

## **Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting (Teleconference), 4 February 2010**

### Participants:

Sir Muir Russell

Professor Jim Norton

Professor Peter Clarke

Professor Geoffrey Boulton

Mr David Eyton

Dr Philip Campbell

Mr Mike Granatt

Ms Kate Moffat

Mr William Hardie

### *Updates*

It was agreed that when the Review was launched there was a need to ensure that the University of East Anglia (UEA) press office had access to the same briefing material as the Review Group.

**Kate** agreed to provide members of the Review Group with internet links to the major press coverage related to the Review. She added that the UEA press office was content to share their press cuttings with the Review Group. **Kate** to maximise utility and minimise duplication of material provided.

### *Our approach*

**Muir and Mike** agreed to draft a synthesis of Geoffrey's, Peter's and Jim's papers, in order to formulate and set out the issues to be explored by the Review Group. The draft would be circulated to Review Group members for comment. It would be important to ensure that all the points in the remit were reflected in the synthesis paper. The Review Group also wanted to ensure that there was opportunity to ask CRU 'why' certain things were done, not simply 'what' they did.

Essentially, the new paper would represent a clear statement of the issues which would be put to the CRU to address. At the same time, the statement would be made public and published on the Review Group's website and members of the public would have the opportunity to comment whether there were other issues relevant to the remit of the Review.

It was recognised that the questions were to be answered with respect to the standards and practices of the day. It should be borne in mind that this would require a degree of peer-review for validation purposes.

In terms of statistical matters the Group was concerned about crossing the line and being drawn into analysis of the statistics and entire data sets which have been applied incrementally and over a long timeframe. However, it was recognised that the recommendations of the Review Group could present opportunities for others to examine the application of statistical methods and analysis.

**David** agreed to find out more about the Penn State investigation and the examination of the American Physical Society (APS) 2007 statement on climate change. The Review Group could point to the work which was being undertaken.

#### *Data issues*

**Jim** agreed to generate a question around the issue of data processes, organisation and preservation of data. It was noted that it had historically been difficult to secure funding for the curation of data.

Peter Clarke had summarised his first impressions of the CRUTEM (and HadCRUT) datasets, focussed on the information which was in the public domain and what could be replicated and verified from the information. **Peter** agreed to continue his work, examine other sources and papers identified and try to form the basis of a question to be put to the CRU.

It was noted that Peter Clarke knew Professor S. Tett, who was one of the contributors to one of the dataset sources he had looked at.

#### *Workplan*

**Muir** agreed to re-work the current workplan in order that it outlined what would be done and by whom, in the context that the Review Group intended to have conclusions by the Spring of 2010.

**Muir** would prepare a short memorandum, based on the modified work plan, which would be submitted to the UK Parliament Science and Technology Committee Inquiry into the CRU, setting out what the Review Group would be doing. The deadline of **Wednesday 10 February** was noted.

The Review Group suggested that it would be useful to have the input of a project manager to ensure that actions and schedules included in a revised work plan were fulfilled. **Mike** said he would try to identify a suitable individual.

#### *Launch Arrangements*

It was agreed that the launch should take place at the **Science Media Centre (SMC) on Thursday 11 February 2010 (a.m.)**. Those who would attend: **Muir Russell, Philip Campbell, Peter Clarke, Jim Norton and Geoffrey Boulton**. Although David Eyton was unavailable to attend he said he would ensure that a representative of BP's press office was present and enquiries about BP's involvement should be filtered through its press office.

**All Review members** should produce biographies of 300 words and send to **Kate**. It was noted that Geoffrey had worked at the UEA in the past and this would be made clear at the launch.

**Mike and Kate** agreed to confirm the launch date with the SMC and expand upon the possible lines of questioning which the Review Group could face.

**William** to draft a short publication scheme encompassing issues related to FOI/ publication of submissions. It was clear that there was a need for clear criteria in the publication scheme. The Review Group agreed that it would operate as openly and transparently as possible. It was establishing a website which would eventually display all of the submissions received, correspondence, analyses and conclusions. The aim would be to publish all submissions received quickly, unless there were wholly exceptional reasons to delay, for example legal issues.

**Muir** agreed to approach the ICO in order to clarify where the Review stood with respect to FOI.

#### *Website*

The term 'submissions' rather than 'evidence' should be used. There should also be a section termed 'correspondence' which could incorporate more general material received e.g. the letter from Lord Lawson and Review Group responses to such matters. The intention was to upload a transcript and MP3 recording of the launch to the website. **Mike** agreed to investigate the structure of the website further, including the 'search' facility.

**William, Kate and Jim** agreed to speak about how submissions and correspondence to the Review should be filtered. A protocol for this should be prepared.