

Dear Mr Stringer

Thank you for your e-mail, asking for details of how the Review has acted in the light of the recommendations of the House of Commons Committee on Science and Technology. As you know, the report will be published tomorrow at 13:00 BST.

In response to your request, I set out below how the Review has acted in relation to points set out in Chapter 5 of the Select Committee's report. The paragraph numbers are those of the conclusions and recommendations section.

We considered carefully whether our Terms of Reference might need changing in the light of the Select Committee's report (para.16), and concluded that they were satisfactory.

The Review reaches specific conclusions about the the availability and transparency of data used by CRU (para. 2) and makes recommendations on best practice to be followed by CRU in the future (para.16).

The Review considers all of the claims that there was a conspiracy to hide evidence that did not support anthropogenic global warming, including the so-called "trick", and the subversion of the peer review process (para. 9).

The Select Committee suggested that the either the Review or the Information Commissioner should conclude whether CRU had been in breach of the Freedom of Information Act (para.11). A chapter of the report examines in how the CRU dealt with requests for information under the FoIA and the Environmental Impact Regulations, and we make recommendations accordingly. However, it is for the Information Commissioner's Office to make declarations about any breach of the law.

The Review received all submissions to it in writing and examined a great deal of written evidence and data. Every submission was read and considered. In respect of oral interviews, the Review focussed on a small number of people and some very technical issues. We therefore concluded that public hearings, as suggested by the Select Committee (para. 17), would be neither useful nor appropriate. Accounts of all the interview sessions and all submissions will be published on the Website, except for a very small proportion of submissions which could not be reproduced for legal reasons.

The Select Committee was concerned that the Inquiry by Lord Oxburgh and this Review liaised to ensure that there were no conflicts (para.21). I made contact with Lord Oxburgh to pre-empt any problems and he expressed himself satisfied that they could be avoided, particularly given his more limited remit.

Finally, The Select Committee suggested that we should not convey our conclusions and recommendations to UEA before publication (para.15) After careful consideration, we provided UEA with an advance of the final report for the following reasons:

- the report had been commissioned by UEA, who were entitled to have the earliest opportunity to consider its response;
- it was necessary for the University to be able to check salient facts in the context of the report; and

the University were entitled to be warned of anything that could be relevant to its duty of care to its staff. Therefore UEA were given a near-final draft for fact-checking alone. Let me stress that none of UEA's comments changed our conclusions or recommendations.

I hope this is helpful

Sir Muir Russell