

From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Sent: 27 May 2008 18:30  
To: Bridget Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael  
Mr (CAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV)  
Subject: FW: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI  
Chapter 6 Assessment Process [FOI\_08-23]  
Attachments: CRU\_2.pdf

Gents,

Please note the response received today from Mr. Holland. Could you provide input as to his additional questions 1, and 2, and check with Mr. Ammann in question 3 as to whether he believes his correspondence with us to be confidential?

Although I fear/anticipate the response, I believe that I should inform the requester that his request will be over the appropriate limit and ask him to limit it - the ICO Guidance states:

12. If an authority estimates that complying with a request will exceed the cost limit, can advice and assistance be offered with a view to the applicant refocusing the request?

In such cases the authority is not obliged to comply with the request and will issue a refusal notice. Included within the notice (which must state the reason for refusing the request, provide details of complaints procedure, and contain particulars of section 50 rights) could be advice and assistance relating to the

refocusing of the request, together with an indication of the information that would be available within the cost limit (as required by the Access Code). This should not preclude other 'verbal' contact with the applicant, whereby the authority can ascertain the requirements of the applicant, and the normal customer service standards that the authority usually adopts.

And... our own Code of Practice states (Annex C, point 5)

5. Where the UEA is not obliged to supply the information requested because the cost of doing so would exceed the "appropriate limit" (i.e. cost threshold), and where the UEA is not prepared to meet the additional costs itself, it should nevertheless provide an indication of what information could be provided within the cost ceiling.

This is based on the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice which contains a virtually identical provision.

In effect, we have to help the requester phrase the request in such a way as to bring it within the appropriate limit - if the requester disregards that advice, then we don't provide the information and allow them to proceed as they wish....

I just wish to ensure that we do as much as possible 'by the book' in this instance as I am certain that this will end up in an appeal, with the statutory potential to end up with the ICO.

Cheers, Dave

From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@theiet.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 5:37 PM  
To: David Palmer  
Subject: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment Process  
Please find attached a response to your letter of 19th May 2008  
David Holland

From: Tim Osborn [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 27 May 2008 23:48  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Cc: "Briffa Keith Prof \" <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>, "Mcgarvie Michael Mr \" <m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk>, "Jones Philip Prof \" <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>, "Osborn Timothy Dr \" <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>  
Subject: Re: FW: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment Process [FOI\_08-23]

Dear Dave,

re. David Holland's follow-up requests...

These follow-up questions appear directed more towards Keith than to me. But Keith may be unavailable for a few days *[Redacted]*<sup>1</sup>, so I'll attempt a brief response in case Keith doesn't get a chance to.

Items (1) and (2) concern requests that were made by the IPCC Technical Support Unit (hosted by UCAR in the USA) and any responses would have been sent direct to the IPCC Technical Support Unit, to the email address specified in the quote included in item (2). These requests are, therefore, irrelevant to UEA.

Item (3): we'll send the same enquiry to Ammann as we sent to our other colleagues, and let you know his response.

Item (3) also asks for emails from "the journal Climatic Change that discuss any matters in relation to the IPCC assessment process". I can confirm that I have not received any such emails or other documents. I expect that a similar answer will hold for Keith, since I cannot imagine that the editor of a journal would be contacting us about the IPCC process.

Best wishes

Tim

On Tue, May 27, 2008 6:30 pm, Palmer Dave Mr \"(LIB\" wrote:

- > Gents,
- > Please note the response received today from Mr. Holland. Could you
- > provide input as to his additional questions 1, and 2, and check with
- > Mr. Ammann in question 3 as to whether he believes his correspondence
- > with us to be confidential?
- >
- > Although I fear/anticipate the response, I believe that I should inform
- > the requester that his request will be over the appropriate limit and
- > ask him to limit it - the ICO Guidance states:
- >
- > 12. If an authority estimates that complying with a request will exceed
- > the cost limit, can advice and assistance be offered with a view to the
- > applicant refocusing the request?
- >

---

<sup>1</sup> Redacted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act 200

> In such cases the authority is not obliged to comply with the request  
> and will issue a refusal notice. Included within the notice (which must  
> state the reason for refusing the request, provide details of complaints  
> procedure, and contain particulars of section 50 rights) could be advice  
> and assistance relating to the  
>  
> refocusing of the request, together with an indication of the  
> information that would be available within the cost limit (as required  
> by the Access Code).

>  
> This should not preclude other 'verbal' contact with the applicant,  
> whereby the authority can ascertain the requirements of the applicant,  
> and the normal customer service standards that the authority usually  
> adopts.

>  
>  
> And... our own Code of Practice states (Annex C, point 5)

>  
> 5. Where the UEA is not obliged to supply the information requested  
> because the cost of doing so would exceed the "appropriate limit" (i.e.  
> cost threshold), and where the UEA is not prepared to meet the  
> additional costs itself, it should nevertheless provide an indication of  
> what information could be provided within the cost ceiling.

>  
> This is based on the Lord Chancellors Code of Practice which contains a  
> virtually identical provision....

>  
> In effect, we have to help the requester phrase the request in such a  
> way as to bring it within the appropriate limit - if the requester  
> disregards that advice, then we don't provide the information and allow  
> them to proceed as they wish....

>  
> I just wish to ensure that we do as much as possible 'by the book' in  
> this instance as I am certain that this will end up in an appeal, with  
> the statutory potential to end up with the ICO.

>  
> Cheers, Dave

>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>

> From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@theiet.org]

> Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 5:37 PM

> To: David Palmer

> Subject: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment  
> Process

>  
>  
> Please find attached a response to your letter of 19th May 2008

>  
> David Holland

>  
>  
>  
>

From: Phil Jones [p.jones@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 28 May 2008 17:14  
To: Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Cc: "Briffa Keith Prof\" <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>, "Mcgarvie Michael Mr \"  
<m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk>  
Subject: Re: FW: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment  
Process [FOI\_08-23]

Dave,  
Although requests (1) and (2) are for the IPCC, so irrelevant to UEA,  
Keith (or you Dave) could say that for (1) Keith didn't get any additional  
comments in the drafts other than those supplied by IPCC. On (2) Keith  
should say that he didn't get any papers through the IPCC process.either.  
I was doing a different chapter from Keith and I didn't get any. What we did get  
were papers sent to us directly - so not through IPCC, asking us to  
refer to them in the IPCC chapters. If only Holland knew how the  
process really worked!! Every faculty member in ENV and all the post docs and  
most PhDs do, but seemingly not Holland.

So the answers to both (1) and (2) should be directed to IPCC, but  
Keith should say that he didn't get anything extra that wasn't in the IPCC  
comments.

As for (3) Tim has asked Caspar, but Caspar is one of the worse responders to  
emails known. I doubt either he emailed Keith or Keith emailed him related to  
IPCC.

I think this will be quite easy to respond to once Keith is back.

From looking at these questions and the Climate Audit web site, this  
all relates to two papers in the journal Climatic Change. I know how  
Keith and Tim got access to these papers and it was nothing to do  
with IPCC.

Cheers  
Phil

At 23:47 27/05/2008, Tim Osborn wrote:

Dear Dave,

re. David Holland's follow-up requests...

These follow-up questions appear directed more towards Keith than to me.  
But Keith may be unavailable for a few days *[Redacted]*<sup>2</sup>, so I'll  
attempt a brief response in case Keith doesn't get a chance to.

Items (1) and (2) concern requests that were made by the IPCC Technical  
Support Unit (hosted by UCAR in the USA) and any responses would have been  
sent direct to the IPCC Technical Support Unit, to the email address  
specified in the quote included in item (2). These requests are,

---

<sup>2</sup> Redacted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act 2000

therefore, irrelevant to UEA.

Item (3): we'll send the same enquiry to Ammann as we sent to our other colleagues, and let you know his response.

Item (3) also asks for emails from "the journal Climatic Change that discuss any matters in relation to the IPCC assessment process". I can confirm that I have not received any such emails or other documents. I expect that a similar answer will hold for Keith, since I cannot imagine that the editor of a journal would be contacting us about the IPCC process.

Best wishes

Tim

On Tue, May 27, 2008 6:30 pm, Palmer Dave Mr \(\LIB\) wrote:

- > Gents,
- > Please note the response received today from Mr. Holland. Could you
- > provide input as to his additional questions 1, and 2, and check with
- > Mr. Ammann in question 3 as to whether he believes his correspondence
- > with us to be confidential?
- >
- > Although I fear/anticipate the response, I believe that I should inform
- > the requester that his request will be over the appropriate limit and
- > ask him to limit it - the ICO Guidance states:
- >
- > 12. If an authority estimates that complying with a request will exceed
- > the cost limit, can advice and assistance be offered with a view to the
- > applicant refocusing the request?
- >
- > In such cases the authority is not obliged to comply with the request
- > and will issue a refusal notice. Included within the notice (which must
- > state the reason for refusing the request, provide details of complaints
- > procedure, and contain particulars of section 50 rights) could be advice
- > and assistance relating to the
- >
- > refocusing of the request, together with an indication of the
- > information that would be available within the cost limit (as required
- > by the Access Code).
- >
- > This should not preclude other 'verbal' contact with the applicant,
- > whereby the authority can ascertain the requirements of the applicant,
- > and the normal customer service standards that the authority usually
- > adopts.
- >
- >
- > And... our own Code of Practice states (Annex C, point 5)
- >
- > 5. Where the UEA is not obliged to supply the information requested
- > because the cost of doing so would exceed the "appropriate limit" (i.e.
- > cost threshold), and where the UEA is not prepared to meet the
- > additional costs itself, it should nevertheless provide an indication of
- > what information could be provided within the cost ceiling.
- >

> This is based on the Lord Chancellors Code of Practice which contains a  
> virtually identical provision....

>

> In effect, we have to help the requester phrase the request in such a  
> way as to bring it within the appropriate limit - if the requester  
> disregards that advice, then we don't provide the information and allow  
> them to proceed as they wish....

>

> I just wish to ensure that we do as much as possible 'by the book' in  
> this instance as I am certain that this will end up in an appeal, with  
> the statutory potential to end up with the ICO.

>

> Cheers, Dave

>

>

>

> From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@theiet.org]

> Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 5:37 PM

> To: David Palmer

> Subject: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment

> Process

>

>

> Please find attached a response to your letter of 19th May 2008

>

> David Holland

>

>

>

>

Prof. Phil Jones

Climatic Research Unit Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090

School of Environmental Sciences Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784

University of East Anglia

Norwich

Email p.jones@uea.ac.uk

NR4 7TJ

UK

-----

From: Tim Osborn [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 30 May 2008 13:11  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

Dear Dave,

I've had a look through this initial draft and it sounds fine. Keith and I will read it in more detail, hopefully this afternoon, with specific reference to the public interest section.

Can we treat Holland's follow-up letter as a separate request? As Phil mentioned, Caspar Ammann can be rather slow at replying, so we haven't yet heard whether any emails that he sent us were sent in confidence on his part. Can we respond to the initial FOI request, and leave the follow-up till we hear back from Ammann?

Best regards

Tim

At 17:38 27/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:

>Gents,  
>An initial draft of a response to Mr. Holland based on the 'appropriate  
>limit' and s.41, Information provided in confidence. In particular, your  
>input on the public interest in not disclosing the correspondence  
>received by the University in this matter would be appreciated.

>  
>This is a first draft so open to comment; the bits about right of appeal  
>are mandated by the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice.

>  
>Cheers, Dave

>  
>  
>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
>>Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2008 5:07 PM  
>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
>>Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>>Subject: Re: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)  
>>

>>Hi Dave  
>>Holland acknowledged receipt - and said he would read my letter over  
>>last weekend. I have heard nothing since. I am happy for you to send  
>>the query but I suspect he will still pursue the original request. I  
>>would prefer that we simply answer that his request is unreasonable -  
>>and decline. We could also state that virtually all Chapter 6 authors  
>>have declined/prohibited the release of their correspondence. This is  
>>a matter a principal as far as I see it and we should not fall into  
>>the trap of claiming time constraint, which would imply likely  
>>compliance with further, less demanding requests.  
>>cheers



>>Keirth  
>>  
>>At 16:51 21/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr \ (LIB\ ) wrote:  
>>>Gents,  
>>>Yesterday was 2 weeks to the deadline on this matter. (3 June)  
>>>  
>>>Keith - any response to your letter as yet from Mr. Holland?  
>>>  
>>>We had discussed inquiring whether this response would satisfy Mr.  
>>>Holland but I'm not sure whether we had decided who was going to make  
>>>the approach to Mr. Holland. I am happy to do something  
>>>along the lines  
>>>of ....  
>>>"I understand that Prof. Briffa has made a response to your  
>>>letter of 31  
>>>March. Does this in any way alter the scope of your request  
>>>under this  
>>>Act or in fact effect your desire to continue with this request?"  
>>>Pretty clear what our 'intention' is but I feel the requester is not  
>>>going to be any more upset with us for having asked the  
>>>question... Your  
>>>opinions?  
>>>  
>>>Will be working on draft response to share with you shortly  
>>>  
>>>Cheers, Dave  
>>>  
>>>>-----Original Message-----  
>>>>From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
>>>>Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:49 PM  
>>>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
>>>>Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>>>>Subject:  
>>>>  
>>>>Dave, Michael, Tim and Phil  
>>>>I have now considered all your thoughtful and helpful  
>>>>comments and on  
>>>>the basis of them have decided to send the attached response to  
>>>>Holland. Unless I hear anything to the contrary from you , I intend  
>>>>to send this letter as a pdf response by email to Holland tomorrow  
>>>>morning. I believe that my responses offer some personal comments  
>>>>while protecting the confidentiality of author interactions. By  
>>>>providing this reply I hope that it will be considered that  
>>>>I did not  
>>>>dismiss Holland's questions out of hand. I do not believe that this  
>>>>letter compromises or undermines the IPCC reporting process in any  
>>>>way and it clearly indicates that further correspondence will not be  
>>>>entered into on the matter. Hope you all agree.  
>>>>thanks again  
>>>>Keith  
>>>>  
>>>>--  
>>>>Professor Keith Briffa,  
>>>>Climatic Research Unit  
>>>>University of East Anglia

>>> >Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.  
>>> >  
>>> >Phone: +44-1603-593909  
>>> >Fax: +44-1603-507784  
>>> >  
>>> ><http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>  
>>> >  
>>  
>>--  
>>Professor Keith Briffa,  
>>Climatic Research Unit  
>>University of East Anglia  
>>Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.  
>>  
>>Phone: +44-1603-593909  
>>Fax: +44-1603-507784  
>>  
>><http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>  
>>  
>>  
>

Dr Timothy J Osborn, Academic Fellow  
Climatic Research Unit  
School of Environmental Sciences  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

e-mail: [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk](mailto:t.osborn@uea.ac.uk)  
phone: +44 1603 592089  
fax: +44 1603 507784  
web: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/>  
sunclock: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm>

From: Keith Briffa [k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 30 May 2008 15:14  
To: Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

Dave

I am happy with this - as the confidentiality statement is entirely consistent with my view. I think we need to consider the second request separately as Tim suggests ( I am just back in *[Redacted]*<sup>3</sup> ). I am happy for the suggested response to the first request to go . Thanks again  
Keith

At 13:10 30/05/2008, Tim Osborn wrote:

>Dear Dave,

>

>I've had a look through this initial draft and it sounds  
>fine. Keith and I will read it in more detail, hopefully this  
>afternoon, with specific reference to the public interest section.

>

>Can we treat Holland's follow-up letter as a separate request? As  
>Phil mentioned, Caspar Ammann can be rather slow at replying, so we  
>haven't yet heard whether any emails that he sent us were sent in  
>confidence on his part. Can we respond to the initial FOI request,  
>and leave the follow-up till we hear back from Ammann?

>

>Best regards

>

>Tim

>

>At 17:38 27/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:

>>Gents,

>>An initial draft of a response to Mr. Holland based on the 'appropriate  
>>limit' and s.41, Information provided in confidence. In particular, your  
>>input on the public interest in not disclosing the correspondence  
>>received by the University in this matter would be appreciated.

>>

>>This is a first draft so open to comment; the bits about right of appeal  
>>are mandated by the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice.

>>

>>Cheers, Dave

>>

>>

>>

>> >-----Original Message-----

>> >From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]

>> >Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2008 5:07 PM

>> >To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn

>> >Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)

>> >Subject: Re: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

>> >

>> >Hi Dave

---

<sup>3</sup> Redacted pursuant to s.40(2), Freedom of Information Act 2000

>> >Holland acknowledged receipt - and said he would read my letter over  
>> >last weekend. I have heard nothing since. I am happy for you to send  
>> >the query but I suspect he will still pursue the original request. I  
>> >would prefer that we simply answer that his request is unreasonable -  
>> >and decline. We could also state that virtually all Chapter 6 authors  
>> >have declined/prohibited the release of their correspondence. This is  
>> >a matter a principal as far as I see it and we should not fall into  
>> >the trap of claiming time constraint, which would imply likely  
>> >compliance with further , less demanding requests.  
>> >cheers  
>> >Keirth  
>> >  
>> >At 16:51 21/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr \ (LIB\ ) wrote:  
>> >>Gents,  
>> >>Yesterday was 2 weeks to the deadline on this matter. (3 June)  
>> >>  
>> >>Keith - any response to your letter as yet from Mr. Holland?  
>> >>  
>> >>We had discussed inquiring whether this response would satisfy Mr.  
>> >>Holland but I'm not sure whether we had decided who was going to make  
>> >>the approach to Mr. Holland. I am happy to do something  
>> >along the lines  
>> >>of ....  
>> >>"I understand that Prof. Briffa has made a response to your  
>> >letter of 31  
>> >>March. Does this in any way alter the scope of your request  
>> >under this  
>> >>Act or in fact effect your desire to continue with this request?"  
>> >>Pretty clear what our 'intention' is but I feel the requester is not  
>> >>going to be any more upset with us for having asked the  
>> >question... Your  
>> >>opinions?  
>> >>  
>> >>Will be working on draft response to share with you shortly  
>> >>  
>> >>Cheers, Dave  
>> >>  
>> >>>-----Original Message-----  
>> >>>>From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
>> >>>>Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:49 PM  
>> >>>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
>> >>>>Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>> >>>>>Subject:  
>> >>>>>  
>> >>>>>Dave, Michael, Tim and Phil  
>> >>>>>I have now considered all your thoughtful and helpful  
>> >>>comments and on  
>> >>>>the basis of them have decided to send the attached response to  
>> >>>>Holland. Unless I hear anything to the contrary from you , I intend  
>> >>>>to send this letter as a pdf response by email to Holland tomorrow  
>> >>>>morning. I believe that my responses offer some personal comments  
>> >>>>while protecting the confidentiality of author interactions. By  
>> >>>>providing this reply I hope that it will be considered that  
>> >>>I did not  
>> >>>>dismiss Holland's questions out of hand. I do not believe that this

>> >> >letter compromises or undermines the IPCC reporting process in any  
>> >> >way and it clearly indicates that further correspondence will not be  
>> >> >entered into on the matter. Hope you all agree.

>> >> >thanks again

>> >> >Keith

>> >> >

>> >> >--

>> >> >Professor Keith Briffa,

>> >> >Climatic Research Unit

>> >> >University of East Anglia

>> >> >Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

>> >> >

>> >> >Phone: +44-1603-593909

>> >> >Fax: +44-1603-507784

>> >> >

>> >> ><http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

>> >> >

>> >

>> >--

>> >Professor Keith Briffa,

>> >Climatic Research Unit

>> >University of East Anglia

>> >Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

>> >

>> >Phone: +44-1603-593909

>> >Fax: +44-1603-507784

>> >

>> ><http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

>> >

>> >

>

>Dr Timothy J Osborn, Academic Fellow

>Climatic Research Unit

>School of Environmental Sciences

>University of East Anglia

>Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

>

>e-mail: [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk](mailto:t.osborn@uea.ac.uk)

>phone: +44 1603 592089

>fax: +44 1603 507784

>web: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/>

>sunclock: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm>

>

--

Professor Keith Briffa,

Climatic Research Unit

University of East Anglia

Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

Phone: +44-1603-593909

Fax: +44-1603-507784

<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

From: Caspar Ammann [mailto:ammann@ucar.edu]  
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2008 5:15 PM  
To: t.osborn@uea.ac.uk  
Cc: keith Briffa; p.jones@uea.ac.uk  
Subject: Re: request for your emails

Hi Tim,

in response to your inquiry about my take on the confidentiality of my email communications with you, Keith or Phil, I have to say that the intent of these emails is to reply or communicate with the individuals on the distribution list, and they are not intended for general 'publication'. If I would consider my texts to potentially get wider dissemination then I would probably have written them in a different style. Having said that, as far as I can remember (and I haven't checked in the records, if they even still exist) I have never written an explicit statement on these messages that would label them strictly confidential.

Not sure if this is of any help, but it seems to me that it reflects our standard way of interaction in the scientific community.

Caspar

On May 27, 2008, at 5:03 PM, Tim Osborn wrote:

Dear Caspar,

I hope everything's fine with you.

Our university has received a request, under the UK Freedom of Information law, from someone called David Holland for emails or other documents that you may have sent to us that discuss any matters related to the IPCC assessment process.

We are not sure what our university's response will be, nor have we even checked whether you sent us emails that relate to the IPCC assessment or that we retained any that you may have sent.

However, it would be useful to know your opinion on this matter. In particular, we would like to know whether you consider any emails that you sent to us as confidential.

Sorry to bother you with this,

Tim (cc Keith & Phil)

Caspar M. Ammann  
National Center for Atmospheric Research  
Climate and Global Dynamics Division - Paleoclimatology  
1850 Table Mesa Drive  
Boulder, CO 80307-3000

email: ammann@ucar.edu tel: 303-497-1705 fax: 303-497-1348  
From: Tim Osborn [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 03 June 2008 17:14  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

Fine by me. Martin Manning would be the person at IPCC technical support unit for working group 1, assuming he is still there and it hasn't been wound up following completion of the report? Phil or Keith may know.

Tim

At 16:07 03/06/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:

>Gents,

>As I have not heard anything further from you subsequent to Tim's email  
>below, I will be doing the following:

>

>A. Will send response to FOI\_08-23 as drafted & circulated

>

>B. Will acknowledge and treat Mr. Holland's letter of 27 May as a

>separate request. I have acknowledged the request as such, and will

>draft a response regarding the referral of some elements of his request

>to the IPCC and answering the other sections. Who would be my contact

>with the IPCC to which I could forward this request?

>

>Cheers, Dave

>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Tim Osborn [mailto:t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]

>>Sent: Friday, May 30, 2008 1:11 PM

>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie

>>Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)

>>Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

>>

>>Dear Dave,

>>

>>I've had a look through this initial draft and it sounds fine. Keith

>>and I will read it in more detail, hopefully this afternoon, with

>>specific reference to the public interest section.

>>

>>Can we treat Holland's follow-up letter as a separate request? As

>>Phil mentioned, Caspar Ammann can be rather slow at replying, so we

>>haven't yet heard whether any emails that he sent us were sent in

>>confidence on his part. Can we respond to the initial FOI request,

>>and leave the follow-up till we hear back from Ammann?

>>

>>Best regards

>>

>>Tim

>>

>>At 17:38 27/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:

>>>Gents,

>>>An initial draft of a response to Mr. Holland based on the

> >'appropriate  
> >>limit' and s.41, Information provided in confidence. In  
> >particular, your  
> >>input on the public interest in not disclosing the correspondence  
> >>received by the University in this matter would be appreciated.  
> >>  
> >>This is a first draft so open to comment; the bits about  
> >right of appeal  
> >>are mandated by the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice.  
> >>  
> >>Cheers, Dave  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >> >-----Original Message-----  
> >> >From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
> >> >Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2008 5:07 PM  
> >> >To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
> >> >Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
> >> >Subject: Re: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)  
> >> >  
> >> >Hi Dave  
> >> >Holland acknowledged receipt - and said he would read my  
> >letter over  
> >> >last weekend. I have heard nothing since. I am happy for you to send  
> >> >the query but I suspect he will still pursue the original request. I  
> >> >would prefer that we simply answer that his request is  
> >unreasonable -  
> >> >and decline. We could also state that virtually all Chapter  
> >6 authors  
> >> >have declined/prohibited the release of their correspondence. This is  
> >> >a matter a principal as far as I see it and we should not fall into  
> >> >the trap of claiming time constraint, which would imply likely  
> >> >compliance with further, less demanding requests.  
> >> >cheers  
> >> >Keirth  
> >> >  
> >> >At 16:51 21/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:  
> >> >>Gents,  
> >> >>Yesterday was 2 weeks to the deadline on this matter. (3 June)  
> >> >>  
> >> >>Keith - any response to your letter as yet from Mr. Holland?  
> >> >>  
> >> >>We had discussed inquiring whether this response would satisfy Mr.  
> >> >>Holland but I'm not sure whether we had decided who was  
> >going to make  
> >> >>the approach to Mr. Holland. I am happy to do something  
> >> >along the lines  
> >> >>of ....  
> >> >>"I understand that Prof. Briffa has made a response to your  
> >> >letter of 31  
> >> >>March. Does this in any way alter the scope of your request  
> >> >under this  
> >> >>Act or in fact effect your desire to continue with this request?"  
> >> >>Pretty clear what our 'intention' is but I feel the



> > requester is not  
> > > going to be any more upset with us for having asked the  
> > > question... Your  
> > > opinions?  
> > >  
> > > Will be working on draft response to share with you shortly  
> > >  
> > > Cheers, Dave  
> > >  
> > > > -----Original Message-----  
> > > > From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
> > > > Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:49 PM  
> > > > To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
> > > > Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
> > > > Subject:  
> > > >  
> > > > Dave, Michael, Tim and Phil  
> > > > I have now considered all your thoughtful and helpful  
> > > > comments and on  
> > > > the basis of them have decided to send the attached response to  
> > > > Holland. Unless I hear anything to the contrary from you  
> > > > , I intend  
> > > > to send this letter as a pdf response by email to  
> > > > Holland tomorrow  
> > > > morning. I believe that my responses offer some personal comments  
> > > > while protecting the confidentiality of author interactions. By  
> > > > providing this reply I hope that it will be considered that  
> > > > I did not  
> > > > dismiss Holland's questions out of hand. I do not  
> > > > believe that this  
> > > > letter compromises or undermines the IPCC reporting  
> > > > process in any  
> > > > way and it clearly indicates that further correspondence  
> > > > will not be  
> > > > entered into on the matter. Hope you all agree.  
> > > > thanks again  
> > > > Keith  
> > > >  
> > > > --  
> > > > Professor Keith Briffa,  
> > > > Climatic Research Unit  
> > > > University of East Anglia  
> > > > Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.  
> > > >  
> > > > Phone: +44-1603-593909  
> > > > Fax: +44-1603-507784  
> > > >  
> > > > <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>  
> > > >  
> > > >  
> > > > --  
> > > > Professor Keith Briffa,  
> > > > Climatic Research Unit  
> > > > University of East Anglia  
> > > > Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.



From: Phil Jones [p.jones@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 04 June 2008 09:29  
To: Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

Dave,

Martin Manning has left the IPCC TSU in Boulder. The whole operation there is running down. Martin is now in NZ, for example.  
[http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/wg1\\_org.html](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/wg1_org.html)

From this web page you can get their address and email. I'd use these and let them see what they can get. There should be someone looking at emails till at least September, then I think they pass the mantle to a new TSU - which may be elsewhere in the US, the UK or Switzerland.

Cheers  
Phil

At 17:13 03/06/2008, Tim Osborn wrote:

>Fine by me. Martin Manning would be the person at IPCC technical  
>support unit for working group 1, assuming he is still there and it  
>hasn't been wound up following completion of the report? Phil or  
>Keith may know.

>

>Tim

>

>At 16:07 03/06/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB\ ) wrote:

>>Gents,

>>As I have not heard anything further from you subsequent to Tim's email  
>>below, I will be doing the following:

>>

>>A. Will send response to FOI\_08-23 as drafted & circulated

>>

>>B. Will acknowledge and treat Mr. Holland's letter of 27 May as a

>>separate request. I have acknowledged the request as such, and will

>>draft a response regarding the referral of some elements of his request

>>to the IPCC and answering the other sections. Who would be my contact

>>with the IPCC to which I could forward this request?

>>

>>Cheers, Dave

>>

>>>-----Original Message-----

>>>>From: Tim Osborn [mailto:t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]

>>>>Sent: Friday, May 30, 2008 1:11 PM

>>>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie

>>>>Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)

>>>>Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)

>>>>

>>>>Dear Dave,

>>>>

>>> I've had a look through this initial draft and it sounds fine. Keith  
>>> and I will read it in more detail, hopefully this afternoon, with  
>>> specific reference to the public interest section.  
>>>  
>>> Can we treat Holland's follow-up letter as a separate request? As  
>>> Phil mentioned, Caspar Ammann can be rather slow at replying, so we  
>>> haven't yet heard whether any emails that he sent us were sent in  
>>> confidence on his part. Can we respond to the initial FOI request,  
>>> and leave the follow-up till we hear back from Ammann?  
>>>  
>>> Best regards  
>>>  
>>> Tim  
>>>  
>>> At 17:38 27/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr \ (LIB\ ) wrote:  
>>>> Gents,  
>>>> An initial draft of a response to Mr. Holland based on the  
>>>> 'appropriate  
>>>> limit' and s.41, Information provided in confidence. In  
>>>> particular, your  
>>>> input on the public interest in not disclosing the correspondence  
>>>> received by the University in this matter would be appreciated.  
>>>>  
>>>> This is a first draft so open to comment; the bits about  
>>>> right of appeal  
>>>> are mandated by the Lord Chancellor's Code of Practice.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers, Dave  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>>> From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
>>>> Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2008 5:07 PM  
>>>> To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
>>>> Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>>>> Subject: Re: Freedom of Information Act request (FOI\_08-23)  
>>>>  
>>>> Hi Dave  
>>>> Holland acknowledged receipt - and said he would read my  
>>>> letter over  
>>>> last weekend. I have heard nothing since. I am happy for you to send  
>>>> the query but I suspect he will still pursue the original request. I  
>>>> would prefer that we simply answer that his request is  
>>>> unreasonable -  
>>>> and decline. We could also state that virtually all Chapter  
>>>> 6 authors  
>>>> have declined/prohibited the release of their correspondence. This is  
>>>> a matter a principal as far as I see it and we should not fall into  
>>>> the trap of claiming time constraint, which would imply likely  
>>>> compliance with further, less demanding requests.  
>>>> cheers  
>>>> Keirith  
>>>>  
>>>> At 16:51 21/05/2008, Palmer Dave Mr \ (LIB\ ) wrote:

>>>>Gents,  
>>>>Yesterday was 2 weeks to the deadline on this matter. (3 June)  
>>>>  
>>>>Keith - any response to your letter as yet from Mr. Holland?  
>>>>  
>>>>We had discussed inquiring whether this response would satisfy Mr.  
>>>>Holland but I'm not sure whether we had decided who was  
>>>>>going to make  
>>>>>the approach to Mr. Holland. I am happy to do something  
>>>>>along the lines  
>>>>>of ....  
>>>>>"I understand that Prof. Briffa has made a response to your  
>>>>>letter of 31  
>>>>>March. Does this in any way alter the scope of your request  
>>>>>under this  
>>>>>Act or in fact effect your desire to continue with this request?"  
>>>>>Pretty clear what our 'intention' is but I feel the  
>>>>>requester is not  
>>>>>going to be any more upset with us for having asked the  
>>>>>question... Your  
>>>>>opinions?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Will be working on draft response to share with you shortly  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Cheers, Dave  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>-----Original Message-----  
>>>>>>>From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
>>>>>>>Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:49 PM  
>>>>>>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn  
>>>>>>>Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>>>>>>>Subject:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>Dave, Michael, Tim and Phil  
>>>>>>>>I have now considered all your thoughtful and helpful  
>>>>>>>>comments and on  
>>>>>>>>the basis of them have decided to send the attached response to  
>>>>>>>>Holland. Unless I hear anything to the contrary from you  
>>>>>>>>, I intend  
>>>>>>>>to send this letter as a pdf response by email to  
>>>>>>>>Holland tomorrow  
>>>>>>>>morning. I believe that my responses offer some personal comments  
>>>>>>>>while protecting the confidentiality of author interactions. By  
>>>>>>>>providing this reply I hope that it will be considered that  
>>>>>>>>I did not  
>>>>>>>>dismiss Holland's questions out of hand. I do not  
>>>>>>>>believe that this  
>>>>>>>>letter compromises or undermines the IPCC reporting  
>>>>>>>>process in any  
>>>>>>>>way and it clearly indicates that further correspondence  
>>>>>>>>will not be  
>>>>>>>>entered into on the matter. Hope you all agree.  
>>>>>>>>thanks again  
>>>>>>>>Keith  
>>>>>>>>



Climatic Research Unit      Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090  
School of Environmental Sciences      Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich      Email      p.jones@uea.ac.uk  
NR4 7TJ  
UK

---

From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Sent: 10 June 2008 12:45  
To: Press Office  
Subject: FW: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment Process  
[FOI\_08-31]

Attachments: CRU02.pdf

Simon/Annie,  
After consultation with CRU staff, we decided to deal with this request as a separate matter to FOI\_08-23, as the response here will be different (and we need time to contact a 3rd party re s.41 concerns).  
I have acknowledged the request.

Cheers, Dave

From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@theiet.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 5:37 PM  
To: David Palmer  
Subject: Your Ref: FOI\_08-23 - IPCC, 2007 WGI Chapter 6 Assessment Process

Please find attached a response to your letter of 19th May 2008  
David Holland



From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Sent: 20 June 2008 09:22  
To: Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) - Draft response

Attachments: Response\_letter\_draft.doc

Gents,

As promised in our meeting on Wed, a draft of the response to Mr. Holland on the second of his requests.

Cheers, Dave

---

David Palmer  
Information Policy Officer  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich, England  
NR4 7TJ

From: Keith Briffa [k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 20 June 2008 09:46  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: Re: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) - Draft response

Dave  
I am happy with this  
Keith  
At 09:21 20/06/2008, Palmer Dave Mr (LIB) wrote:

>Gents,  
>As promised in our meeting on Wed, a draft of the response to Mr.  
>Holland on the second of his requests.  
>  
>Cheers, Dave  
>  
><<Response\_letter\_draft.doc>>  
>  
>  
>\_\_\_\_\_  
>David Palmer  
>Information Policy Officer  
>University of East Anglia  
>Norwich, England  
>NR4 7TJ

--  
Professor Keith Briffa,  
Climatic Research Unit  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

Phone: +44-1603-593909  
Fax: +44-1603-507784

<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

From: Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD)  
Sent: 20 June 2008 09:58  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) - Draft response

Dave,

I am also content with this.

Regards

Michael

Michael McGarvie  
Senior Faculty Manager  
Faculty of Science  
Room 0.22C  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich NR4 7TJ  
tel: 01603 593229  
fax: 01603 593045  
m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk

---

From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Sent: 20 June 2008 09:22  
To: Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV);  
Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) - Draft response

Gents,

As promised in our meeting on Wed, a draft of the response to Mr. Holland on the second of his requests.

Cheers, Dave

<< File: Response\_letter\_draft.doc >>

---

David Palmer  
Information Policy Officer  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich, England  
NR4 7TJ

Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31)

From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)

Sent: 30 June 2008 14:13

To: Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)

Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)

Subject: FW: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

Attachments: CRU20080627H.pdf

Further input from Mr. Holland, inclusive of a request for the input we received from the persons mentioned in his original request. I can't imagine that they would object to their objection being made available to Mr. Holland - I might try a list of names and citing the appropriate correspondence.... opinions?

I think you can see the potential arguments being developed here that may find their way to the ICO eventually.

Will examine this, have a ponder, and get back to you....

Cheers, Dave

From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@tesco.net]

Sent: Friday, June 27, 2008 4:30 PM

To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)

Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)

Subject: Re: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

Please find attached a response to your letters of 20 June 2008 ref FOI\_08-23 and 31

Regards

David Holland

----- Original Message -----

From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)

To: d.holland@theiet.org

Sent: Friday, June 20, 2008 11:24 AM

Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31)

Mr. Holland,

Attached please find a response to your request received on 27 May 2008. If you have any questions don't hesitate to contact me.

Cheers, Dave Palmer

<<Response\_letter\_080620.doc>>

From: Tim Osborn [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 02 July 2008 12:00  
To: Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD); Palmer Dave Mr (LIB); Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

Dave,

I'm happy with Michael's suggestion that this gets dealt with by Jonathan Colam as part of his overall appeal.

A comment on his latest letter, though. In item 1, he claims his first letter to Keith was also under FOIA. Yet my recollection is that he was asking Keith questions about Keith's opinions rather than asking for information that UEA holds, so I disagree with Holland that it "was clearly a FOI Act request".

Tim

At 14:57 30/06/2008, Mcgarvie Michael Mr \ (ACAD\ ) wrote:

>Dave,  
>  
>Shouldn't we just take the full documentation to Jonathan as the  
>next stage of the appeal and deal with this in that capacity?  
>Otherwise we could be back and forth with comments upon comments etc.  
>  
>I see that Jonathan was copied into this letter, which I presume  
>means that Mr Holland wishes to go to the next level of internal process.  
>  
>Thanks  
>  
>Michael  
>  
>  
>Michael McGarvie  
>Senior Faculty Manager  
>Faculty of Science  
>Room 0.22C  
>University of East Anglia  
>Norwich NR4 7TJ  
>tel: 01603 593229  
>fax: 01603 593045  
><mailto:m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk>m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk  
>  
>  
>  
>From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>Sent: 30 June 2008 14:13  
>To: Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Mcgarvie  
>Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
>Subject: FW: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)  
>  
>Further input from Mr. Holland, inclusive of a request for the input

>we received from the persons mentioned in his original request. I  
>can't imagine that they would object to their objection being made  
>available to Mr. Holland - I might try a list of names and citing  
>the appropriate correspondence.... opinions?  
>  
>I think you can see the potential arguments being developed here  
>that may find their way to the ICO eventually.  
>  
>Will examine this, have a ponder, and get back to you....  
>  
>Cheers, Dave  
>  
>  
>From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@tesco.net]  
>Sent: Friday, June 27, 2008 4:30 PM  
>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
>Subject: Re: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)  
>Please find attached a response to your letters of 20 June 2008 ref  
>FOI\_08-23 and 31  
>  
>Regards  
>  
>David Holland  
>----- Original Message -----  
>From: <mailto:David.Palmer@uea.ac.uk>Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>To: <mailto:d.holland@theiet.org>d.holland@theiet.org  
>Sent: Friday, June 20, 2008 11:24 AM  
>Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31)  
>  
>  
>Mr. Holland,  
>  
>Attached please find a response to your request received on 27 May  
>2008. If you have any questions don't hesitate to contact me.  
>  
>Cheers, Dave Palmer  
>  
>  
><<Response\_letter\_080620.doc>>

Dr Timothy J Osborn, Academic Fellow  
Climatic Research Unit  
School of Environmental Sciences  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

e-mail: t.osborn@uea.ac.uk  
phone: +44 1603 592089  
fax: +44 1603 507784  
web: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/>  
sunclock: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm>

From: Keith Briffa [k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 02 July 2008 13:22  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Cc: Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

Dave  
fine with me - though I would appreciate the chance of providing  
input to any further letters sent to Holland still. cheers  
Keith  
P.S. Tim is quite correct re Holland's first letter to me

At 11:59 02/07/2008, you wrote:

>Dave,

>

>I'm happy with Michael's suggestion that this gets dealt with by  
>Jonathan Colam as part of his overall appeal.

>

>A comment on his latest letter, though. In item 1, he claims his  
>first letter to Keith was also under FOIA. Yet my recollection is  
>that he was asking Keith questions about Keith's opinions rather  
>than asking for information that UEA holds, so I disagree with  
>Holland that it "was clearly a FOI Act request".

>

>Tim

>

>At 14:57 30/06/2008, Mcgarvie Michael Mr \ (ACAD\ ) wrote:

>>Dave,

>>

>>Shouldn't we just take the full documentation to Jonathan as the  
>>next stage of the appeal and deal with this in that capacity?

>>Otherwise we could be back and forth with comments upon comments etc.

>>

>>I see that Jonathan was copied into this letter, which I presume  
>>means that Mr Holland wishes to go to the next level of internal process.

>>

>>Thanks

>>

>>Michael

>>

>>

>>Michael McGarvie

>>Senior Faculty Manager

>>Faculty of Science

>>Room 0.22C

>>University of East Anglia

>>Norwich NR4 7TJ

>>tel: 01603 593229

>>fax: 01603 593045

>><mailto:m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk>m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk

>>

>>

>>

>>From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>>Sent: 30 June 2008 14:13  
>>To: Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Mcgarvie  
>>Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
>>Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
>>Subject: FW: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)  
>>  
>>Further input from Mr. Holland, inclusive of a request for the  
>>input we received from the persons mentioned in his original  
>>request. I can't imagine that they would object to their objection  
>>being made available to Mr. Holland - I might try a list of names  
>>and citing the appropriate correspondence.... opinions?  
>>  
>>I think you can see the potential arguments being developed here  
>>that may find their way to the ICO eventually.  
>>  
>>Will examine this, have a ponder, and get back to you....  
>>  
>>Cheers, Dave  
>>  
>>  
>>From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@tesco.net]  
>>Sent: Friday, June 27, 2008 4:30 PM  
>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>>Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
>>Subject: Re: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)  
>>Please find attached a response to your letters of 20 June 2008 ref  
>>FOI\_08-23 and 31  
>>  
>>Regards  
>>  
>>David Holland  
>>----- Original Message -----  
>>From: <mailto:David.Palmer@uea.ac.uk>Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>>To: <mailto:d.holland@theiet.org>d.holland@theiet.org  
>>Sent: Friday, June 20, 2008 11:24 AM  
>>Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31)  
>>  
>>  
>>Mr. Holland,  
>>  
>>Attached please find a response to your request received on 27 May  
>>2008. If you have any questions don't hesitate to contact me.  
>>  
>>Cheers, Dave Palmer  
>>  
>>  
>><<Response\_letter\_080620.doc>>  
>  
>Dr Timothy J Osborn, Academic Fellow  
>Climatic Research Unit  
>School of Environmental Sciences  
>University of East Anglia  
>Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK  
>



>e-mail: [t.osborn@uea.ac.uk](mailto:t.osborn@uea.ac.uk)  
>phone: +44 1603 592089  
>fax: +44 1603 507784  
>web: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/>  
>sunclock: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm>  
>

--

Professor Keith Briffa,  
Climatic Research Unit  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

Phone: +44-1603-593909  
Fax: +44-1603-507784

<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

From: Keith Briffa [k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]  
Sent: 02 July 2008 14:32  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

absolutely fine Dave - thanks for the continuing support and effort  
Keith

At 13:59 02/07/2008, you wrote:

>Keith,  
>No problems with the consultation - my reason for not passing the most  
>recent missive past you is that I thought we had agreed the overall  
>content & message of the note in our meeting. All I have done is  
>re-iterate our position, state that there does not seem to be a chance  
>of informal resolution & note that the appeal was going to the next  
>level.

>

>I attach a copy of the letter I sent...

>

>Cheers, Dave

>

>

>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Keith Briffa [mailto:k.briffa@uea.ac.uk]

>>Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 1:22 PM

>>To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)

>>Cc: Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); Jones Philip Prof (ENV); Mcgarvie

>>Michael Mr (ACAD)

>>Subject: RE: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and (FOI\_08-23)

>>

>>Dave

>>fine with me - though I would appreciate the chance of providing

>>input to any further letters sent to Holland still. cheers

>>Keith

>>P.S. Tim is quite correct re Holland's first letter to me

>>

>>At 11:59 02/07/2008, you wrote:

>>>Dave,

>>>

>>>I'm happy with Michael's suggestion that this gets dealt with by

>>>Jonathan Colam as part of his overall appeal.

>>>

>>>A comment on his latest letter, though. In item 1, he claims his

>>>first letter to Keith was also under FOIA. Yet my recollection is

>>>that he was asking Keith questions about Keith's opinions rather

>>>than asking for information that UEA holds, so I disagree with

>>>Holland that it "was clearly a FOI Act request".

>>>

>>>Tim

>>>

>>>At 14:57 30/06/2008, Mcgarvie Michael Mr (ACAD\ ) wrote:

>>>>Dave,

>>>>

> >>> Shouldn't we just take the full documentation to Jonathan as the  
> >>> next stage of the appeal and deal with this in that capacity?  
> >>> Otherwise we could be back and forth with comments upon comments etc.  
> >>>  
> >>> I see that Jonathan was copied into this letter, which I presume  
> >>> means that Mr Holland wishes to go to the next level of  
> > internal process.  
> >>>  
> >>> Thanks  
> >>>  
> >>> Michael  
> >>>  
> >>>  
> >>> Michael McGarvie  
> >>> Senior Faculty Manager  
> >>> Faculty of Science  
> >>> Room 0.22C  
> >>> University of East Anglia  
> >>> Norwich NR4 7TJ  
> >>> tel: 01603 593229  
> >>> fax: 01603 593045  
> >>> <mailto:m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk>m.mcgarvie@uea.ac.uk  
> >>>  
> >>>  
> >>>  
> >>> From: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
> >>> Sent: 30 June 2008 14:13  
> >>> To: Briffa Keith Prof (ENV); Osborn Timothy Dr (ENV); McGarvie  
> >>> Michael Mr (ACAD); Jones Philip Prof (ENV)  
> >>> Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
> >>> Subject: FW: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and  
> > (FOI\_08-23)  
> >>>  
> >>> Further input from Mr. Holland, inclusive of a request for the  
> >>> input we received from the persons mentioned in his original  
> >>> request. I can't imagine that they would object to their objection  
> >>> being made available to Mr. Holland - I might try a list of names  
> >>> and citing the appropriate correspondence.... opinions?  
> >>>  
> >>> I think you can see the potential arguments being developed here  
> >>> that may find their way to the ICO eventually.  
> >>>  
> >>> Will examine this, have a ponder, and get back to you....  
> >>>  
> >>> Cheers, Dave  
> >>>  
> >>>  
> >>> From: David Holland [mailto:d.holland@tesco.net]  
> >>> Sent: Friday, June 27, 2008 4:30 PM  
> >>> To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
> >>> Cc: Colam Jonathan Mr (ISD)  
> >>> Subject: Re: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31) and  
> > (FOI\_08-23)  
> >>> Please find attached a response to your letters of 20 June 2008 ref  
> >>> FOI\_08-23 and 31

>>>>  
>>>>Regards  
>>>>  
>>>>David Holland  
>>>>----- Original Message -----  
>>>>From: <mailto:David.Palmer@uea.ac.uk>Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
>>>>To: <mailto:d.holland@theiet.org>d.holland@theiet.org  
>>>>Sent: Friday, June 20, 2008 11:24 AM  
>>>>Subject: Freedom of Information request (FOI\_08-31)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>Mr. Holland,  
>>>>  
>>>>Attached please find a response to your request received on 27 May  
>>>>2008. If you have any questions don't hesitate to contact me.  
>>>>  
>>>>Cheers, Dave Palmer  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>><<Response\_letter\_080620.doc>>  
>>>>  
>>>>Dr Timothy J Osborn, Academic Fellow  
>>>>Climatic Research Unit  
>>>>School of Environmental Sciences  
>>>>University of East Anglia  
>>>>Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK  
>>>>  
>>>>e-mail: t.osborn@uea.ac.uk  
>>>>phone: +44 1603 592089  
>>>>fax: +44 1603 507784  
>>>>web: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/>  
>>>>sunclock: <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/~timo/sunclock.htm>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>--  
>>>>Professor Keith Briffa,  
>>>>Climatic Research Unit  
>>>>University of East Anglia  
>>>>Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.  
>>>>  
>>>>Phone: +44-1603-593909  
>>>>Fax: +44-1603-507784  
>>>>  
>>>><http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>

--  
Professor Keith Briffa,  
Climatic Research Unit  
University of East Anglia  
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.

Phone: +44-1603-593909

Fax: +44-1603-507784

<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/>

From: Archer, Marion [marion.archer@metoffice.gov.uk]  
Sent: 03 July 2008 11:43  
To: Palmer Dave Mr (LIB)  
Subject: D Holland

Importance: High

David  
Do you have 5 mins to talk about Mr. Holland FOIs?  
Can you tell me the best time to call?  
Regards  
Marion

Marion Archer  
FOI/Data Protection Manager  
Met Office Alexandria 1  
Fitzroy Road Exeter Devon EX1 3PB United Kingdom  
Direct Tel: +44(0)1392 884036 Fax 0870 900 5050  
email: marion.archer@metoffice.gov.uk  
<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk>  
Met Office climate change predictions can now be viewed on Google Earth  
<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/hadleycentre/google/>