely Dungeness, Folkestone, Dover and Gillingham – which all produce rolling temperature averages to the second decimal place of a degree – are “fiction”. Sanders notes that there has been no weather station at Dungeness since 1986. The *Daily Sceptic* is able to confirm that none of the four stations appear in the list of Met sites with a classification from the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO). The Met Office directs online inquiries about Dover to the “nearest climate station” at Dover Harbour (Beach) and provides a full set of rolling 30-year averages. According to Met Office co-ordinates, the site is on Dover beach as the Google Earth photo below shows. It seems unlikely that any scientific organisation would site a

temperature monitoring station that is likely to be submerged on a regular basis. Who is running this station on the beach, have accurate records been kept for 30 years and why is it not listed under the 380 sites that are given a WMO rating?

Of the 302 sites quoted, Sanders notes that the Met Office “declined to advise me” exactly how or where the alleged ‘data’ were derived for these 103 non-existent sites.

The practice of ‘inventing’ temperature data from non-existent stations is a controversial issue in the United States where the local weather service NOAA has been charged with fabricating data for **more than 30%** of its reporting sites. Data are retrieved from surrounding stations and the resulting averages are given an ‘E’ for estimate. “The addition of the ghost station data means NOAA’s monthly and yearly reports are not representative of reality,” says meteorologist Anthony Watts. “If this kind of process were used in a court of law, then the evidence would be thrown out as being polluted,” he added.

In its historical data section, the Met Office lists a number of sites with long records of temperature data. Lowestoft provides records going back to 1914 but it closed in 2010. Since that date the figures have been compiled on an estimated basis. The stations at Nairn Druim, Paisley and Newton Rigg are similarly closed but still reporting estimated monthly data. “Why would any scientific organisation feel the need to publish what can only be described as fiction?” asks Sanders. “No scientific purpose can possibly be served by fabrication,” he suggests.

It is possible that the Met Office has a reasonable scientific explanations for the way it collects temperature data. Temperature calculation is an imprecise science but concerns have mounted because the data are being used for overtly political purposes to promote the Net Zero fantasy. Alarmists claim that very small temperature rises can make a large climatic difference. To whip up global fear, temperature figures supposedly compiled with an accuracy to one hundredth of a degree centigrade are quoted from sources such as the Met Office and NOAA. To date, the Met Office has been silent over the gathering storm surrounding its figures and the organisation refuses to return the calls of the *Daily Sceptic*.

Sanders refers to another large temperature measurement problem at the Met Office surrounding the WMO classification of its sites. Almost **eight in 10 sites** are rated in junk classes 4 and 5 with possible “uncertainties” of 2°C and 5°C respectively. This means, notes Sanders, that they are not suitable for climate data reporting purposes according to international standards which the Met Office was party to establishing. Only 52 Met Office stations, or a paltry 13.7%, are in Class 1 and 2 with no suggested margin of error. Actually, mark that down by at least one. In his travels, Sanders pointed out the possible heat corruptions at Class 1 Hastings

and this site has now been dropped to Class 4. The Met Office is said to have confirmed that the default classification for stations is set at Class 1, “unless manually adjusted”.

The *Daily Sceptic* has investigated the poor siting of many Met Office stations with obvious heat corruptions making a mockery of attempts to measure the naturally occurring air temperature. Sanders lists the problems of many of these unsuitable sites including those placed in walled kitchen gardens and botanical gardens specifically designed to produce artificially increased temperatures and microclimates. Other unsuitable sites include in or near car parks, airports, domestic gardens, sewage and water treatment plants, electricity sub-stations and solar farms. Sanders has an interesting take on the recent closure of many rural temperature measuring sites. In 1974 there were 32 operational sites in Kent, but this has now fallen to seven. The switch to new electrically-operated platinum resistance thermometers required a reliable electricity supply and data communication. Many rural sites were closed down because such facilities were not available in the early days of automation. But by eliminating cooler recording sites from the overall data record, this left predominantly urbanised sites to cause an unrepresentative temperature uplift from the skewed averages. “Statistical sleight of hand (however inadvertent it may have been) produced inaccurate historic misrepresentation,” observes Sanders.

In his open letter to Peter Kyle MP, Sanders states that he has demonstrated with hard evidence that the Met Office is “clearly fabricating” data. In addition, it is failing to meet high standards of scientific integrity and is not producing reliable or accurate data for climate reporting purposes from a network of poorly sited and inadequately maintained locations. Peter Kyle is the Minister responsible for the Met Office and has yet to respond to Sanders’s allegations. Ray Sanders has done an excellent research job in providing new and highly relevant details in what is becoming a significant scientific scandal. To date, despite repeated requests, the Met Office has refused to make any comment and defend its own temperature measurements and calculations. While the silence in Government, Parliament and the Met Office, aided by a total lack of interest in the mainstream media, is maintained, it can only be assumed that the interests of the Net Zero promotion override any concerns about the underlying scientific data.

Chris Morrison is the Daily Sceptic’s Environment Editor.