
From: REDACTED REDACTED
To: REDACTED REDACTED, [DECC Press Office Operational](#), [PS Chris Huhne](#), [PS DECC SPADS](#), [PS Gregory Barker \(DECC\)](#), [PS Jonathan Marland \(DECC\)](#), [PS Charles Hendry \(DECC\)](#), [Perm Sec \(DECC\)](#), [DECC Chief Science Advisor](#)
Cc:
Sent: 07/07/2010 at 13:32
Received: 07/07/2010 at 13:32
Subject: RE: Top line response to Muir Russell report, published 1pm today, Weds 7 June

Attachments: [Muir Russell Review briefing v1 final.docx \(16 KB\)](#)

Dear all

Please find attached an initial briefing with top level lines to take and a few defensive Q&A for immediate media responses - we will follow this with a more in-depth briefing later this afternoon.

Kind regards,

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED

DECC Climate Science, Observations and International

t: REDACTED REDACTED
m: REDACTED REDACTED

From: REDACTED REDACTED
Sent: 07 July 2010 12:16
To: DECC Press Office Operational; PS Chris Huhne; PS DECC SPADS; PS Gregory Barker (DECC); PS Jonathan Marland (DECC); PS Charles Hendry (DECC); Perm Sec (DECC); DECC Chief Science Advisor; REDACTED REDACTED
Subject: Top line response to Muir Russell report, published 1pm today, Weds 7 June

Line to take

- We welcome the fact that Muir Russell has reported - following publication of the report today, Wednesday 7 June, we look forward to reviewing its detailed findings and recommendations in more detail.
- We note that after three reviews, there is no evidence of scientific malpractice at the University of East Anglia, and the evidence of 20th century warming remains strong.
- We welcome Muir Russell finding that 'their rigour and honesty as scientists are not in doubt' and that the Inquiry 'not find any evidence of behaviour that might undermine the conclusions of the IPCC assessments.

- We also welcome recommendations about the need for scientists to be open and transparent about their work - including communicating uncertainties clearly.
- As with reports of errors in the IPCC 4th Assessment report, **we 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.]

Embargoed Press Association copy (embargoed until 1300hrs 7 July 2010)

EMBARGOED PA - CLIMATEGATE SCIENTISTS' HONESTY NOT IN DOUBT, SAYS REVIEW

This story is embargoed HHH ENVIRONMENT ClimateTopic ENVIRONMENT Published 07 Jul 2010 - 11:34 By Emily Beament, Press Association Environment Correspondent Embargoed to 1300 Wednesday July 7

Page 1: 11:34

The "rigour and honesty" of the scientists at the centre of a row over climate research, sparked when hundreds of emails were stolen from a world-renowned research centre, is not in doubt, an independent review said today.

But the review into the "climategate" affair, led by Sir Muir Russell, found the scientists at the University of East Anglia's climatic research unit (CRU) had not been sufficiently open about their studies.

The row was sparked when 13 years of emails were hacked from the server at the university and posted online, where they were seized upon by climate change sceptics who claimed they showed scientists manipulating and suppressing data to back up a theory of man-made climate change.

The review also found that a graph referred to in a now infamous email from the centre's head, Professor Phil Jones, in which he described a "trick" to "hide the decline" in data on temperatures, was "misleading" because it did not make plain what the scientists had done.

The graph which showed global temperature rises, and which was used in a report published in 1999 by the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), did not show temperature data from tree-rings once they diverged from actual measurements in the 1960s, falling while real temperatures rose.

The review said it was not misleading to omit part of the tree ring temperature series but the process should have been made plain in the graph, caption or text.

The investigation cleared the researchers of other allegations levelled at the CRU by

sceptics, including the suggestion the emails showed researchers were subverting the scientific peer review process to ensure papers they disagreed with were not published.

The scientists did not misuse the process by which the key international body on climate change prepares its reports on the impacts of global warming for governments, the review found.

But Sir Muir's inquiry found there was "unhelpfulness" in CRU's response to Freedom of Information requests, and evidence that emails might have been deleted to make them unavailable for any subsequent request.

The CRU was "unhelpful and defensive" in response to reasonable requests for information about the weather stations used to gather the temperature records.

But the review found that raw data frequently requested by sceptics from which global land temperatures were calculated was directly available from other sources, and the "code" to make the calculations, which they have also demanded was published, could be worked out independently.

mfl

REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED
Department of Energy and Climate Change
Area 5A, 3 Whitehall Place, London SW1A 2HD
Tel. REDACTED
Mob. REDACTED
www.decc.gov.uk
www.youtube.com/deccgovuk
www.flickr.com/deccgovuk

Muir Russell Review

Briefing v.1 (top level for immediate news – more to follow)

Lines to take:

- Following publication of this report today, Wednesday 7 July 2010, we look forward to reviewing its detailed findings and recommendations in more detail.
- Note a huge number of findings supporting CRU's work:
 - That the rigour and honesty of the scientists are not in doubt
 - That there is no evidence of behaviour that might undermine the IPCC assessments
 - That there is no evidence of bias in data selection
 - That there is no evidence of subversion of peer-review
 - That allegations of misusing the IPCC process cannot be upheld
- We note that after three separate reviews, there is no evidence of scientific malpractice at the University, and the evidence of 20th century warming remains strong.
- As with reports of errors in the IPCC 4th 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.

Defensive Q&A

The review found that a graph based on CRU data and used in a World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) report was misleading.

This is not a criticism of the science, but of how the science was communicated. The review found that the underlying science behind this graph cannot be faulted – but that the methods used should have been made more explicit when the graph was used on the front cover of a WMO report. The review team noted those qualifications were contained in the body of the report, but they considered these should have been made clearer up front.

Evidence of deleting emails?

The review did not find evidence that emails were deleted after an FOI request for those emails had been made (this is illegal under FOI law). Instead, the Inquiry found suggestions that scientists had deleted emails, not wishing them to be disclosed in future FOI requests. Clearly, it is important that scientists are open about the data that their conclusions depend on, and the review makes recommendations for how the University can learn from these events and move on. We support that.

Whitewash?

The team got direct access to all the data CRU had used to construct temperature analysis – and analysed it for themselves. They went to the heart of the issue. They could have read all

emails and delayed findings by six months, but agreed to focus on key issues and get findings out sooner. We welcome this.

Other issues that could be raised

Challenging science and role of blogosphere

The report finds that there is no evidence that CRU scientists did their work by setting out looking for a particular answer, and selecting data appropriately. It would be interesting to ask whether the critics of CRU could say the same thing – the report notes that ‘much of the challenge of CRU’s work has not always followed the conventional scientific method of checking and seeking to falsify conclusions or offering alternative hypothesis’.

When launching the report, Professor Geoffrey Boulton noted that science works by challenge AND proposing new hypotheses – the blogosphere has very helpfully provided the first. Scientists can now usefully consider how to work with the blogosphere on the second – channelling challenge into something fruitful and constructive.

Background

Review team is:

- Sir Muir Russell
- Professor Geoffrey Boulton
- Professor Peter Clarke
- David Eyton
- Professor James Norton