

Sir Muir Russell
C/O Judicial Appointments for Scotland
38-39 Drumsheugh Gardens
EDINBURGH
EH3 7SW

Professor Trevor Davies
Pro-Vice-Chancellor – Research,
Enterprise & Engagement
The Vice-Chancellor's Office

University of East Anglia
Norwich
NR4 7TJ
England

Email: t.d.davies@uea.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 1603 592735
Fax: +44 (0) 1603 507753
www.uea.ac.uk

27 May, 2010

Dear Sir Muir,

This letter is related to the draft document recording interviews held at UEA on 9 April 2010 and received on 18 May 2010. We are about to send you colleagues' comments. You will see that they are quite lengthy which is why we could not respond immediately.

I have had a number of exchanges with colleagues who have asked me to point out that they do not believe that the document received on 18 May represents a fair record of the proceedings on 9 April. They feel that detailed answers that were given to the many questions are not recorded. No record is provided of Professor Briffa's response to questions on his role as a journal Editor or of the documentation provided in support of his response that resolved the issue. In his introduction to the meeting, Professor Boulton distinguished between the need to assess CRU reactions to allegations submitted to your Review Team as distinct from "as revealed by the improperly released emails". However, the Review Team members did not identify or raise issues revealed by specific emails, focussing only on the issues as defined by the submitted allegations. The impression my colleagues gained from the draft document is that it consists mainly of a series of repeated allegations as submitted to the Review Team by a small number of individuals. Most importantly, they feel, is that no acknowledgement is made of any details of the contrary arguments and rebuttals that they had previously made to many allegations in the relevant sections of previous submissions to the Review, first on 1st March and later on the 20th April and the 7th May, including pertinent discussion on April 9. They are keen to point

out that most of the allegations repeated here had been made prior to the release of CRU emails. Many relate to issues of science or opinion and are not germane to the content of CRU emails.


This does raise concern in my mind over the difficulty of making factual corrections to the draft minutes as presented since they are structured in a way that does not reflect the order of questioning and they raise new issues (that of McKittrick's article) that were not discussed on April 9. The same issues (allegations) are repeated in various sections of the draft. Sections 3 and 4 and parts of 5 overlap to a degree.

Acutely aware of the time constraint under which the Review Team are working, and wishing to be as helpful as possible in this regard, we considered that the best option at this time was to return a version of the minutes in which colleagues have combined suggested corrections to the original text with new sections of text recording the responses to specific allegations, mostly concerned with the tree-ring issues and which provide a record of our responses that has not yet been recorded. Other sections of text describe initial responses to the invitation in the draft minutes to comment further on the submissions to the Review Team. For other sections of the draft minutes remarks are provided for the Review Team to consider in re-working the document.

One particular concern is that, at the original meeting, Professor Briffa indicated that he intended to produce a detailed point-by-point response to McIntyre's submission. Professor Briffa was informed by the Review Team that this was not required for this Review. Now the draft minutes include an invitation to respond to 'any other matters contained' in McIntyre's submission. My colleagues do not believe there is adequate time now to provide the detail of response that is necessary to support their contention that McIntyre's submission is without merit and represents a misleading account of various issues – particularly the validity of his "updated Polar Urals" series. By not providing the additional comment at this time, CRU researchers do not imply acquiescence to any of his allegations.

I am sensitive to the fact that the document we are returning to you, with its combination of suggested edits, additional text and supplementary comments, is not a near-final record. However, we thought this was the most constructive form of response at this time. I shall be very grateful if CRU colleagues have the opportunity to review the revised version.

Yours sincerely,



Trevor Davies