

JOINT RESEARCH COUNCIL CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE

EXPERT PANEL

MINUTES OF SECOND MEETING, 22 MARCH 2000, Institute of Directors, London.

Attendees

Chairman

Sir Crispin Tickell (**CT**)

Full members

Professor Michael Gibbons (**MG**)

Dr Charlotte Grezo (**CG**)

Professor Steve Rayner (**SR**)

Professor Hans-Joachim Schellnhuber (arrived late) (**JSch**)

Professor Robert William Ernest Shannon (**ES**)

Professor Jim Swithenbank (**JSw**)

Professor Alan Thorpe (**AT**)

Ex Officio members (representing interests)

Mr Adrian Alsop (**AAI**)

Dr Alan Apling (in place of Mr David Warrilow) (**AAp**)

Ms Catherine Coates (**CC**)

Mr Alistair Keddie (in place of Dr Colin Hicks) (**AK**)

Dr Michael Tricker (**MT**) also speaking for Professor Geoff Randall (**GR**) who sent his apologies but met with MT and ID prior to meeting

Secretary

Mr Ian Dwyer (**ID**)

Minutes

Attendees' comments are paraphrased.

1. Preliminaries

Introduction

CT: All Panel members should closely respect the need to maintain confidentiality after the meeting regarding the Panel's recommendation.

Declarations of Conflicts of Interest:

CT: Member of the Advisory Board of the Environmental Change Institute (ECI), Oxford, but have not had conversation with them about the competition since it began. Also

Chairman of Advisory Board to CCLIFF, a climate change initiative in SW England, but have not been directly involved with it since the competition began. Also member of International Commission on Sustainable Consumption, Mansfield College Oxford, which is party to the Imperial college-led bid, but have had no conversations about the competition since it began.

CG: BP had been approached to be a member of the would-be Advisory Board for a UEA-led centre, but I myself have not been involved in any such conversations. Have briefly spoken to [REDACTED] Imperial-led bid) and told him that the engineering appeared weak.

SR: Member of International Commission on Sustainable Consumption, Mansfield College Oxford, which is party to the Imperial college-led bid, but have had no conversations about the competition since it began.

AT: Ongoing research links and have spoken to both bidders.
AT was permitted such involvement with the bidders as detailed in the meeting paper on conflicts of interests.

JSw: None

MG: Previously Director of SPRU, but had not spoken to [REDACTED].

AK: None

MT for GR: None

AAp: Connections through various Advisory and Review Groups. DETR has had conversations with both bidders.
DETR was permitted such involvement with the bidders as detailed in the meeting paper on conflicts of interests.

ES: None

CT: Thus, no one has conflicts of interest which restrict in any way their involvement in the Panel's deliberations.

2. Bid A

CT: After the bidders' presentation, questions to bidders would proceed around the table.

Presentation

[Bidders enter]

Dr Mike Hulme gave a 10-minute presentation.

Questions to bidders

This took **50 minutes**. Answers to questions were not recorded: the Panel's assessment of the answers would be implicit in the proceeding Panel discussions.

SR:

- How do you intend achieving stakeholder involvement across the agenda?
- What proportion of overall efforts are significantly placed in social sciences, and how they are divided between different types of social science, and how will they be integrated with other sciences?
- What are your reasons for not separating out mitigation from the adaptation in the usual manner?

AT:

- How important is climate science to your centre, bearing in mind the many existing activities in this area?

[JSch enters]

- So can we be confident that you will not be undertaking physical climate research that is already being funded (eg by NERC & Hadley)?

JSw:

- You mention you wish to bring in the competitors if you win; will this compromise your ability to manage the large number of institutions involved?

CC:

- Explain in more detail how you will manage the centre?
- What will you do at the end of five years regarding dissemination of results in order to generate something which is more than the sum of the parts?

MG:

- Please give three principle weaknesses of your approach to Integrated Assessment ?

AK:

- What will be the outcomes of your outreach programme and how will you recognise its success?

MT for GR:

- What three things must the management team get right to ensure success and to operate beyond five years?

AAp:

- In order to deliver strategic research results relevant to the needs of users, how do you identify the appropriate research themes?

ES:

- How will you make the centre sustainable after five years, e.g. have you had any thoughts on IPR and exploitation?

CG:

- What is Dr Mike Hulme's management experience?

AAI:

- What is the most significant barrier to interdisciplinarity and how do you intend to overcome it?

JSch:

- You have highlighted extreme weather events as a research theme, do you have methods for dealing with extreme social events and change?

[Bidders exit]

Discussion comments

CT: They supported their research very well especially their social research. They were wise not to specify the RD.

■ I was happy with their responses on management issues, but their engineering research is not as innovative as other aspects so they need a Research Director with engineering knowledge.

■ Slight worry about management experience of Mike Hulme which would have to be counter-balanced through the make up of Advisory Board.

■ Engineering can be boosted by increased involvement of private companies.

■ Their management strategy relies on the management team, but this is not strong management and would have to be addressed in contract if awarded.

SR: I did have grave concerns about their management compared with the Imperial College-led bid, but the enterprise requires diversity and the notion that this can be managed with conventional techniques is suspect. Thus, I am reassured by the network communication approach to management, including the engagement of stakeholders. End-game plan has been successfully addressed by CSERGE (UEA) which they pulled together through decentralised management. This approach is compatible with their research agenda.

■ I Agree with SR. This is not a large managed programme. This distributed research approach requires scientific excitement as the 'glue' rather than centralised management.

■ Research Director is vital to cohesion and UEA can attract a first-rate Director. However, they still need to strengthen the management but without killing scientific innovation.

■ Would have liked more input from engineering side on how they intend to incorporate it.

■ Not so happy about how will they place results into the policy community – it is a rather loose approach.

■ The answer to this problem hasn't been solved; I got the impression that whilst they don't know their exact communication lines, they are obviously serious about it.

CT: We could help solve this problem by ensuring appropriate people on Advisory Panel.

SR: I can see more policy relevance in UEA-led bid than in the Imperial College-led bid. Also UEA are particularly strong on the next generation of policy advice (eg beyond the Kyoto protocol, or in case it fails).

■ I Agree the less conventional management style is appropriate but their appears to be a weakness on technology side. Regarding policy relevance and advice, there is also an onus on government to communicate with the scientists.

■ Distributed network also requires very skilled management.

CT: Let us invite the bidders back in again to elaborate on the incorporation of engineering.

[Bidders re-enter.]

Questions

JSch: How do you intend to link the engineering into the rest of the science?

SR: What about engineering aspects of adaptation to climate change?

[Bidders exit.]

LUNCH [JSch indicated to ID that he had no conflicts of interest]

3. Bid B

Presentation

■ gave a 10 minute presentation.

Questions to bidders

This lasted 70 minutes. Questions went round the table in the opposite direction to Bid A questions.

JSch: What will be the new Integrated Assessment model: will it be a completely new model or a hierarchy of existing models, and how will it deal with uncertainty?

CT: Your five main themes are conventional ones (eg covered by the IPCC assessment), so what is new about your agenda?

- (SR: In particular, why have you chosen to keep the mitigation and adaptation separate?)
- AAI: What do you consider to be the main barrier to interdisciplinary research and how do you intend to overcome it?
- ES: You plan to achieve 65% self-support by the end of year 5, please clarify this in relation to your financial plans stated in the bid.
- CG: How will the Research Committee contribute to interdisciplinarity? what will be its composition? and how will members affect the research agenda?
- AAp: 'Stakeholder' is a common term, who do you see as the stakeholders and how will you use them?
- MT for GR:
How do you think the work of the centre will help to understand public acceptance of new technologies and measures to mitigate against climate change?
- (SR: Your proposal appears not to go beyond the Kyoto Protocol issues. What research will be done to cover the collapse and limitations of the Protocol?)
- AK: What do you see as the outcomes of interaction with business and how would you measure success of business engagement?
- MG: What are the three main weaknesses of your approach to Integrated Assessment?
- (MT: What risks are associated with the failure of your management strategy and how will you address it and protect against the consequences?)
- CC: What will be your outputs regarding what influences technological change?
- JSw: How will you handle the management of a networked consortium with respect to allocating the budget, bearing in mind contentions may arise between universities in gaining credit for financial spend (for the purposes of the RAE)?
- AT: Given that two of your research themes are in basic climate science, which is already well covered in the UK (eg by Hadley and NERC), is there a danger that your programme duplicates existing effort? What is new?
- SR: Your proposal emphasises modelling as the means to integration but some social science does not lend itself to this approach. So, what will you do in these others areas of social science over and above agent-based modelling?
- (CT: Do you consider extreme social events to be within the remit of the centre?)
- (JSch: If you operate such large amounts of money through open calls, how can you be confident that you will still achieve interdisciplinarity and focus?)
- [Bidders exit]

Discussion

■ Bid has the unusual position of a Director (rather than Research Director) which they rely upon too heavily.

ES: They have focused on research management.

■ Concerned that they have not got clear the institutional ownership of their Research Programmes.

■ We didn't ask the same of UEA.

■ Don't think their open call will be very attractive to outside bidders as it comes with too many strings attached.

■ ■ came over very well.

SR: ■ has strong track record with ESRC's Global Environmental Change Programme, in pulling different institutions together. ■ also has a good track record.

■ If ■ is critical then he needs more time from his current job to be involved with the centre.

■ Not sure we got all the answers from the question session, so why don't we invite them back in?

■ The presenters' skills did not cover technology.

CT: They are weakest on socio-economics and we are unclear about ownership of Programme. Let's have them back in.

[Bidders re-enter]

Questions to bidders

CT: Please clarify which of your consortium institutions will own which research programmes.

CT: How much of each of your time will be devoted to the centre?

[Answers included 100% for ■ and 20% for ■]

[Bidders exit]

4. Discussion

Comparing bids

CT: Either bid would do the job, especially as it would take on board elements of the other.

CT: Have each addressed the weaknesses pointed out in the feedback letters from the outline stage? UEA have addressed all of them, Imperial did not strengthen the engineering or socio-economics. Now let us go through each assessment criterion.

Criterion A

CT: Both will do fine in terms of the Director / Research Director (UEA is yet to appoint a Research Director through open competition).

Criteria B and C

CT: UEA is better on long term issues where need is greatest.

■ Business does need some short-term solutions too.

■ Research Councils are more interested in delivering on medium to long term research objectives.

■ NERC is looking for a sea-change in research direction, but this does not preclude short term issues.

ES: Both need more management on resource issues.

Criterion D

■ Imperial will 'link research to action' but UEA will push back the frontiers of scientific knowledge. What do the Research Councils want?

CT: UEA streets ahead in socio-economics.

■ UEA answered supplementary questions on engineering well and they have a stronger engineering element.

Criterion E

■ Both groups will interact with other researchers but Imperial wants to continue to do existing research. So UEA is better positioned for this challenge.

■ Neither comment on collaboration with Europe.

Criterion F

■ As before, Imperial will 'link research to action' but UEA will push back the frontiers of scientific knowledge.

■ Science Museum link is good (as expressed in Imperial bid) – though either centre could implement this. Imperial's channels to government are particularly good.

CT: Struck by UEA's public participation angle.

Imperial has better communication with government but UEA more likely to challenge government (Imperial agenda is rather conservative).

Criterion G

CT: Both would attract additional funding by virtue of their scientific excellence. Imperial would do better from business and UEA would do better from EU and Research Councils.

Criterion H

UEA very persuasive compared to Imperial on offering interdisciplinary training opportunities.

Criterion I

CT: In one sense Imperial offers better value for money, but not sure this is in their favour. (ie research agenda is safe but too conventional).

General discussion

CT: Imperial is established, reliable, connected but conservative and conventional. UEA is more radical, innovative, but carries higher risk. Whoever wins they will involve the others and take on their strengths.

Would the more innovative UEA bid gain credibility in the business community?

Only if they deliver! UEA's MIT link helps here. Business wants to be challenged but this must be well based.

SR: UEA bid therefore has edge because their bid is stronger scientifically, and their scientists certainly have international reputations.

We don't know the Research Director of the UEA bid, which could be crucial, so we don't have equal information about the bids.

This is part of the risk associated with the bid.

Research Councils have a say in the decision over the appointment of the Research Director, which will help ensure an appropriate appointment.

CT: Regarding personalities involved: Dr Hulme was impressive but we don't know much about his management experience, [REDACTED] is very insightful and [REDACTED] obviously has technical competence [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] is first class, [REDACTED] is very effective but only 20% of his time will be in the centre, [REDACTED] is very competent but why didn't [REDACTED]?

Conclusion and Panel's recommendation

CT: Does anyone think the Imperial College-led bid should get it?

No hands went up

CT: Who thinks the UEA-led should get it?

Numerous hands went up all around though they were not counted

CT: Is the view that UEA should get it unanimous? Please raise your hand if you disagree that this view is unanimous.

No hands went up

CT: The Panel therefore recommends that the Research Councils should fund the UEA-led bid. The Panel also recommends that the Research Councils discuss with them options for strengthening certain aspects of their plans, namely:

- Strengthening their operational management so as to provide added security whilst not stifling innovation.
- Strengthening their public understanding activities by considering a partnership with the Science Museum's planned new exhibit on energy and climate change.
- Strengthening their links with industry by making sure the appointed Research Director has credibility with business, and appointing key industrialists to the Advisory Panel.

ID: I will write minutes of the meeting for Research Council purposes. I will then ask Sir Crispin to write a letter to the Chief Executives of the three Research Councils explaining the Panel's recommendations, including the options for strengthening certain aspects of their plans (which the research Councils may change into conditions of the contract). When the Research Councils have made a decision I will inform bidders, issue a press release, and write to all Panel members confirming that a decision is now public.

Meeting closed.

Ian Dwyer (Secretary to Panel)
28 March 2000

SCORING FORM

BID B: IMPERIAL LEAD

Criterion	Description (also see notes in annex A)	Score (A, B or X)	Comments
A	To attract an internationally renowned scientist to be overall Research Director of the centre.	A	I do not know the person
B	To implement an effective management strategy led by a named Executive Director.	A	If anything will be too rigid
C	To develop an innovative research agenda taking account of existing national and international research.	B	Short on Social / Economic / people programme. Subject will have technological start only.
D	To achieve scientifically excellent integrated research which builds upon the environmental, engineering, and socio-economic disciplines, and contributes to their progress.	A	BUT X FOR Social etc see above.
E	To draw upon relevant expertise within the UK scientific community and to collaborate with appropriate research groups abroad (plans might include attracting visiting scientists from the UK and abroad).	B	NARROW BASE COMPARED TO UEA.
F	To include among its outputs strategic research results relevant to the needs of government, business and other users, encouraging take-up of such research by utilising or creating effective knowledge-transfer mechanisms .	A	BUT SOCIAL SCIENCE
G	To attract additional funding to complement the core support provided by the Research Councils. This might include funding from business, government departments and agencies, the EU, and others.	A	GOOD IN TO THIS FROM THE START EVERY CHANCE OF SUCCESS
H	To offer training opportunities for young (postgraduate) scientists to learn interdisciplinary skills.	B	IN COMPARISON TO UEA
I	To demonstrate value for money through operational efficiency and effective utilisation of existing capabilities.	A	
OVERALL COMMENT:		A	IF SOCIAL IS REALLY BUILT IN WILL BE SUCCESSFUL BUT NOT AS INNOVATIVE AS UEA

14.03.2000

SCORING FORM

BID A: UEA LEAD

Criterion	Description (also see notes in annex A)	Score (A, B or X)	Comments
A	To attract an internationally renowned scientist to be overall Research Director of the centre.	N/A	Interaction with Holme, critical. Is Holme integrative mgr or control freak.
B	To implement an effective management strategy led by a named Executive Director.	N/A	MUST BE EXCELLENT INTEGRATIVE MANAGER, AND STRUCTURE - NEED TO USE QUESTIONING TO TEST THIS OUT, WHAT ABOUT DAY TO DAY MGT.
C	To develop an innovative research agenda taking account of existing national and international research.	A	
D	To achieve scientifically excellent integrated research which builds upon the environmental, engineering, and socio-economic disciplines, and contributes to their progress.	N/A A	SCIENCE ALL DIVERSE TEAM COVERING IMPORTANT AREAS.
E	To draw upon relevant expertise within the UK scientific community and to collaborate with appropriate research groups abroad (plans might include attracting visiting scientists from the UK and abroad).	A	
F	To include among its outputs strategic research results relevant to the needs of government, business and other users, encouraging take-up of such research by utilising or creating effective knowledge-transfer mechanisms.	A	
G	To attract additional funding to complement the core support provided by the Research Councils. This might include funding from business, government departments and agencies, the EU, and others.	B	CONCERN ABOUT BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT BEING TOO SMALL IN REAL TERMS.
H	To offer training opportunities for young (postgraduate) scientists to learn interdisciplinary skills.	A	
I	To demonstrate value for money through operational efficiency and effective utilisation of existing capabilities.	A B	TO INTERACTIVE OBJECTIVE EFFICIENCY MEASURED ON NARROW CRITERIA eg PAPERS, CITATIONS
OVERALL COMMENT:		A	YES - If they can convince me that they will manage the diverse team well.

14.03.2000

**JOINT RESEARCH COUNCIL CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE
EXPERT PANEL
LIST OF BID PRESENTERS ATTENDING ON 22 MARCH**

Presenters for Bid A – UEA lead

Dr Mike Hulme, UEA and Executive Director of proposed Centre

[REDACTED], UEA
[REDACTED], UMIST

Presenters for Bid B – Imperial lead

[REDACTED] and Director of proposed centre
[REDACTED]

Supplementary Information to the Tyndall Centre Proposal

The attached sheets provide some supplementary information to the UEA-led proposal to host the new Climate Change Centre. They were absent from our final submission for reasons explained below:

- a. two lines of text at the bottom of p.49 were missing because of rogue pagination introduced by one of our printers. This was missed at the proof stage. It affected the section on the Environment Agency. A correct p.49 is therefore enclosed in this package.
- b. we have received an additional six letters of support for our proposal which were too late to include in the submission. Copies of these six letters are attached in this package and should be regarded as additional to Appendix 9 on p.97 of our proposal. The five letters are from the following organisations:

Powergen
National Centre for
Atmospheric Research
World Resources Institute
Greenpeace
TXU Europe Power
Loss Prevention Council



Dr Mike Hulme, 13 March 2000
(for the UEA-led Tyndall Centre Consortium)

SECTION 6: COLLABORATIVE LINKS

[Challenge E: to draw upon relevant expertise within the UK and to collaborate with appropriate research groups abroad; state the organisations likely to be involved in the Centre in a significant way, including the nature of their involvement and whether their agreement has been secured]

The research funded by the Tyndall Centre will not be executed by members of the Consortium alone. We will work together with the finest researchers in the UK and abroad to meet the research objectives identified by our Programmes. There are many organisations/individuals in the UK who have world-leading expertise to share with the Tyndall Centre, including partner organisations associated with the Consortium led by Imperial College which is also bidding for the new Centre. The Tyndall Centre will engage with these other centres of excellence in one of two ways: first, through the normal process of scientific debate, interaction and exchange of data and ideas through formal (workshops/conferences) and informal means and, second, through formal funded associations where non-Tyndall Centre organisations bid for and gain Tyndall Centre contracts. We list in this Section organisations which have a strategic contribution to make to meeting the objectives of the Centre and **with whom we have been in substantial discussion during the preparation of this bid** (a contact person who has agreed to act as a focal point for Tyndall Centre interactions is named in each case). These organisations are grouped under three headings: UK Governmental organisations (Section 6.1), UK Research (6.2) and International Research (6.3).

6.1 Key UK Government Organisations

The primary responsibility for 'operational climate policy' in the UK lies largely with the following Government organisations. These organisations are clearly important potential users of research results from the Tyndall Centre, but we will also have direct and open lines of communication with each of the following individuals to ensure their involvement in informing and guiding some of the more strategic research questions which arise from Government. We have already discussed such arrangements with each of the individuals listed in this section, and **they have agreed to provide strategic entry points into both national and regional climate policy consultation and formation processes**. We also have extensive experience as a Consortium in having worked with, or for, each of these Government organisations both through consultation exercises and through executing commissioned climate change research. The Tyndall Centre will establish a capacity to respond rapidly to requests from British Governmental organisations for specific advice and expert briefings. This will establish a 'fast-track' by which Government officials can tap into the extensive Tyndall research network.

Department of Trade and Industry. [REDACTED] Environment Directorate.

Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions. David Warrilow, Global Atmospheres Division.

Foreign and Commonwealth Office. [REDACTED] Environmental Policy Department [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

National Assembly of Wales. [REDACTED] Environment Division.

Scottish Executive. [REDACTED] Atmosphere, Climate and Engineering Unit.

Department of Environment for Northern Ireland. [REDACTED] Environment Policy Division,

Local Government Association. [REDACTED] (not yet confirmed).

Environment Agency. The Environment Agency is the principal regulator in England and Wales for industrial pollution, waste, water and radioactive substances. The Agency has commissioned research into climate change impacts conducted by many of the Co-Applicants to this proposal and has a major operational role in both adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change. Climate change is identified as one its key concerns. Collaboration has been agreed through [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].



WSK5011

25 February 2000

[REDACTED]
Department of Electrical Engineering & Electronics
UMIST
PO Box 88
MANCHESTER
M60 1QD

Dear [REDACTED]

The Tyndall Centre: A Proposal to Host the UK National Climate Change Centre

Your letter addressed to [REDACTED] has been passed to me for response as indicated in the letter from [REDACTED] on 3 February.

As you state in your proposal climate change is the greatest environmental challenge facing us in the future. It is just as much a social and economic challenge.

The programme that you have put together addresses the width of the issue through participation of organisations that have a well deserved international reputation.

I would therefore, in principle, support the application and would be interested in its progress.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

NATIONAL CENTER FOR ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH**Environmental and Societal Impacts Group****PO Box 3000 • Boulder, Colorado 80307-3000****Telephone: (303) 497-1000 • Fax: (303) 497-8125****March 10, 2000**

Dr. Mike Hulme
Climatic Research Unit
University of East Anglia
Norwich, England NR4 7TJ

Dear Dr. Hulme:

The proposed Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research presents a provocative research agenda and assembles a consortium of highly respected scientists who can challenge these fundamental issues. If this effort goes forward we would consider the Tyndall Center to be in the lead to become THE world center for integrative research on climate change. We are especially pleased to see that the emphasis in the Tyndall Centre would be on sustainable solutions. Most of the current work on climate change is spent looking for problems and spreading bad news. What is needed most is good science that informs policy—which is the approach that evolves directly from the three key principles that will guide the research agenda at the Tyndall Centre.

The Environmental and Societal Impacts Group at the U. S. National Center for Atmospheric Research is moving in a strategic direction similar to that proposed for the Tyndall Centre. While our research agenda will remain primarily aimed at near-term impacts of weather hazards, we think our complementary efforts would find much common cause. We would very much like to form a collaboration with the Tyndall Centre that would be productive for both institutions. Our newest initiative related to the U.S. National Assessment of Climate Variability and Change would complement your proposed work in the UK very nicely.

In summary, we strongly endorse the proposed Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. The Tyndall Centre assembles a remarkable interdisciplinary team of scientists who are well known leaders in the area of climate change science and assessment. We would definitely hope to establish a strong collaborative link between the Tyndall Centre and our Environmental and Societal Impacts Group.



Environmental and Societal Impacts Group

*The National Center for Atmospheric Research is operated by the University Corporation
for Atmospheric Research under sponsorship of the National Science Foundation.*

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

February 28, 2000

[REDACTED]
School of Environmental Science
University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ
United Kingdom

Dear [REDACTED]

I would like to add the strong support of the World Resources Institute (WRI) to the University of East Anglia's proposed Tyndall Centre. The Centre will examine integrated approaches to climate change policy, science and adaptation.

The proposed Tyndall Centre has demonstrated impressive knowledge and perseverance in this complex arena. WRI supports this bid with enthusiasm and looks forward to cooperating with the new Centre in a variety of ways.

Best,

[REDACTED]
Please note: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

7 MAR 2000



CANONBURY VILLAS, LONDON N1 2PN

TELEPHONE : 0171 865 8100
FAX : 0171 865 8200 / 8201

[REDACTED]
CSERGE
University of East Anglia
Norwich
Norfolk NR4 7TJ

6 March 2000

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks a lot for your letter of 18 February which I have now had a chance to look at on my return from the US and Italy.

Greenpeace would be keen to support what seems to be an important, cross-disciplinary initiative.

I wouldn't be able to be on the international management Board myself, but our [REDACTED], would be interested in being a member.

I have discussed this with [REDACTED], and if this would be acceptable to you, maybe you and he could liaise directly about further action, including a letter of support from Greenpeace, which [REDACTED] would be happy to provide.

I'll get in touch some time in April.

Yours ever,

[REDACTED]

mp

[REDACTED]

Greenpeace UK,

TXU Europe Power
47-53 Charterhouse Street
London
EC1M 6PB
Tel: 0207 553 7501
Fax: 0207 553 7546
Email: [REDACTED]
Web: <http://www.txu-europe.com>

28th February, 2000

Dr. Mike Hulme,
Research in Climatology,
Climatic Research Unit,
School of Environmental Science,
University of East Anglia,
NORWICH.
NR4 7TJ.

Dear Dr. Hulme,

I am writing to you in two capacities:-

- (i) Running a Large European Energy Business, and
- (ii) As Chair of the Round Table for Sustainable Development in the East of England

In both capacities I would strongly support the integrated research programme to be known as the Tyndall Centre.

The centre is planned to focus on key research areas of global importance and of particular interest to those of my business activities.

A number of the proposed participants are well known to me and my business colleagues and have the knowledge and stature to accomplish this important work. This includes the CSERGE team at UEA and [REDACTED] at UMIST. I would also be happy to interact with the Centre were it awarded, in terms of providing help to identify and pose research questions that the Centre could help answer.

I don't know if you want any details from me to back up this endorsement but if so, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
TXU Europe Power
[REDACTED]



L o s s P r e v e n t i o n C o u n c i l

Melrose Avenue Borehamwood Hertfordshire WD6 2BJ

Telephone: 020 8207 2345 Fax: 020 8207 6305 E-mail: info@lpc.co.uk <http://www.lpc.co.uk>

[REDACTED]
UMIST
P.O. Box 88
Manchester
M60 1QD

28th February 2000

Dear [REDACTED],

In response to your letter of 4th February regarding the Proposal for the setting up of the Tyndall Centre to host the UK National Climate Change Centre, I am replying on behalf of the Loss Prevention Council. I would be glad to endorse your proposal for such a venture in conjunction with the consortium members. The science of climate change is beginning to be better understood, but as a consequence the weaknesses in the system lie in connecting the science to industry and civil society. If the proposed Climate Change Centre tackles such issues then real benefit will be gained from funding such an initiative.

I wish you well in your endeavours.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The Loss Prevention Council

Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England No 1248902. Registered Office: Melrose Avenue Borehamwood Hertfordshire WD6 2BJ

A

To: Ian Dwyer
Global Change Co-ordinator
NECR

From: [REDACTED]
Environmental Policy Division
Department of the Environment

UNITED KINGDOM CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE

We are aware that work to select a "home" for the proposed UK Climate Change Centre is now at an advanced stage and a short list of two potential candidates has been established.

We have had informal approaches from both parties explaining the basis of their applications. From a Northern Ireland perspective, a key element of both is the intention to set up the centre on a UK wide basis. This Department would strongly support this line and indeed we consider it vital that a genuine UK dimension is central to the work of the new centre.

It would therefore be very helpful if the adjudicating committee fully explores this aspect of the two applications. We would regard it to be very important that the most positive response to this UK wide aspect of the project be given full weight in the overall evaluation process.

[REDACTED]

1 March 2000

Dear Mike

I gratefully acknowledge receipt of your full bid to run the Climate Change Centre.

The Panel will meet to assess bids on Wednesday, 22 March 2000, at the Institute of Directors, London (map enclosed). I invite you to give a short presentation to the Panel (no more than 10 minutes) after which the Panel would like to ask questions (for about 30 minutes). You may bring up to two other people with you. **Please let me know as soon as possible who will attend.** Be ready to be called in at about 1115. An overhead projector and screen will be available. I enclose a list of Panel members for your information.

The Panel will make a recommendation which will be passed to the Chief Executives of NERC, EPSRC and ESRC. It may take a few weeks for the Research Councils to consider the recommendation and come to a joint decision. Once a decision has been made we will notify you immediately.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to seeing you on 22 March.

Yours sincerely

Ian J Dwyer
Global Change Coordinator
Natural Environment Research Council
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon SN2 1EU

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1 March 2000

Dear [REDACTED]

I gratefully acknowledge receipt of your full bid to run the Climate Change Centre.

The Panel will meet to assess bids on Wednesday, 22 March 2000, at the Institute of Directors, London (map enclosed). I invite you to give a short presentation to the Panel (no more than 10 minutes) after which the Panel would like to ask questions (for about 40 minutes). You may bring up to two other people with you. **Please let me know as soon as possible who will attend.** Be ready to be called in at about 1410. An overhead projector and screen will be available. I enclose a list of Panel members for your information.

The Panel will make a recommendation and pass it to the Chief Executives of NERC, EPSRC and ESRC. It may take a few weeks for the Research Councils to consider the recommendation and come to a joint decision. Once a decision has been made we will notify you immediately.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to seeing you on 22 March.

Yours sincerely

Ian J Dwyer
Global Change Coordinator
Natural Environment Research Council
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon SN2 1EU

[REDACTED]