

**Acton Edward Prof (VCO)**

---

**From:** ALASTAIRMUIR RUSSELL [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 April 2010 17:26  
**To:** Oxburgh@parliament.uk  
**Cc:** Acton Edward Prof (VCO)  
**Subject:** Climate science

*[Information exempted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act]*

Dear Lord Oxburgh.

**Climate Change E-mails Review**

As you know, I chair the Climate Change E-mails Review (CCER) established by the Vice-chancellor of the University of East Anglia.

Details of the remit, the Review Team and how we are going about the task are on the Review website at <http://www.cce-review.org/> What we have been asked to do is separate from, and independent from, the work of the CRU Scientific Assessment Panel that has now been established under your chairmanship.

Reference was made by the Vice-chancellor in the recent hearing by the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology to his intention to establish the Panel, and you will have seen the relevant section of the Select Committee's Report, which states in paragraph 134:

"The process of two reviews or inquiries is underway. In our view there is the potential for overlap between the two inquiries—for example, the question of the operation of peer review needs to examine both methodology and quality of the science subject to review. The two reviews or inquiries need to map their activities to ensure that there are no unmanaged overlaps or gaps. If there are, the whole process could be undermined."

My purpose in sending you this message is to advise you of this background with a view to avoiding overlaps, or indeed gaps. If the two reviews have overlapping remits or objectives, similar conclusions in the areas of overlap could be interpreted as evidence of collusion and differing conclusions as evidence of confusion, both to the detriment of UK science. It is an outcome we are anxious to avoid by ensuring that our two sets of objectives are clearly distinct.

As you will see from the CCER remit, we are looking at whether there is evidence of the manipulation or suppression of data *which is at odds with acceptable scientific practice and may therefore call into question any of the research outcomes*; as well as reviewing 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 italics are mine. The CCER Team is concerned that these are potential areas of overlap. And of course others may emerge as your Panel and the CCER Team address their respective tasks.

Just as an example of the sort of overlaps there might be, addressing allegations in respect of various corrections to data described in papers must by its nature straddle the border of scientific good practice and effect on the scientific conclusions.

Our website contains a number of the submissions we have received, and more will be uploaded shortly. As you will see, these contain a lot of material relevant to the passages I have highlighted, and the CCER Team will be reviewing them carefully. It is too soon to say what conclusions we may reach, or when we will do so, but we will not be able to report before the end of May at the earliest, so questions will clearly remain over the matters highlighted above at least until then.

I and the rest of the CCER Team felt it was important to draw this information to your attention both because of what we believe is its intrinsic relevance to the work of your Panel and the timescale on which that proceeds; and because of the recommendation of the Select Committee.

I look forward to hearing from you. If you wish, I would be happy for us to meet to resolve any issues, or at least to agree a process for resolution, including for example liaison between the secretariats to ensure that mutually salient evidence and findings are shared.

I am copying this to the Vice-chancellor.

Best wishes

Sir Muir Russell