

From: ALASTAIRMUIR RUSSELL [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 11:17 AM
To: Davies Trevor Prof (ENV)
Cc: Williams Lisa Ms (VCO)
Subject: Note of 9 April Meeting

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

Dear Trevor

I am replying to your letter of 27th May after having consulted with my colleagues Professors Boulton and Clarke, who interviewed the CRU team on 9th April.

They believe that the notes that they made during the meeting did identify the substantive issues that were of concern to them, although they were unable to incorporate all the detail that was offered orally. Their notes do not entirely follow the chronological sequence of discussion, but bring together cognate material from different parts of the discussion. Further they indicated at the meeting that they were already fully aware of the arguments of some submissions and have not therefore repeated them in the notes (i.e. the Tornetrask adjustments and the use of the KHAD series in isolation).

The CRU group were asked to “verify that this is a correct record of our meeting and to correct the record where they believe it not to be. If they wish to make further comments, please send these separately, rather than attempting to amend this record.” We accept some of the factual corrections that they make, although notes taken at the time disagree strongly with the UEA participants recollections on at least two issues. I am afraid that we cannot therefore accept their wholesale re-writing of the minutes, but will regard our note not as a minute, but as our summary of salient issues raised at the meeting. I will send a copy to you out of courtesy.

As Professors Boulton and Clarke had invited the CRU group to provide any further clarification and additional information separately, we would accept most of the additional information you have supplied as a response to this invitation. You may wish to resubmit this in the form requested after we have sent you our amended summary, although the time for this is now very short. We would need to have it before the end of next week. It would be published in due course on the Review website.

McKittrick’s article is covered by the statement at the head of the minute that “we have a number of follow-up questions to put”. These were requests for information and response that arose from the discussion during the meeting. The article was felt to be a useful articulation of some of the allegations made against CRU. They are perfectly at liberty not to respond to this if they so wish.

In relation to your comment that Professors Boulton and Clarke focused the discussion on allegations made against CRU rather than matters “as revealed by the improperly released emails”, you will recall that the Review decided to invite submissions on issues covered by the remit and reflected in the emails. It is not therefore primarily an analysis of emails, important though they are, but of issues that

are believed to be reflected in the emails. Moreover it is entirely proper for the Panel to ask any questions that it believes are relevant to its investigation of allegations made against CRU.

We recognise that the relatively short time-frame for the review places considerable demands on the staff of CRU, just as it does on the members of the Review team, but it is in everyone's interest that the issues are confronted as bluntly and directly as possible.

Yours sincerely

Muir Russell