

## Confirmed Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting, 13 April 2010

### Participants:

Sir Muir Russell (MR)

Professor Jim Norton (JN)

Professor Peter Clarke (PC)

Professor Geoffrey Boulton (GB)

Mr David Walker (DW)

Ms Kate Moffat (KM)

Mr William Hardie (WH)

Mr David Eyton (DE) (participated by audio call)

Mr Mike Granatt (MG) (participated by audio call)

### *Minutes of 20 March meeting and 1 April conference call*

Subject to final comments from the Review Team, the notes of the 20 March and 1 April meetings were agreed. They should be published on the Review website. **Action WH, KM**

### *Media Update*

KM updated the Review Team on recent media and press related issues.

A short statement from the Review should be prepared for media purposes once the Oxburgh Science Assessment Panel has reported its findings. **Action MG, KM**

### *Uploading submissions*

KM and WH advised that the second tranche of submissions would be uploaded to the Review website. The Review would continue to publish submissions and correspondence on the website as quickly as possible. **Action WH, KM**

As the Review has received and considered an extensive range of submissions, and is currently working towards its conclusions, it should be noted on the website that the Review does not intend to accept any further submissions. **Action KM**

#### *Peer Review*

The Review has approached Richard Horton, chief editor of The Lancet, as an experienced editor to provide information on peer review in the context of the issues being considered by the Review. The Review Team also agreed to seek input from the chairperson of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). **Action MR, DW**

#### *Data Mining*

In relation to its remit the Review agreed, based on negotiation with the Police for selective access to material held on the CRU server, and the employment by the UEA of a trusted, independent, forensic analyst, to prepare a proposal in terms of which the UEA would seek to determine whether there is more information from the compromised CRU server that might still come into the public domain and which would be of relevance to the Review.

**Action JN, MR**

#### *Report Layout*

The Review considered the skeleton report layout with a chapter-by-chapter discussion. It was agreed that a thematic approach should be taken in the organisation of report chapters. In light of the discussion, a revised report layout should be prepared and circulated in advance of the next meeting. **Action DW**

#### *Timetable for future Review meetings and audio calls*

The Review Team discussed the scheduling of future meetings. It was agreed that meeting dates should be confirmed as soon as possible. **Action WH**

