A list of all FOI and EIR requests received relating to the Climatic Research Unit since 2005.

- *The date the request was received*
- *Who the request was from (name/organisation)* ***[withdrawn by requester and not provided]***
- *A copy of the substantive reply (i.e. not the acknowledgement)*
- *If an internal review was requested, please provide the date it was requested, and a copy of the substantive reply to the internal review.*

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
FOI_ 07-04	25/01/07	I would like to obtain a list of the meteorological stations used in the preparation of the HadCRUT3 global temperature average, and the raw data for those stations. I cannot find it anywhere on the web. The lead author for the temperature average is Dr. Phil Jones of the Climate Research Unit.	Your request for information received on 28 September now been considered and I can report that the information requested is available on non-UEA websites as detailed below. The Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN-Monthly) page within US National Climate Data Centre website provides one of the two US versions of the global dataset and includes raw station data. This site is at: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php This page is where you can get one of the two US versions of the global dataset, and it appears that the raw station data can be obtained from this site. Datasets named ds564.0 and ds570.0 can be found at The Climate & Global Dynamics Division (CGD) page of the Earth and Sun Systems Laboratory (ESSL) at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) site at: http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/tn404/ Between them, these two datasets have the data which the UEA Climate Research Unit (CRU) uses to derive the HadCRUT3 analysis. The latter, NCAR site holds	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the raw station data (including temperature, but other variables as well). The GHCN would give their set of station data (with adjustments for all the numerous problems). They both have a lot more data than the CRU have (in simple station number counts), but the extra are almost entirely within the USA. We have sent all our data to GHCN, so they do, in fact, possess all our data. In accordance with S. 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and the reasons for exemption are as stated below Exemption Reason s. 21, Information accessible to applicant via other means Some information is publicly available on external websites.	
FOI_ 07-09	22/02/07	A couple of years ago, I requested the identities and data for the Russian, Chinese and Australian networks studied in Jones et al Nature 1990 on urbanization. At the time, you said that it would be unduly burdensome to locate the information among your diskettes as the study was then somewhat stale. However, I notice that Jones et al 1990 has been cited in IPCC AR4 (in the section where you were a Coordinating Lead Author) and continues to be cited in the literature (e.g. Peterson 2003). Accordingly, I re-iterate my request for the identification of the stations and the data used for the following three Jones et al 1990 networks:	Your request for information has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed. Some of the information requested cannot, however, be disclosed and, Pursuant to Regulation 12, Environmental Information Regulations 2004, I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below Exemption Reason Reg. 6(1)b Information already publicly available & easily accessible to the applicant	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the west Russian network 2. the Chinese network 3. the Australian network For each network, if a subset of the data of the data was used, e.g. 80 stations selected from a larger dataset, I would appreciate all the data in the network, including the data that was not selected. In each case, please also provide the identification and data for the stations used in the gridded network which was used as a comparandum in this study.	Reg. 12(4)a Information not held by the authority The reason for claiming Regulation 6(1)(b) is that the station specific raw (i.e. daily) 'urban' data requested is already accessible on publicly available websites, specifically: 1) The Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN-Monthly) page within US National Climate Data Centre website at: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php, and, 2) the Climate & Global Dynamics Division (CGD) page of the Earth and Sun Systems Laboratory (ESSL) at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) site at: http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/tn404/ In regards Regulation 12(4)(a), the information from 'rural' data stations no longer exists in the form requested at the University of East Anglia. The public interest in claiming these exemptions is clear; in the case of Reg. 6(1)(b), information can be provided to the requester faster, and without diverting resources of the University than if the University were to provide this information directly. Clearly, we cannot provide information we do not possess, and the public interest is not at issue. I apologise that not all of your request will be met but if you have any further information needs in the future then please contact me.	
FOI_ 07-13	12/03/07	I write regarding the following paper. Jones P.D., Groisman P.Y., Coughlan M., Plummer N.,	Your request for information received on 12 March 2007 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. . For clarity, I have	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Wang W-C., Karl T.R. (1990), "Assessment of urbanization effects in time series of surface air temperature over land", Nature, 347: 169-172 [13 September 1990]. doi:10.1038/347169a0. The lead author is of course Prof. Phil Jones at your university. The paper discusses a Chinese network of meteorological stations. I am seeking the identities/locations of those stations. Please note that I am not seeking any other information; in particular, I am not seeking any environmental information.	included your original question with our response set out underneath. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. *1) I write regarding the following paper.* *Jones P.D., Groisman P.Y., Coughlan M., Plummer N., Wang W-C., Karl T.R. (1990), "Assessment of urbanization effects in time series of surface air temperature over land", Nature, 347: 169-172 [13 September 1990]. doi:10.1038/347169a0.* *The lead author is of course Prof. Phil Jones at your university.* *The paper discusses a Chinese network of meteorological stations. I am seeking the identities/locations of those stations. Please note that I am not seeking any other information; in particular, I am not seeking any environmental information.* The input data for the paper from 1990 can be found at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/jonesetal1990/ This data includes the locations of the sites and the annual temperature values and is prefaced by explanatory text. The 1990 paper data is not extensive, consisting of 6 small files, each of about a half an A4 page. We do not have any information about why the sites for the 1990 paper were selected as Dr. Jones is unaware of how his collaborators selected the sites.	
FOI_ 07-21	29/06/07	In Table 3.2 of IPCC AR4, you refer to Durbin-Watson statistics for various trend calculations, but do not show them. Could you please provide me with these	Your request for information received on 29 June 2007 has now been considered and I understand that the requested was forwarded to you directly by Phil Jones	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		statistics. I am unfamiliar with any prior use of the Durbin-Watson statistic “after allowing for first-order serial correlation”. Could you please provide me your statistical reference showing how one calculates a Durbin-Watson statistic “after allowing for first-order serial correlation” and giving significance levels for the statistic “after allowing for first-order serial correlation”. Could you please identify the statistical packages used in your calculation of REML trends and Durbin-Watson statistics? Would it be correct to say that (1) fitted a trend to the various series; (2) fitted an AR1 arima model to the residuals from (1)? (3) carried out a Durbin-Watson test on the residuals from (2)?	in his email of 2 July 2007. I trust this will be to your satisfaction.	
FOI_ 08-23	05/05/08	Drs Keith Briffa and Timothy Osborn of your Climatic Research Unit served as lead authors on the IPCC Fourth Assessment, which by international agreement was required to be undertaken on an comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis.1 On 31 March 2008, I asked Dr Briffa for important specific information, not so far released, on his work as a lead author to which I have had no reply or acknowledgement, but have, through other FoI enquiries, been given a copy of his email dated 1 April 2008, to several other IPCC participants including Dr Philip Jones, and to which my letter was attached. He told his colleagues his response to me would be brief when he got round to it. Also included in the documents released to me is an email dated 14 March	Your request for information received on 5 May 2008 has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with s.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below Exemption Reason s.12, Cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit The cost of finding & assembling the information will exceed the appropriate limit s.41, Information provided in confidence The release of	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		2008 to Dr Briffa, among others, from Susan Solomon, Co-Chair of WGI, advising the addressees not to disclose information beyond that (which I consider inadequate) already in the public domain. Accordingly, I hereby request the following information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and/or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004: All letters, facsimile and email correspondence to or from Drs Briffa and Osborn in connection with their work as an IPCC Lead Authors, including, but not limited to correspondence between them and the following individuals involved in the assessment: Drs Susan Solomon, John Mitchell, Jean Jouzel, Philip Jones, Eystein Jansen, Jonathan Overpeck, Jean-Claude Duplessy, Fortunat Joos, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Daniel Olago, Bette Otto-Bliesner, W. Richard Peltier, Stefan Rahmstorf, Rengaswamy Ramesh, Dominique Raynaud, David Rind, Olga Solomina, Ricardo Villalba, and De'er Zhang, and/or the following institutions: IPCC, IPCC Working Group I Technical Support Unit, IPCC Working Group II Technical Support Unit, DEFRA and/or the Met office. I am also asking for copies of any internal CRU correspondence in connection with the IPCC WGI assessment process and discussion of IPCC Principles, rules, or procedures.	this information would constitute an actionable breach of confidence Given the amount of material covered by your request, the cost of compliance in locating, retrieving and in the reading, editing or redaction of the relevant documents would clearly exceed the appropriate limit. Additionally, we hold that the s.41 exemption applies to all requested correspondence received by the University. We have consistently treated this information as confidential and have been assured by the persons and organisations giving this information to us that they believe it to be confidential and would expect to be treated as such. The public interest in withholding this information outweighs that of releasing it due to the need to protect the openness and confidentiality of academic intercourse prior to publication which, in turn, assures that such cooperation & openness can continue and inform scientific research and debate.	
FOI_08-31	27/05/08	Thank you for your letter of 19th May 2008. My request remains on the basis of either the FOIA or the EIR and it is not immediately obvious to me how one decides which might apply in advance.	Your request for information received on 27 May 2008 has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		I have now read Dr Briffa's letter of 15th May in answer to mine of 31st March for which I have thanked him. As he indicates that he will refer further enquiries to you I must advise you that I do not feel it answers any of my questions satisfactorily apart from the last and continue to seek any and all documents held by CRU relating to Dr Briffa's participation in the IPCC, 2007 assessment reports. In addition to the questions I put to Dr Briffa, and without limiting my request for all information relating to the IPCC assessment process not already in the public domain, I will specify further particular areas for which I am seeking information. 1. The IPCC stated[1] on July 1, 2006: "We are very grateful to the many reviewers of the second draft of the Working Group I contribution to the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report for suggestions received on issues of balance and citation of additional scientific literature." Did the IPCC receive any such "suggestions" in a written form other than those reported in the documents for each chapter entitled "IPCC Working Group I Fourth Assessment Report: Expert and Government Review Comments on the Second-Order Draft"[2]? If so, please provide them. 2. The IPCC also stated on July 1, 2006: "Reviewers are invited to submit copies of additional papers that are either in-press or published in 2006, along with the chapter and section number to which this material could	In accordance with s.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.1(1)(a) Right to be informed if information held Information not held s.41, Information provided in confidence Release of the information could result in an actionable We are unable to provide the information requested in sections (1) and (2) as we simply do not have the requested information. After consultation with colleagues, I would suggest that you contact the IPCC directly for this information. In regards the correspondence from Mr. Ammann, s.41 is applicable as we have consistently treated this information as confidential and have been assured by Mr. Ammann that he believes it to be confidential and would expect it to be treated as such. The public interest in withholding this information outweighs that of releasing it due to the need to protect the openness and confidentiality of academic intercourse prior to publication which, in turn, assures that such cooperation & openness can continue and inform scientific research and debate.	

[1] http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/PublicationDeadlines_2006-07-01.pdf
[2] http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Comments/comments/

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		pertain, via email to ipcc-wg1@al.noaa.gov, not later than July 24, 2006. In the case of in-press papers a copy of the final acceptance letter from the journal is requested for our records. All submissions must be received by the TSU not later than July 24, 2006 and incomplete submissions can not be accepted." Please provide a copy of all such responses. Any such responses described in 1 and 2 above are clearly "written expert and government review comments" as defined in "Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports" in the Principles Governing IPCC Work. 3. Please also supply any emails or other documents from IPCC contributing author Caspar Ammann or the Journal Climatic Change that discuss any matters in relation to the IPCC assessment process.		
FOI_ 08-50	09/09/08	In the Supporting Information to Mann et al (PNAS 2008), in particular http://www.pnas.org/content/suppl/2008/09/02/0805721105.DCSupplemental/SD1.xls , a number of "Schweingruber" series are listed, with nomenclature such as schweingruber_mxdabd_grid11, which I presume were provided by Keith Briffa or Tim Osborn of the UEA. Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and/or Environmental Information REgulations, whichever is aplicable, would you please provide me with a digital version of these data sets in the form provided to Dr Mann, together with any relevant meta-data, manuals	Your request received on 9 September has now been considered and I can confirm that the University of East Anglia holds this information. The exact file that was sent to Mike Mann and Scott Rutherford in 2000 has been recently placed on the UEA website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/datapages/mxdtrw.htm The data, the locations, and all the available meta-data that UEA/CRU have are under the penultimate subheading (Rutherford et al.) on the above webpage. The bullet points immediately above the "References"	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		or literature describing the grid locations of the series and the method of their calculation.	subheading link to the locations and data files.	
FOI_ 09-01	03/01/09	I am interested in the HADCRUT3 global temperature index. Specifically, I would like to know the impact of adjustments to the data over time as these affect the global mean surface temperature. I imagine that such an assessment must be done as a part of the regular preparation of the index and presumably would take the form of a chart of the index calculated with and without the adjustments, although anything along these lines would meet my needs. For the avoidance of doubt, I'm trying to compare the two extremes - raw data from the weather stations at one end, and the final HADCRUT3 GMST at the other.	Your request for information received on 3 January 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and have provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. *I am interested in the HADCRUT3 global temperature index.* *Specifically, I would like to know the impact of adjustments to the data over time as these affect the global mean surface temperature.* *I imagine that such an assessment must be done as a part of the regular preparation of the index and presumably would take the form of a chart of the index calculated with and without the adjustments, although anything along these lines would meet my needs.* *For the avoidance of doubt, I'm trying to compare the two extremes - raw data from e weather stations at one end, and the final HADCRUT3 GMST at the other.* The only information we can provide is in the most recent scientific paper on HadCRUT3. The paper is Brohan, P., Kennedy, J., Harris, I., Tett, S.F.B. and Jones, P.D., 2006: Uncertainty estimates in regional and global observed temperature changes: a new dataset from 1850. J. Geophys. Res. 111, D12106, doi:10.1029/2005JD006548. We can't put this paper up on our website as this breaks AGU regulations. We are also unable to email it	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			as it is too large. There is, however, a link to the published version of this paper (if one has purchased rights to view it in this form), and to the final version before it went to AGU on a CRU web page, at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/temperature/ The relevant information is within Figure 4 and the accompanying text. The figure shows a histogram of all the station homogeneity adjustments. The distribution is Gaussian with a near zero mean, so global average temperature series with and without these adjustments would be indistinguishable. The effects of other uncertainties are discussed in the paper below: Rayner, N.A., P. Brohan, D.E. Parker, C.K. Folland, J.J. Kennedy, M. Vanicek, T. Ansell and S.F.B. Tett, 2006: Improved analyses of changes and uncertainties in marine temperature measured in situ since the mid-nineteenth century: the HadSST2 dataset. J. Climate, 19, 446-469. Bias adjustments to the SST component in HadCRUT3 are shown in Figure 8.	
FOI_ 09-44	26/06/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and Jun 25, 2009.	Your request for information received on 26 June 2009 has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet all of your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below:	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Exception Reason Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement Regulation 12(5)(f) applies because the information requested was received by the University on terms that prevent further transmission to non-academics Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future.	
FOI_ 09-53	16/07/09	I gather from Dr Phil Jones' correspondence with Douglas Keenan (see http://www.climateaudit.org/correspondence/cru.correspondence.pdf) that restrictions have been placed on redistribution of climate data by some of the countries that have supplied this data. I would like to receive copies of all agreements or other correspondence where such restrictions have been placed.	Your request for information received on 16 July 2009 has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information directly. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.21(1) , Information is available to applicant by other means All of the requested information can be obtained by reviewing the Climate Research Unit website	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and have provided the necessary links to the requested information. *I gather from Dr Phil Jones' correspondence with Douglas Keenan (see http://www.climateaudit.org/correspondence/cru.correspondence.pdf) that restrictions have been placed on redistribution of climate data bysome of the countries that have supplied this data.* *I would like to receive copies of all agreements or other correspondence where such restrictions have been placed.* [Information exempted pursuant to s21(1), Freedom of Information Act] All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries.	
FOI_ 09-60	24/07/09	I request, under the Environmental Information Act, a copy of all raw weather station data currently held by Phil Jones,	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for "a copy of all raw weather station data currently held by Phil Jones" and for "a copy of each agreement	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Where data is not able to be disclosed due to agreements restricting access to the data I would like to receive a copy of each agreement detailing which weather stations are restricted. I would like data for all unrestricted weather stations regardless of the above.	detailing which weather stations are restricted" has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies because the requested data is already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available..	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Further information regarding the history, processing, and handling of this data set is also available at this site. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-61	24/07/09	CRUTEM3 data that you held was the value added data. Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations Act 2004, please provide me with this data in the digital form, together with any documents that you hold describing the procedures under which the data has been quality controlled and where deemed appropriate, adjusted to account for apparent non-climatic influences.	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for the CRUTEM3 data that we hold, and for "…any documents that you hold describing the procedures under which the data has been quality controlled and where deemed appropriate, adjusted to account for apparent non-climatic influences." has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies because the requested data is already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. The same Regulation would apply to the request for "the procedures under which the data has been quality controlled and where deemed appropriate, adjusted…" as the methodology used to compile and adjust the data have been published in numerous articles which are listed on the CRU website at:	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			.http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in not damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-63	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009.	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for a "copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009", has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies because the requested data is a subset of data already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climate Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in not damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-64	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request: 1. A copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 2. A copy of any instructions or stipulations accompanying the transmission of data to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 limiting its further dissemination or disclosure. I write as an academic with publications in peer-reviewed journals and an ongoing research program on the subject of surface climate measurement. With respect to #2, please be aware that restrictions on data disclosure may disqualify any research arising from this data set from being published in many peer-reviewed	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for a "A copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009" and "a copy of any instructions or stipulations accompanying the transmission of data to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 limiting its further dissemination or disclosure" has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		journals, therefore I require a complete response as to whether any such instructions accompanied the data.	Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of data already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format. We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. In regards your request for any stipulations accompanying the transmission of the data to academics at Georgia Tech, no such instructions or stipulations are held by the University. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-65	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009, for academic use.	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for a "a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009" has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists &	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of data already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-66	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request for all CRUTEM data, as received from Phil Johnson of Univ of East Anglia for the following locations, stations, countries, protectorates, and/or trust territories: Kingman Reef Kiribati Johnson Atoll Southern line Islands Palau - Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 1. all historical temperature data, such as minimum temperature, maximum temperature, mean temperature. Daily observations would be greatly appreciated, but please send the monthly averages is that is all that is in your possession. 2. Records, commonly called metadata, containing information such as precise station latitude and longitude, elevation; as well as records of changes in observation times, instrument type, etc.		Withdrawn
FOI_ 09-67	28/07/09	As permitted under the Environmental Information Regulations, I would like to request a digital copy of the CRU weather-station data as prepared at your institution for the Hadley Centre, together with details of the algorithms used to process it.	Your request for information received on 26 July 2009 for a “a digital copy of the CRU weather-station data as prepared at your institution for the Hadley Centre, together with details of the algorithms used to process it.” has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of data already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. The same Regulation would apply to the request for the details of the algorithims used to process the data as the methodology used to compile and process the data	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			have been published in numerous articles which are listed on the CRU website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-68	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environment Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act, I hereby request a list of agreements entered into either by UEA or Dr Jones with information providers associated with the CRUTEM data set which inhibit UEA, Dr Jones or the Met Office from releasing the data to the public. I further ask for copies of these contracts where available, and where not available what steps have been taken by UEA, Dr Jones or the Met Office to confirm these terms and determine if they still stand. I	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. However, it is not possible to satisfy all elements of your request directly. Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding this information to you; this was due entirely to an administrative oversight on my part in regards the transmission of this letter and information to you. In accordance with Section 17 of the Freedom of	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		ask also for any email records referring to these agreements either within or without UEA, either to or from Dr Jones, or any third party who has tried to confirm the existence of such agreements. I ask also for a list of 3rd parties to whom the CRUTEM raw data has been released either by UEA or Dr Jones.	Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information directly. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document along with explanations of the exemptions and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12, Cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit The cost of finding & assembling the information will exceed the appropriate limit We have enclosed the answers to all of your questions save the fourth which concerns emails relating to data confidentiality agreements. These agreements date back at least 15 years and the time it would take to identify and obtain the information requested is such that it would clearly exceed the appropriate limit. I apologise that not all of your request will be met at this time, but if you have any further information needs in the future then please contact me. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and have provided the necessary links to the requested information that is available via the UEA website. For your convenience I have reproduced your request broken down by component part and answered each part thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-68)** *1. Pursuant to the Environment Information Regulations*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			or the Freedom of Information Act, I hereby request a list of agreements entered into either by UEA or Dr Jones with information providers associated with the CRUTEM data set which inhibit UEA, Dr Jones or the Met Office from releasing the data to the public. All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries. *2. I further ask for copies of these contracts where available*, See answer to Question 1. *3,. and where not available what steps have been taken by UEA, Dr Jones or the Met Office to confirm these terms and determine if they still stand.* See answer to Question 1. A search has been conducted for all extant agreements and all have been placed on the above-noted website *4. I ask also for any email records referring to these agreements either within or without UEA, either to or from Dr Jones, or any third party who has tried to confirm the existence of such agreements* [Information not released pursuant to s.12, Freedom of Information Act]	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			5. I ask also for a list of 3rd parties to whom the CRUTEM raw data has been released either by UEA or Dr Jones. The only 3rd parties to which this information has been released are the Met Office Hadley Centre, and to a researcher at Georgia Tech University	
FOI_ 09-69	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby requestthe following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in NIGERIA, NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, NEPAL,NAURU 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents furthertransmission of the data to non-academics or others 4. a copy of the entire agreement In addition, I hereby request the following information: 1. A copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding entering into confidentiality agreements. 2. A copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding the preservation of written agreements. 3. A copy of policies and procedures regarding employees entering into verbal agreements. 4. A copy of instructions to staff regarding compliance with FOI requests.	Further to your request for information received on 24 July 2009, I have consulted relevant units within the University and, pursuant to my obligations under section 16 of the Act to provide advice and guidance, I am writing to request clarification of several aspects of your request. Apologies for the delay in responding to you on this matter, but as you may know, we have received a large number of requests for information under the Act recently and it is taking some time to deal with each request. In your request, you have asked for a copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding entering into confidentiality agreements and verbal agreements, and for a copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding the preservation of written agreements. The University does not have one, overarching policy or procedure regarding entering into confidentiality or verbal agreements. Each division within the University has policies and procedures specific to their area of work . This also applies to the preservation of written agreements. In order to answer your question for all of the University, it is highly likely that we would exceed the statutory appropriate limit of 18 person hours to locate, retrieve & review the requested information. In order to avoid this situation, I would therefore ask	Clarification sought

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			you to clarify what aspect of the University's work would be the focus of your request for such policies and procedures. For example, given the nature of the other components of your request, are you simply interested in policies in relation to research activities? Please note that the statutory timescale of 20 working days as defined by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 will be 'suspended' until such time as we receive clarification of your request. Once that is received, the 'clock' will recommence, your request considered, and you will receive the information requested within the statutory timescale, subject to the information not being exempt or containing a reference to a third party. You will be informed of any exemptions or references to third parties.	
FOI_ 09-70	24/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements which may restrict transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics or any other individuals involving the following countries: China, Japan, India, Pakistan and Russia. The information would include --- the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; --- the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; --- a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 has now been considered. Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that, in regards the information regarding agreements, we do not hold the requested information. However, I note that you have also requested "…copies of the original data itself." In regards this part of the request we have determined that we are not obliged to supply the information you have requested under the Freedom of Information Act pursuant to section 39, exempting information that is 'environmental information' within the meaning of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		--- a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement, I am interested in pursuing the acquisition of detailed information on procedures applied to the CRUTEM global temperature data along with copies of the original data itself, for academic evaluation purposes and I am requesting the specific information above as part of the evaluation study.	This exemption applies because 'environmental information' must be disclosed under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). In short, we have considered this portion of your request under EIR, not FOIA and have determined that it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request under the EIR. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies because the requested data is already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. The same Regulation would apply to the request for "detailed information on procedures applied to the CRUTEM global temperature data" as the methodology used to compile and adjust the data have been published in numerous articles which are listed on the CRU website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-70)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements which may restrict*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics or any other individuals involving the following countries: China, Japan, India, Pakistan and Russia. *The information would include* *--- the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *--- the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *--- a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".* *--- a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,* All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. This means that there is not always a direct correlation between any agreement and the geographic location of the data or stations that the agreement covers *I am interested in pursuing the acquisition of detailed information on procedures applied to the CRUTEM global temperature data along with copies of the original data itself, for academic evaluation purposes and I am requesting the specific information above as part of the evaluation study.* [Excepted pursuant to Regulations 12(4)(b), 12(5)(a),	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			and 12(5)(f) of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004] 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-71	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request regarding the provision of the CRUTEM data set to persons or organizations outside of your organization. 1. Please supply a list of persons and/or organizations to whom the CRUTEM data set has been provided to in the last 5 years. If personal privacy concerns prevent you from identifying which specific persons have been provided such data, then it would be sufficient to simply supply the organizational affilliation of those persons. For example, it has come to my attention that most likely this data set has been provided to Peter Webster of the Georgia Institute of Technology in the USA. If you are unable to confirm that such data has been sent to Peter Webster, then it would meet my needs if you were to simply list Georgia Institute of Technology as the recipient. 2. Please supply a copy of any agreements between your organization and the recipients or the institutional recipients of such data that	Your request for information received on 26 July 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience I have reproduced your request broken down by component part and answered each part thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-71)** *1. Please supply a list of persons and/or organizations to whom the CRUTEM data set has been provided to in the last 5 years. If personal privacy concerns prevent you from identifying which specific persons have been provided such data, then it would be sufficient to simply supply the organizational affilliation of those persons. For example, it has come to my attention that most likely this data set has been provided to Peter Webster of the Georgia Institute of Technology in the USA. If you are unable to confirm that such data has been sent to Peter Webster, then it would meet my needs if you were to simply list Georgia Institute of Technology as the recipient.* The entire CRUTEM data set has not been sent to anyone, or any organisation within the last 5 years. A subset of that data was provided to Georgia Tech University in January 2009. *2. Please supply a copy of any agreements between your organization and the recipients or the institutional*	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		impose any conditions of confidentiality, or which prohibit further transmission of such CRUTEM data sets, or which prohibit the public posting of such data sets on the internet. 3. Please supply a copy of any internal regulations or personnel regulations or rules regarding the supplying so such "raw" temperature data products to persons outside your organization; and any internal regulations, rules, personnel guidelines regarding the confidentiality of CRUTEM data records.	*recipients of such data that impose any conditions of confidentiality, or which prohibit further transmission of such CRUTEM data sets, or which prohibit the public posting of such data sets on the internet.* All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries. *3. Please supply a copy of any internal regulations or personnel regulations or rules regarding the supplying so such "raw" temperature data products to persons outside your organization; and any internal regulations, rules, personnel guidelines regarding the confidentiality of CRUTEM data records* Whilst the University does possess internal guidelines regarding contracting generally, the making of research agreements regarding the conduct of funded research, and financial regulations governing any agreements with financial implications, there are no specific internal regulations or rules regarding the transfer of data to persons outside our organisation, nor any in relation specifically to the confidentiality of CRUTEM data records.	
FOI_	27/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations,	Further to your request for information received on 27	Clarification

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
09-72		I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for any confidentiality agreements covering CRUTEM station data involving station data in Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, and Myanmar. the date of such agreement; the parties to the agreement; a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further distribution of the data to non-academics, a copy of the entire agreement, a copy of policies and procedures covering employee responsibilities entering into confidentiality agreements, a copy of policies and procedures covering employee responsibilities regarding the preservation of written agreements, a copy of policies and procedures regarding employees entering into verbal agreements, and a copy of instructions to staff regarding compliance with FOI requests.	July 2009, I have consulted relevant units within the University and, pursuant to my obligations under section 16 of the Act to provide advice and guidance, I am writing to request clarification of several aspects of your request. Apologies for the delay in responding to you on this matter, but as you may know, we have received a large number of requests for information under the Act recently and it is taking some time to deal with each request. In your request, you have asked for a copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding entering into confidentiality agreements and verbal agreements, and for a copy of policies and procedures regarding employee responsibilities regarding the preservation of written agreements. The University does not have one, overarching policy or procedure regarding entering into confidentiality or verbal agreements. Each division within the University has policies and procedures specific to their area of work . This also applies to the preservation of written agreements. In order to answer your question for all of the University, it is highly likely that we would exceed the statutory appropriate limit of 18 person hours to locate, retrieve & review the requested information. In order to avoid this situation, I would therefore ask you to clarify what aspect of the University's work would be the focus of your request for such policies and procedures. For example, given the nature of the other components of your request, are you simply interested in policies in relation to research activities? Please note that the statutory timescale of 20 working	sought

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			days as defined by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 will be 'suspended' until such time as we receive clarification of your request. Once that is received, the 'clock' will recommence, your request considered, and you will receive the information requested within the statutory timescale, subject to the information not being exempt or containing a reference to a third party. You will be informed of any exemptions or references to third parties.	
FOI_ 09-73	24/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Chile, Finland, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 has now been considered. Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-73)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Chile, Finland, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland.* *1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,* All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. This means that there is not always a direct correlation between any agreement and the geographic location of the data or stations that the agreement covers	
FOI_ 09-74	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request the following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in Russia, China and India: 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further transmission of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-75	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for the following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in France, Germany, Italy, Austria and the Ukraine: 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement;	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further transmission of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement		
FOI_ 09-76	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for any confidentiality agreements covering CRUTEM station data involving station data in ARUBA, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, AFGHANISTAN, ALGERIA, ASCENSION ISLAND. 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further distribution of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-77	24/07/09	In keeping with the EIR regulations, I am requesting the following information in respect to any existing confidentiality agreements that involve CRUTEM station data from South Africa, the USA, Mongolia, Latvia, and Nigeria: 1. The date of said agreement 2. A copy of the part of that agreement that governs further distribution of the information. 3. The signatories to the agreement. 4. A copy of any part of the agreement that places special restrictions on who the information may be redistributed to. 5. A copy of the agreement itself.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-78	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for the following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in Zimbabwe, Zaire, Angola, South Africa and Botswana:	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further transmission of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement		
FOI_ 09-79	24/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreement(s)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: ACORES, ALBANIA, ANDAMAN AND LA, ANTARCTICA, ANTILLES. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-80	24/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that “prevents further transmission to non-academics”. 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-81	24/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Greenland, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand, and Thailand.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-82	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, ECUADOR, EL SALVADOR, ERITREA, and ETHIOPIA. For these countries, I request all information about: 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to all applicable confidentiality agreement, including the full names of any organizations; 3. a copy of the sections of all applicable confidentiality agreements that prevent further transmission of the data to non-academics; and 4. a complete copy of all applicable confidentiality agreements.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-83	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh and Barbados.	Your request for information received on 25 July 2009 has now been considered. . Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information for the requested countries save that relating to Bahrain. In regards Bahrain, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.21(1)(a), Information reasonably accessible to applicant by other means All of the requested information can be obtained from the Climate Research Unit website **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-83)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh and Barbados.* *1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,* I am requesting this information for the purposes of	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			academic research. All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. This means that there is not always a direct correlation between any agreement and the geographic location of the data or stations that the agreement covers	
FOI_ 09-84	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Serbia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Albania and Slovakia 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-85	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, The Kyrgyz	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Republic, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-86	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: SLOVENIA SOMALIA SRI LANKA ST. THOMAS SURINAME 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and, 4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-87	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: TUVALU	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		UGANDA URUGUAY VANUATU VENEZUELA 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-88	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Sudan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and, 4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-89	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: BELIZE, BENIN, BERMUDA, BOLIVIA, BURKINA FASO	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-90	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: CZECH REPUBLIC, D.R. OF CONGO, DJIBOUTI, DOMINICA, and FIJI 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-91	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Laos, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania and Luxembourg. 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and,	Your request for information received on 25 July 2009 has now been considered. Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-91)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Laos, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania and Luxembourg.*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	*1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and,* *4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.* *I am requesting this information for the purposes of academic research.* All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries.	
FOI_ 09-92	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: TUVALU, UGANDA, URUGUAY, VENEZUELA, VANUATU	Response the same as FOI_09-91	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement		
FOI_ 09-93	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: CAROLINE ISLANDS SOLOMON ISLANDS WALLIS ISLANDS COOK ISLANDS NIUE ISLAND 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-94	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: TAJIKISTAN TANZANIA THAILAND TOGO TOKELAU ISLAND	Response the same as FOI_09-91	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-95	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: GIBRALTAR EGYPT GREECE CUBA GREENLAND 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Your request for information received on 25 July 2009 has now been considered. Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information for the requested countries save that relating to Gibraltar. In regards Gibraltar, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.21(1)(a), Information reasonably accessible to applicant by other means All of the requested information can be obtained from the Climate Research Unit website **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-95)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements) restricting transmission of*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: *GIBRALTAR* *EGYPT* *GREECE* *CUBA* *GREENLAND* *1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,* I am requesting this information for the purposes of academic research. All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries.	
FOI_ 09-96	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of	Response the same as FOI_09-91	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Syria, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, and Togo. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the fullname of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-97	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: [insert 5 or so countries that are different from ones already requested1] 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	I acknowledge your request for information received on 24 July 2009. Unfortunately I cannot identify the information you have requested from the details you have provided. In your request, you have asked, “I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: [insert 5 or so countries that are different from ones already requested]” In order to accurately provide a response we would ask to identify the countries for which you are interested in receiving the relevant information? Please note that the statutory timescale of 20 working days as defined by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 will be ‘suspended’ until such time as we receive clarification of your request. Once that is received, the ‘clock’ will recommence, your request considered, and you will receive the information requested within the statutory timescale, subject to the information not being exempt or containing a reference to a third party. You will be informed of any exemptions or references to	Clarification sought

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			third parties.	
FOI_ 09-98	25/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following South American countries: Chile, Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, and Columbia. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-99	25/07/09	I hereby make an EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission to non-academics of CRUTEM data involving the following geographical areas: Cook Islands, Fiji, Samoa (Western and American), Niue Island and Tonga. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-100	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: NAMIBIA	Response the same as FOI_09-91	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		NEW CALEDONIA NICARAGUA NIGER OMAN PORTUGAL 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-101	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: CAMEROON CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHAD COLOMBIA COMOROS ISLAND	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-102	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Costa Rica 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
09-103		confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following locations, protectorates, trust territories and countries: Kingman Reef Kiribati Johnson Atoll Southern line Islands Palau - Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-104	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: QATAR, REUNION, ROMANIA, SAO-TOME-AND, TAIWAN. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-105	26/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for the following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in VIETNAM, WESTERN SAHARA, YEMEN, YUGOSLAVIA, and ZAMBIA: 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further transmission of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement		
FOI_ 09-106	26/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries:TANZANIA, TOGO, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, TUNISIA, TURKEY. 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and, 4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-107	27/07/09	I hereby make an EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: MALAYSIA, MALI, MALTA, and MARTINIQUE, MAURITANIA. In particular; 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-108	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: PANAMA PAPUA NEW GUINEA PARAGUAY PERU PUERTO RICO 1. The date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. The parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. A copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics"; and, 4. A copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.	Response the same as FOI_09-73	
FOI_ 09-109	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: HONG KONG, HUNGARY, JAMAICA, KAMPUCHEA, KENYA 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement.		
FOI_ 09-110	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, French Guiana and French Polynesia. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Your request for information received on 27 July 2009 has now been considered. . Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information for the requested countries save that relating to Cyprus. In regards Cyprus, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.21(1)(a), Information reasonably accessible to applicant by other means All of the requested information can be obtained from the Climate Research Unit website **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-110)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			countries: Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, French Guiana and French Polynesia. *1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements;* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics".* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,* *I am requesting this information for the purposes of academic research.* All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. This means that there is not always a direct correlation between any agreement and the geographic location of the data or stations that the agreement covers	
FOI_ 09-111	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: FRENCH SOUTHERN AND ANTARCTIC LANDS GABON GAMBIA GHANA GUADELOUPE	Response the same as FOI_09-73	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-112	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: Kampuchea, Kenya, Kiribati, Korea, and Kuwait. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-113	27/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby make an EIR/FOI request for the following information in respect to any confidentiality agreements affecting CRUTEM station data involving station data in Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti and Hong Kong: 1. the date of such agreement; 2. the parties to the agreement; 3. a copy of that part of the agreement that prevents further transmission of the data to non-academics 4. a copy of the entire agreement	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any	Response the same as FOI_09-91	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
09-114		confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Finland Martinique Mauritania Mauritius Mexico Marocco 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,		
FOI_ 09-115	28/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements made with the country of Australia restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics contrary to the guidelines specifically listed in W.M.O.RESOLUTION 40 (Cg-XII). WMO policy and practice for the exchange of meteorological and related data and products including guidelines on relationships in commercial meteorological activities which states : " Reminds Members of their obligations under Article 2 of the WMO Convention to facilitate worldwide cooperation in the establishment of observing networks and to promote the exchange of meteorological and related information; and of the need to ensure stable ongoing commitment of resources to meet this obligation in the common interest of all nations.	Your request for information received on 28 July 2009 has now been considered. Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information in relation to the information regarding Australia.. In regards your request or any confidentiality agreements restricting transfer of CRUTEM data t academics, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The reasons for exemption are as stated below:	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any establishment of confidentiality agreements that negate the W.M.O. RESOLUTION 40 (Cg-XII) in particular "Reminds" reproduced above, specifically the exchange of meteorological and related information; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates W.M.O. RESOLUTION 40 (Cg-XII) specifically the exchange of meteorological and related information; 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement. Additionally, if your position is that release of information cannot be made then, I further request a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements) restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to academics contrary to the guidelines specifically listed in EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date:16.2.00 Policy and practice for EuroGOOS for the exchange of ceanographic and related data and products including guidelines on relationships in commercial oceanographic activities which states "Members should provide to the research and education communities, for their non-commercial activities, free and unrestricted access to all data and products exchanged under the auspices of WMO with the understanding that their commercial activities are subject to the same conditions identified in Adopts (2) above":	Exemption Reason s.21(1)(a), Information reasonably accessible to applicant by other means All information available can be obtained from the Climate Research Unit website **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-115)** *I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements made with the country of Australia restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics contrary to the guidelines specifically listed in W.M.O.RESOLUTION 40 (Cg-XII).* *WMO policy and practice for the exchange of meteorological and related data and products including guidelines on relationships in commercial meteorological activities which states : " Reminds Members of their obligations under Article 2 of the WMO Convention to facilitate worldwide cooperation in the establishment of observing networks and to promote the exchange of meteorological and related information; and of the need to ensure stable ongoing commitment of resources to meet this obligation in the common interest of all nations.* *1. the date of any establishment of confidentiality agreements that negate the W.M.O. RESOLUTION 40 (Cg-XII) in particular "Reminds" reproduced above, specifically the exchange of meteorological and related information;* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates W.M.O. RESOLUTION 40*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1. the date of any establishment of confidentiality agreements that negate the EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access"; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access"; 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access".	*(Cg-XII) specifically the exchange of meteorological and related information;* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement. Additionally, if your position is that release of information cannot be made then, I further request a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements) restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to academics contrary to the guidelines specifically listed in EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date:16.2.00 Policy and practice for EuroGOOS for the exchange of ceanographic and related data and products including guidelines on relationships in commercial oceanographic activities which states "Members should provide to the research and education communities, for their non-commercial activities, free and unrestricted access to all data and products exchanged under the auspices of WMO with the understanding that their commercial activities are subject to the same conditions identified in Adopts (2) above":* *1. the date of any establishment of confidentiality agreements that negate the EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access";* *2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization;* *3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access";* *4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement that prevents or negates EuroGOOS EG99.37 Version 3, Date: 16.2.00, specifically "unrestricted access".* *I am requesting this information for the purposes of private research.*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries.	
FOI_ 09-116	28/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements)restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Hungary, Jamaica, Madagascar, Malawi. 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-117	24/07/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations, I hereby request a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and Jun 25, 2009.	Your request for information received on 24 July 2009 for a “a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009” has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of data already available from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) and the Climatic Research Unit already makes requested information available on it's website in a gridded format . We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there	
FOI_ 09-118	27/07/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Haiti; Hong Kong 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-122	12/08/09	Thank you for your response to my request for any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involing the following countries: Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Haiti; Hong Kong. Given that you have stated that you do not hold any confidentiality agreements concerning these countries, I make the following request: I hereby make a EIR/FOI request for a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data involving the following countries: Guinea; Guinea-Bissau;	Your request for information received on 12 August 2009 for a "a copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data involving the following countries: Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Haiti; Hong Kong" has now been considered. Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding a response to your request. Upon consideration, it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Guyana; Haiti; Hong Kong.	Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of highly similar data already available in another format from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit . Both sources already make the requested information available in a gridded format. We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. Whilst there is no agreement restricting transmission of data specific to the countries named in your request, the agreements that do exist relate to recording stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries. As explained on the CRU website, we have merged the data we have received	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			into existing series or begun new ones. Some of the information will be covered by such agreements and we must therefore restrict its further transmission. We believe that disclosure of the requested data would have an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on its progress will be available there.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-123	12/08/09	Based on this information, I hereby submit an EIR/FOI request for: 1. All original station temperature data used to produce the CRU gridded land temperature data set. 2. The code used to convert the original station temperature data series into the gridded land temperature set, to include all homogenization adjustments, adjustments to remove non-climatic influences, and any other adjustment to the original station time series. Text format of the code in the native language is acceptable. To comply with the restrictions of use for academic purposes listed in the UKMO memo, I request this data for a scientific project with the following scope: 1. Investigation of the effects of changing land use, urban heat island effects, and other non-climatic influences; 2. Sensitivity analysis of parameters used to grid and adjust data; 3. Sensitivity analysis of methods to calculate monthly means (e.g., min/max, max only, min only); 4. Analysis of the source of differences between the CRU land temperature index and other indices (e.g., GISTEMP and NOAA); and, 5. Analysis of the effect of using satellite-derived covariance information to interpolate between land	Your request for information received on 12 August 2009 for a "All original station temperature data used to produce the CRU gridded land temperature data set" and "The code used to convert the original station temperature data series into the gridded land temperature set" has now been considered. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your request, Upon consideration, it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of highly similar data already available in another format from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		stations. The expected duration of the project, from the time of receipt of the data, is no less than three (3) years.	Climatic Research Unit . Both sources already make the requested information available in a gridded format. We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. The same Regulation also applies to your request for the code to convert the original station data as this is already available in published work cited on the CRU website noted above. Once again, we are of the opinion that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information which is already available elsewhere. Regulation 12(5)(f) also applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. Whilst there is no agreement restricting transmission of data specific to the countries named in your request, the agreements that do exist relate to recording stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries. As explained on the CRU website, we have merged the data we have received into existing series or begun new ones. Some of the information will be covered by such agreements and we must therefore restrict its further transmission. We believe that disclosure of the requested data would have an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on its progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-125	31/07/09	I wish to make an EIR/FOI request in respect to any confidentiality agreements restricting transmission of CRUTEM data to non-academics involving the following countries: El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Costa Rica 1. the date of any applicable confidentiality agreements; 2. the parties to such confidentiality agreement, including the full name of any organization; 3. a copy of the section of the confidentiality agreement that "prevents further transmission to non-academics". 4. a copy of the entire confidentiality agreement,	Response the same as FOI_09-91	
FOI_ 09-126	12/08/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request in respect of the surviving raw data for the CRUTEM project.	Your request for information received on 12 August 2009 for a “such raw data as exists and is not subject to a confidentiality agreement, a list of stations (and dates	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Based on the webpage http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/and in particular the following statement Since the 1980s, we have merged the data we have received into existing series or begun new ones, so it is impossible to say if all stations within a particular country or if all of an individual record should be freely available. Data storage availability in the 1980s meant that we were not able to keep the multiple sources for some sites, only the station series after adjustment for homogeneity issues. We, therefore, do not hold the original raw data but only the value-added (i.e. quality controlled and homogenized) data. it seems like CRU have discarded some, but not all, raw data and that in addition some, but not all, of the raw data they have may be covered by a confidentiality agreement. I therefore request 1) such raw data as exists and is not subject to a confidentiality agreement 2) a list of stations (and dates if partial data exists) where such raw data is known to be lost and 3) a list of stations and data providers (ie. national meterological organizations) for such data that exists but is under a confidentiality agreement.	if partial data exists) where such raw data is known to be lost, and a list of stations and data providers (ie. national meteorological organizations) for such data that exists but is under a confidentiality agreement" has now been considered. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your request. Upon consideration, it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(a) – Information not held Some of the requested information is not held Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data and the stations from which they come because the requested data and station identity is a already available in another format from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit . Both sources already make the requested information	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			available in a gridded format. We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. Regulation 12(5)(f) also applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. As explained on the CRU website, we have merged the data we have received into existing series or begun new ones. Some of the information will be covered by such agreements and we must therefore restrict its further transmission. We believe that disclosure of the requested data would have an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. In regards your request for "a list of stations (and dates if partial data exists) where such raw data is known to be lost", we would contend that Regulation 12(4)(a) applies as no data has been either lost or misplaced. Data has been explicitly rejected or not included in the CRUTEM data set and the reasons for those decisions are set out in the papers cited on the Climatic Research Unit website . Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on its progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/ 3 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/	
FOI_ 09-127	13/08/09	I request, under FOI/EIR, a list of the individual scientists, governments, NMSs, and any other organization that has been solicited to provide temperature data for inclusion in the CRU land temperature index by any person acting in an official capacity at CRU or the University of East Anglia. I additionally request, as a separate entity, a list of the individual scientists, governments, NMSs, and any other organization that is known to have provided temperature data for the aforementioned purpose. The reason for my request is to determine what parties have or may have contributed information in order to lobby these parties to provide the University of East Anglia written statements of unconditional or conditional		Pending

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		release (on satisfactory terms for academic and scientific research) of this information; or, alternatively, written statements that the information is already considered public domain. It is in the public interest for the temperature information to be freely available in order for the scientific processes of replication and sensitivity analysis of the CRU land temperature index to be conducted. As your organization has offered the position that it lacks the resources to complete this arduous undertaking itself, it is therefore greatly in the public interest that the individuals and organizations that are apparently preventing release of the information be provided such that they can be lobbied through the appropriate channels.		
FOI_ 09-128	14/08/09	1. A copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 2. A copy of any instructions or stipulations accompanying the transmission of data to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 limiting its further dissemination or disclosure.	Your request for information received on 14 August 2009 for a "A copy of any digital version of the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009" and "A copy of any instructions or stipulations accompanying the transmission of data to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and June 25, 2009 limiting its further dissemination or disclosure" has now been considered and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below:	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(a) – Information not held Some of the requested information is not held by the University Reg. 12(4)(b) – Request is manifestly unreasonable Information is available elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(a) – Adverse effect on international relations Release would damage relations with scientists & institutions from other nations Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 12(4)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a subset of highly similar data already available in another format from other sources; namely the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) , and the Climatic Research Unit . Both sources make the requested information available in a gridded format. We believe, following DEFRA guidance, that it is unreasonable for the University to spend public resources on providing information in a different format to that which is already available. In regards Regulation 12(5)(a), much of the requested data comes from both individual scientists and institutions from countries around the world. If this information were to be released contrary to the conditions under which this institution received it, it	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			would damage the trust that other national scientists and institutions have in UK-based public sector organisations and would likely result in them becoming reluctant to share information and participate in scientific projects in future. This would damage the ability of the University and other UK institutions to co-operate with meteorological organisations and governments of other countries. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. In regards your request for any stipulations accompanying the transmission of the data to academics at Georgia Tech, Regulation 12(4)(a) applies as no such instructions or stipulations are held by the University. Any such conditions were verbal and between the parties involved at that time. All the written agreements that we do hold in relation to the station data within the CRUTEM data set are available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4). In this case, we feel that there is a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. In regards Regulation 12(4)(b), we believe it is not in the public interest to divert public resources away from other work to provide information that is available elsewhere. Finally in regards Regulation 12(5)(a), we feel that there is a clear public interest in neither damaging nor restricting scientific collaboration between UK-based scientists and institutions with international colleagues. I should note, however, that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on it's progress will be available there. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/	
FOI_ 09-133	27/07/09	I understand that the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and Jun 25, 2009 is covered by confidentiality agreements and requests for this data have been denied as regulation 12(5)(f) applies because the information requested was received by the University on terms that prevent further transmission to non-academics. Please supply copies of each confidentiality agreement.	Further to your email of 5 September 2009, I hereby acknowledge your request for information received on 27 July 2009. Please accept my sincere apologies for the delay in acknowledging and responding to your request. By way of explanation, at the time of your request we were receiving an unprecedented number of requests and your request unfortunately was overlooked due to an administrative error on my part which I acknowledge. Please note that you can view our FOIA request complaints procedure at:	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			http://www.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf. It should be noted that the Information Commissioners Office will not consider a complaint made to it until all internal procedures of the institution are exhausted. We have now considered your request and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information directly. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.21(1) , Information is available to applicant by other means All of the requested information can be obtained by reviewing the Climate Research Unit website For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and have provided the necessary links to the requested information. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-133)** *I understand that the CRUTEM station data set that has been sent from CRU to Peter Webster and/or any other person at Georgia Tech between January 1, 2007 and Jun 25, 2009 is covered by confidentiality agreements*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			and requests for this data have been denied as regulation 12(5)(f) applies because the information requested was received by the University on terms that prevent further transmission to non-academics. *Please supply copies of each confidentiality agreement. Copies by email are acceptable.* [Information exempted pursuant to s.21(1), Freedom of Information Act] All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/. This page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved & changed over the time of collection of the data. The agreements relate to the stations, which have stayed the same over the years, despite changes to national boundaries.	
FOI_ 09-137	19/09/09	For some years you have been using Australian data from the Bureau of Meteorology, BOM, in which I have an interest as an Australian taxpayer who helped fund it. I have two questions which relate to copyright in particular and the sharing of information in general. Does the University of East Anglia, or any of its	Your request for information received on 19 September 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and indicated our response to each element of your request. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-137)**	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		employees, or Parties sensibly related to the University, have a primary agreement to share data with the BOM? Does the University of East Anglia, or any of its employees, or Parties sensibly related to the University, have a secondary agreement to share data from the BOM with third parties, beyond fair use provisions?	I have two questions which relate to copyright in particular and the sharing of information in general. *Does the University of East Anglia, or any of its employees, or Parties sensibly related to the University, have a primary agreement to share data with the BOM?* No, we do not have any such agreements with the Bureau of Meteorology *Does the University of East Anglia, or any of its employees, or Parties sensibly related to the University, have a secondary agreement to share data from the BOM with third parties, beyond fair use provisions?* No, we do not have any such agreements with the Bureau of Meteorology	
FOI_ 09-152	20/11/09	Please supply copies of emails that address/discuss the subject of "Diagram for WMO Statement"	Your request for information received on 11 November 2009 for "…copies of emails that address/discuss the subject of "Diagram for WMO Statement"" has now been considered, and, upon consideration, it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(a) – Information not held The requested information was not held at the time of the request Reg. 12(5)(b) – Disclosure would adversely affect a criminal enquiry Information is held by the police in connection with a current investigation	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			We believe that Regulation 12(4)(a) applies to your request because the only location that this information was held on was on a backup server as the original information had been 'deleted' some years ago. Only a technical measure resulted in the information being held on the server and, following Department of Justice guidance on this point, we feel that this information was not 'held' by this institution at the time of the request. Further, pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, the server upon which the requested information resided was taken from the University grounds and now resides with the police forces conducting an investigation into a possible criminal offence. We no longer have access to either the server or any of the material on it. Regulation 12(5)(b) also applies to the data requested because the requested data is part of a larger set of data that is the subject of an ongoing police investigation. Such information is now under an embargo by the investigating forces and any disclosure would adversely affect the ability of that public authority to conduct the criminal enquiry. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In the case of Regulation 12(4)(a), there really is no consideration of the public interest as we simply did not, at the time of the request, nor do not now, have the requested information. Turning to Regulation 12(5)(b), we feel that there is a strong public interest in protecting the ability of police forces to investigate	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			criminal offences and that we should abide by established procedures by which evidence is gathered and used. Overall, we therefore believe that the public interest in non-disclosure of the information outweighs that in favour. I should note that whilst we believe that it is extremely likely that this material is already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Regulations. It should also be noted, however, that the University has decided to conduct an independent review, which will address the issue of data security, an assessment of how we responded to a large influx of Freedom of Information requests, and any other relevant issues which the independent reviewer advises should be addressed. This work will explore the issues associated with the requested information and may well be able to both access and then provide the requested information as part of the inquiry process.	
FOI_ 09-154	20/11/09	Ref: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/8370282.stm Please supply copies of all internal and external correspondence between Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), and any other person regarding the recent leak of information	Your request for information received on 20 November 2009 for "copies of all internal and external correspondence between Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), and any other person regarding the recent leak of information" has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information.	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the appropriate limit s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 12 applies because, given the complexity of the investigation and extent of information requested, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. If held, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, the server and servers upon which the requested information resided was taken from the University grounds and now resides with the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			police forces conducting an investigation into a possible criminal offence. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability to speak frankly about serious breaches of information security, and our reaction thereto, is essential to ensure that we address the breach in an efficient and effective manner. There is a very strong public interest in maintaining the ability of institutions to respond to such events properly, quickly and effectively, particularly where there is an ongoing criminal investigation and we feel that disclosure of correspondence such as has been requested would not be in the public interest at this time. We invoke section 40 because, it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-155	21/11/09	Please supply copies of all correspondence (including emails) between Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), and Michael Mann from 1st January 2008 to the present date.	Your request for information received on 21 November 2009 for "copies of all correspondence (including emails) between Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), and Michael Mann from 1st January 2008 to the present date." has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the appropriate limit s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b) (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			information would contravene the data protection principles Section 12 applies because, given the complexity of the investigation and extent of information requested, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. Even if we could assemble the requested information within the appropriate limit, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Serious breaches of information security, and our reaction thereto, is essential to ensure that we address the breach in an efficient and effective manner. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2), in the opinion of our 'qualified	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability of academic staff to speak freely and frankly about their work is one of the cornerstones of academic freedom and is essential to the proper assessment and evaluation of research in preparation for publication. There is a very strong public interest in maintaining the ability of academics to exchange views freely and frankly. The long-accepted practice of peer-reviewed publication of research results provides an avenue for the assessment of the academic quality of work, and affords the accountability and transparency that the public interest merits. Release of the requested correspondence adds nothing to the understanding of the spending of public monies. In sum, we feel that the public interest in preserving the ability of academics to exchange opinions freely & frankly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-156	21/11/09	Under the Freedom of Information Act I request copies of the following information, within twenty working days, and I would like these in PDF format sent by email. Please treat these as three separate FOI requests.	Your request for information received on 21 November 2009 for "A summary of information as to whether anyone in the CRU has been given training in their obligations under the Freedom of Information Act." has now been considered and the information requested is	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		1) A summary of information as to whether anyone in the CRU has been given training in their obligations under the Freedom of Information Act. 2) A summary of information held on the level of understanding of senior members of the CRU of the term "science" and "integrity". 3) A copy of all emails and other communication to or from members of the CRU relating to instructions, suggestions, enticements, encouragement or other communication around the subversion of the law of England given in the Freedom of Information Act.	enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. As per your request, I have separated your request into three (3) individual requests and will address your other requests under separate cover. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-156)** *Under the Freedom of Information Act I request copies of the following information, within twenty working days, and I would like these in PDF format sent by email. Please treat these as three separate FOI requests.* *1) A summary of information as to whether anyone in the CRU has been given training in their obligations under the Freedom of Information Act.* There is an established program of training offered by the University on the Freedom of Information Act that involves both introductory and advanced sessions. The former is meant for all staff who may come into contact with a FOIA request and occurs semi-annually. The latter is intended for those within the University with a frequent and ongoing involvement in administering FOIA requests and is presented annually. Attendance is optional. There is am administrative contact point in each Faculty for the Information Policy & Compliance Manager, who receives all Freedom of Information Act requests. CRU is part of the School of Environmental Sciences which is part of the Faculty of Science. We can confirm that the relevant administrative colleague in the Faculty of Science who co-ordinates FOIA requests to Science Schools has attended the relevant training. There has therefore been no need for academic,	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			research or administrative staff within the Climatic Research Unit to attend the advanced session, nor have any attended the introductory sessions. Additionally, ad hoc training to demand is available upon consultation between the Information Policy and Compliance Manager and the Unit, Faculty or School involved. In response to any request, the Information Policy and Compliance Manager liaises with the staff within the relevant Unit or Faculty whose role is such in the FOI administration process that they have received advanced training in FOIA. These staff assist the Information Policy and Compliance Manager in assembling the requested documentation, assessing potential exemptions, and act as a conduit for information and instruction between the Information Policy and Compliance Manager and University staff. As part of this process, any staff involved with a request are fully briefed on the nature of the Act, our obligations under the Act and their role within the process of administering a request under the Act. This occurred with all staff within CRU that were involved in any of the numerous FOIA requests we have received in the past year for information relating to CRU activities	
FOI_ 09-157	20/11/09	I hereby make a EIR/FOI request for the complete text of the following emails transmitted over the University of East Anglia's (UEA) servers (header information and select excerpts were supplied): ***[Information exempted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act]***	Your request for information received on 20 November 2009 for the complete text of certain emails has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding this response to you. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation Pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, we can advise that the University does not hold some of the requested information. Specifically, a search has revealed that items 1, 3, and 5 in your request are not held currently by the University. For those items that we do hold, it is our belief that section 31(1)(a) and (b) applies because pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, the server and servers upon which the requested information resided was taken from the University grounds and now resides with the police forces conducting an investigation into a possible criminal offence. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2)(b)(ii), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability of academic staff to speak freely and frankly about their work is one of the cornerstones of academic freedom and is essential to the proper assessment and evaluation of research in preparation for publication. There is a very strong public interest in maintaining the ability of academics to exchange views freely and frankly. The long-accepted practice of peer-reviewed publication of research results provides an avenue for the assessment of the academic quality of work, and affords the accountability and transparency that the public interest merits. Release of the requested correspondence adds nothing to the understanding of the spending of public monies. In sum, we feel that the public interest in preserving the ability of academics to exchange opinions freely & frankly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			We invoke section 40(1) because it is our belief that personal information is within the requested information, in that a living individual can be identified and the information relating to them has them as the focus and effects their professional privacy. As we do not have consent for the release of that information, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and would therefore be barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-158	20/11/09	I also submit a SEPARATE FOI request for any emails transmitted over UEA's servers that contain any content related to FOI requests submitted to UEA during calendar year 2009. (As amended on 14/12/09) 1. Were transmitted via UAE's mail system in calendar year 2009, excluding emails transmitted after November 19, 2009; 2. Contain any discussion about the disposition of the request and/or availability of the items being requested; and, 3. Relate to historical or current climatological data, code, and ancillary information to include: Requests concerning temperature/precipitation data received from public sources, Requests concerning temperature/precipitation data received from non-public sources, Requests concerning code for the CRU temperature index, Requests concerning temperature/precipitation proxy data, Requests concerning metadata for the above	Your request for information received on 20 November 2009 for any emails transmitted over UEA's servers in 2009 relating to requests under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 for "historical or current climatological data, code, and ancillary information" has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the appropriate limit s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		mentioned items, and, Requests concerning retransmittal and use restrictions on the above mentioned data	s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 12 applies because, given the extent of information requested and the number of persons potentially involved, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. Even if we could assemble the requested information within the appropriate limit, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability to speak freely and frankly about the administration of a request under the Act, is essential to ensure that we meet our obligations under the Act and address the legitimate interests of the University. All options need to be discussed openly and advice offered to staff involved in the process, and the disclosure of such information would certainly inhibit our ability or willingness to engage in such discussions in future. As required by the Act, we state in every response the reason for our decisions, and the thinking behind those decisions. These decisions, and the reasoning behind them, are open to challenge by the requester and can ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss FOIA requests openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. As noted above, the outcome of this process is openly to challenge and adjudication which provides the transparency and accountability required under the Act. Therefore, that the public interest in the non-disclosure of this internal correspondence outweighs the public	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-160	23/11/09	Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, I hereby request a copy of (1) any emails sent by, sent to, or copied to Phil Jones, David Palmer, Dir Info Services or any other member of the CRU or any other member of the UEA Information Services Directorate during the last ten years concerning FOI requests involving the CRU or any of its memebers, and (2) any documents prepared by or held by Phil Jones, David Palmer, Dir Info Services or any other member of the CRU or any other member of the UEA Information Services Directorate during the last ten years concerning FOI requests involving the CRU or any of its members. My request includes, but is not limited to, any emails or documents containing any of the following phrases: [Information exempted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act].	Your request for information received on 23 November 2009 for any emails sent by, to, or copied to Phil Jones, David Palmer, Dir Info Services or any other member of the CRU or any other member of the UEA Information Services Directorate during the last ten years concerning FOI requests involving the CRU or any of its members, and any documents prepared by or held by the same persons for the same time period in regards the same subject has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the appropriate limit	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 12 applies because, given the extent of information requested and the number of persons potentially involved, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. Even if we could assemble the requested information within the appropriate limit, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability to speak freely and frankly about the administration of a request under the Act, is essential to ensure that we meet our obligations under the Act and address the legitimate interests of the University. All options need to be discussed openly and advice offered to staff involved in the process, and the disclosure of such information would certainly inhibit our ability or willingness to engage in such discussions in future. As required by the Act, we state in every response the reason for our decisions, and the thinking behind those decisions. These decisions, and the reasoning behind them are open to challenge by the requester and can ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss FOIA requests openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. As noted above, the outcome of this process is openly to challenge and adjudication which provides the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			transparency and accountability required under the Act. Therefore, that the public interest in the non-disclosure of this internal correspondence outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-162	23/11/09	I wish to make a FOI request, in respect of the following: 1. Information held by the Climatic Research Unit ("CRU") about the treatment of Freedom of or approach to Freedom of Information Act ("FOI") requests. 2. Information held by the UEA about the treatment of or approach adopted by (or to be adopted) to FOI requests by the CRU. 3. The CRU's data retention policies and methods. 4. Information relating to the removal or destruction of data controlled by the CRU.	Your request for information received on 23 November 2009 as clarified by your email of 23 December 2009, for information held by the Climatic Research Unit ("CRU") about the treatment of, or approach to Freedom of Information Act ("FOI") requests, and for the CRU's data retention policies and methods has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. It is, however, not possible to meet all elements of your request. Therefore, in accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply the exempted information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the appropriate limit	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles In relation to your request for "documents (electronic or otherwise) going to specific FOI requests and their treatment by staff of the CRU", section 12 applies because, given the extent of information requested and the number of persons potentially involved, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. Even if we could assemble the information regarding specific requests within the appropriate limit, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability to speak freely and frankly about the administration of a request under the Act, is essential to ensure that we meet our obligations under the Act and address the legitimate interests of the University. All options need to be discussed openly and advice offered to staff involved in the process, and the disclosure of such information would certainly inhibit our ability or willingness to engage in such discussions in future. As required by the Act, we state in every response the reason for our decisions, and the thinking behind those decisions. These decisions, and the reasoning behind them are open to challenge by the requester and can ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss FOIA requests openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. As noted above, the outcome of this process is open to challenge and adjudication which provides the transparency and accountability required under the Act. Therefore, that the public interest in the non-disclosure of this internal correspondence outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information regarding specific cases, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-162)** *I am seeking information relating to:* *1. General policy relating to the treatment of FOI Requests* The University has a Code of Practice that governs our approach to requests under the Act and is modelled on the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice. It is appended as a separate .pdf file to this cover letter. *2. Documents (electronic or otherwise) going to specific FOI requests and their treatment by staff of the CRU.* [Information exempted pursuant to s.12, s.31(1), s.36(2) & s.40(1), Freedom of Information Act] *3. The CRU's data retention policies and methods relating to research data* The Climatic Research Unit does not have a generic research data retention or destruction policy. The retention and disposal of research data is governed	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			primarily by the terms under which funding for research is granted and varies from project to project.	
FOI_ 09-163	23/11/09	On the BBC Today Programme on 23rd November 2009, your Professor Robert Watson was interviewed by James Naughtie. He made the following statement (verbatim transcript from the BBC recording): "The University is trying to get permission from all of the different meteorological organisations across the world to completely allow this information to be made freely available. They don't own the information - they're trying to make it available now so everyone can see it's open". Please can you tell me which organsations have been contacted to obtain permission to release information and when they were contacted. To avoid any doubt, I am interested in the specific requests to which Professor Watson was referring in the interview. A simple list by email will suffice.	Further to my letter of 23 November 2009 on this matter, I am writing to inform you that your request for information has now been considered, and pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, that we do not hold the requested information. Contact with metrological organisations is mediated by the Met Office. At the request of UEA we believe that the Met Office are now in the process of contacting all the national agencies regarding obtaining consent for release of data. The contact details for the Met Office are as follows: The Met Office FitzRoy Road Exeter Devon EX1 3PB United Kingdom	
FOI_ 09-165	24/11/09	The office is interested in obtaining a report detailing funding amounts received from U.S. grantors (or any other U.S. sources) by the Climatic Research Unit, or any of the staff affiliated with the unit. The period of time in which they are interested is somewhat flexible, but let me throw out from 1990 to the present as a starting point.	Your request for information received on 24 November 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith as a separate Excel file to this cover letter. Apologies for the delay in providing this information to you; it took longer to assemble and convert the numerical values than anticipated. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. By way of explanation of the data provided, the enclosed spreadsheet lists all of the research grant funding which the Climatic Research Unit has received	Additional document attached. FOI_09-165.pdf

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			from US funding sources from 1990 to date. The total value of each award is recorded on our database in pounds sterling and this is shown for each of the grants/contracts awarded. As the records held on the database do not list the exchange rates used to convert from dollars to pounds at the time of the award we have been reviewing our records to find the actual sums in dollars awarded. The Research, Enterprise and Engagement Office at the University keeps paper records for research grants and contracts for a period of seven years after the end of a contract. They also have some data on a central database which has dollar amounts. We have therefore been able to complete the "total values in dollar" spreadsheet for most, but not all of the grants/contracts shown.	
FOI_ 09-166	25/11/09	Please supply a copy of the dataset that was used to create the Climate Research Unit's temperature record. Or failing that, details of where a copy of the dataset may be obtained.	Your request for information received on 25 November 2009 for "a copy of the dataset that was used to create the Climate Research Unit's temperature record" has been considered, and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 6(1)(b) – Information accessible to the requester Information is available publicly available & easily accessible to the requester elsewhere	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 6(1)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is a virtually identical to data already available from other sources; for example, the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) . It is our position that this information is both publicly available and easily accessible to the requester. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limits further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data will shortly be available on the Climate Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/ once the website is re-established. We believe that disclosure of the requested data would have an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climate Research Unit. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that, despite recent events, there remains a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. I should note, however, that, at the request of UEA, the Met Office is now in the process of contacting all the national agencies regarding obtaining consent for release of data. This work has been announced on both the CRU and Met Office websites and further updates on its progress will be available at those locations. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php	
FOI_ 09-167	25/11/09	Please supply: i) Email server logs (for email sent both internally and received from external sources). ii) Logs for email archiving or permanent email storage (for email sent both internally and received from external sources). This is to be understood as any server or centralised storage or retention mechanisms and not the end-users "account". iii) Telephone call logs. iv) Telephone recording archives. for Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) from the period 1st January 2008 to present.	Your request for information received on 25 November 2009 for email server and archive logs, and for telephone call logs and archives for Phil Jones for the period 1st January 2008 to present has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.12(1), Appropriate limit exceeded The time it would take to extract the information would exceed the	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			appropriate limit s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 12 applies because, given the complexity of the investigation and extent of information requested, extraction of data from all the locations where it might be held would exceed the statutory limit as provided for by section 12 and the Fees Regulations. Even if we could assemble the requested information within the appropriate limit, it is our belief that s.31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. For serious breaches of information security, and our reaction thereto, it is essential to ensure that we address the breach in an efficient and effective manner.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			We invoke section 40 because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-168	27/11/09	I am making a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. I would like to know for the period 1 January 2000 to 1 November 2009: (a) how many Environmental Information Regulations requests the University (including the CRU) have received regarding climate change and climate change data, broken down by calendar year; (b) for each year listed in (a) please provide a breakdown of the outcome of the requests, i.e. was the request met in full, the request partially met, the request denied, or the request ignored; (c) for each year listed in (a) please provide the average time to fully respond to the requests (i.e. ignoring any acknowledgement, what is the average number of working days from the receipt to the formal response for these requests); (d) For all of the partially satisfied or denied requests in the period 1 January 2000 to 1 November 2009, please provide a breakdown of the reasons given for the refusal to provide the information requested.	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for statistical information relating to requests made to this institution under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. I should advise that the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 only came into force on 1 January 2005, and therefore we have no statistics preceding that date. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-168)** *I would like to know for the period 1 January 2000 to 1 November 2009:* *(a) how many Environmental Information Regulations requests the University (including the CRU) have received regarding climate change and climate change data, broken down by calendar year;* *(b) for each year listed in (a) please provide a breakdown of the outcome of the requests, i.e. was the*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			request met in full, the request partially met, the request denied, or the request ignored; *(c) for each year listed in (a) please provide the average time to fully respond to the requests (i.e. ignoring any acknowledgement, what is the average number of working days from the receipt to the formal response for these requests);* Year, Number of Requests, Outcome, Average Response Time, Released, Released in Part ,Refused 2005, 0, n/a, n/a, n/a, n/a 2006, 0, n/a, n/a, n/a, n/a 2007, 2, 1, 0, 1, 6 days 2008, 1, 1, 0, 16 days 2009, 24, 1, 0, 171, 15 days Notes 1Please note that one (1) request was withdrawn by the requester without any resolution, and five (5) requests are still open pending response (*d) For all of the partially satisfied or denied requests in the period 1 January 2000 to 1 November 2009, please provide a breakdown of the reasons given for the refusal to provide the information requested.* Regulation Exception Explanation Number of citations1 6(1)(b) Information available 3 12(4)(a) Information not held 4 12(4)(b) Request manifestly unreasonable 12 12(4)(c) Request too general 0 12(4)(d) Information in course of completion 0 12(4)(e) Disclosure of internal communications 0 12(5) Adverse effect on: 12(5)(a) International relations 9 12(5)(b) Course of justice 1 12(5)(c) Intellectual property rights 0	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			12(5)(d) Confidentiality of proceedings 0 12(5)(e) Confidentiality of commercial information 0 12(5)(f) Interests of person providing information 15 12(5)(g) Protection of environment 0 Notes 1Please note that any one request can have a number of exceptions applied to it	
FOI_ 09-169	27/11/09	Please supply copies of all correspondence (including emails) between the UEA Information Policy and Compliance team and Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), from 1st January 2008 to the present date.	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for "copies of all correspondence (including emails) between the UEA Information Policy and Compliance team and Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), from 1st January 2008 to the present date" has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section.17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles It is our belief that section 31(a) and (b) applies because pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, this information is relevant to a current investigation by police forces into a possible criminal offence. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2)(i)&(ii), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation' and 'the provision of advice'. The ability to speak freely and frankly about the administration of a request under the Act and to provide advice to staff members engaged in the process is essential to ensure that we meet our	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			obligations under the Act and address the legitimate interests of the University. All options need to be discussed openly and advice offered to staff involved in the process, and the disclosure of such information would certainly inhibit our ability or willingness to engage in such discussions in future. As required by the Act, we state in every response the reason for our decisions, and the thinking behind those decisions. These decisions, and the reasoning behind them, are open to challenge by the requester and can ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss FOIA requests openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. As noted above, the outcome of this process is openly to challenge and adjudication which provides the transparency and accountability required under the Act. Therefore, that the public interest in the non-disclosure of this internal correspondence outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40(1) because, it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-170	27/11/09	Please supply copies of all correspondence (including emails) between the UEA Chief Librarian and Phil	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for “copies of all correspondence (including	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), from 1st January 2008 to the present date.	emails) between the UEA Chief Librarian and Phil Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), from 1st January 2008 to the present date" has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information directly. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles It is our belief that section 31(a) and (b) applies because pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, this information is relevant to a current investigation by police forces into a possible criminal offence. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. Regardless of the fact that some of the information is likely to be already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2)(b)(i)&(ii), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation' and 'the provision of advice'. The ability to speak freely and frankly about the administration of a request under the Act and to provide advice to staff members engaged in the process is essential to ensure that we meet our obligations under the Act and address the legitimate interests of the University. All options need to be discussed openly and advice offered to staff involved in the process, and the disclosure of such information would certainly inhibit our ability or willingness to engage in such discussions in future. As required by the Act, we state in every response the reason for our decisions, and the thinking behind those decisions. These decisions, and the reasoning behind them, are open to challenge by the requester and can	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss FOIA requests openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. As noted above, the outcome of this process is open to challenge and adjudication which provides the transparency and accountability required under the Act. Therefore, the public interest in the non-disclosure of this internal correspondence outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40(1) because, it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-171	27/11/09	http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid=943&filename=1228922050.txt refers to: [Information exempted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act]. Please supply: 1. a copy of the entire email complete with headers 2. a copy of the email referred to in this section - "I did get an email from the FOI person here early yesterday	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for a copy of an entire email currently listed on a public website has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below:	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		to tell me I shouldn't be deleting emails"	Exemption Reason s.31(1)(a) & (b), Disclosure would prejudice detection of crime & the apprehension of criminals Information is held by the police in connection with an ongoing criminal investigation s.36(2)(b) (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles It is our belief that section 31(a) and (b) applies because the requested information is part of an ongoing investigation into criminal activity being carried out by Norfolk Constabulary. Disclosure of any information relevant to that investigation at this point could or would prejudice the ongoing investigation of this matter. There is a clear public interest in preserving the integrity of, and public confidence in, criminal investigations. As this matter is currently under investigation, the public interest in non-disclosure is even higher than it would be otherwise. For serious breaches of information security, and our reaction thereto, it is essential to ensure that we address the breach in an efficient and effective manner. Regardless of the fact that a version of the requested information is already in the public domain due to the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this fact does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Act. As to section 36(2)(b)(ii), in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability of academic staff to speak freely and frankly about their work is one of the cornerstones of academic freedom and is essential to the proper assessment and evaluation of research in preparation for publication. There is a very strong public interest in maintaining the ability of academics to exchange views freely and frankly. The long-accepted practice of peer-reviewed publication of research results provides an avenue for the assessment of the academic quality of work, and affords the accountability and transparency that the public interest merits. Release of the requested correspondence adds nothing to the understanding of the spending of public monies. In sum, we feel that the public interest in preserving the ability of academics to exchange opinions freely and frankly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. We invoke section 40(1) because it is our belief based on internal consultation, that personal information is within the requested information, and we do not have consent for the release of that information. Therefore, disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
FOI_ 09-172	27/11/09	Given that the alleged scientific and financial fraud at the CRU has dragged the reputation of the UEA into the gutter and down the drain, please supply copies of policy documents about how the vice-chancellor intends to try to restore the reputation of the university.	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for "copies of policy documents about how the vice-chancellor intends to try to restore the reputation of the university" has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-172)** *Given that the alleged scientific and financial fraud at the CRU has dragged the reputation of the UEA into the gutter and down the drain, please supply copies of policy documents about how the vice-chancellor intends to try to restore the reputation of the university.* There are no formally approved University policy documents on actions that the Vice-Chancellor intends to take in response to recent events. However, we can provide the following summary of actions we have, or intend to take. As a starting point, the Vice-Chancellor believes that the reputation and integrity of UEA is of the upmost importance to us all, and as a result, the University wishes to have the allegations about the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) to be examined fully and independently. The University has therefore commissioned Sir Muir Russell, previous Vice-Chancellor of Glasgow University and prior to that the first permanent secretary to the Scottish Executive, to undertake an independent	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			review. Sir Muir is extremely experienced in public life, has an understanding of the conduct of universities and research, and is entirely independent of any association with this University and with the climate change debate. The terms of reference for the Review are: "The Independent Review will investigate the key allegations that arose from a series of hacked e-mails from CRU. The Review will: 1. Examine the hacked e-mail exchanges, other relevant e-mail exchanges and any other information held at CRU to determine whether there is any evidence of the manipulation or suppression of data which is at odds with acceptable scientific practice and may therefore call into question any of the research outcomes. 2. Review CRU's policies and practices for acquiring, assembling, subjecting to peer review and disseminating data and research findings, and their compliance or otherwise with best scientific practice. 3. Review CRU's compliance or otherwise with the University's policies and practices regarding requests under the Freedom of Information Act ('the FOIA') and the Environmental Information Regulations ('the EIR') for the release of data. 4. Review and make recommendations as to the appropriate management, governance and security structures for CRU and the security, integrity and release of the data it holds. Sir Muir will have the discretion to amend or add to the terms of reference if he feels necessary, devise his own methods of working, and call on appropriate expertise in order to investigate the allegations fully.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			The University has asked for the Review to be completed by Spring 2010 and this will be made public along with UEA's response." The University is committed to academic transparency and accountability. CRU's research outcomes have been published in peer-reviewed journals of the highest standing. All adjustments to data where this has been necessary (for example to account for the move of a meteorological station) have been explained. CRU has undertaken, with the good offices of the Met Office, to seek permission from the various national meteorological services which have provided the original station data to publish it. This is not a simple undertaking as some 150 meteorological services were involved in the collection of the original data, and some see the data as having economic value or are otherwise sensitive to its release. It should be noted that over 95% of the data has for some years been in the public domain, such as on the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) within the NOAA site None of the adjusted station data referred to in the emails that have been published has been destroyed. When we receive Sir Muir's findings, we will understand which if any of the allegations stand and which fall and we will act accordingly. We will publish the findings and the University's response. I hope that this response is helpful to you and will give you full confidence that this episode is being treated very seriously by the University, and that our response is both considered and appropriate.	
FOI_	27/11/09	Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, please	Your request for information received on 27 November	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
09-173		provide by return e-mail or via http://www.transferbigfiles.com/Default.aspx the full contents of the folder designated "FOIA" that was purloined from the UEA/Hadley CRU server(s) last week, said folder containing some 4,568 files in some 104 subfolders of some 157 megabytes, said folder having been posted to the Web for some days at http://www.eastangliaemails.com/index.php and other sites. The purpose of this request is solely to determine the authenticity of the leaked files and to establish a validated database that has not been altered. If the files in the FOIA folder cited above are, to the best of your knowledge, known to be authentic (excepting the striking of e-mail addresses), please send a statement to this effect and the Freedom of Information Act request herein is withdrawn.	2009 has now been considered, and, pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information. Your request is for the full contents of the 'FOIA folder' and as far as we are aware no person at UEA compiled this folder and therefore we do not now hold, nor ever have held, a FOIA folder. We cannot reasonably be expected to provide the full contents of a folder that was created by someone outside of our organisation and whose contents we cannot verify.	
FOI_ 09-174	28/11/09	I am writing to you in accordance with the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and the Information Commissioners Decision Notice FER0085500, which stated: "The Commissioner considers that the phrase "any information… on…" should be interpreted widely and that this is in line with the purpose expressed in the first recital of the Council Directive 2003/4/EC. Therefore 'any information on' will usually include information concerning, about or relating to a particular measure, activity, or factor in question. In other words information that would inform the public about the matter under consideration and would therefore facilitate effective participation by the public in environmental decision	Your request for information received on 28 November 2009 for a spreadsheet sent as an attachment to an email of 28 July 2006 from ***[Personal data excised pursuant to s.40(1), FOIA]*** has now been considered, and, upon consideration, it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		making is likely to be environmental information. This approach was informed by the Information Tribunal case Ofcom v Information Commissioner and T-Mobile UK Limited (EA/2006/0078)." The matter, which I seek to be informed about, is a very specific aspect of the Working Group One contribution to the IPCC, 2007 Fourth Assessment Report for which Professor Keith Briffa was a Lead Author. The Chapter 6 in question dealt with the estimation of historic temperatures, which I hope we can agree are states of the environment, which are covered by Regulation 2(1)(a). I also believe my request covered by Regulation 2(1)(c) and (e) Appendix A to the 'Principles Governing IPCC Work' require that: "All written expert, and government review comments will be made available to reviewers on request during the review process and will be retained in an open archive in a location determined by the IPCC Secretariat on completion of the Report for a period of at least five years." Accordingly I believe this information should have been proactively disseminated under Regulation 4. On 28 July 2006 at 6:32 PM UEA/CRU received an email from ***[Personal data excised pursuant to s.40(1), FOIA]***, to which a spreadsheet was attached "listing: the submitter, file name of the paper, its acceptance date, and the chapter and section which the submitter feels is relevant." These were expert	Reg. 12(4)(a) – Information not held The requested information was not held at the time of the request Reg. 12(5)(b) – Disclosure would adversely affect a criminal enquiry Information is held by the police in connection with a current investigation We believe that Regulation 12(4)(a) applies to your request because the only location that this information was held on was on a backup server as the original information had been 'deleted' some years ago. Pursuant to an investigation carried out by the Norfolk Constabulary, the server upon which the requested information resided was taken from the University grounds on 24 November and now resides with the police forces conducting an investigation into a possible criminal offence. Therefore, at the time of the request, we did not hold the requested information, and we currently have no access to either the server or any of the material on it. Regulation 12(5)(b) also applies to the data requested because the requested data is part of a larger set of data that is the subject of an ongoing police investigation. Such information is now under an embargo by the investigating forces and any disclosure would adversely affect the ability of that public authority to conduct the criminal enquiry. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In the case of Regulation 12(4)(a), there really is no consideration of the public interest as we simply did	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		comments received pursuant to an email sent to Reviewers on 5 July 2006, soliciting additional reviewers comments. Please send me an electronic copy of the spreadsheet.	not, at the time of the request, nor do not now, have the requested information. Turning to Regulation 12(5)(b), we feel that there is a strong public interest in protecting the ability of police forces to investigate criminal offences and that we should abide by established procedures by which evidence is gathered and used. Overall, we therefore believe that the public interest in non-disclosure of the information outweighs that in favour. I should note that whilst we believe that it is possible that this material is already in the public domain due to the illegal penetration and use of University computing facilities, this does not relieve us of our obligations to address any request on its merits under the Regulations.	
FOI_ 09-176	30/11/09	The Climate Research Group has refused to release data on the grounds that the data is subject to confidentiality agreements. Can you please summarise what agreements have been signed? A summary the name of the other party, any expiration dates for the agreements, and a summary of the data covered.	Your request for information received on 30 November 2009 for a summary of the agreements regarding further transmission of data received by the Climatic Research Unit inclusive of the name of the other party, any expiration dates for the agreements, and a summary of the data covered has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-176)** *The Climate Research Group has refused to release data on the grounds that the data is subject to confidentiality agreements.* *Can you please summarise what agreements have*	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			been signed? A summary the name of the other party, any expiration dates for the agreements, and a summary of the data covered. All written agreements that we possess in relation to any data received from any country or geographic area are now all available via the Climatic Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk. This site is currently unavailable due to traffic but we do expect it to reappear in the near future. This web page also has information regarding the compilations, processing and handling of any data received. The manner in which the station data was collected, the changes in national boundaries and entities, and the nature of the processing of the data by the CRU have all evolved and changed over the time of the collection of the data. This means that there is not always a direct correlation between any agreement and the geographic location of the data or stations that the agreement covers.	
FOI_ 09-177	27/11/09	I refer to the statement by Professor Trevor Davies posted on the University's website on 24th November 2009 (copy appended for reference); My request is as follow: 1. What advice did Professor Davies take, and from whom, before writing and publishing the statement 2. 2. How many of the leaked emails had he read before writing and publishing the statement?	Your request for information received on 27 November 2009 for information regarding the process Professor Davies undertook in drafting his statement currently on the UEA website has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. Please accept my sincere apologies for the delay in forwarding this response to you. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Exemption Reason s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation Section 36(2) applies because, in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of this University, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the provision of advice and the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. The ability of the Pro Vice Chancellor for Research to converse/correspond freely and frankly while preparing to make a public statement for publication as essential to his role, and in the considered opinion of the Vice-Chancellor, this outweighs the public interest in disclosure. There is a very strong public interest in preserving the ability of an institution to discuss University business openly and freely in order to ensure that all options are addressed, assessed and either chosen or rejected. The decision to not release the requested information and the reasoning behind it are open to challenge by yourself and can ultimately be adjudicated by the Information Commissioner and Information Tribunal. Therefore, that the public interest in the non-disclosure of internal correspondence outweighs the public interest in disclosure. I should also note that, pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, we can advise	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			you that we do not hold some of the requested information. Specifically, in relation to your query regarding how many of the leaked emails had Prof. Davies read before writing and publishing the statement, we can advise that no recorded information exists as to the exact number of emails viewed nor does Prof. Davies have any accurate recollection of the number viewed. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-177)** *My request is as follow:* *1. What advice did Professor Davies take, and from whom, before writing and publishing the statement?* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii), Freedom of Information Act] *2. How many of the leaked emails had he read before writing and publishing the statement?* [Information not held - s.1(1)(a), Freedom of Information Act] There is no record of the exact number of emails viewed.	
FOI_ 09-179	01/12/09	In one of the leaked emails there is reference to a report written by "Harry" (presumably Ian Harris) on the subject of HADCRUT data. See http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid=506&filename=1112622624.txt I'd like to receive a copy of this report, in electronic format if possible, but on paper if not.	Your request for information received on 1 December 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith as a separate .pdf file appended to this cover letter. I trust this will be to your satisfaction.	Additional document attached. FOI_09-179.pdf
FOI_ 09-180	02/12/2009	In view of Mr Jones's decision to step down:	Your request for information received on 2 December 2009 for copies of all correspondence relating to the	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/01/AR2009120102737_pf.html please supply copies of all correspondence relating to this decision between Mr Jones and any other person.	decision of Dr. Jones to step aside from his position of Head of the Climatic Research Unit has now been considered and unfortunately, it is not possible to provide the information. In accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles We invoke section 40(1) because there is no doubt that the information requested is personal information within the definition of the Act as it both identifies a living individual and very much effects both the personal and professional privacy of the individual concerned. We do not have consent for the disclosure of this information, and therefore, any disclosure without that consent would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40.	
FOI_ 09-182	03/12/09	I have the right, and so I am asking in the name of that right, to have your people share with me thru the freedom of information act the data that has been gathered...complete...on all of the climate conditions that show global warming, so that I may duplicate, should I wish, the conditions, and evaluate the validity (to show that there has been no manipulation of data).	Your request for information received on 3 December 2009 for "the data that has been gathered...complete...on all of the climate conditions that show global warming" has been considered, and it is, unfortunately, not possible to meet your request. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		This, of course, is what peer review is all about. I know that the data is in folders in computers, and it is a simple thing to compile (as it should already be together) and I am asking that it be sent to me	Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 6(1)(b) – Information accessible to the requester Information is available publicly available and easily accessible to the requester elsewhere Reg. 12(5)(f) – Adverse effect on the person providing information Information is covered by a confidentiality agreement We believe that Regulation 6(1)(b) applies to your request for the data because the requested data is virtually identical to data already available from other sources; for example, the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) . It is our position that this information is both publicly available and easily accessible to the requester. Regulation 12(5)(f) applies to the data requested because the data was received by the University on terms that limit further transmission. We believe that there would be an adverse effect on the institutions that supplied data under those agreements as it would undermine the conditions under which they supplied the data to the Climatic Research Unit. All the agreements that we do hold in relation to the requested data will shortly be available on the Climatic Research Unit website at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			once the website is re-established. Regulation 12(1)(b) mandates that we consider the public interest in any decision to release or refuse information under Regulation 12(4) and Reg. 12(5). In this case, we feel that, despite recent events, there remains a strong public interest in upholding contract terms governing the use of received information. To not do so would be to potentially risk the loss of access to such data in future as noted above. I should note, however, that, at the request of UEA, the Met Office is now in the process of contacting all the national agencies regarding obtaining consent for release of data. This work has been announced on the Met Office website and further updates on its progress will be available at those locations. 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php 2 ttp://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/pressoffice/2009/pr20091205.html	
FOI_ 09-183	03/12/09	Under the FOIA I would like to know the method in which Sir Muir Russell was selected to head an independent panel to investigate the leaked e-mails in your Climate Science Unit. How did the university come to select Sir Muir Russell over other candidates? Who else was considered? What makes you think he is independent? Does he have any preconcieved views on global warming supporters or deniers?	Your request for information received on 3 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. It is, however, not possible to meet all elements of your request. Therefore, in accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply the exempted information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		If you were picking a jury in a murder trial you would ask the jurist if they had a pre-trial opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused. Was Sir Muir Russell asked this question?	reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 36(2) applies because, in the opinion of the 'qualified person' (the Vice-Chancellor), disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit the free and frank provision of advice and the exchange of views necessary to identify the appropriate person to undertake the independent review. Proposals could not be communicated or justified if those providing the information considered it to be provided other than in strict confidence. A number of individuals of high public standing would be considered, but without their knowledge. There is a very strong public interest in allowing appropriate consultation to take place to ensure that the best possible appointment is made which exceeds any public interest there may be in disclosure of the names of those considered or the questions asked of any particular appointee. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief that disclosure of the names of any person under consideration for such a post is the personal information of that person within the definition of the	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Act, and as we do not have consent for the release of that information, disclosure would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-183)** *1. Under the FOIA I would like to know the method in which Sir Muir Russell was selected to head an independent panel to investigate the leaked e-mails in your Climate Science Unit.* *2. How did the university come to select Sir Muir Russell over other candidates?* The background to the appointment of Sir Muir Russell to lead the independent review into allegations arising from the hacking and publication of emails and data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia is within an University press statement available on the University website here: http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/2009/dec/CRUreview In making this appointment the University considered it important to approach an individual with the stature, experience and ability to head the review, drawing on the additional expertise and support he considers appropriate. It was a prerequisite that the appointee should have had no previous links with the University of East Anglia, the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) or the Climate Science community but it was considered helpful if they had an existing understanding of the ways in which university departments are organised and managed. To expedite the review it was also important that they would be able to prepare a	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			report for consideration by Spring 2010. This was an exacting brief but Sir Muir's background and public standing were, however, a suitable match and he was the first candidate approached. After discussions he agreed to lead the review and will be carrying out the initial stages of his work before Christmas 2009 *3. Who else was considered?* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2) & s.40(1), Freedom of Information Act] *4. What makes you think he is independent?* See answer to first & second question above *5. Does he have any preconceived views on global warming supporters or deniers?* See answer to first & second question above *6. If you were picking a jury in a murder trial you would ask the jurist if they had a pre-trial opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused. Was Sir Muir Russell asked this question?* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2), Freedom of Information Act]	
FOI_ 09-184	03/12/09	What was the process leading to Muir Russells appointment to head the Independent Review into the allegations against the Climatic Research Unit ? What other options were considered ? Who was envolved in the decision ? Have any of decision makers had any professional or working relationship past or present with Muir Russell ? Does any of the University Court or senior management have any professional relationship past or present with	Your request for information received on 3 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. It is, however, not possible to meet all elements of your request. Therefore, in accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply the exempted information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below:	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		Muir Russell ? What is the remuneration package and allowable expense criteria for this exercise ? What is the project and quality management methodology for this exercise ? "devise his own method of working" what does this mean ?	Exemption Reason s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 36(2) applies because, in the opinion of the 'qualified person' (the Vice-Chancellor), disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit the free and frank provision of advice and the exchange of views necessary to identify the appropriate person to undertake the independent review. Proposals could not be communicated or justified if those providing the information considered it to be provided other than in strict confidence. A number of individuals of high public standing would be considered, but without their knowledge. There is a very strong public interest in allowing appropriate consultation to take place to ensure that the best possible appointment is made which exceeds any public interest there may be in disclosure of the names of those considered or the remuneration of any particular appointee. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief that disclosure of the names of any person under consideration for such a post is the personal information of that person within the definition of the Act, and as we do not have consent for the release of that information, disclosure would contravene the first	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-184)** *1. What was the process leading to Muir Russells appointment to head the Independent Review into the allegations against the Climatic Research Unit ?* The background to the appointment of Sir Muir Russell to lead the independent review into allegations arising from the hacking and publication of emails and data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia is within an University press statement available on the University website here: http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/2009/dec/CRUreview In making this appointment the University considered it important to approach an individual with the stature, experience and ability to head the review, drawing on the additional expertise and support he considers appropriate. It was a prerequisite that the appointee should have had no previous links with the University of East Anglia, the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) or the Climate Science community but it was considered helpful if they had an existing understanding of the ways in which university departments are organised and managed. To expedite the review it was also important that they would be able to prepare a report for consideration by Spring 2010. This was an exacting brief but Sir Muir's background and public standing were, however, a suitable match and he was the first candidate approached. After	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			discussions he agreed to lead the review and will be carrying out the initial stages of his work before Christmas 2009. *2. What other options were considered?* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2) & s.40(1), Freedom of Information Act] *3. Who was involved in the decision? Have any of decision makers had any professional or working relationship past or present with Muir Russell?* See answer to question 1 above *4. Does any of the University Court or senior management have any professional relationship past or present with Muir Russell?* See answer to question 1 above *5. What is the remuneration package and allowable expense criteria for this exercise?* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2) & s.40(1), Freedom of Information Act] *6. What is the project and quality management methodology for this exercise? "devise his own method of working" what does this mean ??* Sir Muir Russell is independent of the University of East Anglia and we have no recorded information as to project and quality methodology for the inquiry. Any queries regarding the conduct of the inquiry should be directed at Sir Muir Russell himself.	
FOI_ 09-185	04/12/09	On page 45 of last week's Sydney Morning Herald's Good Weekend Magazine 25th anniversary edition, some events of world wide significance were listed. The 6 March 1984 commencement on of the British coalminers year long strike opposing Thatcher's decision to close 20 mines with the loss of 20,000 jobs was one listed, as was the following, and I quote "British scientists warn of the dangers of the	Further to your request of 4 December 2009, I can advise that your request for information has been initially considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and we have determined that we are not obliged to consider your request or supply the information you have requested under that Act. The exemption applied is section 39, exempting	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		greenhouse effect on March 5. The scientists, from the University of East Anglia, find that 1981 and 1983 were the warmest years on record and warn that a warmer climate caused by carbon dioxide emissions could result in damaged agriculture and polar icecaps melting' end quote. Dave, how can I access or get a copy of that report please?	information that is 'environmental information' within the meaning of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (hereafter 'EIR') from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This exemption applies because 'environmental information' must be disclosed under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). In short, we have considered your request under EIR, not FOIA. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exception Reason Reg. 12(4)(a) – Information not held The requested information was not held at the time of the request Regulation 12(4)(a) applies due to the fact that, after an extensive search by the relevant staff within the University, we can find no copy of the information you have requested. Indeed, we are reliably informed that there was no publication or report produced in 1984 by CRU staff regarding the comparative temperature of that year in relation to preceding years. There are, however, two papers from 1986 which have temperature series in them, with respect to a different base period, and we offer the citations for those papers as follows: Jones, P.D., Raper, S.C.B., Bradley, R.S., Diaz, H.F.,	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Kelly, P.M. and Wigley, T.M.L., 1986: Northern Hemisphere surface air temperature variations: 1851-1984. Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology 25, 161-179. Jones, P.D., Raper, S.C.B. and Wigley, T.M.L., 1986: Southern Hemisphere surface air temperature variations: 1851-1984. Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology 25, 1213-1230.	
FOI_ 09-186	05/12/09	Please supply copies of the accounts for the Climatic Research Unit for each of the last five years.	Your request for information received on 5 December 2009 has now been considered, and, pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information. Your request is for copies of the accounts for the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) for each of the last five years. I can advise that there are no separate accounts for the CRU either at a central or local level within our institution. The CRU is part of the School of Environmental Sciences, and not a separate legal entity. We only publish accounts at a University level and these are readily available on our website.	
FOI_ 09-187	05/12/09	Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations and FOIA regulations, I hereby requestthe following information. 1. Any correspondence including but not limited to letters, emails and faxes pertaining to UEAs efforts to obtain permissions from third parties to release data used in the construction of CRU's global temperature index.	Your request for information received on 5 December 2009 as clarified by your email of 7 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed. Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding this response to you; I was awaiting a response from a third party that I was consulting and felt it best to defer responding until I had said response. In accordance with s.17 of the Freedom of Information	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		In an news release issued by MET: http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/pressoffice/2009/pr20091205.html I read the following: "As soon as we[MET] have all permissions in place we will release the remaining station records - around 5000 in total - that make up the full land temperature record. We are dependant on international approvals to enable this final step and cannot guarantee that we will get permission from all data owners. UEA fully supports the Met Office in making this data publicly available and is continuing to work with the Met Office to seek the necessary permission from national data owners to publish, as soon as possible as much of the data that we can gain permission for." For many years as you know several people have been requesting this data. CRU have given various reasons for denying this data. I am glad that CRU is now working with the MET to get permission for the release of this data. I request all correspondence related to these requests. Further, I reference the following guideline published by CRU: http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests In section 4 UEA is required to comply with the following: d. Consult with third parties before releasing any data that may affect them	Act 2000, this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply this information and the reasons for exemption are as stated below Exemption Reason s.40(2), Personal information Disclosure of information would be in contravention of the first data protection principle within the Data Protection Act 1998 Section 40(2) is cited because there are three (3) pieces of correspondence that comprise personal information for which consent for disclosure has been explicitly withheld. Disclosure of this information without the consent of the data subject would be in contravention of the first data protection principle within the DPA and is barred by section 40 of the FOIA. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. There is also information relevant to your request that is attached as a separate .zip file to this letter. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-187)** *Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations and FOIA regulations, I hereby request the following information.* *1. Any correspondence including but not limited to letters, emails and faxes pertaining to UEAs efforts to obtain permissions from third parties to release data used in the construction of CRU's global temperature index. (the first request I make is for all the*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		e. Also consult with third parties where it might assist UEA in determining if and how the information should be released. As this guideline indicates you had a responsibility to consult with third parties before releasing the data, and consult with them where it might assist in determining if and how the information should be released. I therefore request any and all documentation you have that shows your office and CRU complied with this requirement relative to earlier FOIA requests.	*correspondence that is related to the current activity; That is, the activity described in the press release.)* The Climatic Research Unit (CRU) receives the temperature data from weather stations which are simply numbered. The CRU compiled a list of which stations were the responsibility of which national meteorological services and supplied the Met Office with this information. The CRU also drafted a letter for transmission to the Permanent Representatives for each national meteorological agency but it was agreed that the Met Office would be responsible for transmitting this letter and so has circulated it. A copy of this letter is attached as a separate .pdf document to this cover letter. All other communication was verbal in nature. There was also correspondence between members of CRU and other institutions. Where we have consent for release, we have included this material as a separate .zip file attachment to this letter. 2. *I therefore request any and all documentation you have that shows your office and CRU complied with this requirement relative to earlier FOIA requests. (The second request focuses on prior FOIA requests for the CRU data. … What I am requesting is any correspondence that related to these earlier requests).* The University contacted the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) within the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) discussing whether WMO would send the letter out, but the WMO suggested that any communication should originate from a national body and suggested the UK Met Office. A copy of the salient email in this matter is attached as a separate .pdf document to this cover letter.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			In regards earlier requests under FOIA, given that the conclusion that we had arrived at was that the requested material was not to be released on a number of grounds, there was no reason to contact those agencies in relation to each specific request. However, it was felt that an attempt should be made to secure consent for the release of the information in the long term and therefore the above-noted process was undertaken.	
FOI_ 09-188	06/12/09	In an news release issued by METhttp://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/pressoffice/2009/pr20091205.html I read the following: "As soon as we[MET] have all permissions in place we will release the remaining station records - around 5000 in total - that make up the full land temperature record. We are dependant on international approvals to enable this final step and cannot guarantee that we will get permission from all data owners. UEA fully supports the Met Office in making this data publicly available and is continuing to work with the Met Office to seek the necessary permission from national data owners to publish, as soon as possible as much of the data that we can gain permission for." Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations and FOIA regulations, I hereby requestthe following information. Any documentation including but not limited to letters, emails and faxes pertaining to UEAs efforts to comply	Your request for information received on 6 December 2009 as clarified by your email of 8 December 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Environmental Information Regulations request** **(FOI_09-188; EIR_09-27)** *Pursuant to the Environmental Information Regulations and FOIA regulations, I hereby request the following information.* *Any documentation including but not limited to letters, emails and faxes pertaining to UEAs efforts to comply with its obligations spelled out in section 27 of the following document:* *http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests* *Specifically, in the press release cited above CRU appear to maintain that the new temperature record constructed from public data will show that the world is*	Appeal

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		with its obligations spelled out in section 27 of the following document http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests 27. Contracts and 3rd Party Confidence. The UEA should only accept information from third parties in confidence if it is necessary to obtain that information in connection with the exercise of any of its functions and it would not otherwise be provided. In addition, the UEA should not agree to hold information received from third parties "in confidence" which is not confidential in nature. Again, acceptance of any confidentiality provisions must be for good reasons, capable of being justified to the Commissioner. Further details are given in Annex D and in Annex G. Specifically, In the press release cited above CRU appear to maintain that the new temperature record constructed from public data will show that the world is warming. If this conclusion can be supported using public data, then have CRU shown that it is NECESSARY to obtain confidential data. Please provide any analysis that CRU have performed to show that it is necessary to obtain this data. Further annex D and Annex G detail other considerations that must be taken into account. Please provide any documentation to show that CRU has complied with the requirements set forth in Annex D and G.	*warming. If this conclusion can be supported using public data, then have CRU shown that it is NECESSARY to obtain confidential data. Please provide any analysis that CRU have performed to show that it is necessary to obtain this data. Further annex D and Annex G detail other considerations that must be taken into account.* *Please provide any documentation to show that CRU has complied with the requirements set forth in Annex D and G.* There is no analysis per se in existence to show the necessity of obtaining the referenced data other than that which is provided in the many publications of CRU staff in relation to the data set. However, in order to construct a global record of land temperature data, measurement data had to be secured from those bodies making, or responsible for, the measurement; namely the national institutions responsible for each nation. In order to construct the data set CRU had to accept data under the terms under which it was offered, which in some cases included restrictions on the further transmission of the data. There were no other sources of data that could provide the quality and quantity of data that these national organisations could offer. Therefore, it was necessary to secure data from these sources under the terms that they imposed. In relation to your request for information concerning consultation with 3rd parties, we believe that your other recent request, (Our file: FOI_09-187) covers that issue more precisely and we will be responding fully under the cover of that request.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
FOI_ 09-190	07/12/09	Please provide all internal material (including but not limited to Emails, minutes of meetings) covering discussions about the frame of reference for, and selection of the chairperson of, the UEA inquiry into what has come to be known as 'ClimateGate'. Of particular interest is: 1. a list of persons considered, and those short-listed, for this position and the reasons why they were rejected or why they declined if an offer to Chair the inquiry was made. 2. what efforts were made to select a chairperson who is not a member of an organisation which is already on record as being a supporter and/or a promoter of anthropogenic global warming theory?	Your request for information received on 7 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. It is, however, not possible to meet all elements of your request. Therefore, in accordance with section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply the exempted information. The exemptions are clearly indicated within the attached document and the reasons for exemption are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.36(2)(b)(i) & (ii) – Prejudice to the conduct of public affairs Release of the requested information, would inhibit provision of advice, and the free & frank exchange of view for deliberation s.40(1), Personal information Release of personal information would contravene the data protection principles Section 36(2) applies because, in the opinion of the 'qualified person' (the Vice-Chancellor), disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit the free and frank provision of advice and the exchange of views necessary to identify the appropriate person to undertake the independent review. Proposals could not be communicated or justified if those providing the information considered it to be provided other than in strict confidence. A number of individuals of high public standing would be considered, but without their	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			knowledge. There is a very strong public interest in allowing appropriate consultation to take place to ensure that the best possible appointment is made which exceeds any public interest there maybe in disclosure of the names of those considered. We invoke section 40 because it is our belief that disclosure of the names of any person under consideration for such a post is the personal information of that person within the definition of the Act, and as we do not have consent for the release of that information, disclosure would contravene the first data protection principle and is therefore barred by section 40. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-190)** *Please provide all internal material (including but not limited to Emails, minutes of meetings) covering discussions about the frame of reference for, and selection of the chairperson of, the UEA inquiry into what has come to be known as 'ClimateGate'.* [Information exempted pursuant to s.36(2), Freedom of Information Act] Of particular interest is: *1. a list of persons considered, and those short-listed, for this position and the reasons why they were rejected or why they declined if an offer to Chair the inquiry was made.* [Information exempted pursuant to s.40(1), Freedom of Information Act] *2. what efforts were made to select a chairperson who is not a member of an organisation which is already on record as being a supporter and/or a promoter of anthropogenic global warming theory?*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			The background to the appointment of Sir Muir Russell to lead the independent review into allegations arising from the hacking and publication of emails and data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia is within an University press statement available on the University website here: http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/2009/dec/CRUreview In making this appointment the University considered it important to approach an individual with the stature, experience and ability to head the review, drawing on the additional expertise and support he considers appropriate. It was a prerequisite that the appointee should have had no previous links with the University of East Anglia, the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) or the Climate Science community but it was considered helpful if they had an existing understanding of the ways in which university departments are organised and managed. To expedite the review it was also important that they would be able to prepare a report for consideration by Spring 2010. This was an exacting brief but Sir Muir's background and public standing were, however, a suitable match and he was the first candidate approached. After discussions he agreed to lead the review and will be carrying out the initial stages of his work before Christmas 2009.	
FOI_ 09-192	21/11/09	Under the Freedom of Information Act I request copies of the following information, within twenty working days, and I would like these in PDF format sent by email. Please treat these as three separate FOI requests.	Your request for information received on 21 November 2009 for "A summary of information held on the level of understanding of senior members of the CRU of the term 'science' and 'integrity'" has now been considered,	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		2) A summary of information held on the level of understanding of senior members of the CRU of the term "science" and "integrity".	and, pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, this letter is to formally advise you that we do not hold the requested information. All senior members of CRU are well respected and qualified members of the scientific community with a full understanding of both science and integrity as evidenced by their peer-reviewed published work, participation in international bodies, and academic qualifications, some of which are available on our website . We do not hold, nor think it necessary to hold, any 'summary' of the level of understanding by senior members of CRU of the concept or idea of science and/or integrity.	
FOI_ 09-193	21/11/09	Under the Freedom of Information Act I request copies of the following information, within twenty working days, and I would like these in PDF format sent by email. Please treat these as three separate FOI requests. 3) A copy of all emails and other communication to or from members of the CRU relating to instructions, suggestions, enticements, encouragement or other communication around the subversion of the law of England given in the Freedom of Information Act.	Further to your original request of 21 November & my acknowledgment of same on 24 November 2009, I am writing to confirm that we will be splitting your request, as you desired, into 3 parts. Apologies for not notifying you of this previously; I simply overlooked your request in the process of dealing with the large number of requests we have received recently. For your information, the file number above will apply to the third question within your email of 21 November; namely a request for "A copy of all emails and other communication to or from members of the CRU relating to instructions, suggestions, enticements, encouragement or other communication around the subversion of the law of England given in the Freedom of Information Act". However, in order to proceed with this request, I would ask for clarification of the request. I believe that your	Clarification sought

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			request, as worded, requires us to apply our own subjective interpretation in regards 'subversion' in order to define the information that you require. What we would ask is if you could perhaps be more specific as to the actual data or information that you wish to see or receive. Please note that the statutory timescale of 20 working days as defined by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 will be 'suspended' until such time as we receive clarification of your request. Once that is received, the 'clock' will recommence, your request considered, and you will receive the information requested within the statutory timescale, subject to the information not being exempt or containing a reference to a third party. You will be informed of any exemptions or references to third parties.	
FOI_ 09-194	11/12/09	I write with reference to the global temperature dataset maintained by the Climate Research Unit based at the UEA (The dataset known a the CRU or HAD/CRUT record). This dataset is itself based upon raw temperature data which is currently or was held by the CRU. I would be grateful if you could provide a list of institutions and other persons with whom this raw (unprocessed) data has been shared since January 1st 2005	Your request for information received on 11 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. It is, however, not possible to meet all elements of your request. In accordance with Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a partial Refusal Notice, and I am not obliged to supply exempted information. The reasons for the non-disclosure are as stated below: Exemption Reason s.1(1)(a) Right to be informed if information held Information not held	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			s.12 Cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit The cost of finding & assembling the information will exceed the appropriate limit For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and indicated our response to each element of your request. We do not hold a record of those organisations which have been sent a copy of the data set. It is therefore not possible for us to provide this information. A confirmation of who has been sent the data set may be able to be extracted via a detailed search of our email archives. However, we estimate the amount of work required to complete this task would exceed the statutory appropriate limit. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-194)** *I write with reference to the global temperature dataset maintained by the Climate Research Unit based at the UEA (The dataset known a the CRU or HAD/CRUT record). This dataset is itself based upon raw temperature data which is currently or was held by the CRU. I would be grateful if you could provide a list of institutions and other persons with whom this raw (unprocessed) data has been shared since January 1st 2005* Since the beginning of 2005, the only group we have shared the whole of the CRU station temperature archive with is the Met Office Hadley Centre. A partial set of the data was sent to Georgia Tech in	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			Jan 2009.	
FOI_ 09-197	12/12/09	Could you please send to me the raw data information that relates to the Yamal Tree ring analysis? Ideally electronically to this email as a zipped file with comma separated values. A data dictionary would be helpful as well, or at least column headers. Please also confirm how this raw data was measured (number of ring measurers, any automation?). Please only include all the data you have before any corrections, omissions or amendments have been made in any way. In case you need any justification for this freedom of information request, I have decided I would like to conduct some of my own analysis. Since the leaked emails I have been torn between being a sceptic or supporter of man-made climate change theory. I really don't know much about climatology. But I am a Financial Analyst with a Physics degree, and at the moment I don't know who to trust except myself. Therefore I do not see the point in reading any more from either sceptics or supporters, as I have no way of knowing how much bias may have featured in their various stages of analysis and conclusions. I need to do the analysis independently myself to decide.	Your request for information received on 12 December 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith as 4 separate .pdf files and one zip file to this cover letter. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. The four (4) .pdf files provide context for the data contained on the zip file and are facsimiles of the web pages that until recently, were mounted on the CRU website. Due to the recent hacking incident, the CRU webserver was temporarily taken offline and we are now engaged in a gradual process of re-establishing the site.	Additional documents attached. FOI_09-197_1.pdf FOI_09-197_2.pdf FOI_09-197_3.pdf FOI_09-197_4.pdf FOI_09-197_data.zip
FOI_ 09-199	22/12/09	I request a list of FOI requests that have been made to UEA relating to the Climate Research Unit, including the content of the request, and its status (answered, turned down, pending, etc), going back to the commencement of FOI.	Response attached as a separate file	FOI_09-199.pdf
FOI_ 09-201	26/12/09	Reference: http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/climatic_research_unit_accounts#incoming-61723	Your request for information received on 26 December 2009 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response in line with each	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		The CRU receives money in the form of grants etc. Please explain how this money is accounted for and give details of the checks and balances that are in place to ensure that this money is properly spent. How is this money audited?	question. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-201)** *The CRU receives money in the form of grants etc.* *Please explain how this money is accounted for and give details of the checks and balances that are in place to ensure that this money is properly spent.* *How is this money audited?* University projects are accounted for in line with UK Generally Accounted Accounting Practise (UK GAAP), with income recognised in line with the appropriate expenditure incurred by the project. At a University level, this is audited by the external auditors as part of the University's financial statements. All projects are administered in line with the University's financial regulations, which may be found here: http://www.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.92953!finregs2.pdf. The University's internal audit function also includes projects as part of its remit, and documents and interrogates the internal administration of projects. Further to this, a project may have additional requirements placed upon it by the funder, which will be stipulated in the contract at award. Such requirements vary, from the need to have the project signed off by a third party auditor, to some with no requirements at all.	
FOI_ 09-202	30/12/09	Under the Environmental Information Regulations, UEA is required to	Your request for information received on 30 December 2009 for information on the steps the University of East Anglia has taken to ensure compliance with the EIR	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
		"(a) progressively make the information available to the public by electronic means which are easily accessible; and (b) take reasonable steps to organize the information relevant to its functions with a view to the active and systematic dissemination to the public of the information." What steps has UEA taken to ensure compliance with this part of the EIR, in particular with respect to the work of scientists at CRU?	requirements for proactive dissemination of environmental information in relation to the work of scientists at CRU has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and provided our response thereunder. I trust this will be to your satisfaction. Please note that this request has been initially considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and we have determined that we are not obliged to supply the information you have requested under that Act. The exemption applied is section 39, exempting information that is 'environmental information' within the meaning of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This exemption applies because 'environmental information' must be disclosed under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). In short, we have considered your request and are providing the information under EIR, not FOIA. **Response to Environmental Information Regulations request** **(FOI_09-202; EIR_09-31)** *Under the Environmental Information Regulations, UEA is required to* *"(a) progressively make the information available to the public by electronic means which are easily accessible; and*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			(b) take reasonable steps to organize the information relevant to its functions with a view to the active and systematic dissemination to the public of the information." *What steps has UEA taken to ensure compliance with this part of the EIR, in particular with respect to the work of scientists at CRU?* It is our belief that the both the University and the Climatic Research Unit comply with the requirement to disseminate information regarding its work and functions to the public, primarily through its website. Due to recent events, and the high volume of traffic now being encountered, the CRU website is currently being rebuilt. However it has a number of pages which demonstrate the University's commitment to proactive dissemination of CRU-related information. A list of available data held by CRU is presented at: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/ (Please note that, at present, not all of the links are live as the website is being rebuilt from scratch, but we believe it indicates that a range of data has routinely been published in line with EIR requirements) One of the links from this page takes you to a statement on "data availability" (see: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/) which provides extensive information on how information is compiled, processed and handled along with a bibliography of relevant research. We should also note that the CRU website has a page of introductory material on a variety of climate-related subjects intended for the interested layperson (see: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/info/) The CRU website includes a list of the major	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			publications of the CRU along with a summary of their contents (see: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/pubs/). A full list of the publications authored by CRU staff is also available along with links to the full text of each work (where available) (see: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/pubs/full/). A full list of reports published by, or in collaboration with, the Climatic Research Unit is presented at http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/pubs/reports.htm. All these pages are monitored and updated regularly. Biographical information on CRU staff is presented on the CRU website as well as information on the academic programmes associated with the CRU. On the School of Environmental Sciences (ENV) website, current research highlights are presented along with links, where available, to the full text of the published research at (see: https://www.uea.ac.uk/env/research/reshigh) and an archive is also available (see: https://www.uea.ac.uk/env/research/reshigh/arch). It should be noted that the ENV website also provides biographies of all CRU research staff along with a complete list of their publications since 2000 inclusive of links to the full text of their most significant work (where available). The ENV website also provides links to initiatives or organisations associated with ENV such as the Tyndall Centre (see: http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/), the Low Carbon Innovation Centre (see: http://www.lcic.com/), the CRed Programme (see: http://www.cred-uk.org/), and Renewables East (see: http://www.renewableseast.org.uk/). Each one of these sites has extensive information about their work and	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			output.	
FOI_ 09-204	21/12/09	I would be grateful if you could send me a copy of the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor which you cite in your section 36(2) claim.	Your request for information received on 21 December 2009 for a copy of the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor cited in the s.36(2)(b) exemption claimed in Mr. Palmer's letter of 18 December in relation to Freedom of Information request FOI_09-160 has now been considered and the information requested is enclosed herewith. I trust this will be to your satisfaction.	Additional document attached. FOI_09-204.pdf
FOI_ 10-06	30/12/09	I would be obliged if you would treat this as a Freedom of Information Act enquiry. Could you please provide me with a copy of the Terms of Reference for the above Independent Review? Would you also provide details of the process by which the Head of the Independent Review was selected and in particular what steps were taken to ensure that the appointment complied with the University's Equal Opportunities Policy? Would you please confirm which other persons are engaged in carrying out the review, and supply details of their professional and academic backgrounds and qualifications. Additionally please would you confirm the process and amount by which the Independent Review is funded and the payments that are expected to be made to its members including the Head of the Review Finally, please can you advise what disclosures have been made – or are expected by review team members in order that the University can demonstrate good governance? I am particularly concerned that the Head of the Independent Review also serves as a member of the Advisory Board of Iberdrola – a company that stands to benefit from any findings of the review which support their renewable energy business.	Your request for information received on 30 December 2009 has now been considered and some of the information requested is enclosed herewith. However, it is not possible to satisfy all elements of your request as, pursuant to your rights under section 1(1)(a) of Freedom of Information Act 2000 to be informed whether information is held, we do not hold some of the requested information. For your convenience, I have reproduced your request in the attachment to this letter and indicated where we do not hold the requested information. Specifically, the information on team members and is still in the process of formulation and is held by Sir Muir Russell himself and not by the University. An announcement will be made in the near future in regards the composition of the inquiry team. Clearly any information regarding the interests held by team members is dependent upon the appointment of the team members and an announcement will be made when the team is appointed. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_10-06)** *I would be obliged if you would treat this as a Freedom*	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			of Information Act enquiry. *1. Could you please provide me with a copy of the Terms of Reference for the above Independent Review?* The Terms of Reference for the review are on the UEA website at: http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/2009/dec/CRUreview *2. Would you also provide details of the process by which the Head of the Independent Review was selected and in particular what steps were taken to ensure that the appointment complied with the University's Equal Opportunities Policy?* The background to the appointment of Sir Muir Russell to lead the independent review into allegations arising from the hacking and publication of emails and data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia is within an University press statement available on the University website here: http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/2009/dec/CRUreview In making this appointment, the University considered it important to approach an individual with the stature, experience and ability to head the review, drawing on the additional expertise and support he considers appropriate. It was a prerequisite that the appointee should have had no previous links with the University of East Anglia, the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) or the Climate Science community but it was considered helpful if they had an existing understanding of the ways in which university departments are organised and managed. To expedite the review, it was also important that they would be able to prepare a	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			report for consideration by Spring 2010. This is an exacting brief but Sir Muir's background and public standing are, however, a suitable match and he was the first candidate approached. Sir Muir has had a distinguished career in the civil service combined with his time as a Vice-Chancellor, which means that he also understands the way that universities operate and the standards of behaviour expected. He continues to hold prominent roles in public life. He has no connection with the University of East Anglia and we believe that his independence and record are unquestionable. This will be a completely independent review. After discussions he agreed to lead the review and carried out the initial stages of his work before Christmas 2009. We do not hold any information in relation to compliance with the University's Equal Opportunities Policy as this Policy only applies to UEA employees and not to ad hoc consultants such as Sir Muir Russell. *3. Would you please confirm which other persons are engaged in carrying out the review, and supply details of their professional and academic backgrounds and qualifications.* [Information not held - s.1(1), Freedom of Information Act] The identity of other team members has yet to be confirmed. An announcement about the identity other Team members will be made in the near future.	

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
			4. Additionally please would you confirm the process and amount by which the Independent Review is funded and the payments that are expected to be made to its members including the Head of the Review. In regards funding of the Review, we will be guided by Sir Muir on what is required. Our intention is to ensure that the review is appropriately resourced to deal with the issues before it. Members of his review team will be paid normal consultancy rates. Payment is commensurate with the scale and complexity of the task as well as the time that will have to be committed to it. The salary of Sir Muir has been agreed as £40,000 to complete the review and report. This is commensurate with his previous salary as a Vice-Chancellor. *5. Finally, please can you advise what disclosures have been made – or are expected by review team members in order that the University can demonstrate good governance? I am particularly concerned that the Head of the Independent Review also serves as a member of the Advisory Board of Iberdrola – a company that stands to benefit from any findings of the review which support their renewable energy business* [Information not held - s.1(1), Freedom of Information Act] Interests will be made clear when the Team is announced and are the responsibility of Sir Muir; the University does not hold this information. To clarify one point within your question, we can advise that the Scottish Power Advisory Board was wound up in 2009, and it is our understanding that Sir Muir Russell has no business connection with Scottish Power or Iberdrola.	
FOI_	29/01/20	I would like to receive the following as your response to		Pending

Ref	Date received	Request	Response	Notes
10-11	10	my FOI request: The date of first meeting of any CRU academic staff involved with the Sir Muir or any independent member of the inquiry. I am not interested in meetings with UEA administrators but with academics. The number of meetings with academic staff that have so far occurred up to the point of receipt of this request. The names and status of independent members of the inquiry that have met with UEA staff, for example I would assume that Sir Muir will be helped by a computer scientist and a scientist who have no connections with UEA.		

List of Appeals

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
FOI_ 07-04	08/03/07	Further to your email of 14 April 2007 in which you re-stated your request to see "a list of stations used by Jones et al. to prepare the HadCRUT3 dataset… I am asking for: 1) A list of the actual sites used by Dr. Jones in the preparation of the HadCRUT3 dataset, and 2) A clear indication of where the data for each site is available. This is quite important, as there are significant differences between the versions of each site's data at e.g. GHCN and NCAR." In your note you also requested "the name and WMO number of each site and the location of the source data (NCAR, GHCN, or National Met Service)", I have contacted Dr. Jones and can update you on our efforts to resolve this matter. We cannot produce a simple list with this format and with the information you described in your note of 14 April. Firstly, we do not have a list consisting solely of the sites we currently use. Our list is larger, as it includes data not used due to incomplete reference periods, for example. Additionally, even if we were able to create such a list we would not be able to link the sites with sources of data. The station database has evolved over time and the Climate Research Unit was not able to keep multiple versions of it as stations were added, amended and deleted. This was a consequence of a lack of data storage in the 1980s and early 1990s compared to what we have at our disposal currently. It is also likely that quite a few stations consist of a mixture of sources.	Following David Palmer's letter of 27th April 2007 to you regarding your dissatisfaction with our response to your FOI request of 25th January 2007, I have undertaken a thorough review of the contents of our file and have spoken with both Mr. Palmer and Professor Jones. As a result of this investigation, I am satisfied that we have done all we can to satisfy your request and to provide you with the information you require where it is possible for us to do so. I confirm that we are able to make available on the Climatic Research Unit website a list of stations, including name, latitude, longitude, elevation and WMO number. (where available). We are unable to provide a list of sources for these stations as we do not hold this information. Nor do we hold the raw station data, as you describe it, at UEA. As stated in prior letters to you, gridded data is available on the NCAR and GHCN websites. If this data is insufficient for your requirements, you will need to contact the NMS for the country in which the station is located to obtain the information you require. I hope you are able to accept this response. We have contacted the Information Commissioners Office in regards this matter and their advice is that if you are still dissatisfied with this response, you can, at this time, exercise your right of appeal to the Information Commissioner by contacting

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		I have also been informed that, as the GHCN and NCAR are merely databases, the ultimate source of all data is the respective NMS in the country where the station is located. Even GHCN and NCAR can't say with precision where they got their data from as the data comes not only from each NMS, but also comes from scientists in each reporting country. In short, we simply don't have what you are requesting. The only true source would be the NMS for each reporting country. We can, however, send a list of all stations used, but without sources. This would include locations, names and lengths of record, although the latter are no guide as to the completeness of the series. This is, in effect, our final attempt to resolve this matter informally. If this response is not to your satisfaction, I will initiate the second stage of our internal complaint process and will advise you of progress and outcome as appropriate. For your information, the complaint process is within our Code of Practice and can be found at: http://www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf	them at: Information Commissioner's Office Wycliffe House Water Lane Wilmslow Cheshire SK9 5AF Telephone: 01625 545 700 Website: www.ico.gov.uk Yours sincerely, Kitty Inglis Library and Learning Resources Director & Acting Librarian
FOI_ 07-09	12/03/07	In your email of 17 April 2007, you re-iterated your request from your email of 12 March 2007, to see "B) identification ... of the stations used in the gridded network which was used as a comparandum in this study" I have been in conversation with Dr. Jones and have been advised that, in fact, we are unable to answer (B) as we do not have a copy of the station data as we had it in 1990. The station database has evolved since that time and CRU was not able to keep versions of it as stations were added, amended and deleted. This was a consequence of a lack of data storage comparable to what we have at our disposal currently. I have been advised that the best equivalent data available is within the current version of CRUTEM3(v) or CRUTEM2(v). The latter is still	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		available on the CRU web site, though not updated beyond 2005. These latest versions are likely different from what was used in 1990. Australia and China have both released more data since then - it is likely that much of this was not digitized in 1990. Dr. Jones acknowledges that the grid resolution is now different, but this is again due to greater disk storage available. The details of our updating of the raw station data is discussed in the following article: Jones, P.D. and Moberg, A., 2003: Hemispheric and large-scale surface air temperature variations: An extensive revision and an update to 2001. J. Climate 16, 206-223. This is, in effect, our final attempt to resolve this matter informally. If this response is not to your satisfaction, I will initiate the second stage of our internal complaint process and will advise you of progress and outcome as appropriate. For your information, the complaint process is within our Code of Practice and can be found at: http://www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf	
FOI_ 08-23	04/06/08	Further to your appeal received 4 June 2008 against the Refusal Notice of 3 June 2008 and my response of the same date, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. We have had extensive discussions regarding this matter and considered the grounds of your appeal closely. I am not convinced, however, that the points you raise would persuade me to reverse the position stated in my letter of 3 June. Specifically, any requested correspondence that we have received that is not already in the public domain clearly, in our opinion, meets the common law test of confidentiality and is subject to s.41. Additionally, further investigations have not revealed any reason to change my estimate that the appropriate limit would be exceeded for the recovery, assembly & review of the requested material.	Following Mr. Palmer's letter of 20 June 2007 to you regarding your dissatisfaction with our response to your FOI request of 5 May 2008, and your letter of 27 June 2008, I have undertaken a review of the contents of our file and have spoken with Mr. Palmer and other relevant staff involved in this matter. As a result of this investigation, I am satisfied that our decision to not disclose the requested information is correct. I would re-iterate our position that the requested correspondence that we have received is subject to s.41(1) as it meets the common law test of confidentiality.

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		Given all the above, and the nature of your request, I can see no way in which your request can be resolved informally. Therefore, in order to expedite the process, I am hereby initiating the second stage of our internal complaint process as laid out in our Code of Practice for Responding to Requests, and referring this matter to Mr. Jonathan Colam, Director of Information Services. As per our commitment in our Code, Mr. Colam will respond to you within 28 calendar days of referral of this matter, effectively, by 18 July 2008. All information in my file on this matter has been passed to Mr. Colam for his review and he will advise you of the outcome of this review as appropriate For your information, the complaint process is within our Code of Practice and can be found at: http://www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	Additionally, further investigations have not revealed any reason to change the estimate that the appropriate limit would be exceeded for the recovery, assembly & review of the requested material, and that, pursuant to s.12(1), we are not obliged to provide the requested information. Additionally, we feel that s.36(2)(b)(ii) would apply in that in the opinion of our 'qualified person' as defined by the Act, disclosure of this information would be likely to inhibit 'the free and frank exchange of views for the purpose of deliberation'. As noted in prior correspondence, there is a public interest in maintaining the ability of academic researchers to exchange views prior to finalisation and publication of results as this process is critical to the cooperative conduct of research and we assert that the exposure of such exchanges would have a significant negative effect on this cooperative research. Further, we also feel that s.27(2) and (3) would be applicable in this case to material received from the IPCC and it's contributing authors. We believe that the requested information is confidential information obtained from a from an international organisation, on the basis that the circumstances in which it was obtained make it reasonable for that organisation to expect that it will be held as confidential. It is therefore exempt information under the provisions of s.27(2). The public interest in non-disclosure of this information is that disclosure is likely to undermine the willingness of the international organisation that supplied the information to supply other confidential information in future We have contacted the Information Commissioners Office in

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			regards this matter and their advice is that if you are still dissatisfied with this response, you should, at this time, exercise your right of appeal to the Information Commissioner. Yours sincerely Jonathan Colam Director of Information Services University of East Anglia
FOI_ 08-50	31/10/08	Further to your correspondence of 31 October and subsequent email of 11 November 2008, I have now received further information that will hopefully satisfy your request for clarification and elaboration of the material sent to you 2 October 2008 in response to your original request of 22 September 2008. Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding of this information to you. As noted in my letter of 10 November, I have dealt with your email of 31 October as an appeal of our release of information on 2 October. For your convenience, I have reproduced your requests of 31 October with our response noted thereunder. **Response to Environmental Information Regulations request (FOI_08-50; EIR_08-01)** *1) Many Schweingruber series (see listing at http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/treering-wsl-data.htm) within one of the gridboxes listed at the webpage ("Rutherford gridbox") (about 109) are excluded from the 341 sites sent to Rutherford - an example is the series athapcen. What was the basis for excluding this and the other excluded series? Please provide any manuals, computer code or correspondence explaining the exclusion*. The website already provides information about the reasons for selection of the series: "The MXD data from the 341 sites determined by Briffa et al. (2002a) to exhibit correlations with nearby gridded April-	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		September temperature of at least +0.22 were used in this study." *2) A few (3) series are included in the Rutherford roster even though they are not within the 4 corners of a Rutherford gridbox (rempisy kuba4lag kuba2lag). What was the basis for including these series? Please provide any manuals, computer code, documents or correspondence explaining the inclusion.* We do not have any manuals, computer code, documents or correspondence about the 3 series listed. It has been suggested that perhaps Dr. Rutherford should be approached with this question, to see if he can answer it. *3) I examined Gridbox 7(132.5E 72.5N) in more detail. It contains one series: omoloyla. The gridded series (#7) has values from 1400-1991, but the underlying omoloyla chronology at ITRDB only goes from 1496 to 1991 and the underlying measurement data for omoloyla at ITRDB only has values for the period 1496-1991. Please provide any manuals, computer code, documents or correspondence explaining how the values from 1400-1495 were obtained. If a different omoloyla data set was used for this study than the data set at ITRDB, would you please advise and provide the data actually used in this study. If there are similar discrepancies for other sites, would you please provide a listing of sites for which the version used differs from the ITRDB version.* We have checked our files and no manuals, computer code, documents or correspondence are available. We can confirm, however, that we did not use a different Omoloyla data set and therefore there is no further data to provide. *4). A few series have incorrect codes (adybogla balyebla leshpcob*	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		vanc) compared to the Shweingruber codes. Does this affect the operation of any computer programs? No it does not. 5) Not all series listed at the Osborn webpage are in the ITRDB data set. Some examples are: id name type long lat start end 327 gartogfi Gartog PCBA 98.52 29.67 1709 1993 328 haizefi Haize Shan PCBA 99.50 30.30 1777 1993 329 lhamafi Lhamcoka PCBA 99.12 31.82 1784 1994 330 lhambfi Lhamcoka PCBA 99.13 31.80 1669 1994 331 lhamcfi Lhamcoka PCBA 99.10 31.82 1768 1994 332 lhamdfi Lhamcoka PCBA 99.10 31.82 1630 1994 333 qamdofi Qamdo PCBA 96.95 31.08 1406 1994 334 riwofi1 Riwoqe PCBA 96.48 31.23 1709 1994 335 riwofi2 Riwoqe PCBA 96.48 31.30 1673 1994 *Can you please provide this data.* These chronologies are in fact already available elsewhere on our website -- see: http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/projects/soap/data/proxy/ In order to lessen the number of multiple archives of the same data set on the internet, it is preferred that the ITRDB be used as the primary source wherever possible. However, as some of the chronologies that were used are apparently not available at the ITRDB, the above webpage holds a copy of the chronology data that were actually used. Important information regarding the standardisation applied in the construction of these chronologies is given at this webpage and should be read and considered carefully when using these data. *6) The Tornetrask id tornxx does not match the corresponding*	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		Schweingruber ids, where there are 3 ids for this site. Can you please provide the data set with id tornxx as used in the gridding study. The file available at the above webpage also contains the "tornxx" chronology that was used, so that too is already available.	
FOI_ 09-44	24/07/09	Further to your appeal received 24 July 2009 against the Refusal Notice of the same date and my response of 27 July, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. I have had extensive discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter and considered the grounds of your appeal closely. I am not convinced, however, that the points you raise would persuade the University to reverse the position stated in my letter of 24 July. Specifically, we would maintain our position in regards the applicability of Regulation 12(5)(f); namely that the requested data is covered by a confidentiality agreement that prevent further transmission. We would also maintain our assessment of the public interest as required under Regulation 12(1)(b). We are, however, aware of recent developments that might affect the progress of this matter. Firstly, we have become aware that you have indeed secured an older version of the master data set from which the requested information was drawn, Secondly, we can advise that the University is commencing work, in concert with the Met Office Hadley Centre, to seek permission from data suppliers in advance of the next update of the CRUTEM database in 2010 in order to provide public access to this data. This work has been announced on the CRU website and further updates on its progress will be available there. In the light of the above developments, I would therefore, ask whether you still wish to proceed with your appeal of our response to your request of 26 June 2009. If you wish to continue with your appeal, I can see no way at present in which your request can be resolved informally to our mutual satisfaction. If this proves to be the case, I will initiate the second stage of our internal complaint process as laid out in our Code of	Pursuant to Mr. Palmer's letter of 21 September 2009 to you regarding the handling of your appeal of 24 July to our response of the same date in regards your FOI request of 26 June 2009, I have undertaken a review of the contents of our file and have spoken with Mr. Palmer and other relevant staff involved in this matter. I apologise for the delay informing you of my decision but we were awaiting the 'further particulars' in relation to this matter that you mentioned in your email of 2 September. Having not received such particulars, I have decided to proceed, given the passage of time, with my decision in their absence. As a result of this investigation, I am satisfied that our overall decision to not disclose the requested information is correct. In response to your first point in your email of 24 July regarding the non-transmission of data to non-academics, I have concluded that the reference to non-academics was in error and that the status of yourself, or any other requester, is irrelevant to the factors to consider regarding disclosure of the requested information. Turning to the points you raised in your email of 2 September, you note that other earlier versions of this data are available on the US Department of Energy website and that Dr. Jones had sent an earlier version of the data to you and had mounted it on FTP server.

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		Practice for Responding to Requests, and will refer this matter to Mr. Dir Info Services Director of Information Services for review. As per our commitment in our Code, Dir Info Services will respond to you within 28 calendar days of referral of this matter.	In regards the information provided to the US Department of Energy, my investigation has revealed that this was done in the early 1990s prior to the imposition of the restrictions now pertaining to the data pursuant to a contractual obligation at the time. Therefore, the analogy you are drawing does not apply to the data that is the subject of this request. In regards your second point regarding the provision of the data to yourself, and the fact that the information was mounted & left on our FTP site & also provided to Georgia Tech without securing consent of the institutions that provided it, we would, upon reflection, consider this an action that we not choose to take again. However, having made errors in past does not, in our eyes, justify making the same errors again. I note that in your email of 2 September, you state that your request was 'for the current version of the data set' but in your original request, you asked for the subset of data that was sent to Georgia Tech University. I would advise that the many of the same restrictions apply to the full CRUTEM dataset as apply to the subset sent to Georgia Tech, but this analysis and answer is based on your original request. . In regards the substance of the exception claimed under Reg. 12(5)(f), I would maintain the position taken to date. There are restrictions on the release of at least some of the data cited, and our opinion is that any release would be contrary to the agreements, and release would have an adverse effect on those organisations.

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			DEFRA guidance notes that the Aarhus Convention, which contains the origins of the Directive on which the EIRs are based, protects information volunteered by a third party and requires their consent to disclose it. The purpose of the exception is to encourage the free flow of information from private persons or institutions in order to protect the environment where making it available to the public could inhibit that process. To provide information that has a restriction on further transmission on it would not only damage CRU's ability to secure such information in future, but would also harm the interests of the organisations providing the information, who clearly have an interest in restricting transmission of the information due to the very existence of the restrictions. Regulation 12(11) requires that we provide as much requested information as is possible outside the coverage of any applicable exception. After consultation with Phil Jones and other relevant staff in regards the nature and composition of the requested dataset, I have concluded that the data is organised in such a way as to make it extremely difficult and time-consuming to segregate the data in the manner that you suggest and would indeed, in our view, amount to an unreasonable diversion of resources from the provision of services for which we, as an institution, are mandated. Further, we would maintain that where no such segregation has, or will occur, we should not release any of the data for fear of breaching such restrictions as do exist. I would note that we are, however, proceeding with efforts with the international community to secure consent from national meteorological institutions for the release of the information that they provide us with, and it is fully our

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			intention to publish such data where, and when, we have secured such consent. This is in line with guidance from DEFRA that suppliers of volunteered information should be encouraged to consent to release where appropriate, and where it is lacking, such consent can be sought later in response to a particular request or in order to proactively disseminate the information. In regards our obligation to assess the public interest in applying these exceptions, I am of the opinion that the public interest balance is in favour of non-disclosure of the requested information. As noted above, the public interest in maintaining the flow of information from institutions to CRU, and maintaining good working relations with international organisations, outweighs, in this case, the interest in the release of the data. We have contacted the Information Commissioners Office in regards this matter and their advice is that if you are still dissatisfied with this response, you should, at this time, exercise your right of appeal to the Information Commissioner. Yours sincerely Dir Info Services Director of Information Services University of East Anglia
FOI_ 09-71	13/08/09	I acknowledge your appeal (as defined by Lord Chancellors Code of Practice) received on13 August 2009 of our response of the same date to your request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 received on 26 July 2009. I apologise for the delay in acknowledging and responding to your appeal. This was due to my inability to process this appeal prior to my absence from the office for	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		the past three (3) weeks Your appeal has being considered pursuant to our internal complaints procedure as mandated by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and our initial 'informal' response is attached. You can view our internal complaints procedure at: http://www.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf In your appeal of 13 August 2009, you were of the opinion that we had misunderstood your second question and that it, in fact, referred to agreements between ourselves and recipients of data to whom CRU had sent data. We accept your point and have provided a response based on your clarification. **Response to Freedom of Information request (FOI_09-71)** *2. Please supply a copy of any agreements between your organization and the recipients or the institutional recipients of such data that impose any conditions of confidentiality, or which prohibit further transmission of such CRUTEM data sets, or which prohibit the public posting of such data sets on the internet*. Further to your appeal and clarification of 13 August 2009, we can state that no written agreement imposing any condition of confidentiality or that prohibits further transmission or public posting of data exists in relation to the material sent to Georgia Tech University in January 2009. Any such conditions were verbal and between the parties involved at that time.	
FOI_ 09-117	27/08/09	Further to my letter of 28 August 2009 in response to your appeal of 27 August, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. I have had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter and considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel	Pursuant to Mr. Palmer's letter of 22 August 2009 to you regarding the handling of your appeal of 27 August to our response of 14 August, to your FOI request of 24 July 2009, I have undertaken a review of the contents of our file and have spoken with Mr. Palmer and other relevant staff

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in my letter of 14 August 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. Given the above, and in attempt to expedite the process, I am hereby initiating the second stage of our internal complaint process as laid out in our Code of Practice for Responding to Requests, and am referring this matter to Mr. Dir Info Services Director of Information Services. As per our Code of Practice, Dir Info Services will respond to you within 28 calendar days of referral of this matter, effectively, by 20 October 2008. All information in my file on this matter has been passed to Dir Info Services for his review and he will advise you of the outcome of this review within the timeframe noted above. For your information, the complaint process is within our Code of Practice and can be found at: http://www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	involved in this matter. As a result of this investigation, I am satisfied that our overall decision to not disclose the requested information is correct. In response to your first point regarding the existing availability of the requested data, whilst it is true that the requested data is station data and not gridded data, we still maintain our position that this information is already available from the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN)1. In regards our exceptions under Reg. 12(5)(a) & (f), we would maintain the position taken to date. Whilst you make a number of arguments relevant to an exemption under s.41 of the Freedom of Information Act, the EIR Regulation sections cited in this matter are different and the tests for exception are different. The EIR does not mention confidentiality nor is there any equivalent test under EIR to that imposed by section 41 of the FOIA. It is the terms under which we secured the data that restrict our further transmission of the data which are key, not necessarily the inherent confidentiality of the data itself. Regardless of any guidelines from WMO or any other organisation, given that there are restrictions on at least some of the data cited that are not in any way effected or superceded by any such guidelines, our opinion is that releasing the data would be contrary to the agreements we have made with other organisations and the effect on international relations and on those organisations would be adversely effected.

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			In considering the exception under Reg. 12(5)(a), it is still our position that disclosure might compromise future co-operation with the UK or undermine the relationship between UK and other countries or international organisations. Release of information contrary to the wishes of the organisation that give us that information would likely result in a reluctance of any such organisation to provide further information to, or cooperate with, not only CRU, but any UK-based institution subject to the EIR where such information could be subject to release. In regards the Reg. 12(5)(f) exception, DEFRA guidance notes that the Aarhus Convention, which contains the origins of the Directive on which the EIRs are based, protects information volunteered by a third party and requires their consent to disclose it. The purpose of the exception is to encourage the free flow of information from private persons or institutions in order to protect the environment where making it available to the public could inhibit that process. To provide information that has a restriction on further transmission on it would not only damage CRU's ability to secure such information in future, but would also harm the interests of the organisations providing the information, who clearly have an interest in restricting transmission of the information due to the very existence of the restrictions. We do concede that information was provided to Georgia Tech without securing consent of the institutions that provided it, and, upon reflection, this is an action we would not choose to take again. However, having made one error does not, in our eyes, justify making the same error again.

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			In regards your point regarding your status as an academic and any perceived effect on our decision in this matter, I can assure you that at no time have we based any of our decisions on your status as an academic or not. I note your reference to Regulation 12(11) requesting such data as can be provided that is not subject to any restriction on further transmission. The data is organised in such a way as to make it extremely difficult and time-consuming to segregate the data in the manner that you suggest and would indeed, in our view, amount to an unreasonable diversion of resources from the provision of services for which we, as an institution, are mandated. Further, we would maintain that where no such segregation has, or will occur, we should not release any of the data for fear of breaching such restrictions as do exist. I would note that we are, however, proceeding with efforts with the international community to secure consent from national meteorological institutions for the release of the information that they provide us with, and it is fully our intention to publish such data where, and when, we have secured such consent. This is in line with guidance from DEFRA that suppliers of volunteered information should be encouraged to consent to release where appropriate, and where it is lacking, such consent can be sought later in response to a particular request or in order to proactively disseminate the information. In regards our obligation to assess the public interest in applying these exceptions, I am of the opinion that the public interest balance is in favour of non-disclosure of the

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
			requested information. As noted above, the public interest in maintaining the flow of information from institutions to CRU, and maintaining good working relations with international organisations, outweighs, in this case, the interest in the release of the data. We have contacted the Information Commissioners Office in regard to this matter and their advice is that if you are still dissatisfied with this response, you should, at this time, exercise your right of appeal to the Information Commissioner. Yours sincerely Dir Info Services Director of Information Services 1 http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/ghcn-monthly/index.php
FOI_ 09-128	21/09/09	Further to my letter of 21 September 2009 in response to your appeal of the same date, and your email of today's date, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. Please accept my apologies for the delay in reporting on this matter to you. This was due entirely to an administrative oversight on my part. I have had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter and considered the grounds of your appeal closely. I am however, not convinced that we should alter our initial response to your request. Accordingly, upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in our original response of 11 September 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself.	Further to my letter of 21 September 2009 in response to your appeal of the same date, and your email of yesterday, 29 October, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. Please accept my apologies for the delay in reporting on this matter to you. This was due entirely to an administrative oversight on my part. I have had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter and considered the grounds of your appeal closely. I am however, not convinced that we should alter our initial response to your request. Accordingly, upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in our original response of 11

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		Given the above, and in attempt to expedite the process, I am hereby initiating the second stage of our internal complaint process as laid out in our Code of Practice for Responding to Requests, and am referring this matter to Mr. Dir Info Services Director of Information Services. As per our Code of Practice, Dir Info Services will respond to you within 28 calendar days of referral of this matter, effectively, by 26 November 2008. All information in my file on this matter has been passed to Dir Info Services for his review and he will advise you of the outcome of this review within the timeframe noted above. For your information, the complaint process is within our Code of Practice and can be found at: http://www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.2750!uea_manual_draft_04b.pdf	September 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. I note that your request is virtually identical to a large number of requests that we have already received and that some of those requests have already been considered by our internal complaints/appeals process both informally and by way of review by Mr. Dir Info Services Director of Information Services. In all cases we have found in favour of non-disclosure of the requested information. Therefore, in order to expedite matters, we will not conduct a separate review of your request but suggest that you now contact the Information Commissioners Office. For clarity, we attach as Appendix A, a copy of the internal review by Dir Info Services of an identical request to yours, absent of course, any personal data of the requester. We would be happy for you to advise the Information Commissioners Office of our response and the fact that given the nature and subject of the request, we have both responded to your request and, by the transmission of this letter, dealt with any possible complaint via our internal processes by the production of this letter. I can further advise that I have contacted the Information Commissioners Office on this matter and they are satisfied with our approach. Appendix A – stage two response of FOI_09-117 (see above)
FOI_ 09-154	21/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 21 December 2009 in response to your appeal of 21 December, I am writing to update you on the appeals	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 18 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. Your original request was for correspondence between Professor Jones and any other person about the leak of information. This request is not for environmental information and does not satisfy any of the criteria for handling under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. To be regarded as 'Environmental Information' the information needs to satisfy at least one of these criteria: state of elements of the environment and the interaction between those elements; factors affecting or likely to affect the elements; measures such as policies, legislation, plans, programmes, agreements, and activities affecting or likely to affect or protect the elements; reports on environmental legislation; economic analyses and assumptions used within the framework of environmental measures and activities; human health and safety, cultural sites and built structures as they are affected by elements of the environment. While elements of the information requested may contain 'Environmental Information' and therefore come under EIR, they also may not, and this would not be clear until a detailed examination of the information has been conducted – an action we declined to undertake under our claim for the FOIA s.12 exemption 'Appropriate limit exceeded'. It is our view that it is correct that your request should be initially handled under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		The other exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are equally valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-155	21/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 21 December 2009 in response to your appeal of 21 December, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 18 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. When estimating the time taken to handle your request, we are advised that all of the following activities should be included in the calculation: determining whether the information is held, locating the information, retrieving the information, and extracting the information including editing or redacting information. Accounting for all of these activities in relation to the information you have requested, we believe that the	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		appropriate limit will be exceeded and that our claim for exemption under s.12 is correct. The other exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are equally valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-167	23/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 in response to your appeal of 23 December, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. When estimating the time taken to handle your request, we are advised that all of the following activities should be included in the calculation:	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		determining whether the information is held, locating the information, retrieving the information, and extracting the information including editing or redacting information. Accounting for all of these activities in relation to the information you have requested, we believe that the appropriate limit will be exceeded and that our claim for exemption under s.12 is correct. The other exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are equally valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-169	23/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 7 January 2010 in response to your appeal of 23 December 2009, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. I believe the exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-170	23/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 5 January 2010 in response to your appeal of 23 December 2009, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. I believe the exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you.	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-171	23/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 5 January 2010 in response to your appeal of 23 December 2009, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. I believe the exemptions cited in Mr. Palmer's letter are valid, and I have no reason to revoke any part of the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-176	30/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 5 January 2010 in response to your appeal of 30 December, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. In Mr. Palmer's letter of 22 December 2009 in response to your request of 30 November for a summary of the agreements regarding further transmission of data received by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) inclusive of the name of the other party, any expiration dates for the agreements, and a summary of the data covered, you were supplied with a web link to the CRU web site. The response noted that the site was at the time of writing unavailable due to traffic, and that we expected it to be available in the near future. I have examined your original request and the grounds of your appeal, and would like to offer our apologies for supplying a non-working web link in our response. Over the period of your request, the CRU web site was being rebuilt with the expectation that the pages would be re-established before the Christmas break. I could not find any evidence that any of the information on the web site was being deliberately withheld. The web page describing the availability of data is now (checked on 18 January 2010) available on the CRU web site at	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/ and a document (http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/agreements.pdf) shows the agreements which the CRU has entered into. Both of these files are also supplied separately with this response. If any content you would like to view is still missing from the site, you are invited to contact CRU direct on cru@uea.ac.uk to request its restoration. I hope this answer will be to your satisfaction. If not, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-180	23/12/09	Further to Mr. Palmer's letter of 5 January 2010 in response to your appeal of 23 December 2009, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request. For the purposes of the Stage One informal review, I am acting as the UEA Information Policy Officer while Mr. Palmer is away from work. I have examined the request and had discussions with relevant staff regarding this matter. I have also considered the grounds of your appeal closely. Upon reflection, I feel that the distance that exists between your position and that of the University as stated in Mr. Palmer's letter of 23 December 2009 is too great to be bridged by an initial informal attempt at resolution by myself. I believe the s.40(1) exemption cited in Mr. Palmer's letter is valid, and	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		I have no reason to revoke the decision conveyed in our response to you. Given the above, could you confirm whether you would like me to progress your appeal further to Stage Two. For your information, the complaint process is described in Annex H of our Code of Practice available on the web at http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/FOIA+Code+of+Practice+for+Responding+to+Requests If you are dissatisfied with the final adjudication of your complaint by our internal complaint process, you have the right of appeal to the Information Commissioner	
FOI_ 09-188	06/01/10	Further to your appeal received 6 January 2010 against the Refusal Notice of the same date and your further email of 29 January 2010, I am writing to update you on the appeals process as it applies to this request and to offer further information in satisfaction of your request. As both your emails were long and somewhat discursive, I would first like to confirm that we have identified your concerns so that we can address them. In my reading of your emails, I perceive the following concerns that you have with our response of 6 January 2009: 1. You dispute our statement that it is necessary to obtain confidential data in order to construct a global temperature index and question the amount and validity of any work to determine the necessity to secure that data 2. You question whether our answer actually does indicate whether the construction of a global temperature index is necessary to the work of the CRU or mandated 3. You ask two (2) specific questions regarding the internal process leading to the decision to acquire the data subject to restrictions and question past actions, or lack thereof, namely: “Did you do anything to determine if this 2% was necessary to CRU performing its mission?”,	

Ref	Date review requested	Stage One: Informal Review	Stage Two
		and, “Was the decision taken without even reviewing the guidelines for conduct?” 4. You ask a question regarding future conduct of CRU staff in regards the acquisition of confidential data; namely “Do you intend to require the employees to show that their decision to employ confidential data actually adds value that is necessary to CRU's mission?” 5. You question existing practices regarding CRU data handling practices; namely “Has your office informed the employees working with this confidential data that should not co mingle it with non confidential data, at least from a records keeping standpoint?” Could you please confirm that my analysis is correct and that these are the questions that you wish to be addressed. If so, I will take further action based on your confirmation. I should note that, within the FOIA framework, we are only obligated to provide recorded information and where none exists, simply to report that fact (as we have done with this request). The FOIA process is a ‘seek and provide’ process relating to held information and not one in which policies, actions or reasoning are discussed in the absence of any recorded information. Therefore, it may well be that this process will not be able to provide the answers that you seek from your email of 6 January. My apologies for the delay in dealing with your appeal and I assure you that we are proceeding with a response post-haste.	