

**Confirmed Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting (Teleconference), 25  
February 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)  
Ms Kate Moffat (KM)  
Mr William Hardie (WH)

The note of the 4 February Review Group meeting was agreed. **KM and WH** to prepare it for upload to Review website.

*Reaction to the Launch*

The Review Group acknowledged the considerable media interest in the launch and aftermath. Recognising that the Science Media Centre (SMC) made no charge for its services, the Review Group agreed to make a donation of £1,500 to the SMC in recognition of the help and support provided.

**Action - WH**

*Current Media Issues*

It was noted that a number of blogs referred to a CV of Professor Boulton stating that he had contributed submissions to the IPCC. The Review Group was advised that this was not the case, and the FAQs and other material would reflect this. **Action – MG/KM**

It was agreed that what Members had said at the Launch should be carried on the website. David, who had not been present, agreed to provide a short statement. He would confirm that, although BP had helped fund the set-up of the CRU in 1971, the UEA/CRU had not received any funding from BP in recent years (as far back as UEA current records go - 1990s). **Action – MG/KM**

### *Replacement of Dr Philip Campbell*

The Review Group agreed that it was important to co-opt someone who was well versed in the peer review process but was not part of the community under Review. **Action: MR**

### *Handling correspondence/submissions and website publication*

The Review Group agreed to publish submissions relevant to the remit on the Review website as soon as practicable. If any of those who had submitted evidence had indicated that they would not want their submission to be made public, they would be asked to reconsider, as the policy of the Review Group, as set out on the website, was to publish all submissions and correspondence.

The Review Group agreed that the CRU submission, once received, should also be published on the Review website as soon as practicable.

The Review Group agreed to consider whether, in the light of the external input received, there were other issues which should be addressed by the issues paper.

### *Work on data and publications*

It would be necessary to obtain from UEA PDFs and electronic links to CRU publications. **Action - WH**

The Review Group discussed the paper on how work on the issues might be stratified. It was agreed that a revised paper should set out the immediate actions in analyzing the evidence relevant to the remit of the Review. Actions by members of the Review Group in relation to the issues set out by the Review would be discussed at the 20 March Review Group meeting. **Action: GB, PC, JN**

### *Visit to meet with people from the CRU*

It was noted that **JN** and **PC** were meeting with Professor Philip Jones and Dr Tim Osborn at the UEA on Thursday 4 March to consolidate their understanding of the production of the CRUTEM data sets.

*Science and Technology Select Committee Oral Evidence Session, 1 March: lines of questioning*

Possible lines of questioning prior to the Science and Technology Committee oral evidence session were considered. **Action: MR, MG**

*Coordination with other investigations*

The Review needed to clarify with ICO how its investigation into whether UEA correctly applied FOIA/EIR exemptions related to the Review's own terms of reference. **Action: JN**

*Project Management*

**MR** updated the Review Group that he was in the process of making enquiries regarding the procurement of the services of a project manager.

*Full day meeting of the Review Group*

It was noted that the Review Group would meet in Edinburgh on Saturday 20 March. The meeting was scheduled to start at 9 a.m. and finish at 6 p.m. The agenda would be circulated in due course.

**Action MR, WH**

**WH** agreed to canvass the group on their availability to attend a subsequent full day Review Group meeting in April.