

**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR  
GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH**



**EC-XXIV & CoP-XIV**  
*June 12-15, 2007*  
*Manaus, Brazil*

**Minutes of the EC-XXIII**

**3\_ECXXIV/DWD/English/May 3, 2007**

**Minutes of the Twenty-Third Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)  
*December 9 and 10, 2006 - Panama City, Panama***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda

1. Opening Session
  2. Approval of the Agenda
  3. Approval of the Report of the Twenty Second meeting of the EC
  4. Report of the Executive Council Chair
  5. Report of the IAI Directorate
  6. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee (FAC)
  7. Report on Relations with Member States
  8. Report on IGFA
  9. Report of the IAI External Review Committee
  10. Report of the SAC Chair
  11. Scientific Presentations
  12. Other Issues
  13. Approval of the Action List of Day 1
  14. Items to be forwarded to CoP
  15. Future Sites and Meetings
  16. Adjournment of the Meeting
- Action List EC-XXII (day 1)
- Action List EC-XXII (day 2)
- Acronyms

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

---

## 1. Opening Session

Eduardo Reyes, from the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Panama, opened the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the EC. He welcomed all the participants and wished them a successful meeting. He then talked about climate change activities in Panamá and remarked that global change is one of the main topics in the environmental strategy of the country carried out by ANAM (Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente). He mentioned that the installation of a node from NASA at Cathalac has allowed data sharing with other Central American countries so as to prevent natural disasters. He said Panama was very proud of being a member of the Executive Council and finally conveyed the greetings from Ligia Castro, Director of ANAM.

The EC Chair, Maria Assunção Faus da Silva Dias, thanked Panama for the hospitality and for the local perspective about global change. She also welcomed the participants and wished a successful meeting.

Participants at the meeting were:

### EC Country Representatives

Argentina:	Carlos Ereño
Brazil:	Maria Assunção Faus da Silva Dias
Canada:	Michel Béland, Louis Grittani
Costa Rica:	Paulo Manso Salgado
Mexico:	Andrés Flores Montalvo
Panama:	Oliver Sánchez, Eduardo Reyes, Zoila Aquino
United States:	Margaret Leinen, Paul Filmer, Louis B. Brown, Margarita Gregg, William Smith, Elizabeth Williams, Norman Barth
Venezuela:	Gladys Maggi

### SAC Members:

Michael Brklacich (SAC Chair)

### Observers / Lecturers:

Mahabir Gupta (IAI External Review Committee)  
 Darysbeth Magaly Martínez (Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente)  
 Emilio Sempris (CATHALAC)  
 Diana Laguna (Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente)

### IAI Directorate:

Holm Tiessen (IAI Director), Gerhard Breulmann (Scientific Officer), Marcella Ohira (Training, Communications and Outreach Officer), Elvira Gentile (support to the IAI Directorate), Roseli Luz (Assistant to the Scientific Officer)

### Local Staff:

Anabel Hernández, Elba Cortes, Modesto Tunon

## 2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty Third Meeting with a modification in the schedule of the invited presentations:

- The presentation about IGFA would be heard after the overview of the IAI Director.
- The presentations of the local scientists would be heard after lunch. (*Action 1, Day 1*)

## 3. Approval of the Report of the XXII Meeting of the EC

The EC approved the Report of its Twenty Second Meeting with a minor modification: in page 14 (*English version*), last paragraph, it should read: “involve more stake holders and actors *from* the private sector” (Action 2, Day 1).

## 4. Report of the EC Chair

The EC Chair said that the Action Lists of the EC 22 and the CoP 13 included mostly executive actions, which would be mentioned by the IAI Director in his report.

A few specific actions taken by the EC Chair were:

1. Meeting with several members of INPE to discuss a MoU and the Capacity Building Activities between IAI and INPE (as INPE has other areas of interest to IAI, the MoU could include them as well apart from CPTEC)
2. Meeting with Bob Swap regarding IAI evaluation and strategic plan discussions.
3. Interaction with the Directorate and the Bureau concerning the Cuban participation in IAI funded research (it would be presented by the IAI Director)
4. Participation in the IAI capacity building event on Climate and Land Use Modeling in Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil on August 2006.
5. Meeting with the INPA Director to discuss the next CoP/EC meeting to be held in Manaus.
6. Intervention in the preparation of the next INPE’s bid for administrative personnel with the objective of improving their salaries.

## 5. Report of the IAI Directorate

### 5.1. Overview from the IAI Director

Holm Tiessen, the IAI Director, explained that he would concentrate on the most strategic questions. All the details regarding activities, outcomes and initiatives during the period May – November 2006 can be found in Document 4 *ECXXIII/DID/English/November 27, 2006*.

He talked about the following three issues:

#### 1) Broadening the institutional base

During this period the IAI Directorate has taken the initiative to contact some sister organizations across the continent in search for common interest and strategies. This is an important step to place the IAI into the regional context and explore synergies between different regional initiatives. The following institutions were approached:

*Red Iberoamericana de Oficinas de Cambio Climático-RIOCC (Iberoamerican Network of Climate Change Offices)*

It is an initiative from the Ministry of the Environment and gathers all the Climate Change Offices depending from the Ministries of the Environment in all the member countries. It is a highly institutionalized organization and includes most of IAI member countries except those in North America and some Caribbean countries.

*Programa Iberoamericano de Ciencia y Tecnología para el Desarrollo (Iberoamerican Program of Science and Technology for Development)*

This program, whose office for LA is in Sao Paulo, is technologically and development oriented in addition to be science oriented. It is a complementary program to the IAI and mutual benefits are expected as the result of interaction.

*INPE - CPTEC (Center for weather forecasting and climate studies)*

It is a very important institution in terms of climate change, climate modeling, weather prediction, etc. and therefore, it is integral to the IAI interests and programs. The first IAI-INPE fellows have been chosen. They will spend 6 months at CPTEC working in scientific projects. The first fellows would arrive in March 2007.

*University of Sao Paulo – Instituto de Estudios Avanzados (Institute of advanced studies)*

It has scientists working in climate change area, social sciences area. When I was created its main purpose was to be a focal point for renewal (historical context: after the return of democracy in Brazil). Now it is an institution of international standing and, as the IAI, is broadening out into more societal and political concerns. Since the IAI needs to form a sound scientific basis for the interdisciplinarity that will be required it will cooperate with the IEA especially in the planning phase of the new Human Dimensions program.

*IICA – Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture*

It has headquarters in Costa Rica. The membership is very similar to IAI's. Agriculture is that point where global change and environmental change affect human activities. IICA will become an important partner of IAI. For example, on December 12, 2006 there would be a Joint IAI-IICA symposium in Costa Rica, which would be followed by one of the synthesis workshops for the CRN.

*SCOPE (Scientific Committee on the Problems of the Environment)*

It is one of the ICSU organizations, with headquarters in Paris. It has helped IAI to synthesize the policy aspects of CRN I. The resulting book would go to publisher before the end of the December. The IAI Director distributed among the participants the first product of this cooperation: the Policy Brief "How to improve the dialogue between science and society", published jointly by SCOPE and UNESCO based on the IAI experience. This is the first move into a very brief *bullet like* information package for the policy sector that has been derived from IAI experience, from the UBATUBA workshop (CRN I synthesis workshop co-organized by IAI and SCOPE held in Ubatuba, Brazil in December 2005), and from the contributions towards the SCOPE-IAI book.

*IDRC – International Development Research Center (Canada)*

It is a Canadian institution rather than an international institution only to some degree because it is an institution vested with the parliament of Canada (not with the government of Canada) and it has an international board of governors. It bridges an important gap: the link between global change science and development. According to the Director, there will be no mitigation, no adaptation efforts that will ignore the

need for development, particularly in the LA region, so that link is a vital one for the IAI activities in the future.

The IAI is now broadening its spectrum of strategic alliances to cover a range of activities from the excellence science that it has been able to conduct for the last 13 years to an integration, a strong emphasis on interdisciplinarity, on integration with institutions across the continent who range all the way from science to the very concerns of agriculture or weather prediction on the ground. That is the way to assure that in the future the scientific output finds an easier way into society relevance.

The Institutional spectrum is now moving to embrace from the peer reviewed disciplinary science, where IAI has established excellence, to a stronger interdisciplinary approach and particularly including HD (medicine, law, economics, sociology, economics, legal aspects of international conventions) to the applications, and involving more stake holders and NGOs stake-holder-organizations to assure that IAI's science is translated into action that leads to adaptation and to adequate response of society to the opportunities and threats of Global Change.

## **2) The analysis of the CRN networks and an attempt to synthesize them**

The IAI Director said that the IAI was seeing the first fruits of the policy relevance analysis.

The analysis for CRN-I is ongoing: A major effort has gone into the editing of the contributions from the IAI-SCOPE workshop in Ubatuba (Nov. 2005). Cross-cutting chapters were delivered in March 2006. The book has gone through the internal edits and external reviews, and the final chapters will be delivered to Island Press in December 2006. The book will be: *Linking Global Environmental Change Science to Society and Policy*, SCOPE 68, edited by H. Tiessen, M. Brklacich, G. Breulmann and R.S.C. Menezes, to be published in 2007 by Island Press, Washington.

The Director also mentioned the following workshops:

- *IAI-CPTEC Training Institute on Climate, Land Use and Modeling (August 13-18, 2006 in Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil)*. This initial workshop on Climate-land use interactions has been successfully conducted with CPTEC and has resulted in recommendations for CRN-II. One of the important scientific outcomes, was that, for the first time, different groups of people, (land use people and climate people) started to develop a common language. In terms of how interdisciplinarity might work in the future, they identified those sub-modules that need to be worked on if we want to link climate models with land use models.
- *Training Workshop on Variability, Change, Disaster Reduction and management of risk associated to Climate. Forum: Science & Policy in risk management (November 19-24, 2006 in Panama City, Panama)*. It has concluded with both institutional development and program recommendations and opportunities,
- *Workshop on the application of ecological knowledge to land use decisions*, that would be held jointly with IICA in Costa Rica in December 2006. The workshop is similar to the one in Ubatuba, where the task would be to write cross cutting-chapters to develop new ideas. The outcome will also be a book.

These activities represent a new direction in the IAI program: they integrate science and education / capacity building; and they engage the IAI in science synthesis activities to provide additional program outputs and guide future programming.

The IAI Director expressed that the main challenges to science are those of becoming credible to different audiences. Societies have very different measures of credibility. And again there we need a process of mutual learning and communications to make our science more relevant. An important task for IAI is to deal with that complex problem of global environmental change (GEC), of all these interactions in a

scientifically, rigorous manner and, at the same time, make sure that the results of all the scientific work are useful for the policy sector and for the societies that funds the scientific work.

This is a crucial point in the relationships between the IAI and its Member Countries and in the engagement by Member Countries in the IAI. Therefore, the main points that we are seeing in this policy analysis coming out of the Ubatuba workshop and the 10 years of the scientific activity that the IAI has supported are also the principal points that make the IAI itself as an institution relevant in this continent.

### 3) Scientific Priorities Country Survey

The IAI Directorate was challenged to make the scientific activity relevant to the countries and to sound out the countries for their ideas as to what their priorities might be. A previous survey of the IAI Member Countries had resulted in a short list of topics that might be relevant to them.

The IAI Director explained that as Global Change Science moves from global scale to the regional, from global process to detail and complexity, from observation and model to impact, it develops regional and local relevance.

As part of the process of improving the relevance of the IAI's activities the IAI Directorate contacted the RIOCC who offered the IAI the country survey they had conducted (the Director discussed about this topic in the meetings of Santa Cruz de la Sierra and Madrid).

He presented a secondary analysis of RIOCC country survey:

In the RIOCC country survey 17 MC are represented. It Excludes USA and Canada and some of the English Caribbean members. There is full representation of IAI LA members plus some additional countries that are not IAI members.

The Ranking of the *declared priorities* of the countries is as follows:

1. Hidrology
2. agriculture
3. health
4. forestry
5. biodiversity
6. energy
7. soils
8. fisheries
9. urban issues

The countries were also asked to declare in which of those areas they had *low knowledge on impact and adaptation*. Generally, the countries declared that they had some knowledge on impacts but very little in adaptation. For example, in the case of agriculture there is a high knowledge about impact but much less about adaptation. In urban issues, a large number of countries declared that they neither know what the impact is nor what the adaptation might be.

Finally he showed a new table combining the priority declared, and the lack of knowledge either on impact or adaptation. The result of this combination was a new "*Need*" ranking:

1. energy
2. biodiversity
3. hydrology
4. forestry
5. urban issues
6. health

7. agriculture
8. soils
9. fisheries

The IAI Director said that the development of a guideline on relevant issues is not a simple question; it is a synthetic process that IAI has to go through. And this leads to the issue of development in LA societies and how to link the threats and opportunities of GEC to development. The questions of development, of misdevelopment and of threats to development are central to not only the IAI but to all the member nations.

The IAI Director then gave the floor to Mexico who made a presentation about IGFA (see item 9)

#### *Comments from participants*

The EC members complimented the IAI Director on his presentation and on the work he had been doing in trying to engage other organizations that work in GEC areas. They were pleased to see that a dialogue with these institutions was fundamental for IAI's visibility. They also found that the analysis of priorities that have been established by RIOCC was very interesting. They thought that a strategy to link the science program with country needs was the way forward.

*USA* (in the name of the NSF), expressed his concern about the funding sources to support applications such as mitigation and adaptation. From the stand point of USA, the main funding institution is the NSF and its objective is fundamentally scientific research. Therefore, if the IAI was going in that direction, he suggested thinking about which other organizations would be approached. He also said that those organizations would bring an additional set of constrains, (e.g. huge over subscription in international organizations). He added that, in that case, a strategy should be discussed to forward to the Cop.

*IAI Director* clarified that the immediate goal of the IAI is that of research towards adaptation and mitigation.

*Panama* expressed its satisfaction with the results of the Meeting and Science and Policy Forum on Climate-Risk reduction and suggested that the IAI Directorate send the results of all these events to member countries in order to improve knowledge on impact and adaptation to GEC.

### **5.2. Overview on Science Programs (Gerhard Breulman)**

Gerhard Breulman, the Scientific Officer (SO), gave an update on the activities on the Science Area. He mentioned the following topics:

#### *1. Closure of CRN I Program*

The SO explained that although the program has officially been closed with the submission (1 Sep 2006) and approval (2 Sep 2006) of the final report to the NSF, several synthesis and dissemination activities were still ongoing with remaining CRN-I funds committed for this purpose before 31 May 2006. The final CRN-I report is provided to the EC as document 5.

The CRN has been the IAI flagship program during 1999-2005, representing a financial investment of approx. US\$ 10.3 Mio + leveraging parallel funds of approx. US\$ 16 Mio. Some facts and highlights about CRN I are:

- generated significant, high-quality scientific information that can be used and has been used by stakeholders and policy/decision makers;
- involved at the PI/Co-PI level more than 100 institutions and 220 scientists;
- supported 619 students to complete their degrees;



- produced more 370 publications incl. books/book chapters;
- promoted 179 workshops across the Americas;
- 250 papers presented in symposia;
- 1954 students participated/presented their work in conferences, seminars, WS, training courses.

He also emphasized that the CRN has pioneered the way of doing global change science as a combination of top science and regional networking. The program has generated a Multi-layered network of networks (within individual projects – scientists, institutions, countries, disciplines, natural sciences, social science - between the projects – between the projects and other regional/global programs (e.g. the DIVERSITAS, IGBP, IHDP, PAHO, WCRP etc.). It also enhanced the dialogue with the international conventions (UNFCCC, UNCBD) and was instrumental in the creation of chapters for IPCC or MA (Millennium Assessment). Finally, the CRN resulted in a stronger & more cohesive global change community throughout the IAI region & developed Southern leadership.

#### 2) Status of CRN II Program

- All contracts were signed
- Officially all Projects started on 1 July 2006
- Projects are combined into thematic and/or regional clusters
- CRN II PI's participated in CRN I synthesis activities (*Ubatuba, ESSP Beijing, Cachoeira Paulista, Panama, San Jose*)
- PI (& possibly AIRs) meeting planned for 2007 – *jointly with Small Grants Program for HD*

#### 3) NCAR-IAI colloquium, 11-22 September, Boulder, USA

The first joint IAI-NCAR colloquium was held at the NCAR MESA lab in Boulder, Colorado, USA. The colloquium with the title “Policy Planning and Decision Making Involving Climate Change and Variability” was organized jointly by IAI and NCAR funded through a NSF grant. 21 participants (scientists and professionals from different backgrounds) from 13 countries across the Americas attended the meeting. The focus was on water resource management. Colloquium information is available at <http://www.sere.ucar.edu/iai/>

The SO also announced that the NCAR-IAI Fellowships were already implemented and 2 fellows had been selected (one from Brazil and one from Ecuador) who would spend 2 years at NCAR.

#### 4) Participation of IAI at Beijing meetings (YSC, START SSC, ESSP OM)

The IAI participated in the following meetings were held back to back in Beijing from 6-12 November 2006:

- a) The 2nd START Young Scientists Conference (6-8 Nov. 2006)  
21 participants from North America and 8 from Latin America attended the meeting (total number of participants: 97). Among them, there were 3 participants from CRN I, 1 from SGP, 1 from PESCA. The SGP presentation received an ‘honorary mention’ (Michela Silva Figueira, CENA/USP “Evidence of changes in the nitrogen cycle along a secondary forest chronosequence in eastern Amazonia”)
- b) 2nd Open Meeting of the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP), 9-12 Nov. 2006  
Joint session of IAI-NSF-SCOPE “*Collaborative regional GEC networks in the Americas: Opportunities for stakeholders and governance*” co-convened by SO & Mike Brklacich. – Basically presented results from the Ubatuba CRN synthesis workshop. It included 5 speakers & 4 posters. Presentations & posters will be available on the IAI website. There was also an IAI info booth.
- c) START SCC (Scientific Steering Committee) meeting, 8 Nov 2006. The SO made an update on IAI activities.

#### 5) SGP-HD, new IAI initiative

Since only a small portion (8%) of the CRN II projects corresponds to Human Dimensions and policy applications (Issue 4 of the IAI Agenda), the IAI Directorate submitted a grant proposal “Small Grant

Program for the Human Dimensions, SGP-HD” to the NSF. This program was designed to strengthen the agenda, specifically under theme 4, but within the CRN II program. It is expected that this program will build on the strong interdisciplinary networks created in CRN II. NSF approved the grant on 27 September 2006.

The New Call for Proposals is scheduled for 2007. The program will support 5-8 projects for 24 months. The grants will be of US\$ 50 -100K per year (total of US\$ 800K) and the Proposals must link to and be endorsed by at least one CRN II project

*6) Other activities (UNFCCC, APN)*

•UNFCCC SBSTA

The IAI participated at the 24<sup>th</sup> UNFCCC SBSTA in May 2006 in Bonn and there was a research special side event. A summary report was submitted to SBSTA 25, Nairobi, Nov 06. The Compiled document FCCC/SBSTA/2006/MISC.15 will be considered at SBSTA 26, Bonn, May 07. It is available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2006/sbsta/eng/misc15.pdf>

- One of the immediate results out of the presentation in may 2006 was the RIOCC connection.
- IAI has been asked by the Brazilian Government for a list of activities potentially to be included into its Second National Communication to the UNFCCC.
- IAI has signed a MoU with APN. One idea to implement this MoU is to have a joint side-event at SBSTA, in Bonn, May 2007 (if possible).

*Comments from participants:*

*The Chair* thanked the SO for his presentation showing so many activities and suggested preparing a panflet describing the IAI in numbers. It would be a clear way to show the magnitude of the IAI

*USA* thanked the SO for presentation and agreed with the Chair on preparing summaries with numbers and finding some method of wider distribution of these type of high level synthesis (web, panflets). He also made a comment regarding human dimensions and policy relevance. He stated that HD should not be interpreted as policy relevance. For example, one of the results of CRN I was that scientists at the beginning were unsure of the policy relevance of their projects, and at the end they realized their results were more policy relevant than they had thought. That will surely be the case with CRN II as well. He also emphasized that one of the great successes for IAI was the institutional change the IAI had been able to encourage throughout the region in the sense of the administration of international and multidisciplinary projects. That in itself is a type of capacity building which he thought was understated in many of the presentations or publications of IAI. IAI is an integrator in the Americas and is leading the way and providing an example. He complimented the IAI Directorate for having achieved that goal.

*Mexico* thanked the SO and stated that for Mexico the research conducted with IAI funding has been fundamental. Many scientists from IAI projects have participated in 3<sup>rd</sup> national communication submitted by Mexico at Nairobi. In that communication Mexico acknowledges especially the support from the IAI.

**5.2. Overview of the Training, Communications and Outreach Areas (Marcella Ohira)**

Marcella Ohira, Training, Communications and Outreach Officer (TO), made an update on the IAI Capacity Building Activities during the period May - December 2006:

- 1) *IAI-CPTEC Training Institute on Climate, Land Use and Modeling (August 13-18, 2006 in Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil)*

The main objectives of this TI, co-organized with INPE/CPTEC and APLBA, were to foster communication and collaboration (common language, mechanisms); to promote integration (modeling as a common tool); to explore synergies among the climate, land use and modeling communities; and to disseminate and combine research information of the IAI CRN I projects and other initiatives in the region.

40 people participated at the TI and there was a strong participation of CRNs (PIs, CoPIs and students). Some Initial Results were: collaboration between CRN I and CRN II (initial development and integration new components), “PIs meeting” at beginning of CRN II, and opportunities for future collaboration.

### *2) Meeting on Climate-Disasters Reduction and Risk Management and Forum "Science and policy in Climate-risk management (November 19-24, 2006 in Panama City, Panama);*

It was organized in collaboration with the UN-ISDR, CATHALAC, CRID, ANAM and FLACSO. The main objectives of the Meeting were: to improve risk management; to Establish a common ground between the climate change and variability, disaster and risk (scientific, policy, and civil society) communities; Advance interdisciplinary research; develop synergies among several actors and institutions involved in risk management. The Forum objective was to foster dialogue and interaction between Science and Policy Communities and present the results of the “Meeting”. The meeting encouraged the exchange of information and cooperation among CRN I, CRN II, TISG and other ongoing research and application activities held in the region by other organizations (UNDP, GEF, CATHALAC, UICN, Red Cross, etc). Synthesis and dissemination of CRN-I work served as guidance for CRN II and other research programs. A publication will be produced as an output from the meeting and forum, which will contain the main recommendations regarding further development of multidisciplinary science and integration and communication between the science and policy communities.

Some initial results of the Training Institutes 2006 were:

- New Initiative promoting Science Integration and Multidisciplinarity;
- High level of satisfaction from the participants with new approach and methodology of Meeting and Forum, despite difficulties and problems identified;
- Reached out new people (professionals and decision makers from the Americas), including small and non-member countries; Reached out to press, civil society, etc;
- Fostered country membership with participation of non-member countries: Barbados, Netherlands Antilles;
- Increased IAI profile towards small countries and communities;
- Strengthened relationship with IAI member countries Brazil (CPTEC) and Panama (ANAM);
- Developed institutional, financial and programmatic partnerships with other organizations (CATHALAC, ANAM, CRID, UNDP, ISDR, etc);
- Engaged NGOs and civil society in IAI events (Red Cross, UICN, ASTPA, Catholic Church, Indigenous groups, etc) and the Press;
- Encouraged human network development, multidisciplinary research, multinational collaboration and Science-Policy interface;
- Identification of future collaborators, e.g. World Bank, Red Cross, UICN, OFDA/USaid etc;
- Production & distribution of interactive CD ROM, “Encuentro & Foro” website;
- Production of “Encuentro & Foro” publication.
- Specific Role for CRN I young scientists/students: joint multidisciplinary article.

### *3) 2007-2009 INPE-IAI Research Internships*

It is a program for 6 research internship positions in Climate Variability in the Americas at INPE-CPTEC. This Program was approved in 2004 by CoP and launched in 2006.

- Description of the position: One time internship positions of 6 months duration to be developed at CPTEC in Cachoeira Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil. Internships must be related to specific science themes of global environmental change and must look at ways to promote multinational collaboration among Latin American countries.
- Status: Two applicants (1 from Peru and 1 from Colombia) had been selected. They will start their research at CPTEC in March 2007.

•IAI-CPTEC will make next call for 2 more positions in early 2007

#### 4) *Follow-up of the Training Institute Seed Grants Program*

It was launched as an assessment activity of the TIs 2005. Its main goals were: promote opportunity for small country participation in IAI research; extend IAI's scientific network; foster capacity building in developing countries; apply science information in policy, decision-making; and provide training in proposal development, evaluation and administration of international research grants (request of EC and CoP).

The evaluation of proposals followed the IAI selection standards. Eight grants (100% of submitted proposals) were awarded at a total cost of US\$ 110K involving 44 professionals and policy makers from 18 countries in the Americas, many from small nations, who participate in an IAI research activity for the first time. Awards are one-time US\$ 10-15K grants. Canada's IDRC is co-sponsoring 1 TISG (pre-IDRC Ecohealth program).

Some positive outcomes of the TISG program were:

- High level of interest of participants: all 44 participated in the TISG and all 8 initial pre-proposals submitted full proposals.
- Engagement of guest speakers (10 as mail reviewers and 2 as proposal advisors).
- Opportunity for networking: interaction of TISG PIs with CRN I and II at the Cachoeira Paulista and Panama events in 2006.
- PIs from Bolivia, Colombia, Uruguay, Paraguay/USA, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico.

#### 5) *PIs Meeting of TISG (August 21-22, 2006, São José dos Campos, Brazil).*

Sixteen PIs and co-PIs from the 8 TISG grants representing 10 IAI member countries attended the meeting. The PIs meeting held at the IAI Directorate was organized back to back with the IAI-CPTEC Training Institute on Climate, Land Use and Modeling. PIs provided a brief project report which was followed by discussion about potential integration with CRN I, II or among TISG projects. Additional presentations and discussions were held on project management and administration of IAI research funds

Regarding *Communications & outreach*, the TO announced that during this period the IAI Newsletter Issue 2/2006 was published with a renewed layout and content. The number of subscribers increased from 1,637 in April 2006 to 2,738 subscribers in November 2006. The Biennial Report 2004-2006 was also published for EC members distribution. The IAI Website is under constant revision and the Listserv has more than 4000 recipients (181 announcements distributed by November 2006)

As to *Institutional collaboration and country engagement*, the TO participated in RIOCC's Inter-American Climate Change Bureaux Network Annual Meeting, Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia, October 4-6, 2006. The objectives of this participation were to make the IAI known to the RIOCC network community and to encourage country engagement and contribution to IAI core budget. (cases of Bolivia, Peru and Colombia through strategic support and contacts from TISG PIs and visit to Bolivia's Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Science and Technology).

The TCO also approached small countries of the Caribbean (Barbados and Netherland Antilles) in view of IAI country membership, with the collaboration and strategic support from TISG co-PIs.

#### *Comments from participants:*

*USA* congratulated the TO for the tremendous amount of activity that was able to be carried out with modest funding.

*Costa Rica* also congratulated the TO and asked if in the future they planned to include the applications community in TIs (since up to then the participants of the TIs were mostly academics and researchers).

The *TO* explained that at the beginning the main goal of the TIs was to train students but gradually they began to involve other participants such as government agencies, NGOs, policy makers, professionals, etc. This year, within the context of promoting a synthesis of CRN I, the TIs also focused on the participation of PIs and Co-PIs from CRN and other IAI programs. However, in Panama, apart from scientists we had the participation of other actors and institutions that work in applications. At the Forum there were representatives from the press, the private sector, the government, indigenous groups and a group from the Catholic Church.

#### ***5.4. Overview of the IAI Data and Information System (DIS) and other information technology matters (Holm Tiessen)***

The IAI Director recalled that Article 2 of the IAI Agreement states that the Institute shall pursue the principle full and open exchange of science information relevant to global change.

He reported that IAI has made big investment in DIS during the period of CRN I in order to comply with this mandate. However, the system was unmanageable under CRN I. The DIS has been substantially improved with a cooperation with Oak Ridge, but it is very expensive. Now there is a move to open-source software but still there will be substantial investment in technical expertise and know-how to run this system.

He considered the main problem was the lack of strategy on how to link research results data to the concept of information and to the concept of dissemination of information. It is very serious issue because of the diversity of the research projects the IAI is engaged in: from agricultural projects to ecological projects, to meteorological and oceanographic projects. Now IAI has the technological base in place in terms of a manageable DIS but the issue of information still has to be addressed. The IAI Director brought this to the attention of the SAC and this committee also realized it was a problem that needed attention.

*Cathalac* made a comment about the data management and suggested some tools that may help many institutions with this kind of problems. *Cathalac* installed successfully an open-source software that helps in storing all the information produced.

The *IAI Director* said that apart from the technical tools, other issues that had to be considered were the mechanisms of communication and dialogue between scientists and the managers of the data that make sure that the data provided by the scientists be useful to somebody else. Scientists generate data and the IAI's mandate is to disseminate information. That distinction is critical and that is a gap to bridge.

The *Second Vice-Chair* stated that since the creation of IAI much has change in the area of data and information systems. The issue of data was in the minds of the founders of IAI. They recognized very early that there would be 3 legacies of the IAI:

- 1 - Data that would be used by scientists in the future.
- 2 - Legacy of intellectual contribution
- 3 - Networks, connections and development of new capacity.

In those 3 arenas the one that has moved more rapidly has been the information systems. She agreed it was very appropriate to look at this area again. She suggested the IAI Directorate and the SAC work on this and try to engage part of the scientific community that works in this area.

*The EC Chair* said the IAI had grown very fast and perhaps still was not aware of the impact of the data generated. She also considered that apart from the technical point of view, the IAI needed to think about information management. She suggested the IAI Directorate bring an update at the next meetings on how this issue would be worked both from the technical and the strategic point of view.

**5.5. Overview of the financial status of the Core Budget as of November 30, 2006 and Auditors Report as of June 30, 2006 (Holm Tiessen)**

The IAI Director announced that Silvio Bianchi, the Administrative and Financial Officer, would leave the IAI the following week. Rafael Atmella of Costa Rica was hired as the new AFO and started his position effective Dec. 1, 2006. Both were in Sao Jose dos Campos in the transition period.

He presented some highlights of the Financial Report and told the participants that all details could be found in *Document 7*.

He presented the following table with the status of the contributions received from the member countries as of November 23, 2006. As it was early in the FY, only a few contributions had been received.

	Arrears from Previous FYs	Contribution for FY 06/07	Paid Jul-Nov/06	Due as of November 2006
Argentina	175,025.00	50,000.00	(50,000.00)	175,025.00
Bolivia	20,000.00	5,000.00		25,000.00
Brazil	0.00	85,000.00		85,000.00
Canada	0.00	125,000.00		125,000.00
Chile	5,000.00	5,000.00	(15,000.00)	(5,000.00)
Colombia	40,000.00	10,000.00		50,000.00
Costa Rica	1,991.64	5,000.00		6,991.64
Cuba	15,066.56	5,000.00		20,066.56
Dominican Republic	45,000.00	5,000.00		50,000.00
Ecuador	25,000.00	5,000.00		30,000.00
Guatemala	45,000.00	5,000.00		50,000.00
Jamaica	10,000.00	5,000.00		15,000.00
Mexico	(60,000.00)	60,000.00		0.00
Panama	(5,000.00)	5,000.00		0.00
Paraguay	50,000.00	5,000.00		55,000.00
Peru	40,000.00	5,000.00		45,000.00
Uruguay	40,000.00	5,000.00		45,000.00
USA	0.00	595,000.00		595,000.00
Venezuela	166,981.43	30,000.00		196,981.43
	<b>614,064.63</b>	<b>1,015,000.00</b>	<b>(65,000.00)</b>	<b>1,564,064.63</b>

**% Received**

**6%**

The IAI Director said that the problem of country contributions still continued and it was highly related to the interest in IAI. Some countries simply do not pay and that low level of interest has to do with systemic failures in IAI organization and in the political and bureaucratic embedding of the IAI in the individual countries administrations.

Different strategies were undertaken: reminder letters, and basically a case by case approach. Some PIs and co-PIs also contacted their local authorities in order to give an additional support to the efforts of the Directorate in the collection of the country contributions

The EC accepted the Financial Status Report as of November 2006 (Document 7). (*Action 2, Day 2*).

### *Auditors Report*

The IAI Director announced that on October 9, 2006, *BDO Trevisan Auditores Independentes*, -chosen by the IAI to perform the external audit review of the IAI financial statements for the fiscal years 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08-, finished their work and issued their report about the financial statements as of June 30, 2006.

The auditors have made no special observations and no management recommendations and the qualifications raised by the former auditors were solved because the CRN-I Program is finished

## **6. Report of the Financial and Administrative Committee**

Louis Grittani presented the report of the FAC (document 9). He informed the composition of the Committee has undergone two membership changes over the past few months and as of November 2006, the FAC consisted of three members: Evair Sergio da Silva (Brazil), Louis Grittani (Canada) and William Smith (USA).

The FAC formally met twice since last reporting to the EC (May 22-24, Venezuela and September 11-15, Sao José dos Campos).

The main activities of the FAC during this period were:

- Search for the new Administrative and Financial Officer
- Search for the new firm to perform the external audit review of the IAI financial statements and meetings with the selected firm (BDO Trevisan) and analysis of the Audit report
- Salary adjustment: The FAC had endorsed the extension of the 13% salary adjustment for an additional year while working with the IAI Director to develop an IAI policy. Finally a temporary solution was found. The FAC and the IAI Director agreed on a formula to calculate future 'salary adjustments' (when appropriate) with the provision that the resulting percentage would be an initial base from which to start discussions / budget development.
- Review of Management Checklist to identify areas that still require action.
- Contracting and procurement manual: The entire manual was reviewed and is now very close to completion.
- Meeting with EC Chair: the main topics of discussion included re-engaging the IAI's member countries (not just from a financial contribution perspective, but from a participation / meeting attendance perspective, as well), marketing the IAI, development of an IAI Strategic Plan, and addressing the unresolved issue of the INPE-supported IAI staff members.

Finally, the FAC endorsed the approval of the Auditors Report.

The EC accepted the Auditors Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2006 to be forwarded to the CoP. *Action 3, Day 1*

After the Report of the FAC, the EC members discussed about financial issues:

*Canada* expressed concern about the reserves of the IAI (cash flow table in document 8) and asked about the strategies that were being implemented to solve the problem.

The *IAI Director* said that although the problem is not so serious as to jeopardize IAI's operations within the next few years it certainly deserves attention. In fact there are some countries that are benefiting from IAI but they do not pay and the IAI Directorate is on its way to remedy a lot of the shortcomings of the past couple of years. He also mentioned that the IAI's staff has been doing a tremendous job for several years and while their contracts say there is an annual renegotiation of their salaries, this has never happened. The problem is that they see that it never will happen until the overall financial situation has improved. As to the several strategies to improve this situation, one is clearly related to the engagement of member countries but others are related to additional activities that have to do with linking programs, broadening the institutional base, etc.

*Argentina* made an update on its situation regarding contributions to the Core Budget. During the visit of the IAI Director the Argentinean authorities committed to make the annual contribution. As to the arrears, an agreement was reached that Argentina would support meetings for the IAI.

The *IAI Director* added that Argentina includes in its IAI budget funds for attending EC and CoP meetings. This is a very good practice that encouraged among other countries because many times, the representatives cannot attend the meetings.

*Argentina* also suggested the FAC and the IAI Directorate that, in occasion of future adjustments in the contributions to the Core Budget, going back to the recommendation from the CoP of considering 1000 US\$ steps (instead of US\$ 5000 steps). This amendment to the Agreement has not entered into force due to lack of ratification.

*USA* explained that the motion of 1000 steps was ratified by the CoP V. The next step was the ratification of the individual countries of this change to the Agreement. Cuba is the only one that ratified the change. The Rules Committee has reported in the past the Treaty of Vienna states that for cases where there is a consensus from the parties, rules can be put into effect before they are actually ratified by the member countries. Therefore, the EC might wish to consider forwarding to the CoP the suggestion that consensus be sought so that the contributions could be changed to a 1000 USD scale while the process of individual ratification of amendments to the Agreement should continue actively.

*The Second Vice Chair* suggested the IAI Directorate develop a format for the contribution table that is more informative for the members of EC and CoP (e.g. extended over a longer period so it would be easier to see the trends, amount of the reserve, changes in participation of the MC). She also congratulated the IAI Directorate and the FAC for the clean audit.

The EC suggested that the IAI Directorate, -in future reports on contributions to the Core Budget, include additional information about Member Countries contribution history and payments in advance. (Action 4, Day 1)

The EC endorsed the proposal of Argentina that, -in occasion of future adjustments in the contributions to the Core Budget-, the FAC and the IAI Directorate propose adjustments in 1000 USD steps. This was approved by CoP V but has not been ratified by the Member Countries yet. Therefore, a reminder should be sent to appropriate Member Countries to encourage the ratification process. (Action 5, Day 1)



## 7. Relations with Member States (Holm Tiessen)

The IAI Director briefly mentioned 3 issues in terms of country relationships:

- Financial contributions (already discussed)
- Dialogue required for strategic development of the IAI (importance of the participation of the representatives in the fora of the IAI in order to get their input in strategic discussions and further development of country priorities)
- Cases of irregularities with CRN projects (not compliance with contract, financial irregularities..)

He mentioned it was very critical for the IAI to receive guidance from representatives in this issue. He reported on the case of the CRN I project involving CICESE. After several negotiations CICESE has undertaken the responsibility for the sums that were used inappropriately. CICESE will fund the first 3 years of the new CRN II project and reimburse the IAI through that activity. This renegotiation with CICESE has taken a considerable amount of time.

He also recalled the case with Cathalac during CRN I and expressed it is important that country representatives be aware that IAI operates in their countries, with their institutions and under their rules. The IAI needs to be able to enforce its rules in order to maintain its credibility in the eyes of the funding agencies and the international community. Fortunately both problems were resolved, but with a lot of efforts. He asked the EC members to translate these issues within their organizations in their countries.

The *EC Chair* said that these incidents were consequences of the maturing process of the IAI. Fortunately now, there is a more efficient system in place, with clearer administrative rules and agreements. She also asked the Director for an update on the participation of Cuban scientists in IAI projects.

The *IAI Director* reported that a solution had been found for 2 of the main projects. The total sums involved were in the range of US\$ 200 K. The funding has been made available from a Canadian institution and would benefit a project of Canadian origin and one of Brazilian origin who share a Cuban partner. There were also some minor Cuban components in other projects (one Mexican and one from US). In both cases funding would be made available from the IAI Director special fund.

In the initial science meeting of Brazilian project of Guevara and the Canadian project of Sanches the Cuban Co-PIs did not show up even though the projects had considerable funds air tickets, hotels, etc. The Director received a call from Canada asking him to release those funds from the Agreement because they were convinced that the Cubans were not in an adequate position to interact with this project. The IAI Director's advice was to maintain the funds available for the time being. The Chair of the EC communicated to Cuba her concern that something clearly must have gone wrong (problems with exit visas) but to date IAI only received the apologies from the Cuban representative but not a satisfactory reply from Cuba as to why this happened.

## 8. Presentation about IGFA

Andrés Flores Montalvo, representative of Mexico made a presentation about the *International Group of Funding Agencies for Global Change Research*. IGFA is a forum through which national agencies that fund Research on Global Change identify issues of mutual interest and ways to address these through national and when appropriate through coordinated international actions. Its goal is to foster Global Change Research. Mexico and China are the only developing countries involved in IGFA.

IGFA provides a unique discussion forum for officials in research funding from different countries in good connection with representatives of the International Research Programs and other leading scientists in the field. Topics of mutual interest to all funding agencies, such as the discussion about priority setting in national funding, as well as simply information exchange on new initiatives or arising infrastructural questions are high on the agenda of IGFA.

IGFA is primarily concerned with the four International Global Change Research Programs WCRP, IGBP, IHDP, and DIVERSITAS, under the parenthood of ICSU. However, Regional Programs are also involved (IAI, APN, EU, Africaness). The focus in IGFA is not on the funding of single projects – this is still a matter of national procedures – but on the coordination of the support for the Programs themselves (Secretariats, International Project Offices, etc.).

IGFA has a plenary meeting once a year. In the last meeting, one of the main issues was the need to increase the participation of countries and regions not represented. Some benefits of national membership at IGFA are: Discussion/updating on global change research advances, new approaches, needs, strategies for resource allocation, objectives; Optimization of resources and addressing key research areas; Links for cooperation and collaboration on GCR; and for a developing country, it contributes to capacity building

### **9. Report of the External Review Committee**

Mahabir Gupta, Executive Director of Interciencia Association and Member of the ERC, gave an update of the activities of the External Review Committee.

He first recalled on the membership of the Committee and reported briefly on the first meeting of the Committee in Washington, DC in July 12-13. During that meeting the Committee members received formal presentations on the IAI and discussed about the design of the interviews to be conducted. During a next meeting in San Francisco they would review the draft report, which hopefully would be finished by the end of January or middle February.

The EC members expressed their concern because they realized that only 2 members of the Council had been interviewed. The SAC Chair had not been interviewed either.

The EC considered the report did not provide enough information on such an important activity and asked for a new status report.

The EC decided to send an e-mail urgently to the chair of the IAI External Review Committee to ask for a detailed work plan and a status report, which should be sent to the EC members as soon as possible but not later than December 20<sup>th</sup> (*Action 6, Day 1*)

### **10. Report of the SAC Chair**

Mike Brklacich, the SAC chair, focused his presentation in 3 main issues:

- 1) SAC's Role & Responsibilities Within IAI
- 2) Strategic Planning Process
- 3) SAC Renewal

These issues had been discussed during the 24th meeting of the SAC (6-7 December Cuernavaca, Mexico).

#### ***1) SAC's role and responsibilities***

The IAI's mission (“*To develop the capacity of understanding the integrated impact of present and future global change on regional and continental environments in the Americas and to promote collaborative research and informed action at all levels.*”) guides much of SAC discussion. The IAI has a lot of experience in collaborative research but it still needs to focus on integrated action. This term is related to relevance,

policy relevance, society relevance and it is a very important focal point for the SAC in the set of principles that guides its action

After reminding the 4 items of the IAI Agenda, which are basically disciplinary based, the SAC chair, explained the SAC role. He emphasized that even though the SAC is an *independent* organ, it is not in *isolation*. It is much concerned about the realities of doing science in particular countries, but its job is to rise above the individual countries issues or perspectives and provide guidelines to the Institute as a whole.

The SAC has a triple mandate:

- Make recommendations on long-range & annual science plans
- Establish peer-review panels for specific issues
- Assess scientific achievements

Keeping that on mind, he addressed the *relationship SAC - CRN II*. There are many reasons why it is important for the SAC to develop clear relationships with the CRN II projects and clusters:

a) Identify synergies within and across CRN research clusters (and in the long term, across the clusters of research)

b) Define emerging & new CRN research clusters.

For example the IAI, as many other institutions, is underrepresented in the area of urban activity and GEC. At the moment, there is only one CRN that is directly related to urban activity. The SAC will try to assist with the process of establishing new clusters.

c) Foster interdisciplinary research (It is not a new activity but has to be continually fostered)

d) Facilitate transition from research projects to programs of research (opportunity to advance the Scientific Agenda for IAI, both in terms of contributing to GEC science but also to a science that is more responsive to societal needs in the Americas)

f) Nurture policy relevance & synthesis throughout the CRN II 5-year period

The CRN I overall was extremely successful, but the plan synthesis was left to the end. The SAC, in its guidance role, will try to ensure that the synthesis is an ongoing activity during the CRN II, and also in terms of ensuring that policy relevance is not something that is done at the end of the process.

g) Track development of emerging scientific issues

CRN II projects will provide guidance on the next generation of science that is needed. The IAI will be in a position to know the areas of science that need to be tackled in advance of the calls

The SAC Chair then moved on to the *implementation of the relationships with CRN II*. He first recalled that during CRN I, one member of the SAC was assigned to one or two CRN I projects. The nature of that relationship between the SAC member and the project was highly variable: in some cases it was quite productive and in others, the relationship was only administrative without much exchange.

Therefore, the implementation plan for CRN II is different from the CRN I in different aspects:

1 – SAC members' interactions with CRN II Clusters

Once the clusters are established, the idea is to find 2-3 SAC members to be working in conjunction with a particular cluster over time

2 - Contribute to the "*Human Dimensions SGP*"

The SAC sees a new opportunity in the new round of funding for Human Dimensions research associated with CRN II. The IAI has made a very important decision: rather than having a parallel HD program besides the 3 biophysical programs, is choosing to integrate the HD with the various clusters many of which are

biophysical-science-oriented. This is a very different strategy from what can be seen in the international science arena where the IGBP, the WCRP, Diversitas, etc., are on the one side and then, parallel to them the IHDP. The SAC wishes to be part of the process of fostering the HD side of research within the IAI research portfolio under a completely different style of doing science.

### 3 - Facilitating integration workshops.

The first terrestrial ecosystems integration workshop will be held in Aug 2007 jointly with SAC 25. This cluster is the best defined and is able to mature faster than the others. Integration issues and identification of opportunities and synergies are main topics for the workshops.

### 4 - Synthesis planning

It will initiate this part of the SAC activities. This is an ongoing activity; it is not something that is handed off to the people once all the hard work is done.

#### *Comments from participants:*

The *EC Chair* made a comment regarding HD. In CRN I, the requirement for HD activities was not in the original call for proposals and was asked for later. In CRN II, HD were included in the call, therefore, all researchers know they have to include HD component in their projects. She was worried because this pressure for more HD might overload the PIs and asked for the SAC chair opinion on this issue.

*The SAC Chair:* Even though the HD component was included in the call, the extent to which HD is incorporated in each of the CRN II projects is quite variable. In some cases it is an attachment to the project, in other cases it is fully woven into the science plan. The SAC agrees that this cannot be seen as a new forced requirement on CRN IIs. It has to be presented as a win-win situation, as an arrangement that will allow each of the CRN IIs to do new things and by providing some supplemental funding through the HD initiative. It is not a request as in CRN I (after the contract was signed, the work plan was in place and some time later they were asked to do some additional items). The arrangement this time is officially different, presented as a new opportunity as opposed to an additional action that has to be added to the work plan.

*IAI Director* explained the new HD program would alleviate pressures because they are independent proposals from new groups, from experts who can bring their disciplines to the CRNs. That should make the incorporation easier than it was before because the teams usually reported back that they did not have the experts to guide them. This is a new opportunity for these experts to come forward and interact with the teams in place, and might be seen as a relief rather than an additional imposition. He added that, as a previous CRN I PI, one of the principal reasons for the overload at that stage was that the IAI changed course many times during the program and the demands kept changing. IAI Directorate is now engaged in very rigorous communication with the projects from the very beginning. The other reason for the overload phenomenon possibly was that IAI totally excluded communications through co-PIs, everything was channeled through the PIs.

*Canada* asked the SAC Chair what kind of strategy he would take to get HD scientists from universities and research institutions actually agree to work on applied problems.

*The SAC Chair* answered that one of the key things was searching for people who could come with their own disciplinary views but able to look beyond their own discipline. As to how to do that, this funding opportunity will be immensely helpful. The call will include linking up with existing CRN II projects so that even during the proposal writing stage there will be an opportunity to try to develop relationships among the various members.

*Argentina* recalled that the assignment of SAC members to projects did not work well during CRN I, and asked the SAC chair how he would prevent this from happening with the clusters in CRN II.

He also said that the CRNs are the core programs of the IAI and 5 years is a long period of time. However, the IAI has to show what it is doing. During CRN 1, the PIs were under the pressure of doing science plus the reports to the IAI. When they were asked for a brief document for dissemination, they were overloaded. He suggested that the integration workshops could be a good opportunity to produce brief dissemination reports.

*SAC Chair:* In CRN II the SAC members will not only verify the advancement of the project (it is not necessary to duplicate the peer-review). The SAC is looking for a partnership and that is substantially different from CR I. He thanked for the recommendation about brief reports from the projects. The workshops are key opportunities for identifying synergies across the projects and produce brief reports.

*Second Vice-Chair:* Congratulated the SAC, above all for the strategic plan and the new directions for the CRN. She expressed concern about the implications that the clusters might have for the SAC membership. As to the need for some “mid-term” information, she suggested thinking about that in light of the new requirement for review of the CRNs after 2 years. That is an opportunity at which the results of the CRN would be put together in a way that could facilitate information transfer. She also pointed out that the ability to pull together science into information was one of the things that they were looking for in the new Program Officer.

*The EC Chair* asked how the different projects (based in different problems) would be unified. The *SAC Chair* answered it was a challenge. He stated that not all projects were going to be formed into clusters; some would remain lone projects. They were in the process of building some clusters and identifying which of the projects are best in terms of advancing IAI’s mission.

*IAI Director:* IAI is looking for opportunities on, within, and around proposals and research projects to generate programmatic knowledge. The idea is not to design programs and then ask projects to fit into these programs. Defining programs beforehand and forcing projects to fit kills science and the IAI’s programmatic approach should be understood as one of creating opportunities.

*Venezuela:* Talked about the experience of areas of work in networks, not as a program or cluster but as research projects where national capabilities are linked. They identified specific problems to be faced within a theme and then identified the areas that required more impact. Researchers formulated their projects according to these work strategies. This was successful in Venezuela.

## **2) Strategic Planning Process**

The SAC chair continued his report with the second point and first mentioned the strategic planning related to the IAI’s mission:

- Built on *understanding the integrated impacts, collaborative research and informed action*
- SAC continues to endorse this mission statement, especially high-quality science as the foundation for all other activities
- But it encourages better balance among the 3 components (enhance informed actions but not at expense of other two components)

IAI has done an extremely good job on the science of GEC and some impacts, an extremely good job on collaborative research and significantly advances on informed action but, clearly, the latter has been the less developed area.

As to expanding relevance science, the SAC chair emphasized that the question *relevant science for whom?* had to be addressed. The answer is not simple, but there are a few things that can be done to help understanding relevance:

- Embedding GEC within broader issues (e.g. economic development, poverty alleviation, equity).
- GEC at continental & regional scales => Expand existing GEC - local linkages  
He mentioned the example of Michael McClain's CRNI project about sedimentation in the upper edges of the Amazon river. They initially thought that their relevant group was national governments. The governments expressed interest in the project but there was no feedback from them. However, researchers found that at the local level there was enormous interest and support basically in issues related to local water pollution and also issues of GEC curricula in high schools. Then McClain's project became a model of how to make the global local. This is a very different relevance. Therefore, the question "relevance for whom" is crucial.

As part of the relevance, it is also important to think about some ways of filling the gaps to ensure that the IAI's portfolio of research activities become more balanced including the GEC science uptake by society. There are 4 main thematic areas:

- Peer-reviewed disciplinary science (IAI has been doing this successfully for many years)
- Peer-reviewed interdisciplinary science (the same kind of report as in disciplinary science but for a different audience)
- Science policy dialogues (regional & national) - (e.g. the first IAI policy brief published by UNESCO-SCOPE. The science-policy dialogue is a process that requires an ongoing well designed plan)
- Applications (Inclusion of GEC science into international development & resource management, mechanisms for broader dissemination of data & information, insuring the information is available after the life of the project (some sort of a large database, etc.)

Finally, the SAC Chair mentioned the SAC priorities for the next 5 years:

- Facilitate optimization CRN II outputs – The SAC will not only help in overseeing individual projects but also in synthesizing within clusters and across clusters.
- Determine emerging GEC science  
For example workshops are a good opportunity to foster multi-lateral dialogue between CRN II scientists, IAI countries, development agencies, NGOs/CSOs, etc.

- Expand the IAI – GEC community

The SAC chair emphasized that they had reached that point in the strategic planning process with full support and in collaboration with the IAI Directorate.

#### *Comments from participants*

*The EC Chair* asked about the implementation plan that would follow the strategic plan

*The SAC Chair* clarified that they were looking at describing a different way of doing science (and not a hard action stone science plan). If there is a mid-term synthesis of the CRN, under the applications side it means an opportunity to include them there (as opposed to at the end).

*IAI Director:* In terms of implementation, the strategic planning is a new exercise after a couple of years of dealing with problems rather than strategic thinking, but it does not represent anything new at all for the IAI. The IAI has had a science plan, a tremendous strategic thought in its program and we are picking up that tradition. If that tradition hasn't been fully implemented was perhaps due to lack of communication, lack of dialogue, lack of transparency, etc. The implementation means to take the points that the SAC Chair has

shown --that are not new in substance, but in synthetic achievement-- and to build an ongoing strong dialogue with scientists so that they are part of this process. The new series of workshops we are organizing with the scientists are opportunities for them to improve their science and to make their work more interesting and more exciting. We are seeing a change in mood rather a change in strategy.

*The First Vice Chair* emphasized that the importance of improving this dialogue between EC and SAC in sake of transparency. He thought that was the way to build our road map to the future and remarked the importance of looking for issues that are mainstream in the public opinion, in the mass media, in the geopolitics.

*The SAC Chair* agreed that the dialogue between SAC and EC was very important. He said the SAC wishes to take on information as part of its consultation. It is also important to recognize that the SAC will continue to be an independent organ. The SAC does not wish to be isolated; it wishes to be part of that dialogue.

### **3) SAC Renewal**

During the past 4 years, the focus of the IAI SAC has been on helping to implement the science plan. There have been 2 consequences of the SAC focusing on implementing the science plan through review of proposals:

- less time dedicated to strategic planning
- SAC members tended to “defend” their “science theme”

The SAC needs to look after the institute as a whole. Its job is not to defend particular areas of science but to look after the intellectual and scientific well-being of the IAI as an institution.

Now it is time to reorient and renew SAC as the Institute’s scientific intellectual motor. The SAC will try to optimize what is in the agenda today but insuring that larger questions came to IAI as an institute (to the Directorate, to the CoP and to the EC as well).

#### *Factors influencing renewal*

- Credible high quality science
- Different approaches in GEC science changes
- Urgency of GEC science
- Adjustments in funding institutions
- International development community emergent GEC interest
- Relationships with Global GEC programs
- More balanced delivery of IAI mandate (sciences & application)
- Departing SAC members (4 in mid -07, 2 in mid-08)

As 60 % of sac will be renewed during the next year, it is a big opportunity to reorient the SAC.

#### Departing Members **mid-2007:**

- Barros (end of 1<sup>st</sup> term, decided not to continue), Capote, Fernandez, Legey (end of second term)
- All CoP nominated
- Nominations & election required at next CoP in June 2007

#### Departing Members **mid-2008:**

- Brklacich & Garzoli (end of 2<sup>nd</sup> term)
- SAC nominated
- Nominations & election required at CoP 2008

The SAC has had a long talk in Cuernavaca about how to match the attributes of SAC members to its mandate. They decided that the most important factor was to fill some areas and also identified the following *General Attributes*:

- High caliber scientific background
- Able to work beyond the discipline & home country
- Integration – interdisciplinary appetite.

At the same time, the SAC chair emphasized that apart from the importance of individual members the overall make up of the team is also very important. He also clarified that it is not a one for one replacement for people that are leaving. It should be a reorientation.

The primary science gaps to be addressed are:

- Meteorology & climatology
- Biodiversity & ecosystems services
- Urban & energy
- Environment & economy

There are also some *secondary attributes* that could also be considered so long as the primary science gaps are filled:

- Links to international development
- Strong links to the broader GEC community
- Interdisciplinary science capacity

*Comments:*

*The EC Chair* thanked the SAC Chair for the recommendations and added another attribute: the North South balance. The SAC Chair thanked and apologized for the involuntary omission of that item.

*Costa Rica* asked the SAC chair which was, according to his perception, the way forward to orient this intellectual model in light of the SAC, the EC and the CoP.

*SAC Chair:* First of all, the level of trust has to be built, therefore the dialogue between SAC and EC and IAI Directorate is crucial. Another point is the focus on a balanced and relevant science portfolio of research programs during CRNII and beyond (i.e. the next generation of GEC science). The third point is that SAC renewal be integral to on-going development of IAI as Institute supporting advanced GEC science that is relevant to the region.

The EC members then discussed about the process of presenting nominations for the CoP.

*Canada* stated that an important message to pass to the CoP was what the SAC chair had said about the modification in the role of the SAC because that had to have an influence on the nominations and decision process and had to be separated from the purely bureaucratic process. Having the SAC become the intellectual motor, having it filled with people who have those all those attributes will mean a major transformation.

*The EC Chair* suggested asking the SAC chair writing a brief document with the SAC recommendations that would go out with the call for nominations.

*USA* suggested the documents of the strategic plan and for the renewal of the SAC be distributed with enough anticipation due to its fundamental importance.



*Argentina* said that in past elections, there were nominations submitted during the first day of the CoP. To make a deep analysis, it is important to have the complete list of nominees well in advance. He suggested fixing a deadline (if there is no rule against it), not inferior to 15 days before the CoP, for the submission of nominations so that everybody has enough time to analyze the complete list.

*The Chair of Rules Committee* (Lou Brown) said there was no a specific comments with respect to deadlines for nominations for the SAC in the rules. As the CoP tries to be as open as possible it can accept nominations until the last minute. However, the EC has the authority to recommend to the CoP and to ask the IAI Directorate --in its preparations for the CoP meeting-- to encourage the submission of nominations as far in advance as is needed in order to assist the Cop to make intelligent decisions.

The *IAI Director* added that perhaps some of the problems in the past in terms of timing simply had to do with the normal timing of the SAC meeting being approximately 1 month before the CoP. As the communication from the SAC has been received 6 months before the CoP meeting, there is plenty of flexibility for asking for full nominations and circulation of the documents well in advance of the meeting.

The EC asked the SAC Chair to prepare a brief document describing the profiles and attributes suggested for new SAC members. This document would go with the official call for nominations that should be sent to Member Countries before the next CoP. (*Action 3, Day 2*)

## 11. Science Presentations

The EC received the following science presentations:

- “Prácticas útiles asociadas a eventos meteorológicos extremos asociados a la variabilidad y el cambio climático en América Latina y el Caribe”, by Darysbeth Magaly Martínez (Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente)
- " SERVIR – Sistema de Regional de Monitoreo y Visualización para Mesoamérica", by Emilio Sempris (CATHALAC)
- "Indicadores Ambientales de Paama", by Diana Laguna (Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente)

## 12. Other issues

Margaret Leinen, head of the US delegation and Second Vice-Chair of the EC, announced that she would be leaving NSF in January 2007. She told the EC members that a successor would be named for her very quickly so that there would be a smooth transition. She informed the EC members she had spoken with the Director of NSF, who knows IAI very well and has highlighted the importance of the Institute. He indicated his strong support to IAI and expressed that the NSF remains strongly committed to IAI.

She also highlighted that outside of NSF, the US has strong participation through NOAA and the Department of State and both are taking a very active role in interactions with IAI.

Margaret had spent the last 35 years of her career in the academic sector and in government and she would leave both to go with the private sector. Her role will be the interaction with the science community and also with the US national and international institutional communities, NGOs, etc.

The *EC Chair* in the name on IAI congratulated her on her new job and said that she would be missed by all. She thanked her for her exceptional work and her commitment to the IAI cause.

The *Second Vice-Chair* stated the EC would be best served by having a full bureau, above all in this important time in the life of the IAI. Therefore, she was happy to resign the remainder of her term as a member of the Bureau so that the EC will be able to fill out the vacant position with another individual.

*Argentina* thanked the Second vice-chair for her attitude and suggested that the US alternate representative, Paul Filmer, replace her in the Bureau. Canada and Panama seconded the motion.

The EC elected Paul Filmer (USA) as Second Vice Chair of the EC Bureau to fill the vacancy left by Margaret Leinen. ( <i>Action 4, Day 2</i> ).
---

### **13. Approval of the Action List of Day 1**

The EC approved the Action List of Day 1 with some modifications already included in it. ( <i>Action 1, Day 2</i> )
---

### **14. Approval of items to be forwarded to the CoP**

The EC will forward to the CoP the Auditors Report and the recommendations for the nominations for the SAC positions.

### **15. Future meetings and Sites**

Brazil renewed its offer to host the next EC/CoP Meeting in Manaus during the second week of June 2007 ( <i>Action 5, Day 2</i> ).
--

### **16. Adjournment of the meeting**

The EC Chair said it had been a very productive meeting and thanked the EC representatives for their presence and Panama for the hospitality. She also thanked the IAI Directorate staff for their work.

Lou Brown, on behalf of the USA, thanked the EC chair for her effective leadership and chairmanship of the meeting. He considered that meeting had added new emphasis to the EC's involvement and concern with scientific issues and it was a very positive and constructive step.

The meeting was adjourned.

**23rd Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)  
December 9-10, 2006 – Panama City, Panama**

**Action List**

**Day 1: December 9**

1. The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty Third Meeting with a modification in the schedule of the invited presentations:

- The presentation about IGFA would be heard after the overview of the IAI Director.
- The presentations of the local scientists would be heard after lunch.

2. The EC approved the Report of its Twenty Second Meeting with a minor modification: in page 14 (*English version*), last paragraph, it should read: “involve more stake holders and actors *from* the private sector”

3. The EC accepted the Auditors Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2006 to be forwarded to the CoP.

4. The EC suggested that the IAI Directorate, -in future reports on contributions to the Core Budget, include additional information about Member Countries contribution history and payments in advance.

5. The EC endorsed the proposal of Argentina that, -in occasion of future adjustments in the contributions to the Core Budget-, the FAC and the IAI Directorate propose adjustments in 1000 USD steps. This was approved by CoP V but has not been ratified by the Member Countries yet. Therefore, a reminder should be sent to appropriate Member Countries to encourage the ratification process.

6. The EC decided to send an e-mail urgently to the chair of the IAI External Review Committee to ask for a detailed work plan and a status report, which should be sent to the EC members as soon as possible but not later than December 20<sup>th</sup>.

**23rd Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)  
December 9-10, 2006 – Panama City, Panama**

**Action List**

**Day 2: December 10**

1. The EC approved the Action List of Day 1 with some modifications already included in it.
2. The EC accepted the Financial Status Report as of November 2006 (Document 7).
3. The EC asked the SAC Chair to prepare a brief document describing the profiles and attributes suggested for new SAC members. This document would go with the official call for nominations that should be sent to Member Countries before the next CoP.
4. The EC elected Paul Filmer (USA) as Second Vice Chair of the EC Bureau to fill the vacancy left by Margaret Leinen.
5. Brazil renewed its offer to host the next EC/CoP Meeting in Manaus during the second week of June 2007.

## ACRONYMS

AFO	Administrative and Financial Officer
ANAM	Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente (Panama)
APN	The Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research
CATHALAC	Centro del Agua del Trópico Húmedo para América Latina y el Caribe
CICESE	Centro de Investigación Científica y de Educación Superior de Ensenada (México)
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CPTEC/INPE	Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos / Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais
CRN	Collaborative Research Network Program
DIS	Data and Information System
EC	Executive Council
EU	European Union
ESSP	Earth System Science Partnership
FAC	Financial and Administrative Committee (of the EC)
GEC	Global Environmental Change
IDRC	International Development Research Center - Canada
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme
IHDP	International Human Dimensions Programme
IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRI	International Research Institute for Climate Prediction
NCAR	National Center for Atmospheric Research (USA)
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Organization (USA)
NSF	National Science Foundation
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PI	Principal Investigator
RIOCC	Red Iberoamericana de Oficinas de Cambio Climático
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
SCRP	Rules and Procedures Standing Committee (of the CoP)
SO	Scientific Officer
START	System for Analysis, Research and Training

TCO	Training and Communications Officer
TI	Training Institute
TISG	Training Institute Seed Grant
UN	United Nations
UNA	Universidad Nacional de Asunción (Paraguay)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNCB	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
UN-ISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
WCRP	World Climate Research Program
WMO	World Meteorological Organization