

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED(DECC)  
**Sent:** 28 July 2011 11:03  
**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED(Science & Innovation); REDACTED REDACTED(DECC)  
**Subject:** RE: CRU dataREDACTED REDACTED (DECC)

REDACTED

Thanks for this.

REDACTED

Please note final lines below from REDACTED on the release of CRU, for any future correspondence.

REDACTED

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED(Science & Innovation)  
**Sent:** 27 July 2011 11:49  
**To:** REDACTED REDACTED(DECC); REDACTED REDACTED(DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Subject:** RE: CRU data

Great

- REDACTED please note updated lines, here in red, as approved by REDACTED.
- REDACTED please use these for your TOs etc

Think that's the issue closed for us now.

Thanks,

REDACTED

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

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Sent:** 27 July 2011 11:44  
**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (Science & Innovation); REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Subject:** RE: CRU data

REDACTED perhaps you could re-order thus:

- **Welcome the efforts of scientists and data owners to improve the availability of climate data by addressing the complex issues of data ownership and commercial value that have been a barrier to greater transparency in the analysis of climate records.**
- **Note that doing so benefits both science, and public confidence in the science process.**
- **Assert that DECC is fully in favour of openness in scientific debate and encourages transparency in delivering climate data.**

Not sure we need the last one but it's not wrong!

REDACTED REDACTED  
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED  
Department of Energy and Climate Change  
Area 6D, 3 Whitehall Place,  
London SW1A 2HD

Office Telephone +44 (0) REDACTED REDACTED  
Mobile Phone +44 (0) REDACTED

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED (Science & Innovation)  
**Sent:** 27 July 2011 11:29  
**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Subject:** RE: CRU data

Can you suggest wording? The words below welcome the efforts of scientists and data owners to resolve this – what more do we need to say?

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

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Sent:** 27 July 2011 11:09  
**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (Science & Innovation); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)  
**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)  
**Subject:** RE: CRU data

...and UEA and MO have gone further (releasing almost all global station data) in an effort to be transparent. I think we should consider welcoming this.

REDACTED

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED (Science & Innovation)

**Sent:** 27 July 2011 11:01

**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)

**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)

**Subject:** RE: CRU data

REDACTED – I understand the issues at hand, but in truth think it will look strange if we welcome an 'open approach' when they have waited for an ICO decision before releasing the data.

I'd recommend tweaking slightly – what do you think?

**Suggested lines:**

Thanks

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED

DECC Climate Science, Observations and International

t: +44 (0) REDACTED

m: +44 (0) REDACTED REDACTED

---

**From:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC)

**Sent:** 27 July 2011 10:04

**To:** REDACTED REDACTED (Science & Innovation); REDACTED REDACTED (Communications)

**Cc:** REDACTED REDACTED (DECC); DECC CESA Climate Science Observations and International; DECC CESA HoTs; PS DECC Chief Science Advisor

**Subject:** CRU data

**Importance:** High

Pls ignore previous email on this

Resend – minor errors corrected

REDACTED, REDACTED

(REDACTED, for reference when the questions start coming in).

**Background**

I have confirmed with UEA today that they have been ordered by ICO to release CRUTEM station data requested by REDACTED (apparently the original request predated 'climategate'). Last time I spoke to UEA (early July), they were still fighting the ruling on the grounds that some of these data were owned by certain National Met Services and that they didn't yet have permission to release them – thus 'it's still not ours to release'.

ICO was not swayed by this argument and ruled that UEA had a case but that it was not strong enough to prevent them from immediately releasing the data '*in the public interest*'.

After consultation with the Met Office, UEA will release data to comply with the ICO ruling.

Precisely:

- ICO ordered release of all land station data from the tropics and subtropics (40N to 40S?).
- Met Office sought permissions and within that zone, owner countries either agreed or *still haven't yet replied*.
- UEA wishes to comply with the ICO directive and will release today or tomorrow (27<sup>th</sup> or 28<sup>th</sup> July) all these data *INCLUDING for Trinidad and Tobago*, which replied with a firm NO (no permission granted).
- To demonstrate theirs and Met Office's determination to try to comply with ICO rulings, UEA will also release all other station data (i.e. including those from north and south of the tropical and subtropical zones) with one exception.
- Whilst most data owners in these extra-tropical zones have either agreed to release their data or not yet replied, *Poland* has explicitly refused to allow data from its 19 stations to be released, so the global data set released will *exclude* Polish data.
- It is worth noting that most of the extra-tropical data concerned are accessible through other means, so Met Office has agreed to release them, even in the absence of an explicit *YES* from data owners.

I understand that at the moment the WMO is fairly relaxed about the ICO's release order because most of the data are available already through other sources but this may change, depending on how data owners who have said no or not yet replied perceive the situation, or what pressure they put on the WMO.

UEA and Met Office are *concerned* that the ICO feels it has the authority, in the public interest, to countermand explicit orders from data owners.

To sum up, I consider that DECC should distance itself from these tea cup storms but am wary that arguments between UEA and ICO will likely rumble on and may escalate into other areas of research, leading to much greater storms.

**Suggested lines:**

- **Understand that this is a matter for the scientists and data owners to resolve but DECC welcomes UEA's and the Met Office's positive approach in adhering to the ICO's orders and going further, to release as much global climate land station as possible.**
- **Assert that DECC is fully in favour of openness in scientific debate and encourages transparency in delivering climate data.**

Happy to discuss further to improve lines.

REDACTED