From: REDACTED REDACTED

To: PS Gregory Barker (DECC)

Cc: PS Chris Huhne, PS Charles Hendry (DECC), PS

Jonathan Marland (DECC), Perm Sec (DECC), DECC Chief Science Advisor, REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED, Cavendish Will (International Energy and Technology), Meah Nafees (DECC), Hosker

Edmund (CPS), Wynnowen Phil (National Climate Change), REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED

REDACTED

**Sent:** 02/07/2010 at 19:30 **Received:** 02/07/2010 at 19:30

**Subject:** Submission - Muir Russell Review on climate science

Attachments: Muir Russell submission 2 July 2010.doc (51 KB)

Annex A - Climate science confidence.docx (32 KB)

## REDACTED,

Please find attached (for Monday's box) a submission on the upcoming Muir Russell review, due for release on Wednesday - with appendix covering broader themes of public confidence in climate science.

We expect to see a copy of the Muir Russell review on Wednesday and will submit final lines to take at that point.

Kind regards, <> <>

REDACTED

REDACTED

Climate Science, Observations and International Department of Energy and Climate Change Area 6E, 3 Whitehall Place, London SW1A 2HD

t: REDACTED REDACTED m: REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED Climate Science REDACTED 26 May 2010

To: GREGORY BARKER

## **MUIR RUSSELL REVIEW**

Inquiry reporting into science controversy at the University of East Anglia

#### ISSUE

1. Release on Wednesday 7 July 2010 of review into allegations of misconduct in UK climate science.

#### **TIMING**

2. Routine

#### RECOMMENDATION

3. To note the upcoming review, approve the proposed handling response and note the wider work undertaken in communicating climate science (Annex A).

# **RATIONALE**

## **Background**

- 4. In November 2009, a server at UEA was hacked, releasing emails between climate scientists. The emails described the scientists' work using phrases including 'trick' and 'hiding the decline', which were taken to suggest the scientists had manipulated data trends. On 3 December 2009, UEA announced that Sir Muir Russell would head an Independent Review into allegations made.
- 5. Two inquiries have already reported into these events. Lord Oxburgh chaired an external reappraisal of the Climate Research Unit's key science publications, which reported in April. A Parliamentary Science and Technology Select Committee Inquiry reported in March. Both confirmed there was no evidence of deliberate scientific malpractice or impropriety at CRU and that core climate change evidence is not changed by events. However, both reviews criticised UEA's response to Freedom of Information requests and highlighted a reluctance of scientists at CRU to make raw data available publically especially to those they suspected were sceptical of human-induced climate change.
- 6. A fuller description of how these events may have influenced public confidence in climate science, and action to address confidence in this area, are provided in Annex A. Further briefing on this topic can be provided if desired.

## **Options/argument**

7. The Muir Russell review was carried out independently of Government, and we do not expect to receive a copy of the report far in advance of its public release.

- Once we have received the review, we will finalise the formal Government response to the Select Committee report.
- 8. The findings of the Muir Russell review are likely to be of broader relevance to the Government Office of Science (GO-Science), which leads on issues of data transparency in science and the Ministry of Justice, due to links with Freedom of Information law. Officials from these departments are inputting to the Select Committee response.

## HANDLING/PRESENTATION

- 9. REDACTED REDACTED.
- 10. REDACTED REDACTED.

## Lines to take

Up-to-date lines (written by Press Office and CESA) will be issued across Departments once we have seen the report. You will be provided with these for comment. The lines are likely to be as follows:

- We welcome the fact that Muir Russell has reported, and the commitment by UEA and the wider scientific community to improve transparency in climate science.
- We note that after three reviews, there is no evidence of scientific malpractice at the University, and the evidence of 20<sup>th</sup> century warming remains strong.
- As with reports of errors in the IPCC 4<sup>th</sup> Assessment report, we also note that nothing whatsoever has been found to undermine the underlying scientific evidence for human-induced climate change.
- The fact remains that our dependency on fossil fuels poses a dual threat: the potential impacts of climate change, and to the UK's energy security. The Government is focussed on tackling this through the move to a low-carbon economy.
- [If asked: We will also shortly give a formal Government response to the Commons Science and Technology Committee's report on these issues.]

cc:

All Ministers
Special Advisers
Permanent Secretary
All DGs
REDACTED REDACTED
Nafees Meah
REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED

## **CONFIDENCE IN CLIMATE SCIENCE**

## What's the problem?

## Polling data

Following climate science controversies at University of East Anglia and within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a drop in confidence in climate science has been tracked in multiple polls:

- Populus showed a drop in those believing climate change is **taking place** (from 84% in November 2009 to 75% in February 2010).
- DECC's tracking shows those believing climate change is 'mainly or entirely due to **human activities**' was 74% in October, 71% in December and 69% in March. Populus found fewer people now judge this is established scientific fact (50% in November; 34% in February) and more that it is widespread theory but not conclusively proven (39% in November; 50% in February). 1
- In May 2010, You Gov showed a small increase in those thinking climate change is 'scaremongering' (from 4% in 2007 to 7% in 2010), but a greater increase in those thinking that 'scientists are divided on the issue' (from 25% in 2007 to 33% in 2010).
- When asked, people broadly claim not to have changed opinion in response
  to these events: 73% of people who had seen stories questioning climate
  science said they had not changed their views as a result; 11% claim to be
  less convinced of the risks of climate change, but 16% claim they are more
  convinced of the risks as a result.

These short-term findings were echoed in a recent major survey by UK social scientists (Pidgeon et al). However, in presenting their results, the researchers were keen to stress the limited impact of media coverage on people's perceptions — with people already doubtful of climate science likely to interpret events in a negative light, but those confident in the science likely to interpret these events as media hype. This indicates we should not over-state the seriousness of short term trends.

#### **Analysis**

Shaky confidence in climate science is not new. Polls have long shown that the UK public is split into three broad segments:

- The broadly convinced and concerned around 40%
- The unengaged and uncertain around 40%
- The unconvinced around 20%.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Populus poll for Times (November 2009) and BBC (February 2010) – the second figures are proportions of those who DO accept climate change is happening (83% in Nov; 75% in Feb)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ipsos MORI, *Turning Point or Tipping Point*, 2007

Polls show these groups are fluid, with short-term shifts in conviction in response to:

- Short-term weather trends (recent cold winter)
- Political action (or perceived lack of action after Copenhagen).

Broadly, analysis finds those 'highly convinced' and those least convinced/most sceptical both tend to judge themselves as very confident in their own knowledge and least likely to change their opinion. Those in the middle ('the uncertain') judge themselves as most open to new information.<sup>3</sup> However, even those who are convinced in the science of climate change, don't prioritise climate change personally – externalising it as a problem for other people, in other places, and primarily for the future.<sup>4</sup> Confidence in climate science will not alone tackle these barriers. However, 'anti-climate-science' narratives provide a convenient excuse and barrier to those seeking not to engage.

#### REDACTED REDACTED

#### REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:

- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED -REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED .
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

#### REDACTED REDACTED - REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:

• REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED - REDACTED REDACTED.

- REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

REDACTED REDACTED

<sup>4</sup> Ipsos MORI, 2007

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See e.g. Six Americas (Yale) for an analysis, although these themes are also echoed in UK studies

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

#### REDACTED REDACTED - REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED RE

### REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:

- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED (REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED).
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED (REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED).
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
   (REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED)
   REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
   REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED — REDACTED (REDACTED) REDACTED (REDACTED REDACTED).

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:

- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED (REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED).
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

## REDACTED REDACTED: REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Scientists 64% trusted to 'tell the truth', cf civil servants 45% trusted and politicians 19% trusted – MORI 2002

REDACTED RED

REDACTED REDACTED:

- REDACTED REDACTED
- REDACTED REDACTED
- REDACTED

#### 'REDACTED REDACTED': REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED.

#### REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:

- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED;
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED;
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED;
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
   REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED:
- REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.

REDACTED REDACTED

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 81% fairly or very concerned that in the future, the UK will become too dependent on importing energy

# REDACTED REDACTED: REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED			
REDACTED REDACTED.								

# REDACTED: REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED				
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED.									