

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED(Science & Innovation)  
**Sent:** 30 September 2011 14:33  
**To:** REDACTED(DECC); REDACTED REDACTED(DECC)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED(CD); FOI Requests  
**Subject:** FW: FoI/EIR Request 11/1306 - Government Public Policy on Climate in relation to Global Warming - Due 27 October 2011

REDACTED, I think this is a general climate science FOI – seems like one for your team?

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED

DECC Climate Science, Observations and International  
t: +44 (0) REDACTED  
m: +44 (0) REDACTED

---

**From:** FOI Requests  
**Sent:** 30 September 2011 14:30  
**To:** REDACTED(Science & Innovation); REDACTED(CD)  
**Cc:** PS Chris Huhne; Perm Sec (DECC); REDACTED(DECC); PS DECC SPADS; REDACTED(DECC)  
**Subject:** FoI/EIR Request 11/1307 - Government Public Policy on Climate in relation to Global Warming - Due 27 October 2011

---

**FOI/EIR Request:**  
**REDACTED**

**Ref: 11/1307 - REDACTED**

**Draft response must be submitted to your IRU Case Adviser no later than:**  
**20/10/2011**

**IRU Case Adviser:** REDACTED REDACTED (020  
**7REDACTED)** - your first point of contact for advice and queries, you must keep  
her informed of progress and issues which  
arise.

**Statutory deadline date for response:** **27/10/2011**

---

Dear REDACTED,

c.i REDACTEDFYI

This request has been assigned to you to action as I believe you are the most appropriate official to lead on this. I have attached for ease of reference the five FoI questions at the bottom of this email.

<< Message: FW: CORRECTED VERSION Complaint ref: TO2011/12371 & TO2011/16635 - Government Public Policy on Climate in relation to AGW >>

If you have obtained the agreement of another official to answer this request please forward this e-mail IMMEDIATELY to that official; ensuring that you let the above named Case Adviser know about the change.

- IRU has acknowledged receipt of the FOI/EIR request below.

## Actions

- **Legislation** requires you to respond to this request within **20** working days.
- You will receive automatic notification emails to remind you about the request on days 5, 10, 19 and when the request is 36 days late.
- Please see intranet guidance on how to handle an FOI/EIR request: <http://bisintranet/services/im/FOI/Pages/WelcometoFOI.aspx>
- The **link** below is a step by step checklist to help you plan your time when working on this request: <http://bisintranet/services/im/FOI/Pages/WeeklyChecklist.aspx>
- Please submit a draft response to your case adviser no later than **20/10/2011**.
- If this request is from the media or is likely to attract media interest or contains a ministerial or expenses element, **you must consult Press Office within your 15 day deadline period.**

**Please note that The Information Commissioner monitors BIS FOI performance. Should we fail to respond to FOI requests within the statutory time limits the ICO can take enforcement action against BIS.**

Many thanks,  
REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED | Freedom of Information Adviser | Security and Information Rights Unit | Department for Business, Innovation & Skills | REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED, London, SW1H OET | [www.bis.gov.uk](http://www.bis.gov.uk) | 020 REDACTED

- Q1. Who, [responsible signatories] in the last Government, would have actually signed off on approving these recommendations to go forward into legislation to initiate/implement current Governmental Public Policy on the notion of Anthropogenic Global Warming [AGW] due to the increase of Co2 by the use of fossil fuels?
- Q2a. What policy, processes, procedures or regulations were in place to ensure that those authorising such approval/advancement of these recommendations into legislation [to mitigate the notion of AGW] were there to ensure the veracity of the data & methods? [Other than those of the CRU - or their associates]
- Q2b. Did they [those responsible signatories] **actually** comply with those regulations, policies, processes or procedures specifically relating to **due diligence on the CRU** [and its data sets, methods and ethics] and was it in compliance with aforesaid policies or regulations? If so, what evidence is there to show this?
- Q3a. What evidence is there to show that those approving/advancing this new policy into legislation were **fully aware & appreciated that:**

The UEA's Climate Research Unit was **under resourced** and that only **"three fulltime members of academic staff"** were dealing with the science as well as other administrative and regulatory responsibilities such as complying with ***The Freedom of Information Act 2000*** as stated by

Professor Acton in his statement to The Science and Technology Select Committee inquiry 31 March 2010?

Source <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/387/387ii.pdf>

**Q92 Professor Acton's response to Chairman:**

"May I point out, Chairman, that this is a very small unit. There are three fulltime members of academic staff within it and the manpower involved in exactly what has just been described is actually very considerable."

Q3b. What evidence is there to show that those advancing this new policy into legislation were fully aware & appreciated that; the homogenized data output [representing up to 75% of world data sets] was NOT performed, or even overseen, by a recognised statistical body, team or organisation?

Q3c. Did any, of the then in place policies or regulations, stipulate whether due diligence had to be performed by a statistical body, team or organisation on the data sets before such legislative changes could be enacted – if not, would this oversight contravene parliamentary practice [necessary to enact legitimate legislation]?

Q4. In a similar vein, [of] to this government's "public" disclosures/announcements insisting that they were "unaware" of the profligate [actual] expenditure of the previous Governments spending [until they subsequently had "access to the books"];

Did the current [coalition] Government, when it took over and continued with what had become the *de facto* Government Public Policy on AGW, have a responsibility to ensure the responsibilities and issues in Q1, Q2 and Q3 had been adhered to or verified, when they had access to the confidential records, meetings or files relating to this issue?

Q5. At each and every public pronouncement of the launch of these inquiries in to this matter [Climategate, or during such inquiries] each of those heading or speaking on its/their behalf, implied or stated the science is being dealt with else where. We have seen no such *confirmation of the science*, of the CRU's data cleaning/analysis input and output, as a result of these inquiries, only obfuscation, why not?