

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED  
**To:** PS/Ed Miliband (DECC), PS/Joan Ruddock (DECC), Perm Sec (DECC), PS.Special Advisers (DECC), REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED, Turton Nick (DECC), REDACTED REDACTED, DECC Chief Science Advisor, Meah Nafees (DECC), REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED  
**Cc:**  
**Sent:** 30/03/2010 at 15:00  
**Received:** 30/03/2010 at 15:00  
**Subject:** Science and Technology Cttee report on disclosure of CRU climate data

---

**Attachments:** [2010 03 30 STSC report on CRU climate data.docx \(22 KB\)](#)  
[HC 387-I UEA Final \(Embargoed\) v2.pdf \(494 KB\)](#)

---

Please find attached the Science and Technology Committee's report on the UEA hacked emails, along with their press notice (both embargoed until 00:01 tomorrow) and our draft top lines below.

A brief from CESA is also attached. This contains further Q&A.

**Grateful for clearance of these lines as No.10 has asked for these for COP today.**

The Science Media Centre hosted a media briefing by the STC this morning, chaired by Phil Willis, to launch the report. This was very well attended by media, with both BBC and Sky planning to cover the report, but the impression is that as with the Committee's 1 March marathon evidence session, the contents of the report does not really live up to the media anticipation, and they will really need to wait for the Muir Russell and Lord Oxburgh inquiries into the UEA emails and CRU science to report later in the year. The Committee's report does include a useful statement accepting the underlying science of man-made climate change, and overall will be a disappointing read for climate change 'sceptics' and critics of UEA/CRU/'AGW'.

Regards

REDACTED

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](http://www.decc.gov.uk)  
[www.youtube.com/energyclimatechange](http://www.youtube.com/energyclimatechange)  
[www.twitter.com/deccgovuk](http://www.twitter.com/deccgovuk)

**Draft Ed Miliband response:**

I welcome the Committee's report, in particular the Committee's statement that they have

seen no reason to challenge the scientific consensus on man-made climate change.

The vast majority of climate scientists are clear about the threat climate change poses. Investigating the issues arising from the UEA emails demand the willingness to learn lessons and make any reforms that are required. However, those who believe that climate change is real and man-made have nothing to fear and everything to gain from maximum transparency.

I look forward to seeing the outcomes of Muir Russell and Lord Oxburgh's independent inquiries into these issues.

**Lines to take:**

We welcome the Committee's report and recommendations and will respond to them fully in due course. We also await with interest the two ongoing independent reviews at UEA, Muir Russell's review on the hacked emails and Lord Oxburgh's review of the CRU's published science.

We note that the Committee found no reason to challenge the scientific consensus that human-induced climate change is happening, and that the results and conclusions of CRU are independently verified by other sources.

We note that the Committee asks that climate scientists take further steps to make raw data and computer codes available. We welcome the principles of transparency but note that this is an important issue, which will need to be considered by the scientific community and their wider stakeholders including government.

We welcome the Committee's statements on FOI law. We agree that scientists should be supported in understanding how FOI law applies to them.

**Science and Technology Committee Press Notice**

No. 32 (09-10): 31 March 2010

\*\*\*EMBARGOED UNTIL 00.01 WEDNESDAY 31 MARCH 2010\*\*\*

**CLIMATE SCIENCE MUST BECOME MORE TRANSPARENT SAY MPs**

The Science and Technology Committee today publishes its report on the disclosure of climate data from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. The Committee calls for the climate science community to become more transparent by publishing raw data and detailed methodologies.

Phil Willis MP, Committee Chair, said:

"Climate science is a matter of global importance. On the basis of the science, governments across the world will be spending trillions of pounds on climate change mitigation. The quality of the science therefore has to be irreproachable. What this inquiry revealed was that climate scientists need to take steps to make available all the data that support their work and full methodological workings, including their computer codes. Had both been available, many of the problems at CRU could have been avoided."

The focus on Professor Jones and CRU has been largely misplaced. On the accusations relating to Professor Jones's refusal to share raw data and computer codes, the Committee

considers that his actions were in line with common practice in the climate science community but that those practices need to change.

On the much cited phrases in the leaked e-mails-"trick" and "hiding the decline"-the Committee considers that they were colloquial terms used in private e-mails and the balance of evidence is that they were not part of a systematic attempt to mislead.

Insofar as the Committee was able to consider accusations of dishonesty against CRU, the Committee considers that there is no case to answer.

The Committee found no reason in this inquiry to challenge the scientific consensus as expressed by Professor Beddington, the Government Chief Scientific Adviser, that "global warming is happening [and] that it is induced by human activity". But this was not an inquiry into the science produced by CRU and it will be for the Scientific Appraisal Panel, announced by the University on 22 March, to determine whether the work of CRU has been soundly built.

On the mishandling of Freedom of Information (Fol) requests, the Committee considers that much of the responsibility should lie with the University, not CRU. The leaked e-mails appear to show a culture of non-disclosure at CRU and instances where information may have been deleted to avoid disclosure, particularly to climate change sceptics. The failure of the University to grasp fully the potential damage this could do and did was regrettable. The University needs to re-assess how it can support academics whose expertise in Fol requests is limited.

#### NOTES TO EDITORS:

Further details about this inquiry can be found at:

[http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary\\_committees/science\\_technology/s\\_t\\_cru\\_inquiry.cfm](http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/science_technology/s_t_cru_inquiry.cfm)

Media Enquiries: Becky Jones: 020 7219 5693

Committee Website: <http://www.parliament.uk/science>

Publications / Reports / Reference Material: Copies of all select committee reports are available from the Parliamentary Bookshop (12 Bridge St, Westminster, 020 7219 3890) or the Stationery Office (0845 7023474). Committee reports, press releases, evidence transcripts, Bills; research papers, a directory of MPs, plus Hansard (from 8am daily) and much more, can be found on [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

## Report from the Science and Technology Select Committee on climate data disclosure at UEA

### Lines to take

- We welcome the Committee's report and recommendations and will respond to them fully in due course. We also await with interest the two ongoing independent reviews at UEA, Muir Russell's review on the hacked emails and Lord Oxburgh's review of the CRU's published science.
- We note that the Committee found no reason to challenge the scientific consensus that human-induced climate change is happening, and that the results and conclusions of CRU are independently verified by other sources.
- Note that the Committee asks that climate scientists take further steps to make raw data and computer codes available. We welcome the principles of transparency but note that this is an important issue, which will need to be considered by the scientific community and their wider stakeholders, including government.
- Welcome the Committee's statements on FOI law. Agree that scientists should be supported in understanding how FOI law applies to them.

As Ed Miliband, Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, has made clear –

*“Those who believe that climate change is real and man-made have nothing to fear and everything to gain from maximum transparency.”*

### Key points

- The report is broadly supportive of Phil Jones, Director of University of East Anglia's (UEA) Climatic Research Unit (CRU), recognising that his actions were 'in line with common practice in the climate science community'. The committee found no evidence that he subverted the peer-review process or that his widely-publicised terms 'hide the decline' and 'trick' were more than colloquial expressions in a private email.
- The committee was supportive of the scientific consensus on climate change. While the Lord Oxburgh review should determine whether the work of CRU has been 'soundly built', the Committee noted that the results and conclusions of CRU are independently verified by other methodologies and other sources of data:

*“Even if the data that CRU used were not publically available—which they mostly are—or the methods not published—which they have been—its published results would still be credible: the results from CRU agree with those drawn from other international data sets; in other words, the analyses have been repeated and the conclusions have been verified”*

- The Committee note that publishing raw data and computer code is not standard practice in climate science – largely for practical reasons. However, due to the 'global importance' of climate change, the committee propose that 'climate scientists should

take steps to make available all the data that support their work (including raw data) and full methodological workings (including the computer codes).’ HMG is supportive of transparency in principle, but recognise that there are barriers that make this difficult in practice – including the volume of data, commercial confidentiality, and the need to keep data private ahead of peer-review. Setting this precedent could also have consequences for other areas of science, and technical experts in other areas.

- The committee found evidence to suggest that ‘UEA found ways to support the culture at CRU of resisting disclosure of information to climate change sceptics...’. It blamed UEA, rather than individual scientists, and recommended that UEA review its policy towards FOI and re-assess how it can support academics whose expertise in this area is limited.
- The committee also notes that Deputy Information Commissioner gave a clear indication that a breach of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 may have occurred but that a prosecution was time-barred; however no investigation was carried out. The committee concludes that it is unsatisfactory to leave this unresolved in this fashion that the matter ‘needs to be resolved conclusively’ either by the Information Commissioner or the Muir Russell Review – FOI are included in the Muir Russell review terms of reference.

## **Background**

- The STSC Report will be published at 00:01 Wednesday 31 March. The Committee held an embargoed press conference on 30 March.
- Two further review into these matters are still ongoing. The Independent Climate Change Email Review (chaired by Muir Russell) will look at the key allegations arising from the stolen emails. A further Scientific Appraisal Panel (chaired by Lord Oxburgh) will examine key scientific publications from the Climatic Research unit. Both will report in late Spring 2010, though not necessarily at the same time.

## **Q&A**

### **When will HMG respond?**

A formal response is expected within two months, although we will be in a better position to comment when the Independent Climate Change Email Review (Muir Russell) and Scientific Appraisal Panel (Lord Oxburgh) report [*this may be later*].

### **Has Phil Jones been let off the hook?**

The two ongoing reviews will have a chance to look in more detail. We note these initial findings, that there was no evidence of Phil Jones trying to subvert the peer-review process, and that his behaviour was in line with normal practice – but it’s right that the other reviews have time to look in more detail.

### **Does the FOI issue need to be investigated? Will you be pushing Muir Russell to include this?**

Yes, agree that FOI law should be investigated properly – the Muir Russell terms of reference indicate that he will include this. It’s also important that we learn and move

forward. The Committee has highlighted that researchers and UEA may not fully understand their obligations under FOI, so welcome the review's findings that researchers should be supported by their universities in understanding this.

**Committee member Graham Stringer does not fully agree with these findings and feels the Muir Russell investigation should have a 'sceptical' climate scientist on the panel. Do you agree?**

We welcome that the STSC concluded that the Muir Russell review is suitably independent. What matters about the panel itself is that the people are competent to carry out the job required of them and prepared to be open to the evidence that faces them.

**Is this a rushed 'whitewash'?**

The review has taken a wide range of evidence. It has not been reticent to criticise where it considers that appropriate. It notes that some issues will be more thoroughly addressed by later reviews.

REDACTED, CESA  
30 March 2010