

Confirmed Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting, 20 March 2010

Participants:

Sir Muir Russell (MR)
Professor Jim Norton (JN)
Professor Peter Clarke (PC)
Professor Geoffrey Boulton (GB)
Mr David Eyton (DE)
Mr David Walker (DW)
Ms Kate Moffat (KM)
Mr William Hardie (WH)

Minutes of the Last meeting

Subject to final comment from MR, the note of the 25 February meeting was agreed. It should be published on the Review website. **Action WH, KM**

Work-in-progress

DE presented an analysis (to be published on completion of the Review) of the emails which were the subject of unauthorized release from the UEA.

GB gave an oral presentation on the submissions received in relation to the remit and issues identified by the Review. It was agreed that a further meeting should involve PC and GB meeting with Professor Keith Briffa and Professor Phil Jones in order that they respond to the further issues identified by the Review team. **Action PC, GB**

PC gave a presentation (to be published on completion of the Review) on the CRUTEM data set, data handling issues and the reproducibility of research.

It was agreed that members from the Review should arrange meetings at the UEA to examine the management, governance, security structures for the CRU, the UEA's policies and controls on quality, standards, processes and procedures, and the associated financial disciplines. **Action MR, DE**

It was agreed that the Review should contact the police investigation to seek access to the CRU full back-up server data and emails. **Action JN**

JN informed the group that he is to meet with representatives from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). As the ICO is the statutory regulator for FOIA, the Review would ensure that there are open lines of communication and coordination between it and the ICO investigation.

The Review agreed that some members should meet with representatives from the UEA to examine FOI/EIR, data protection, IT systems and security issues. **Action MR, JN**

Project Management

The Review discussed the scope and layout of the final report, the work plan and whether any third party work would be required. The Review agreed to produce a draft report outline for discussion at the next meeting. **Action DW**

Peer Review

The Review agreed that the issue of peer review is a very important consideration. The Review agreed to commission work from the editor of a leading peer review journal. **Action MR**

Publication

The Review considered whether it should convey its conclusions to the UEA in advance of publication. As the Review was commissioned by the University to report on policies and practices within the University, should the Review find matters of immediate and pressing concern, then it clearly has a duty to inform the University. Natural justice demands that both the UEA and members of CRU should be told of any critical findings which are to be leveled at them, and be given the opportunity to answer.

Submissions and the Website

The Review's stated intention is to publish all submissions unless there are legal constraints such as defamation or copyright, or the submission is abusive. In these cases, the Review will seek the author's permission to list their contact details so that others may obtain a copy of the submission directly. Otherwise, submissions should be published on the Review website as soon as possible. **Action WH, KM**

Focusing the Issues

In light of the discussion, the Review is focussing the issues. **Action PC, GB**

Date of Next Meeting

The next face-to-face meeting of the Review Group would take place on Tuesday 13 April. The agenda would be circulated in due course. **Action MR, WH, DW**