INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH (IAI)

EC XIII - CoP VIII

July 17-20, 2001

Panama City, Panama

7_ECXIII/CoPVIII/DID/English/June 26, 2001

Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) November 27-28, 2000 Washington, DC, USA

The Fourteenth Meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) was held in Washington, DC, USA, during November 27-28, 2000, hosted by Dr. Margaret Leinen, NSF Deputy Director for Geosciences, Dr. Richard Ries, Deputy Director of NSF's Division of International Programs, and Dr. Paul Filmer, NSF Program Director for International Collaboration and Infrastructure Development.

Participating Members: John Stewart (chair), Ronald Woodman, Diana Liverman, Luis Bevilacqua, Omar Masera, Walter Fernandez.

Observers: Margaret Leinen, (NSF), Paul Filmer (NSF), Richard Ries (NSF), Harold Stolberg (NSF), Tianay Robinson (NSF), Jonathan Pundsack (NOAA), Roland Fuchs (START), Hassan Virji (START), Robert Corell (Harvard University), Evamaria Koch (University of Maryland), Ronald Scheman (OEA), Jerry Melillo (Marine Biological Laboratory) and Tom Malone (The Western Hemisphere Knowledge Partnership Initiative).

IAI Directorate Personnel: Armando Rabuffetti (Director), Marcella Ohira Schwarz (Communications and Training and Education Officer), Reynaldo Luiz Victoria (Interim Scientific Officer), Eduardo Banus (CRN Project Manager) and Luciana Queiroz Ribeiro (Secretary).

Dr. John Stewart, SAC Chair, briefly gave some general opening remarks and welcomed all participants, specially the newly appointed SAC members. In addition, Dr. M. Leinen, host of the meeting, welcomed the participants to Washington, D.C.

The agenda for the meeting (see annex1) was discussed and approved with the addition of a presentation by Dr. Robert Corell.

Presentation by Dr. M. Leinen - US Global Change Research Program: Dr. Leinen gave a presentation focused on the Long-Range Planning of the US Global Change Research Program. She stressed the importance of the congressional demand for research more closely linked to policy and management issues. The key challenge for the program is to develop Global Change Science that matters to decision makers; one of the most important overall theme is the Vulnerability and Resilience issues associated to Global Change. Several working groups have been working on the program elements to date. The Interdisciplinary Program for the next phase should include: climate variability and change, water cycle, carbon cycle, ecosystems/natural resources, land use/cover change (LUCC), atmospheric processes and composition. The key question to be addressed is how to get from the program elements to science that supports decision making. Of the several integrating tools and elements discussed, the role of Human Dimension (HD) was considered to be very important. The key question is how to integrate HD into global change issues and to develop the science of HD and several of its elements, such as industrial transformation, or linking specific kinds of HD problems at global level such as LUCC. The goals is to start generating interdisciplinary communities and also to ask HD

advisory groups to look at other science elements to tell us what kind of activities we should develop to link the communities. For other areas we need to develop a community that addresses other important issues of global change that promotes the integration. The tool that we have is money and we have realized that many agencies have invested in HD, such as NOAA and NASA and that is the trend. The budget of those programs will increase in the next decade. We have to, at least, start with the commitment.

After the presentation there were some discussions about the value of international cooperation in developing the program on HD, and how it could help in leveraging resources or promoting scientific collaboration. Dr. Leinen commented that it is a challenge to explain to the US congress and other high levels that in dealing with global change there are no boundaries. She also commented on the need for better articulation between agencies in the USA, especially for LUCC issues. The situation is particularly poor in the social sciences area. Scientists are generally afraid of getting involved with politics, but they are doing a better job in influencing the political agenda both at the regional or national/global levels.

Presentation by Dr. Richard Ries, NSF Division of International Programs:

Dr. Ries gave an overview of the NSF Division of International Programs (INT) activities. On the global arena, NSF plays a lead role in about two dozen projects and participate in many others, providing substantial financial support, playing also a major role in shaping, managing and coordinating programs. The INT main mission is to facilitate the advancement of NSF's overall goal through international activities. INT manages about 0.5% of NSF's budget and it is responsible for about 5% of the international expenditures. Programs supported have highly targeted objectives and integrated strategies.

INT is organized by geographic regions and have overseas offices in Paris and Tokyo. It has a staff of 42 persons (international and scientific experts) interacting extensively with all NSF programs, senior NSF management, foreign scientific organizations and personnel. With an annual budget of about US\$ 25M, it receives about 1200 proposals annually, funding about 400 of them, covering all fields of science and education, and all parts of the world. Main program thrusts are to provide young US researchers opportunity to gain international professional experience, and to enable US researchers to launch new international partnership.

The example of the Summer Programs for US Graduate Students in Japan and Korea was given. Dr. Ries finalized recognizing that there are many common interests between INT and IAI, and that a more close relation should be pursued, especially through NSF's Geosciences, that is primarily linked to IAI.

In the discussions that followed, Dr. Ries clarified that the funds for the Japan /Korea program comes primarily from Japan and Korea. He informed that the INT office would be willing to promote communication and contact with the science community in the USA.

The SAC then welcomed the following presentations of invited guests:

Dr. Evamaria Koch, from the University of Maryland, who presented the results of the project "The effect of UV-B Radiation on Salt-Marsh Vegetation along a Latitudinal Gradient". This was an ISPII project, that Dr. Koch was the PI.

Dr. Robert Corell, from the John Kennedy School of Government of Harvard University, discussed the need to develop a research agenda to address sustainability science. He proposed to have IAI involved in co-organizing a Sustainability Science workshop in Latin America.

Dr. Jerry Melillo, from the Marine Biological Laboratory, presented the experiences and lessons learned in the development of the US National Regional Assessment of Impacts of Global Changes. He suggested that SCOPPE could help and work with IAI in the development of regional assessment scenario for key regions of Latin America.

Dr. Roland Fuchs presented an overview of the Global Change System for Analysis, Research and Training (START) and its major activities.

Dr. Tom Malone, from The Western Hemisphere Knowledge Partnership Initiative, discussed the concept of equitability, giving examples of scenarios useful if one is to choose a path toward an Environmentally Sustainable and Economically Prosperable and Equitable Society.

Dr. Ronald Scheman, from the Organization of American States (OAS)/Inter-American Agency for Cooperation and Development (IACD) presented an overview of the objectives and activities of the agency. He gave examples of several financial mechanisms available to implement technical cooperation with developing countries and explored the issue of how to apply the concept to Science and Technology. Here IAI could be helpful in identifying the niches and what to do in Science. Maybe one good suggestion would be to support some activities on regional assessments. Dr Rabuffetti, Dr. Filmer, and Dr. Stewart will work together with the IAI-EC to prepare an official response to R. Scheman.

The SAC chair thanked the guests for their participation and contribution.

Dr. Armando Rabuffetti, IAI Director, gave a presentation on the overall institutional aspects, informing that Mr. Silvio Bianchi, from Uruguay, was hired for the position of Financial Officer, and Dr. Reynaldo Luiz Victoria, from Brazil, was appointed as the Interim Scientific Officer, until the position is permanently filled. Dr. Rabuffetti informed about the general status of the Initial Science Program (ISP) Program and its major accomplishments. Regarding institutional membership the Director informed the SAC that no new countries have joined IAI, but promising contacts have been made with El Salvador and Honduras. Together with the new chair of the Executive Council, the Directorate will try to reenergize the institutional aspects and linkages. Both the chair and the Director will try their best to make new contacts and strengthen old ones.

Following, Mr. Eduardo Banus gave a presentation on the general status of the Collaborative Research Network (CRN) Program, Dr. Victoria presented his first impressions on the activities and accomplishments of the CRN Program, and Mrs. Marcella

O. Schwarz presented the Training and Education activities, highlighting the results of the IAI/University of Miami Summer Institute on Interdisciplinary Sciences and other Regional Training Courses.

In the sequence Dr. Armando Rabuffetti gave an overview of the IAI relationship with other international organizations and programs such as START, IHDP, IGBP, WCRP, APN and LBA.

On the general discussions that followed, Dr. Paul Filmer made a comment about the coordination of the CRN projects. He reminded that in the May 2000 at the first CRN PIs meeting, there was a strong move toward self-organization in order to find out opportunities for collaboration. IAI should support this initiative and provide more opportunities for interactions.

Dr. H. Virji was pleased to hear about the relationships of IAI with other programs, and specifically commented about LBA. Dr. Victoria assured that the strengthening of the relationship between IAI and LBA will be one of the main goals of his interim time as Scientific Officer. Dr. Bevilacqua informed that he contacted Dr. Carlos Nobre, the LBA Scientific Coordinator, who demonstrated great interest to collaborate with IAI, and we should explore this opportunity.

There was a general discussion about the quantity and quality of publications. There was a general consensus that PIs and Co-PIs should be encouraged to publish in high quality journals. Dr. Liverman informed that some journals are quite open to receive articles from scientists. IAI should encourage PIs and Co-PIs to contact journals.

The SAC discussed the status of the CRN Program and made the following comments and suggestions:

The major issue discussed was the relationship between the PIs and the SAC members. Although some especific problems were discussed, it was felt that in general, the SAC experience with most PIs has been positive. The PIs were generally happy to receive comments and constructive criticisms. Nevertheless, it was felt that the SAC should always try to improve the communications with the PIs. The PIs should know that the SAC member's role in communicating with them is to strengthen the network.

Some of the CRN projects were then reassigned among the SAC members: H. Tiessen's project, originally assigned to Scoppa, was reassigned to Omar Masera; J. Silva's project originally assigned to Ortega was reassigned to Omar Masera and M. Nunez's project, which was assigned to Diana Liverman was reassigned to Walter Fernandez. Eduardo Banus shall contact the PIs to let them know about the new liaisons.

Regarding progress report of CRN and ISP projects, the SAC feeling was that the reports should only be available to the IAI and SAC. Only final reports should be available openly on the Institute's web. Dr. Filmer suggested that the PI could be asked permission to post his/her report openly on the web and that the IAI should only do it if permission is granted.

The SAC also approved the report of its thirteenth meeting with no modifications.

The SAC chair informed the members about the Conflict of Interest Document, which was approved by the EC at its last meeting. The final document will be posted on the IAI web.

IAI Vision and Strategy Document was presented by Dr. Armando Rabuffetti. It was agreed that this document could be useful for the development of a strategy for several working groups of the IAI, such as fundraising and programmatic development. It was recommended that high priority should be given to seek other funding possibilities. For instance, integrated assessment projects clearly need to find joint support from different agencies. It was suggested that the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) initiative is a great opportunity for IAI to play a major role in taking the lead in Latin America. It was informed that IAI presented a project to the MEA, led by Dr. Osvaldo Sala. There was also the suggestion to support new programs with the involvement of new scientists, especially in the area of mitigation and adaptation issues. The SAC chair suggested that a small group should work with the Directorate to explore these ideas; Dr. Bevilacqua agreed to start up and will try to identify some on-going actions in Brazil and other countries.

NSF announced the possibility of considering a proposal from IAI for a new program, with funds of approximately US\$ 300,000.00 dollars. The SAC will wait for guidelines from the EC, after the announcement is official, to act on the development of the strategy for the announcement of opportunity.

The Directorate requested SAC guidelines about the continuation and future of the Summer Institute given that the grant expires in 2001. The SAC decided to further discuss this issue at its next meeting.

In addition, the SAC should discuss the terms and conditions that should be considered in the eventual need to terminate an IAI project.

Finally, it was agreed that the next SAC meeting could be tentatively scheduled for mid-April, 2001 in São Jose dos Campos, Brazil. The Directorate will investigate all members' availability and the most convenient site for the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. In connection to Dr. Scheman presentation there was a suggestion to support some activities on regional assessments. Dr Rabuffetti, Dr. Filmer, and Dr. Stewart will work together with the IAI-EC to prepare an official response to R. Scheman.
- 2. There were changes in the assignments of CRN projects to SAC Members. Eduardo Banus shall contact the PIs to let them know about the new liaisons.
- 3. Regarding the IAI Vision and Strategy Document, several ideas were presented. The SAC chair suggested that a small group should work with the Directorate to explore these ideas; Dr. Bevilacqua agreed to start up and will try to identify some on-going actions in Brazil and other countries.
- 4. Regarding NSF's annoucement of funds, the SAC will wait for guidelines from the EC, after the announcement is official, to act on the development of the strategy for the announcement of opportunity.
- 5. The Directorate requested SAC guidelines about the continuation and future of the Summer Institute given that the grant expires in 2001. The SAC decided to further discuss this issue at its next meeting.
- 6. In the next meeting, the SAC should discuss the terms and conditions that should be considered in the eventual need to terminate an IAI project.
- 7. The next SAC meeting was tentatively scheduled for mid-April, 2001 in São Jose dos Campos, Brazil. The Directorate will investigate all members' availability and the most convenient site for the meeting.

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH (IAI)

EC XIII - CoP VIII

July 17-20, 2001

Panama City, Panama

8_ECXIII/CoPVIII/DID/English/June 26, 2001

Report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)

May 16-17, 2001 São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil

The Fifteenth Meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) was held at the IAI Headquarters in São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil, during May 16-17, 2001

Participating Members: John Stewart (chair), Diana Liverman, Luis Bevilacqua, Walter Fernandez, Ernesto Medina,

Observers: Paul Filmer (NSF

IAI Directorate Personnel: Armando Rabuffetti (Director), Marcella Ohira Schwarz (Communications and Training and Education Officer), Reynaldo Luiz Victoria (Interim Scientific Officer), Eduardo Banús (CRN Project Manager)

May 23. Day 1

The participants were welcomed by Dr. John Stewart, SAC chair, and by Dr. Armando Rabuffetti, IAI Director.

The first item to be discussed was the approval of the agenda. The SAC chair requested a change in the order of discussion, in order to bring the item about SAC vacancies to the beginning of the discussions. Dr. Liverman requested that a discussion item about the upcoming Human Dimension (HD) open meeting should also be added. The changes were accepted and the agenda then approved.

There will be 4 vacant seats that are to be nominated by the parties and one additional seat to be nominated by the Associated Institutes (CIESIN and CATHALAC). The chair made reference to the e-mail sent on March 19, 2001, to all SAC members with suggestions of the possible scientific areas to be covered by the new members. It is important that the SAC confirm or modify those areas. Presently the SAC is formed by 9 members, 6 of them nominated by the parties, and 3 nominated by the SAC and approved by the COP (Otis Brown, Luis Bevilacqua, and John Robinson).

Dr Stewart and Dr Liverman are both finishing their second term and shall leave. Their last meeting should be in October 2001; if possible, in order to have a minimum of interaction, the newly elected members should also participate in this meeting. Dr. Medina and Dr. Woodman are finishing their first term. Dr. Medina would consider to stay for a second term, if appointed. There was no information with regard to Dr. Woodman, as he was not present. He shall be eventually contacted. It was also noted that Dr. Brown, Dr. Bevilacqua and Dr. Robinson will finish their second term in 2002.

IAI has now 2 Associated Institutions (CIESIN and CATHALAC), and according to the agreement they should present candidates and 1 is elected by the parties. The Director is contacting both Institutions and explaining the procedure.

Reviewing what was sent with the above mentioned e-mail to the SAC, 5 science areas were suggested, that would complement the areas of expertise of the remaining members:

- 1. climate variability and risk assessment;
- 2. human dimensions of land/climate/urban change;
- 3. biogeochemistry of change in land cover and sustainability
- 4. integration of science and policy
- 5. changes in the composition of the atmosphere, oceans and fresh waters.

The SAC agreed on the areas, and the chairman then asked for suggestion of names of experts in the above areas, that could be mentioned to the EC only as examples of likely persons.

D. Liverman suggested that an increase in the number of women in the Committee should be considered. She has been the only woman in the SAC for the past 8 years. Dr. Fernandez suggested the SAC should have at least 2 persons in each area of the 4 themes of the IAI science agenda. Several names were then suggested:

Climate and climate modeling: Maria Assunção Dias (USP/LBA)

Changes in the composition of atmosphere, oceans and fresh waters: Susan Solomon (NOAA), Mary Ann Carol (University of Michigan), Pamela Matson (Stanford University), Lelys Bravo Gueni (Venezuela), Eugenio Sanhueza (Venezuela), Paulo Artaxo (USP/LBA)

Climate variability and risk assessment: Alice Grimm (Brazil), Gordon McBean (Canada), Henry Dias (USA), Patricio Aceituno (Chile).

HD of land/climate and urban change: Thelma Krug (Brazil), Paulo Egler (UnB and MCT), Charles Wood (USA), Mike Brklacich (Canada), Oliver Cummes.

Biocheochemistry: Rafael Herrera (Venezuela), Carlos Cerri (Brazil)

Integration of Science and Policy: José G. Tundisi (Brazil), former president of CONYCIT (Uruguay). Victoria Isaac (UFPa/Uruguay/Brazil), Eduardo Viola (UnB Argentina/Brazil), Guy de Terramon (president of CONYCIT Costa Rica). Bob Corell (USA), and William Clark (USA), Danilo Lopes president of national research council (CONYCIT, Venezuela).

Biodiversity: Mary Kalyn Arroyo (Chile), Jorge Morelo (Argentina), Osvaldo Sala (Argentina).

Dr. Liverman suggested that the CIESIN should be contacted about the area of integration of science and policy, as they have a lot of expertise in the area.

It was generally concluded that at least 2 women should be included in the SAC. Again it should be stressed to the EC that the names above are only suggestions of likely persons. The EC is responsible for the final nomination and should explain to the candidates that this is a voluntary work demanding a great deal of time commitment to strongly participate in the SAC.

Discussion approval of the SAC XIV meeting report.

The report was approved with a rephrasing of the first paragraph on the discussions about the CRN projects on page 4.

The next item discussed was the 2001 HD open science meeting that IAI is helping to organize. The meeting will be a good opportunity for IAI to reinforce its Human Dimension agenda. 140 abstracts were selected for oral and poster presentations, from 550. There will be 6 plenary sessions. The current list of participants include 100 from Latin America, 80 from North America, 15 from Africa, 30 from Asia, and others from Europe. Financial support include US\$ 100K from Brazil through the ministries of Environment and S&T, and US\$ 100K from NSF (PF and TB), IAI, Japan, CIDA, IHDP, ICSU, EU.

There was a suggestion that someone from open meeting could be invited to make a presentation to the meeting of the CRN PIs that will be held immediately prior to the HD meeting. Dr. Liverman will coordinate with Eduardo Banús to organize this activity.

Dr. Rabuffetti clarified to the chairman that IAI will cover the SAC members' expenses to attend the open meeting. All the logistical information about hotel reservation, registration, etc., will be sent in due time. The Chairman congratulated Dr. Liverman and Marcella Schwartz for their work in co-organizing this open meeting, that will ensure increase IAI's international visibility.

CRN/PESCA programs discussion:

We are now practically in the end of the first year of the CRN program, and the first results are starting to appear. It is estimated that more scientific results will appear for the second year, as a great deal of time was dedicated to administrative issues as setting up contracts and sub-contracts during this first year.

One of the problems discussed is that IAI do not have a standard report format. Therefore, the information reported for different projects are not homogeneous, which in turn makes it difficult for the Directorate to extract important information as publications, list of supported students, data to include into IAI-DIS, etc. The Directorate is working in a standard report format tat shall be used by the PIs for the second year report.

CRN Projects: Specific comments on each project

CRN 001

Title: Biogeochemical Cycles under Land Use Change in the Semiarid Americas PI: Holm Tiessen

This is in general a successful project up to now. It is a good example of IAI's linear model of funding. It is building very strong connections among the participating countries, and it is also actively seeking integration with other CRN's. A very minor problem observed, likely due to the lack of a standard report format, was the lack of consisted information about T&E activities. It is also not totally clear what are the common goals of the experiments at different sites, and how they are going to be integrated in the future.

CRN 003

Title: The Assessment of Present, Past, and Future Climate Variability in the Americas from Treeline Environments

PI: Brian Luckman

This is also a very successful project. The scientific results are impressive, even for a first year report. The project is very strong in science, but weak in human dimension aspects. However, it was clearly stated in the proposal that the activities would be mainly concentrated on scientific work. This project was a combination of Luckman's and Boninsegna's teams, and is very successful up to now.

At this point there was a discussion about giving credit to IAI on the project achievements. It was stressed that IAI should not accept that a report comes incomplete and with no copies or references of publications, etc. Again, it was suggested that this is a problem of the lack of a standard reporting format, which shall be solved for next year.

CRN 009

Title: Cattle Ranching, Land Use and Deforestation in Brazil, Peru, and Ecuador PI: Charles Wood

The start was delayed due to bureaucratic problems that the university had to set up sub-contracts and transfer funds to other countries. Therefore, the report has very little information, and it was generally felt that there was not a good basis to do any judgment on the progress of this project.

CRN 012

The Role of Biodiversity and Climate in the Functioning of Ecosystems: A Comparative Study of Grasslands, Savannas, and Forests. PI: Osvaldo Sala

With the letter of clarification sent by O. Sala, this project was considered to be successful. There was some discussion about which publications were really generated by IAI funding. The matter should be made more clear in future reports.

CRN 026

Title: Enhanced Ultraviolet-B Radiation in Natural Ecosystems as an Added Perturbation due to Ozone Depletion

PI: Maria Vernet

Very good project. It is demonstrating a very strong networking achievement that comes from a previous ISPII project developed by the same group. The fieldwork is proceeding well, and the level of coordination seems to be good. The structure of report is good. The HD is still weak; they are trying to improve on that, and already held a workshop involving the community to learn and talk about ozone and UV radiation. One good aspect that was pointed out is that the publications are clearly joint, which indicate that the network is going well.

CRN 031

Title: ENSO Disaster Risk Management in Latin America: A Proposal for the Consolidation of a Regional Network for Comparative Research, Information, and Training from a Social Perspective

PI: Eduardo Franco

The progress report was difficult to understand. A lot of work was reported, but not in an integrated and organized way. It came as 11 separate files. Contrary to other projects, this one is very strong in the HD, and somewhat week in the science area; they do need strong guidance in this area. The project is clearly part of a larger international network. They are committed to the network concept, and trough several meetings they are bringing more people together. A prototype of GIS has been developed, that bring together information from hard and social sciences about El Niño and disasters. What they need now is to come up with more cutting edge questions, and they are working on that. The T&E aspects of the project are very strong.

CRN 038

Title: Multi-Objective Study of Climate Variability for Impact Mitigation in the Trade Convergence Climate Complex Region

PI: Pilar Cornejo

The project started in January 2000. It has well developed in the HD component, and is in general being well managed. It was suggested that more clear information about the PI involvement in the 12 listed sub-projects, and also about the T&E component should be given in the future.

CRN 040

Title: Estudio Comparativo de los Efectos de Cambios Globales sobre la Vegetación de Dos Ecosistemas: Alta Montaña y Sabana Tropical

PI: Juan Silva

Very little was discussed about this project. It was considered to be going well, with some minor problems. One that was pointed out was that the PI was actually in Harvard, and there was no information about the project management in Venezuela while he is away. This should be clarified in the future. One good aspect was that they are in contact with O. Sala and H. Tiessen, trying to develop a more integrated work on savannas trough the Americas.

CRN 047

Title: Andean Amazon Rivers Analysis and Monitoring (AARAM) Project PI: Michael McClain

This is a very well established project and its activities go back to the first Start-up Grant. It was observed that the project is not strong in human dimensions, although they are starting to include this area in studies of LUCC and Environmental Education in the Pachitea region in Peru. The project is fully or partially supporting 11 graduate students and 13 undergraduates from Latin American countries. They do not have publications yet. One general criticism was that the report was somewhat confusing, not separating clearly work planned from what was actually done. It was

agreed that for the second year, with the implementation of a standard report format, those aspects should be clarified.

In the general discussion that followed, it was agreed that a much better feeling of the progress and achievements of the projects will probably be possible at the end of the 2nd year. The SAC will then have better grounds to judge the projects and make recommendations and warnings sanctions if and where necessary. It was suggested that this is an issue to be discussed at the October PIs meeting. IAI should them make very clear that the standard reporting system should be strictly followed, and that IAI policy will be tougher from the second year on.

CRN 048

Title: Diagnostics and Prediction of Climate Variability and Human Health Impacts in the **Tropical Americas**

PI: Ulisses Confalonieri

This project was delayed because of administrative problems. It just started last April, and they just had their first workshop last week. For this reason there is no report.

CRN 055

Title: Development of a Collaborative Research Network for the Study of Regional Climate Variability and Changes, their Prediction and Impact in the MERCOSUR Area PI: Mario Nuñez

The project actually started in July 2000. The list of CO-PIs is impressive; they are all top scientists in their area of expertise, which is an indication of the potential that this project has to be successful. They are proposing a project in flood management (which involves HD), and held a workshop in February 2001 to develop the framework. It could show good results in the future, but should be closely followed. It was suggested that they should seek more collaboration with Magaña, Baumgartner and Campos' projects. One criticism was that the report, as presented, was not clear and was very difficult to read. There was also a general concern about the network to be formed by this project, and how they will support the less strong groups and Universities; this should be also closely followed in the future, since main concern is the development of a real network.

CRN 061

Title: South Atlantic Climate Changes (SACC): An International Consortium for the Study of Global and Climate Changes in the Western South Atlantic PI: Edmo Campos

This is a project built up from ISPI funded research, and it is highly successful up to now. It is very strong on the network aspect, with a very good and informative web page. One pointed problem is that they are not reporting data to the IAI-DIS. The project is supporting many students, reported several publications, but do not have a strong HD component. It was suggested that they should be encouraged to seek more collaboration with Tim Baumgartner, Victor Magaña and Eduardo Franco's projects.

CRN 062

Title: An Eastern Pacific Consortium for Research on Global Change in Coastal and

Oceanic Regions

PI: Timothy Baumgartner

This project is very strong on the network component and is highly successful in obtaining additional resources. The project is in general being well managed.

CRN 073

Title: Climate Variability and its Impacts in the Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean Region

PI: Victor Magaña

The start was delayed because a general strike at UNAM. They have just started.

The next item to be discussed was the IAI-DIS. In the discussions of the Data Working Group it was felt that because the easy availability of other data sources (NASA for instance), and that putting data into a DIS system would not be accessed easily by many people, IAI should reconsider its DIS strategy. The group recommended that a simpler website based version, with links to each project web page, should be encouraged. Each PI should be responsible to implement a web page where information and data would be entered and could be accessed from outside. The IAI web page would have links to all projects pages. This would make it easier and quicker for now, but in the long term, the development of the IAI-DIS should not be discarded.

The next item discussed was the Indicators of Network Development. Several points were suggested, such as: meetings within and with other projects, joint publications, joint field experiments, exchange of students, etc. Hard copies of publications should always be included in the reports, and IAI acknowledgment should be made clear.

It was concluded that, once IAI has a revised and standard reporting system, possibly with a website electronic form in place, there will be better grounds to further discuss the matter. This should be in place for the second year report, but the PIs should be encouraged to already verbally report at the October meeting.

PESCA update:

Only 3 PIs reported back to the Directorate request. Some reported back administrative problems in establishing the sub-contracts, and the project was therefore not even started. It was pointed out that, when the reports are late (90 days after the deadline) IAI should send a very clear signal that the matter is serious and there are implications. The funds should either be sent back or future funds should be frozen.

Second visit to the PIs of the CRN Program

The proposed second visit to project sites was not carried out because of agenda problems. This is a problem that should be solved in the future, and the Directorate asked further recommendations

from the SAC on how to proceed. One suggestion was to have a master calendar in the website, with all schedule meetings for all projects, that he SAC and the Directorate could look at try to figure out a person to go to each place.

Summer Institute:

It was generally accepted that the Summer Institute was a very successful activity and all efforts should be made to continue it. It was suggested that an effort should be made to raise funds trough proposals in T&E to other funding agencies, like Hewlett Packard for instance.

The possibility of having other SI in other places, and in collaboration with other local organizers, e.g. with CICESE, INPE, CPTEC, etc., was then proposed by the IAI Director. The idea was accepted, but it was remembered that the uniqueness of the SI to include social and natural sciences should remain.

The IAI Director proposed to use some remaining ISPIII and PESCA funds to announce an open call for proposal that would hopefully be a co-funded SI between IAI and the proponent Institution. The proposals should preferentially consider SI in the Latin American Region. The idea was accepted and the SAC gave the clearance to the Director to proceed.

Conference of Ministers of Environment of the Americas.

The IAI Director had the opportunity to make a presentation of IAI at the Conference. The results were an increased visibility of IAI, in specially at the Ministerial level of Central America countries. The Director acknowledged the effort of G. McBean, Bruce Angel and John Stone in Canada, and also the Minister of Environment of Panama, Ricardo Anguizola who is strongly involved with IAI.

Procedure to terminate a project.

A small committee evaluated the document, and considered it to be a standard procedure also adopted by other agencies, as the NSF for instance. The SAC is not directly involved, as most of the dispute is done either by the IAI Directorate or the EC.

A better understanding on the role of the scientific evaluation to determine the termination of a project is needed. There was some concern about confidentiality, as the PI knows SAC member responsible for his project. Some independent review process was felt necessary. The final decision should be taken by the Director

New announcement for proposals.

It was generally felt that the announcement should give priority to research projects rather than start-up workshops. It should give priority to young and new scientists.

The final conclusion was that that the announcement should give priority to research projects with one to two years duration. The grants should be small (20-50k or a maximum of 100k for 2 years), involving at least 3 countries. The program should be targeted preferentially to junior researchers, opening opportunities to alumni of summer institutes, and students of ISP or CRN projects. Current PIs should not be allowed to compete and equal division of funds between participating countries should be encouraged.

Following, the idea of a synthesis work of the ISP program was discussed. It was generally accepted as a way to capture and revise the accomplishments of the ISP program. The suggestion was to hold a Conference, with themes coincident with IAI science agenda, where each project

should present a synthesis of the work done, and the final product would be a book or series of books. There was a suggestion that this could be considered as part of the Montevideo plus 10 meeting in 2002.

Day 2: May 24

Report of the Communication Task Force

There was a suggestion that the IAI website should be more user friendly, and that a list of papers should be more easily accessible, classified by topics and ecosystems. The SAC was informed that the website currently have only a PDF file listing the publications; it was also informed that the website is being redesigned and will try to include the SAC suggestions.

The discussion then return to the topic of the ISP Synthesis Conference. The Director pointed out that at least 1 year is needed to organize and prepare for this meeting. A better estimate would be to hold it at the end of 2002. As for funds for the meeting, Dr. Filmer felt that it is important enough to justify funds from NSF. Dr. Bevilacqua also felt that it will be possible to raise Brazilian funds. The concept will be presented to the next EC meeting. In the meantime, a letter will be sent by the SAC Chairman and the IAI Director inviting and encouraging the ISP PIs to participate in the Conference, explaining its goals and objectives. The meeting should focus on the IAI Science Agenda, and some persons were suggested, and will be contacted to help to organize

Theme I: Otis Brown, David Enfield, Henry Dias, Carlos Nobre, Gordon McBean.

Theme II: Ernesto Medina, John Day, Holm Tiessen, Osvaldo Sala

Theme III: (member of the SAC to be nominated), Fuenzalida, Eugenio Sanhueza, Jeffrey Richey

Theme IV: Diana Liverman, Luis Bevilacqua, Eduardo Viola

The SAC Chairman will be the general coordinator of this committee.

It was estimated that about 50 people will attend the Conference. The letter to the PIs should stress that they are to synthesize the contribution and major findings of their work, putting it in a context of understanding Global Change in the Americas. There was a suggestion that the IAI Director should try to approach Dr. Federico Garcia Brum and ask him to help to convince the Uruguayan Government of the importance of such meeting. Considering that a new Scientific Officer is not likely to be in place before September 2001, and that the SAC Chairman and the Director will need help in organizing the meeting from the very beginning, it was suggested that the IAI Director should consider having another interim Scientific Officer, for a period of 4-5 months. The names of Klaus Reichardt and Getulio Batista were suggested, and the Director will approach one of them.

The Directorate will find all final reports from ISP that are in electronic format and will make them available to the SAC members in an FTP site.

Regional Assessment

From contacts with START, the IAI was invited to present a proposal to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Osvaldo Sala presented the proposal on IAI's behalf, which was unfortunately declined. Latin America was not considered for the Millennium Assessment. The

decision was to fund only projects in Asia and Africa. Nevertheless, the review was positive, and other sources of funds should be pursued.

The IAI Director will send a copy of the proposal to all SAC Members done.

Dr. Bevilacqua informed that he contacted the Brazilian Minister of S&T to see if there would be government interest to support this initiative. He did not feel an interest for commitment, and unfortunately he feels that such activities cannot be done without government support.

The SAC Chairman suggested that IAI should report the matter to the government representatives at the CoP meeting. IAI is aware that there have been suggestions that regional assessment will be necessary, and it should be made clear what IAI has accomplished in these areas. The SAC considers that it is necessary to show that IAI have not been inactive in is matter.