Confirmed Note of Actions from CRU Review Group Meeting (Teleconference), 22 April 2010

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

Media Update

KM provided the Review Team with a media update. She would continue to track media developments in relation to the publication of the report from Lord Oxburgh’s Scientific Assessment Panel. Action KM

FOIA

The Review Team noted the recent decision by the ICO in relation to the release of tree ring data from Queen’s University Belfast.

Submissions

WH updated the group on the latest upload of submissions to the Review website. The Review noted that WH has been in contact with a small number of those who have submitted evidence regarding publication of their submissions. Submissions would continue to be uploaded to the Review website as soon as is practicable. Action WH, KM

Data Mining
It was noted that the UEA has agreed to the proposal that they should make contact with a trusted, independent, forensic analyst, to take this work forward. The Review Team agreed to facilitate the initial contacts. **Action JN**

**Peer Review**

The Review Team noted that MR and DW have met with Richard Horton, chief editor of The Lancet, who has agreed to produce a draft paper on peer review in the context of the issues being considered by the Review. Elizabeth Wager, chairperson of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), has also been approached with a view to contributing to the paper on peer review in her personal capacity.

**Review of IPCC Processes and Procedures**

The Review Team emphasised that it had not been commissioned to examine the IPCC’s processes. As part of its remit, the Review is reviewing the CRU’s policies and practices for acquiring, assembling, subjecting to peer review and disseminating data and research findings, and their compliance or otherwise with best scientific practice. The Review recognised that a separate independent review of the IPCC’s processes and procedures is being conducted by the InterAcademy Council.

**Report Content and Layout**

DW agreed to produce guidelines on report format which would be circulated to the Review members. **Action DW.** The Review would give further consideration to the processes for report handling and editing. **Action MR, DW, WH**

**Principles of Evidence**

The Review Team considered principles of evidence in relation to the Review process.

**Date of Next Meeting**

The Review Team discussed the arrangements for the next meeting which would be held on 28 April.