

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH



Minutes of EC-XXXVI

June 14, 2013

Montevideo, Uruguay

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Opening Remarks..... 3

2. Approval of the Agenda..... 4

3. Approval of the Action List of the EC-35..... 4

4. Review of CoP-21 items for action by EC-36 and implementation strategies for action items from EC-35 and CoP-21..... 4

5. Strategies for strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding..... 5

6. Other issues arising..... 6

7. Future Meetings & Sites:..... 7

8. Adjourn..... 7

Action List of EC XXXVI
Acronyms

Note: This report is not a chronological record. For completeness, greater clarity and readability it grouped discussions of an agenda item together under the first occurrence of the topic.

Approved – June 2013

**36th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
14 June 2013 – Montevideo, Uruguay
AGENDA**

Approval of the Agenda
Approval of the Action List of EC-35
Review of CoP-21 items for action by EC-36 and implementation strategies for action items from EC-35 and CoP-21
Strategies for strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding
Other decisions arising
Future meetings and sites
Adjourn
Debriefing session – EC Bureau and Directorate
Meetings of working groups as needed

1. Opening Remarks

Carlos Ereño opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the Executive Council. After the introductory remarks, the EC determined that the quorum was present. Participants at the meeting were:

EC Country Representatives

Argentina:	Carlos Ereño (Chair of the EC Bureau)
Brazil:	Maria Virgínia Alves, Jean Ometto, Alexandre Barbedo
Canada:	Eric Gagné, Kathryn Lundy
Colombia:	Omar Franco Torres
Dominican Rep.:	William Fermín Gomez
Ecuador:	Juan Carlos Moreno
Paraguay:	Ricardo Cabellero Aquino
United States:	Maria Uhle (First Vice Chair of the EC Bureau),
Uruguay:	Jorge Rucks (Second Vice Chair of the EC Bureau), Gabriel Aintablian

Observers:

Mexico	Eduardo Sosa
--------	--------------

SAC Chair

Frank Muller-Karger

IAI Directorate:

Holm Tiessen (Director), Rafael Atmetlla (Assistant Director, Finance and Administration), Marcella Ohira (Assistant Director, Capacity Building), Elma Montaña (Assistant Director for Science Programs), Nicolás Lucas (Science Policy Consultant), Louis Brown (Chair of the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures), Tania R. Freire Sánchez (Assistant to the IAI Director), Paula Richter (IAI Publications Editor), Elvira Gentile (IAI Directorate support).

Local Staff: Laura Oliveira, Mariana Adorni, Pablo Montes Goitia (MVOTMA/DINAMA)

2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Sixth Meeting. (*Action 1*)

3. Approval of the Action List of the EC-35

The EC approved the action list of its Thirty Fifth Meeting (*Action 2*).

4. Review of CoP-21 items for action by EC-36 and implementation strategies for action items from EC-35 and CoP-21

CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison

The CoP 21 approved the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison to provide advice to the CoP and the IAI Directorates on how to use and design science for policy and decision-making (Action 7, Day 2). The CoP also charged the EC and the Directorate with the drafting of the terms of reference for the Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison as well as the preparation of a list of possible candidates to be considered by the next CoP (Action 8, Day 2).

The members of the EC discussed the Terms of Reference and the composition of the committee. It was agreed that the members of the committee would be people of high-level decision-making positions who would be invited to compose it and not submitted to an election process. The committee should represent different sectors, including the private sector and development banks among others as well as the diversity of socio cultural contexts. The issue of innovation in science production (including public and private sectors) should be taken into account in the ToRs as well. It was agreed that the main objective of the Science Policy Liaison Advisory Committee would be to enhance the accessibility and impact of IAI science to a wide variety of users. The EC members also highlighted the Advisory Science-Policy committee should have close interaction with the Science-Policy Directorate and the SAC.

The EC decided to designate a group to prepare the ToRs as well as a list of possible members so that the next CoP could decide whom to invite to compose the committee.

The EC established an ad hoc committee to elaborate the Terms of Reference for the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. Members of this committee are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Uruguay, the USA. The Chair of the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures, the Science-Policy Consultant and the Chair of the SAC will participate as ex-officio members. The EC decided that the ToRs should be ready by the end of 2013. The ToRs and a list of candidates nominated to the Advisory Committee will be presented at CoP 22. The Rules for operation for this committee will be also presented at that time (*Action 3*).

The EC debated ideas for the Terms of Reference of the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. The main ideas to guide the design of the ToRs were: provide input to the IAI on effective science-policy integration on global change without interference in internal political processes of member states; help the IAI to make science useful for decision and policy making in global change related issues from multiple sectors; members of the Advisory Committee should be representative of

multiple sectors and regions, the integration of the committee should be by invitation and should not involve a voting process (*Action 4*).

After the EC meeting was closed, the ad hoc committee for Terms of Reference gathered and appointed Carlos Ereño from Argentina as chair and Maria Ulhe from the US as co chair.

5. Strategies for strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding

The EC asked the Executive Director to comment on the different mechanisms to engage member countries the IAI Directorate had used before and on how the EC could cooperate in this task.

Executive Director: The training events are the most successful means of engaging countries; the impact is higher when the event gathers students, practitioners, politicians, and scientists. There were also positive results from specific activities that brought scientists and institutions together, as in the case of the tropical Andean countries: Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia where the IAI received funding from the Mac Arthur Foundation (the mandate was to analyze research needs and the institutional capacities of these countries to address global change issues).

I am confident that with a Science Policy Directorate and a Science Policy Committee that will support us and will reach out into different member countries, we will be able to engage in institutional contacts in a different way. In some countries that have been unresponsive to IAI initiatives the mechanism has been to include additional ministries, go beyond the focal points, so that when a critical person changed the contacts did not break. We have discussed in previous CoPs if countries that do not participate or do not pay their dues should benefit from IAI activities. It is a very difficult question to answer. I have referred to the political decision of inclusiveness earlier in these meetings. We have clearly seen in the cases of Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Mexico, that they made major reversals in attitudes, policies, presence, involvement, payment, etc. Countries have ups and downs, sometimes due to economic crises, or an institution that disappears. Every country is a different case.

The overriding lesson is that we had truly positive impact in member countries through actions:

- One or several neighboring countries intervened on behalf of the IAI and reestablished contact.
- Training institutes, particularly in the new format, with the involvement of students, politicians, practitioners. This has a limit because at this time they are exclusively funded through a grant from NSF. Countries sometimes contribute with support for travel. Therefore the engagement of other member countries is needed to enlarge these activities.
- Visit specific events of Global Change meetings in member countries, but after the meetings the effect is often not lasting.

Canada: suggested inviting distinguished scientists of member countries (specially those not engaged in IAI activities) as observers in SAC meetings. He also recommended checking if these countries also participated in the IPCC in order to take the opportunity to engage them in the IAI as well.

The Executive Director reported he had been at an IPCC regional meeting. Even though the IAI was not participating as an institution, 60% of the scientists present came from IAI projects. There was a coincidence in the scientific excellence promoted by the IAI and those people called to interact with the IPCC. This fact means the IAI is fulfilling its mandate as it generated the capacity on the continent to deal with global change issues. This fact should be documented for member countries.

The *SAC Chair* reported the SAC interacted with local scientists during meetings for proposal reviews or visits to countries. He also suggested considering the models of funding, specially co-funding mechanism as the Belmont forum.

The *Executive Director* asked the EC to recommend member countries that their national funding councils come together. As many of them have bilateral agreements or meet once a year, there is an opportunity to develop alliances to reinforce the IAI. The example of the Agreement signed with CONICET, or the negotiations with Ecuador are crucial, not only to increase the funding available but also to make IAI science more visible, to link local science to the regional science. The IAI mandate is to fund and promote that science that cannot be done by any individual country; member countries can cooperate making contacts, visits, etc. to complement the IAI's efforts.

USA supported the idea of having a regional meeting of funding agencies to talk about priorities, points in common, how to link their research under global environmental change, etc. . She exhorted the EC members to take this information back to their funding agencies and encourage them to get involved in an activity like this.

The *Executive Director* suggested having science networking events at the CoPs where national funding agencies be invited to discuss how to organize international funding. That will be of relevance to the CoP members and extremely useful for kick starting a process of dialogue between funding agencies. Canada suggested inviting also those countries that do not have funding agencies or are not engaged in the IAI.

Brazil: reported it has received many students from the Americas in the context of a program of fellowships, which is open for every country. *Marcella Ohira (Assistant director, Capacity Building)* added that there was an agreement between IAI and INPE/CPTEC and for more than 5 years 2 scientists per year have been supported to receive training on modeling and climate science. The program is now closed because there are no more funds. Perhaps with a new Directorate in Brazil it will be easier to strengthen the program.

Ecuador: reported on a program of fellowships and said they were looking for tutors in universities of excellence so as to guide the students. The Executive Director offered the support of the SAC (present and past members), many of them bilingual professors associated to IAI.

Regarding the strategies for strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding, the ideas resulting from the brainstorming exercise in the EC were: engage members of the SAC in different IAI activities; using bilateral agreements with national funding agencies to help develop multilateral co-funding of IAI research projects, have scientists from member countries be invited to be observers at SAC meetings, facilitate regional dialogues on funding global change science between national funding agencies including countries that do not have funding agencies; support national efforts to support young scientists in high-level universities through IAI scientific networks (*Action 5*).

Ecuador and *Dominican Republic* suggested revising the IAI Strategic Plan in terms of goals, results, indicators, etc. The Executive Director also mentioned that the innovation factor (for example the new funding modalities such as Future Earth) is not captured in the document.

The EC will analyze the need for modifying the IAI Strategic Plan in the light of the new initiatives arising in the IAI and the global environmental research landscape (*Action 6*).

6. Other issues arising

The *representative of Argentina* raised the issue of the contracting of the Science Policy director, which was delayed because a difficulty that has come up concerning his Mexican degrees and the requirement for revalidation for his level of position (which is a difficult procedure because Argentina and Mexico do not have an agreement for automatic revalidation of degrees). It was further explained that Argentina could make available the funds for hiring the director, but that these funds could not be transferred to the IAI's head offices in Brazil or, in the future, Uruguay because it required a special agreement. Funds can only be transferred to an institution with base in Argentina and with a bank account, which would require the IAI to undertake the necessary administrative steps to become a legal employer in Argentina.

The EC discussed the circumstances and concluded that the experience of the past 10 years makes it imperative that the IAI not enter into administrative obligations related to employer-employee relationships in any other country than Uruguay, which in its host country agreement is granting IAI broad exemptions from taxation etc.

The EC recommended that the IAI could contract personnel in countries other than Uruguay *only* as part-time consultants who would be entirely responsible themselves for all legal obligations related to social security, taxation and insurance. Under both Argentinean and Brazilian conditions that is limited to sporadic or part-time employment.

Brazil took note and thanked the EC for the clarification regarding the mode of contracting for the local director, since this will affect the planning by Brazil for its local office.

7. Future Meetings & Sites:

If by October 2013 there are no invitations from member countries to host the next EC-CoP meetings, the Directorate will start working with the host country, to have the meetings at the Directorate headquarters as stated in Rule 13, Chapter 2 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties.

Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay offered to ask in their countries about the possibility of hosting the meeting.

8. Adjourn

The EC Chair thanked Uruguay for its hospitality. He also thanked all the delegates, the IAI staff, and the interpreters. The meeting was adjourned.

**36th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council
14 June 2013, Montevideo, Uruguay**

Action List

1. The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Sixth Meeting.
2. The EC approved the action list of its Thirty Fifth Meeting.
3. The EC established an ad hoc committee to elaborate the Terms of Reference for the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. Members of this committee are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Uruguay, the USA. The Chair of the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures, the Assistant Director for Science-Policy Liaison and the Chair of the SAC will participate as ex-officio members. The EC decided that the ToRs should be ready by the end of 2013. The ToRs and a list of candidates nominated to the Advisory Committee will be presented at CoP 22. The Rules for operation for this committee will be also presented at that time.
4. The EC debated ideas for the Terms of Reference of the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. The main ideas to guide the design of the ToRs were: provide input to the IAI on effective science-policy integration on global change without interference in internal political processes of member states; help the IAI to make science useful for decision and policy making in global change related issues from multiple sectors; members of the Advisory Committee should be representative of multiple sectors and regions, the integration of the committee should be by invitation and should not involve a voting process.
5. Regarding the strategies for strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding, the ideas resulting from the brainstorming exercise in the EC were: engage members of the SAC in different IAI activities; using bilateral agreements with national funding agencies to help develop multilateral co-funding of IAI research projects, have scientists from member countries be invited to be observers at SAC meetings, facilitate regional dialogues on funding global change science between national funding agencies including countries that do not have funding agencies; support national efforts to support young scientists in high-level universities through IAI scientific networks.
6. The EC will analyze the need for modifying the IAI Strategic Plan in the light of the new initiatives arising in the IAI and the global environmental research landscape.

Acronyms

CoP	Conference of the Parties / Conferencia de las Partes
CRN	Collaborative Research Network Program//Programa de Redes de Investigación Cooperativa
EC/ CE	Executive Council / Consejo Ejecutivo
INPE	Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais
NSF	National Science Foundation – USA
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee / Comité Asesor Científico
SCRIP	Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures (of the CoP)/Comité Permanente de Reglas y Procedimientos
ToRs	Terms of Reference