

Confirmed Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting (Teleconference), 1 April 2010

Participants:

Sir Muir Russell (MR)

Professor Jim Norton (JN)

Professor Peter Clarke (PC)

Professor Geoffrey Boulton (GB)

Mr David Eyton (DE)

Mr Mike Granatt (MG)

Mr David Walker (DW)

Mr William Hardie (WH)

Science and Technology Committee Report

The Review would prepare a response to the Science and Technology Committee's Report **Action MG/MR**

The Review noted the recommendation from the Science and Technology Committee that Review interviews should be carried out in public wherever possible. The Review's agreed process of fact finding is that interviews will be written up and will form part of the record.

The Scientific Appraisal Panel

The Review noted the recommendation of the Science and Technology Committee that the Review and Lord Oxburgh's Scientific Appraisal Panel (SAP) should map their activities to ensure that there are no unmanaged overlaps. The Review agreed to follow this up by writing to Lord Oxburgh. **Action MR**

The Peer Review Process

The group agreed that it is important that it receives authoritative comment on the standards of the peer review process and an insight into the tests that ought to be applied. **Action MR**

Data Mining

The Review noted the actions being taken as regards searching the entire CRU back-up server record. **Action JN**

FOIA

The Review noted the points made by the Science and Technology Select Committee with respect to FOIA. The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) is the statutory regulator for FOIA and the Review will maintain contact with the ICO. **Action JN/PC**

Review of IPCC Processes and Procedures

The Review would ensure that it is fully aware of the independent review into IPCC's processes and procedures. **Action WH**

Draft Report Outline

The Review members considered a possible layout for the report and were invited to make comments. The draft report outline would be re-circulated in light of the comments received. **Action DW**

Continuing analysis of the submissions was enabling the matters identified in the initial issues paper to be focused more sharply, while it was clear that the essential questions for examination had not changed. This process would continue. **Action PC/GB**

Members should draft contributions to report chapters by the next meeting. **Action All**