

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR  
GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH



**EC-XIX & CoP-XI**  
*June 29 – July 2, 2004*  
*Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**13\_ECXIX/DID/English/11 May 04**

## Report of the IAI Ad Hoc Committee on Relations with Member States

### **Terms of Reference:**

At the June 3-5 2003, meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP), the Ad Hoc Committee on Relations with Member States was established to work with the Director on the following:

- **identifying** appropriate contacts at all levels, including the policy level, in Member States for IAI interactions with Member States on financial and participation issues;
- **advising** the Director as to the most effective ways to approach Member States on these issues;
- **providing** direct support for and participating with the Director in these interactions, when appropriate; and,
- **working with** the Standing Committee on Rules in analyzing the consequences of reducing the frequency of IAI meetings.

### **Membership:**

IAI Director	Gustavo Necco,
Executive Council	Antônio MacDowell, Chair
	Bruce Angle
Conference of the Parties	Adrián Fernandez
Scientific Advisory Committee	Michael Brklacich
CRN Principal Investigators	Michael McClain
	Alberto Piola
Financial and Administrative Committee	Vanessa Richardson, Chair
Observer	Margaret Leinen

The work of the Ad Hoc Committee has been through a meeting held in São José dos Campos, Brazil, 5-6 February 2004, conference calls and e:mail correspondence.

At the meeting in Brazil, Adrián Fernandez was selected as Chair of the Committee.

The meeting agenda focused on the following:

I. Previous efforts to increase member country participation in the IAI were discussed, with a document of excerpts of previous reports and recommendations as background.

In reviewing available materials, it was recommended that the existing ‘Country Profiles’ needed to include cost-benefit analysis. With input from the Committee, the IAI Directorate prepared the “Argentina-IAI Partnership” document in preparation for Margaret Leinen’s trip to Argentina in early April. The IAI Directorate will develop “Partnership” documents for all IAI member countries with priority given to the “target” countries to be identified later.

## II. Preliminary discussion of strategic objectives included:

1. increasing IAI's visibility within the various Government agencies in the member countries. Three types of focal points were identified.
  - Science implementation
  - Science policy
  - Science funding

Need to help develop the links in the member countries so that the correct individuals and organizations are identified and contacted – approximately 3-5 key people in each country. Communicating the relevance of the science is important, but is probably secondary to addressing the immediate problem, which is the financial situation. **What do countries want from the IAI? Is the IAI science relevant to country interests?**

2. country prioritization, in which two groups of countries were identified for targeted outreach – a) those that have been recently active in the IAI but have fallen behind in Core Budget Contributions and b) those that have not been active recently but that had contributed to the IAI in the past. Bolivia was identified for special outreach as having recent 'momentum' to ratify the Agreement two years ago and shows interest in the IAI.
3. contact identification by country, included extensive discussions of the countries listed above and focused on networking existing sources from the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) CoP 9 (Milan) attendees; IPCC contacts, etc.

## III. Two draft letters were edited and discussed.

- The 'invoice' letter to IAI Member Countries requesting Core Budget contributions (both current and arrears) and
- the letter to 'high-level' officials requesting assistance in setting priorities.

It was suggested that Scientific Officer, Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members and Principal Investigators (PIs) could help in identifying the key individuals in the targeted countries. The IAI Director sent out the 'invoice' letter to countries who currently owe either current or past contributions during the week of February 9-13. In the future, the 'invoice' letter will be sent out annually at the beginning of each fiscal year. The IAI Directorate developed database of names with input from the Ad Hoc Committee that the "high level" letter was sent to in mid-March.

General observations:

1. Mobilize all available resources –take advantage of SAC members and PI and CoPI travel, connections/contacts, etc. for presentations, letters of support, etc.
2. Develop country portfolios that easily consolidate information by country – MOUs, former and current SAC members, PIs, workshop attendees supported by IAI funds and Summer Institute participants, award lists, etc.

IV. Committee member availability for assisting Director with visits was discussed, and with exception of Margaret's trip to Argentina and Mike McClain's planned trips to Cuba, Jamaica and Bolivia, it was decided to wait until the responses to the letters had been received by the Directorate. It was suggested that it might be worth the Director taking trips to Chile and Colombia depending upon the response to the 'invoice' letter.

V. The impact of reducing the frequency of IAI meetings was discussed and it was felt that this is probably not the time to change the frequency of the meeting since we are trying to re-engage the Member Countries.

VI. The proposed principles regarding in-kind contributions were developed with the recommendation that the document be forwarded to the Executive Council and the Conference of the Parties for consideration. Prior to submission to the EC and CoP, the document was shared with the Executive Council Bureau and the Financial and Administrative Committee and was modified accordingly.

VII. Other topics discussed:

Several members of the Committee expressed concern about the timing of the next phase of the Collaborative Research Networks (CRN) program. This is perhaps the greatest enticement for member country participation in the IAI.

- Every effort should be made to ensure that the momentum of CRN I is not lost.
- It should be clear that this will be an open call for proposals that new Networks will be funded. What should the balance be
- Broader impacts (applications, policy relevance, etc.) should weight more heavily in the evaluation/review process.

It was requested that the SAC (at its April 1-2 meeting) prepare a 'philosophy' for CRN II, to be forwarded to the EC/CoP for consideration.

In subsequent conference calls and e-mail correspondence, the Ad Hoc Committee has discussed progress on action items from the meeting in Brazil and plans for outreach to targeted countries.

11 May 2004