

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH



Minutes of CE-XXXVII

August 12th, 2014

Mexico DF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Opening Remarks..... | 3 |
| 2. Approval of the Agenda..... | 4 |
| 3. Approval of the Report of the 35th and 36th Meetings of the EC..... | 4 |
| 4. Progress Report of the EC..... | 5 |
| 5. CoP Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison..... | 5 |
| 6. Committee to recommend candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members..... | 7 |
| 7. Financial and Budgetary Matters..... | 8 |
| 7.1. Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2012-2013 and Audit of 2012..... | 8 |
| 7.2. Core Budget and country contributions for FY 2014-2015..... | 11 |
| 7.3. Financial and Administrative Committee Report..... | 12 |
| 8. Discussion: strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding..... | 13 |
| 9. Report of the Meeting of Funding Agencies..... | 15 |
| 10. Report from the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite IAI Directorate..... | 16 |
| 11. Reports on Science and Capacity Building..... | 18 |
| 12. Initiatives with conventions and international organizations, collaborations of the IAI..... | 19 |
| 13. Report of the Standing Committee of Rules and Procedures..... | 20 |
| 14. Report of the SAC..... | 20 |
| 15. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP..... | 21 |
| 16. Adjourn..... | 21 |

Annex I: Action List of EC XXXVII

Annex II: Acronyms

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

Approved – August 2014

**37th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
12 August 2014 – Ciudad de Mexico, Mexico
AGENDA**

Morning session (08:30 – 12:30)

Registration

Welcome by Representative of Mexico

Welcome by EC Chair

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 35th and 36th Meetings of the EC

Discussion on SAC renewal and establishment of a committee to recommend candidates for the SAC election

Report of the EC: *EC Chair*

- Activities charged to the EC and its Bureau

- Activities, actions, and decisions of the EC Bureau or its members

Advances towards the establishment of a Science-Policy Advisory Committee

Financial and Budgetary matters:

- Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2013-2014 and Audit of 2013 - *Rafael Atmetlla*

- Core Budget and Country Contributions for FY 2014-2015

- Financial and Administrative Committee Report - *William Smith*

Discussion: strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding

General comments and discussion on Finances

Receival of the Auditors Report and approval of Financial Status Report, financial items to be forwarded to the CoP

Report on the Implementation of the Tripartite Agreement - *Directorate and Implementation committee*

Afternoon session (02:00 – 06:00)

Reports on Science and Capacity Building *IAI Directorate & SAC Chair*

Initiatives with conventions and international organizations, collaborations of the IAI - *IAI Directorate*

Presentation of EC and CoP rules - Rules and Procedures Committee - *Louis B. Brown*

Report of the committee to recommend candidates for the election of SAC members

Approval of the items to be forwarded to the CoP - *EC Chair*

Adjourn

1. Opening Remarks

María Amparo Martínez Arroyo, representative of Mexico welcomed the parties on behalf of the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change and wished a successful meeting. Carlos Ereño, EC Chair, opened the meeting and thanked the host country.

After the introductory remarks, the EC determined that the quorum was present. Participants at the meeting were:

EC Country Representatives –

Argentina: Carlos Ereño (EC Chair)

Brazil: Jean Pierre Ometto, Pablo Braga Costa Pereira

Canada: Eric Gagné, Lauren Walshe Rouseel
Paraguay: Fernando Méndez Gaona
Uruguay: Jorge Rucks (EC Vice Chair)
USA: Maria Uhle (EC Vice Chair), Farhan H. Akhtar

Observers – Member Countries:

Chile: Gladys Santis
Costa Rica: Roberto Villalobos
Mexico: María Amparo Martínez Arroyo, Alejandra López Carbajal, Misael Perez,
Socorro Almaraz Muñoz, Mario Pampini, Rodolfo Godínez,
Alejandro Rivera Becerra
Panama: Ayxa Chuljak
Peru: Elizabeth Silvestre Espinoza

Observers – Other Institutions

UNESCO: Lidia Brito, Denise Gorfinkiel
AAAS: MargaGual Soler
CEPAL: Diana Ramírez
CONACyT: Luis G. Hernández-Sandoval
FAPESP: Reynaldo Victoria
CONICET: Viviana Alvarez
ICSU-ROLAC: Jose Arturo Martinez
APN: Lou Brown

IAI Directorate:

Holm Tiessen (Executive Director), Rafael Atmetlla (Director, Finance and Administration), Marcella Ohira (Director, Capacity Building), Elma Montaña (Director, Science Programs), Nicolás Lucas (Communications and Policy Specialist), Tania R. Freire Sánchez (Assistant to the IAI Director), Paula Richter (IAI Publications Editor), Elvira Gentile (IAI Directorate support).

IAI SAC Chair

Frank Muller-Karger

IAI Chair of the Rules and Procedures Committee

Louis Brown

2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Seventh Meeting with the following modifications:

- The report of the Scientific Advisory Committee was postponed to the end of the afternoon session.
- Maria Uhle, representative of the US will present the report of the Financial and Administrative Committee instead of William Smith.
- New item: report of the meeting of Funding Agencies, held on 11 August 2014 (*Action 1*).

3. Approval of the Report of the 35th and 36th Meetings of the EC

The EC approved the reports of the 35th and 36th Meetings of the Executive Council (*Action 2*).

4. Progress Report of the EC

The EC chair, Carlos Ereño, reported on, a) the activities charged to the EC by the CoP, and b) other activities, actions, and decisions of the EC Bureau or its members (document 9 of the Meetings Twiki site).

a) Activities charged by the CoP to the EC

The CoP 21 approved the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison to provide advice to the CoP and the IAI Directorates on how to use and design science for policy and decision-making. Additionally, the CoP charged the EC and the Directorate with the drafting of the terms of reference for this committee as well as the preparation of a list of possible candidates to be considered by the next CoP. During the intersession an ad hoc committee drafted the Terms of Reference.

The last EC also suggested reviewing the IAI Strategic Plan in the light of the new initiatives arising in the IAI and the global environmental research landscape (with new funding strategies such as Future Earth and/or associations of regional funding agencies. The IAI Directorate convened a meeting of funding agencies to the EC/CoP meetings, and the EC will have a report.

Last year the EC considered the extraordinary situation of the SAC regarding the lack continuity in its membership. The measures adopted by CoP 21 allowed to improve the situation, but as the SAC Chair has expressed in his recent note to CoP members, some problems still persist. With the aim of maintaining the continuity in the actions of the SAC, it will be necessary to consider again the exceptional reappointment of some members that are finishing their second term.

b) Activities, actions and decisions of the EC Bureau or its members

On June 20-21, 2013, the EC Chair participated in the Kick Off Meeting of ENSOCIO LA. After this meeting and with the input of all participating institutions, a data base was built of international projects in LAC on resource efficiency, climate change and raw materials financed by the European Union, or by regional mechanisms such as the IAI or the Inter American Development Bank. This database is contains 186 projects on climate change, 261 on resources efficiency and 87 on raw materials. At the International Workshop ENSOCIO-LAC held in June, the most promising areas for Europe-Latin-American cooperation were identified and three main groups were established: Biodiversity, land use change and climate services, Urban and rural Hydrology, and raw materials (waste). Three projects funded by the IAI participated at the Cancun Workshop and were considered as potential applicants of a proposal to be funded within the framework of EU Horizon 2020.

5. CoP Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison

The *IAI Executive Director* explained the Directorate was charged with the process of establishing a Committee that can help the IAI develop further its science-policy interface. The explicit mandate was to make it inclusive beyond national governmental representation bringing representatives from the private sector, NGOs, of different governmental levels (from municipalities to international bodies). This body is to be constituted at CoP 22 without an election process. CoP 21 provided no explicit tools on how to move forward with that mandate, so the Directorate has taken the initiative of starting a consultative process with those people that contributed to the Science-Policy event at the CoP in Washington. The IAI SP consultant contacted people and made a series of interviews with the aim of getting advice on how to conform such a committee and finally ask them for suggestions for potential candidates. (Details in Doc Nro. 11 in the twiki site that contains a proposal by the Directorate on establishing an initial Committee on Science Policy).

Nicolas Lucas provided background on the creation of the committee. The AAAS evaluation had concluded that the IAI had achieved excellent science but it was weak in the liaison with policy. In 2012, the Cop 20 created the Science Policy Liaison Directorate, with an office in Buenos Aires, as part of the tripartite directorate. The Cop also decided it would be useful to have an advisory committee, similar to the SAC, but focused in the relation science-policy. Some countries and the IAI Directorate were charged to outline the initial ToRs and a list of potential candidates. This ad hoc committee, with the input of the SAC, finished the ToRs by the end of 2013. The second task was to provide a list of candidates. Since the IAI is not the first institute with a committee of this type, the idea was to gain experience from similar institutions. The IAI Director requested advice from four leading policy-makers from different sectors with significant experience in science-policy relations:

- ✓ Walter Baethgen, Uruguay and USA. Director, Regional Program for Latin America and the Caribbean, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, Columbia University. IAI SAC member.
- ✓ Luis Basterra, Argentina. President, Commission for Agriculture, Chamber of Deputies, National Congress of Argentina. Former Minister of Production and Environment, Province of Formosa, Argentina.
- ✓ Carlos H. Brito Cruz, Brazil. Scientific Director, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Sao Paulo (FAPESP).
- ✓ Yolanda Kakabadse, Ecuador. President, WWF International. Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador

The purpose of the consultation was to assist the Director in drafting the design of the Science-Policy Advisory Committee, and for the interviewees to suggest names of potential candidates.

IAI Executive Director: Now we have a list of 24 names but we do not have a mechanism to move forward these names to the CoP and establish the committee. These are our suggestions: we tried to develop a list that is representative of the region. We are aware that there are gaps. The strong advice was to establish the committee quickly, to ask members to take on mandates varying in between one to 3 years. I am asking the EC how you would wish to proceed with the establishing of the committee and forward these names to the CoP.

Some representatives felt the list was not very representative and they would like to have more time to submit potential candidates. *Canada* for example is making a selection process in the country to recommend highly experienced candidates. The *IAI Executive Director* explained that the list made by the Directorate was only a first approach following the only mandate of not replicating the CoP. Finally the EC agreed that in this transition period, it would be appropriate to move forward with an initial committee (CoP rules provide for the CoP to establish a committee and its initial composition, which can be modified later), that would adjust the ToRs, define profiles, provide advice on future candidates, etc.

Canada: Part of the rationale for us being comfortable with an interim committee is that in Canada we have set up a process to come up with our own list of who are the science policy experts in Canada. I convened a group of NGOs, the federal and provincial public service, and academia and I have a group of peers searching in different parts of Canada (not only Federal Government) in order to be able to come up with our short list. We are hoping that having an interim committee will allow us to find our 6 or 7 candidates that we will bring to the CoP next year. That will be voted not only by the Government but also by the community relevant to science policy in Canada. We will be comfortable with an initial Committee, in particular if most members have 1 year term to set it up so that we would have time to bring forward our nominations next year.

The *Executive Director* added that the 3 candidates nominated by the IAI Directorate would have a 3-year term in order to give the process continuity and 6 candidates would be chosen by the CoP following a process to be determined by the EC. He also recalled that from the 9 members of the SPAC 3 are nominated by the IAI Directorate, 3 by the CoP, and 3 from the SPAC itself.

Peru: We would like that the representation of the Andean Region be considered in the selection process, as well as the gender issue.

The EC decided to create a committee to recommend candidates to the Science-Policy Committee (SPAC). Members of this committee are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, and the US. This committee will recommend 6 candidates from an original list of 24 candidates suggested by the Directorate. According to the ToRs, the SPAC will be composed of 9 members (3 elected by the Directorate, 3 by the CoP and 3 by the SPAC itself). However, in this first occasion, since the SPAC does not exist yet, 6 positions will be nominated by the CoP and appointed for only one-year term. This will allow an additional year for all IAI member countries to identify candidates and participate in the nomination process. Members of the SPAC can be renominated.

The three SPAC members nominated by the Directorate nominations are: Luis Basterra (Chamber of Deputies, National Congress of Argentina), Yolanda Kakabadse (International President of WWF) and Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz (Science Director of FAPESP, São Paulo, Brazil). Their term of appointment is three years (*Action 3*).

The EC members reviewed the list of 24 potential candidates submitted by the Directorate. The 3 candidates selected by the IAI Directorate were removed from the list. Canada also requested removing the two Canadian candidates because there is a process moving forward in Canada to bring names next year. Three alternates were also selected.

The EC accepted the report of the Committee to recommend 6 candidates for the SPAC. The nominated members are: Boris Graizbord, Bob Corell, Brigitte Baptiste, Emilio Moran, Walter Baethgen, Maria Netto Schneider, and alternates Janet Ranganathan, Anthony Clayton, and Max Campos. The report will be forwarded to the CoP (*Action 13*).

6. Committee to recommend candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members

The EC Chair explained that according to the letter sent by the SAC Chair to the CoP in July, there is a need to appoint five members to the IAI SAC in 2014. Four (4) members will have their terms expire in mid-2014. Two of these are eligible for reappointment to a second term. In addition, there is an unfilled membership in the SAC (the new member appointed by the CoP in 2013 also resigned in 2013 for personal reasons).

The SAC provided the following recommendations to the CoP to fill the upcoming slots in the SAC:

- 1) Re-elect the two members completing their first term who are eligible for a second term (José Marengo & Rodolfo Dirzo)
- 2) Reappoint in an extraordinary manner the following two members for two years to maintain continuity in the SAC (Frank Muller Karger (chair) and Walter Baethgen). The SAC has prepared a list of potential nominees in case the CoP does not agree to the extension of one or both mandates (because they are SAC-nominated positions).
- 3) The CoP needs to nominate and appoint one scientist of their choosing to the SAC to fill the slot that requires a CoP nomination.

The EC decided that the members of the committee to review the CVs of nominees to the Scientific Advisory Committee would be Argentina, Chile, USA, and the SAC Chair and the Director for Science Programs as members ex officio. The committee will take into consideration the need for extraordinary extension of the terms of appointment of the SAC Chair and one SAC member to maintain continuity on the SAC (*Action 4*).

Report of the Committee (recommendation to the CoP):

In the afternoon session the Committee reviewed the CVs of 5 candidates nominated by the SAC and 2 nominated by the parties to fill 5 vacancies.

Since Walter Baethgen and Carlos Joly were nominated for both the SAC and the SPAC), the committee recommended Carlos Joly for the SAC and preferred to set apart Walter Baethgen as a potential SPAC candidate.

The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SAC members recommending the reelection of José Antonio Marengo Orsini and Rodolfo Dirzo for a second term, and the election of Trevor Platt (from SAC nominations); and Carlos Joly (from CoP nominations) The committee also recommended that the term of Frank E. Müller Karger be extended for two years to help with the continuity of SAC activities. The report will be forwarded to the CoP (*Action 11*).

7. Financial and Budgetary Matters

Rafael Atmetlla (Assistant Director, Finance and Administration) made a presentation on the financial status for FY 2013-2014 and Audit of year 2013 (further details in the Addendum of Document 10 in the Meetings Twiki site).

7.1. Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2012-2013 and Audit of 2012

Status of the Core Budget

As of June 30, 2014 the funds collected (cash incomes) represent 98% of the approved contributions for the fiscal year 2013/2014. Table I shows the status of the contributions received as of June 30, 2014.

Table 1. Core Budget 2013/2014
Status of Country Contributions as of June 30, 2014 (Amount in US\$)

| | Contribution for FY 13/14 | Paid in 2013/14 to be applied to: | | | Due as of 30-Jun-14 |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | | Arrears | Current Year | Advances | |
| Argentina | 63000 | | | | 204.957 |
| Bolivia | 5000 | | | | 40.000 |
| Brazil | 110.000 | | | | 220.000 |
| Canada | 159.000 | | (159.000) | | - |
| Chile | 7.000 | | (2.000) | (3.000) | (3.000) |
| Colombia | 12.000 | | (12.000) | | 0 |
| Costa Rica | 5.000 | | (4.931) | | 17.631 |
| Cuba | 5.000 | | | | 50.067 |
| Dominican Republic | 5.000 | | | | 85.000 |
| Ecuador | 5.000 | | (5.000) | | - |
| Guatemala | 5.000 | | | | 85.000 |
| Jamaica | 5.000 | | | | 50.000 |
| México | 77.000 | | | | 77.000 |
| Panamá | 5.000 | | (5.000) | | - |
| Paraguay | 5.000 | | | | 46.371 |
| Perú | 5.000 | (10.657) | | | 27.694 |
| Uruguay | 5.000 | | | | 5.000 |
| USA (*) | 762.000 | (290.319) | (762.000) | | - |
| Venezuela | 41.000 | (12.500) | | | 352.521 |
| Totals | 1.286.000 | (313.476) | (949.931) | (3.000) | 1.258.242 |
| | | | Total revenues | | (1.263.407) |
| | | | Total advances | | (3.000) |
| | | | Contributions not received | | (22.593) |

The response from the countries to the IAI contacts has decreased, with some of the biggest parties of the Institute failing to pay their dues before the end of the fiscal year. The impact of these missing contributions is critical as the funds missing at the close of the fiscal year amount to US\$ 360,000, which creates a difficult financial environment for IAI. Issues are remaining with countries that continue to accumulate unpaid contributions. Venezuela continues to make partial payments (payments are only received from the Ministry of Science and Technology) and its debt now totals US\$352,521. Guatemala and Dominican Republic have paid no contributions.

Offsetting some of these losses is the US contribution, which at the close of the fiscal year is at zero. This shows the effect of a plan made with the US representation and the FAC to collect all contributions for the past 3 years. The new award for the US contributions is expected to be in place by Oct 1st 2014.

The IAI needs more support from the member countries, as contributions should be received at the earliest from all members. We have undertaken additional collection efforts with positive results, however some major contributors are still not paying the full amounts, and some small countries are not contributing, and therefore, the balance of pending contributions continues to increase: the total amount not yet collected is now US\$1.26 million.

Expenses

The following table shows the expenses at the close of April 2014 (ten months into the fiscal year). This comparison shows the status of the core budget compared to the actual expenses in the corresponding period (5/6 of the total approved budget). These expenses include the provisions for holidays, contributions to social security, and depreciation of fixed assets.

Budget Performance

July 2013 - April 2014

| Category | Actuals 2013/2014 | YTD Budget 2013/2014 | Difference | % |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Salaries & Benefits | 711.966 | 772.999 | (61.032) | -7.9 % |
| Travel & Training | 18.504 | 82.733 | (64.229) | -77.6 % |
| Equipment | 6.017 | 8.917 | (2.900) | -32.5 % |
| Operational Costs | 432.843 | 138.446 | 294.397 | 212,6 % |
| Dissemination & Outreach | 31.130 | 32.500 | (1.370) | -4.2 % |
| Director's Fund | 16.039 | 45.000 | (29.961) | 64.4 % |
| Total | 1.216.499 | 1.080.595 | (135.905) | -12,6 % |

- At the close of April 2014, the expenses were 12.6% higher than the 10-month budget, due to the effect of Operational Costs for activities related office implementation in Uruguay.
- Savings on all other budget categories.
- Total annual performance is expected at -5% under the full-year budget.
- All funds from Director's Fund have been delayed or frozen, awaiting contribution payments from member countries.

Cash balance and CB Reserves

The cash balance at the end of April 2014 was 53.6% higher than the ending balance at the end of March 2013. Program Funds from NSF have been requested and the balance of Cash-on-hand for these funds is zero, consistent with the change of policy in NSF.

The Cash reconciliation reflects a slightly improved position in the core budget, with reserves covering 3.9 months of operations; if the committed funds by the US are taken into consideration, the current available funds cover 9.4 months of operations, unchanged from last year.

Cash Reconciliation at the end of Apr-14 (Amounts in US\$)

| | Mar -13 | Apr-14 | Variance |
|---------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| Program Funds | (66.361,97) | 114.854,73 | 173,1% |
| IAI CB Funds | 415.173,04 | 421.038,14 | 1,4% |
| Total Cash | 348.811,07 | 535.892,87 | 53,6% |

Administrative Area*Local staff hired by INPE:*

Contracts were cancelled in October 2012. The Staff was hired directly by IAI with Core Budget funds, This represents a breach of the Host Country Agreement over the past two years and is one of the reasons for the relocation of administration..

Tripartite Agreement Implementation:

- Move to Uruguay completed (cost US\$175k) – includes Directorate and Staff move and furniture and equipment for offices.
- Current contribution situation directly affects the ability of IAI to hire new staff. All new hiring is suspended and non-essential expenses are frozen.

Internal controls and Audit

- No pending items on internal controls from the FAC or External Auditors.

- External Audit report which was delayed last year was received. The latest report (12/13) was also received
- A non-critical control issue was raised by the External Auditors related to project oversight and adjustments, a solution however is already in place and a clean audit is expected for next year (at the close of CRN2 in the books).

Uruguay: we have already committed the payments for 2013/14 (there was a delay due to the funds assigned to the organization of the CoP last year). In addition, according to the host agreement, Uruguay contributes with the offices (USD 30,000 in rest per year) and support staff. This amounts to additional USD 50,000, which is a big effort for our country and an indication of our commitment.

Mexico and Argentina explained that since the fiscal year in their countries is from January to December (not like the IAI) sometimes there were some delays in the contribution, but fortunately payments were ready and they would try to avoid delays the following year.

Brazil: we have information from the ministry that they were processing part of the contribution.

The EC also received the Auditors report of year 2013 (Document 14 in the twiki site). It was a clean audit.

The EC accepted the Financial Report and the Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, and will forward them to the CoP (*Action 8*).

7.2. Core Budget and country contributions for FY 2014-2015

Rafael Atmetlla presented the core Budget Request for FY 2014-2015 (further details in Document 13 in the Meeting Twiki site). The proposed FY 14/15 budget amount increases the operational budget of the Institute by 6% as proposed over the previous year. The budget considers a proposal for changes in the total contribution amount, as was anticipated the previous year. The proposed budget level allows IAI to continue with an improved level of activities and services and compensation for additional liabilities that have in the past not been included in the budget. The proposed budget estimates the full cost for the following fiscal year operating in Montevideo plus 2 transition staff in Brazil for up to 6 months.

Table 4: Core Budget Request (*Amounts in US\$*)

| Amounts in US\$ | Fiscal Year 2014-2015 | Fiscal Year 2013-2014 | Difference |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Salaries & Benefits | 977.702 | 927.599 | 50.103 |
| Travel | 99,280 | 99.280 | - |
| Equipment | 10,700 | 10,700 | - |
| Operational Costs | 189.346 | 166.135 | 23.211 |
| Dissemination & Outreach | 39,000 | 39.000 | - |
| Director's Fund | 54,000 | 54,000 | - |
| Total | 1.370.028 | 1,296.714 | 73.314 |

Member Country Contributions to the Core Budget

For fiscal year 2014-2015, the IAI Directorate is proposing a 8.9% increase in the level of contributions from the previous fiscal year (which had been constant for 4 years). This increase was originally planned and delayed the previous fiscal year (2013-2014), however is consistent with the data presented for the previous budget at the last EC/CoP.

Table 5: Current Contribution to CB by country (Amounts in US\$)

| Country | % (*) | Contribution | |
|--------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Argentina | 5.01 | 63,000 | 69.000 |
| Bolivia | 0.07 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Brazil | 8.73 | 110,000 | 120.000 |
| Canada | 12.63 | 159,000 | 173.000 |
| Chile | 0.55 | 7,000 | 8.000 |
| Colombia | 0.96 | 12,000 | 13.000 |
| Costa Rica | 0.13 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Cuba | 0.13 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Dominican Republic | 0,18 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Ecuador | 0.18 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Guatemala | 0.13 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Jamaica | 0.18 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| México | 6.21 | 77,000 | 85.000 |
| Panamá | 0.13 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Paraguay | 0.20 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| Peru | 0.42 | 5,000 | 6.000 |
| Uruguay | 0.27 | 5,000 | 5.000 |
| USA | 60.75 | 762,000 | 831.000 |
| Venezuela | 3.27 | 41,000 | 45.000 |
| Fund Total | 100.00 | 1,286,000 | 1.400.000 |

(*): This percentage represents the participation of each member country in the distribution of the operational costs of the Directorate according to the OAS Table of Contributions for 2001. The 26th EC requested contributions in multiples of US\$1,000 implemented in 2007

With the current forecast for contributions, IAI expects to fund 100% of the 2014/2015 budget, either by current year contributions or payments to previous year's contributions; however we will continue to pursue the maximization of these funds and to get all member countries to participate in and contribute to the IAI's activities.

The EC accepted the Core Budget request for 2014-2015 and will forward it to the CoP for approval (*Action 6*).

The EC accepted to forward the proposed changes in the level of Country Contributions for 2014-2015 to the CoP for approval (*Action 7*).

7.3. Financial and Administrative Committee Report

Maria Uhle, presented the report on behalf of William Smith (See document 16 in the Meetings twiki site). She explained the FAC had received and reviewed the IAI's core budget request for FY 14/15, and recommended that the Executive Council forward it to the Conference of the Parties for approval.

The FAC found the budget request to be responsive to the changing nature of IAI operations as the headquarters transitions to a new location and additional offices are established, and the proposed expenses reasonable and appropriate.

The FAC noted that the proposed budget includes an annual \$30,000 payment toward the salary of a Director for Communications in Argentina, which was established by a resolution of the 19th Council of the Parties. The resolution establishing that office reads in part “We agree that this should be implemented in a manner neutral to the IAI Core Budget” and the FAC noted that this budget element may not be consistent with the CoP resolution and that the Executive Council may wish to consider the appropriateness of this particular budget element.

The FAC recently received the independent auditors’ report on the IAI financial statement for fiscal year 2012-13. The FAC was pleased with the overall finding that the IAI’s financial statement presented fairly in all material respects the financial position of the IAI. However, the auditors also noted that the way the IAI recognizes awardees’ expenses and reconciles those against documented expenses at a future date might lead to adjustments in the statements from prior years. The FAC works with IAI in considering ways to address this issue

The FAC is a subcommittee of the Executive Council, and typically has a charter renewed every two years. The current charter expires at the conclusion of the first EC meeting in 2014 (August 12, 2014 in this case). Membership on the FAC is established by country instead of by individual, and all countries are invited to participate. The countries currently serving on the FAC (USA, Canada, Brazil) are willing to continue in that capacity. The FAC recommends that the EC renew the existing charter for an additional two years and that any countries interested in participating on the FAC contact the chair of the Executive Council.

The EC decided to renew the charter and composition of the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC) for the next two years (*Action 5*).

8. Discussion: strengthening member country involvement and IAI funding

The EC Chair recalled Action 5 from EC 36 in order to follow up on these suggestions:

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

The *IAI Executive Director* reported on the funding of the Science Program and the Core Budget. In terms of funding of the Science programs there is a very major contribution by USA and additional contributions by Canada’s IDRC, private Foundations like the Mac Arthur Foundation, and a contribution by Argentina’s CONICET towards the CRN3 Program. It would be desirable to have more leverage on the science funding.

For many years IAI had a considerable leverage of funds, for example the CRN2 raised secondary funds 27 million dollars. Those funds do not appear in the books of IAI unless they are managed within an agreement like the one with CONICET that states the commitment of some funds for projects of the

IAI. IAI would like to see more agreements like this one. In order to enhance multilateral cooperation, IAI called a meeting of the Funding Agencies of the continent. Several countries participated and many more showed interest (see report in item 8)

Regarding country participation, there have been some positive developments, including new representatives in Chile and Peru. For many years the representation of Chile was associated to a public funding institution that showed little interest in IAI. The IAI Directorate has invited and confirmed the participation of the Ministry of the Environment and is working in many other countries including Peru on broadening the base of contacts within the country. It will be easier for Institutions to deal with the contribution if they have the support of other bodies in their country.

The most important part of the IAI Program in terms of local visibility is the *Capacity Building Program*. Every time the IAI makes an event in one particular member country, that creates a lot of visibility because apart from scientists, it convenes policy-makers, decision makers, civil society and also the private sector.

Some time ago there was a suggestion regarding voluntary contributions. The contributions of member countries are voluntary, but Parties have suggested that once an annual budget has been decided, resulting contributions become obligatory so that it would be easier for the representatives to ask for the funding. This is an issue to discuss in the future.

Uruguay: we member countries have been weak in strengthening the cohesion of institutions within our countries. We have focused in only one institution as representative and that implied a fragmented participation. We have the responsibility of generating spaces of connection of global change activities. In Uruguay we are creating a National Committee for the IAI with the participation of the academic sector and government (not only the environmental area but also science and technology, education, agricultural development, etc.). We want to coordinate IAI work through a national committee with the participation of other governmental sectors.

Canada: commented regarding moving forward the language from voluntary to mandatory. Canada contributes to other international platforms such as the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, the IPCC, with a contribution similar to that of the IAI. These contributions are also voluntary. We could look how are countries providing contributions to other international organizations, what wording do they use, etc.

Executive Director: the IAI Directorate could ask the new Science-Policy Liaison Directorate, the SAC and the SPAC to find patterns of funding and see how countries manage this kind of funding and on what rules and regulations.

I am glad to see initiatives like the Committee for the IAI in Uruguay, or the broad consultation for nominating science-policy candidates in Canada. Uruguay also has a National Committee on Climate Change, with broad representation of secretariats and ministries, including public health, environment, education, meteorological services, etc. I think a recommendation towards the CoP and by the CoP to its Member Countries would be to try to broaden the representation of the groups of interest within their countries beyond representative's institutions. We have some examples that are very encouraging. This is the direction to go.

USA: the US has been the backbone of the CRN. Current program CRN3 funds will run out in September 2016 and it will be up to the Directorate to submit a new proposal for funding of CRN type activities. We have been under increasing pressure in the US to justify our involvement in international activities and to justify funding for developed countries. I had this discussion with the Asia Pacific Network and the idea now moving forward is that US funds will be used to support developing countries

only. Therefore in two years there will be a shock to the system about which countries will be able to receive funds from the US in terms of supporting their research directly.

In yesterday's meeting with funding agencies we have discussed ways for filling that gap. There are many countries here that can support their own researchers and I would like to push the members here and the members of the CoP to get their funding agencies together to talk about funding multi lateral projects within the Americas.

EC Chair: based on the experience of the CONICET from Argentina I invite other countries to consider similar arrangements. Most countries have funding systems; they could commit some of the funds they are already providing to be used by their scientists in IAI programs.

IAI Executive Director: Sometimes these additional funds require a lot of work from the IAI Directorate. In the case of Canada for example, we have targeted activities for IAI. The IAI Directorate is the recipient of the funds. We do not have enough staff to manage projects. We have to be careful with the flow of funds.

CONICET: In the case of Argentina, the Mincyt paid the contribution but CONICET had almost not participation. Now, through our agreement, we choose the themes of our interest and fund our scientists in those projects.

The EC strongly encouraged that all IAI member countries broaden the representation of the groups of interest beyond the representatives' institutions, following the example of Uruguay National IAI Committee (*Action 10*).

9. Report of the Meeting of Funding Agencies

The *IAI Executive Director* reported on the Funding Agencies meeting held on August 11th. The global change scientific organizations around the globe (IGBP, IHDP, Diversitas, etc.) are merging into a new initiative called Future Earth. As part of the development of Future Earth's global secretariat, IAI offered to provide the regional link for Latin America, and potentially all of the American Continent. This proposal has been accepted. In a joint initiative with CONICET of Argentina, CONACYT of Mexico, FAPESP of São Paulo State, Brazil, the IAI is now part of the task of developing a global, inclusive, equitable science governance initiative to guide global change research for the future.

In order to consolidate the participation of funding agencies of the continent in the funding of global change research, based on the experience of Future Earth and the Belmont Forum (group of funding agencies supporting Global Change Research), it would be good if we had a similar structure on the continent. Some months ago we started contacting agencies in all Member Countries, many of them came to the meeting yesterday. The agenda had one single item: how can national funding agencies come together as a group to fund international science endeavors on global change under their common rules that prevent agencies from funding activities outside their borders.

- All funding agencies present were interested in such a mechanism of collaboration.
- All funding agencies have an interest in funding global change research in various forms of interdisciplinarity and realized that global change does not stop at boundaries and therefore that they need new mechanisms in order to come together to do effective global change research.
- The agencies also agreed that the currently successfully operational Belmont Forum might be a good example of how to organize the collaboration between funding agencies on this continent.

Therefore the documentation that establishes the Belmont Forum was distributed among funding agencies as well as the procedures for open calls, for the establishment of evaluation committees, for evaluation of proposals, for interchange of information on the evaluation, and for the final choice of funded proposals. These are now in the hands of the agencies to cross check against national legislations and see if this might help to develop the first trial projects of international collaborations in global change research between the different agencies that were present.

Because the funding agencies present came from La Plata Basin and the Andean region, the first trial projects may be:

1) Hydrology in mountainous zones that would involve Chile, Argentina, Peru. Peru would invite Ecuador and Colombia

2) Trial for LPB involving the State of San Pablo, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, that could not be present yesterday will also be contacted.

These projects are scheduled to be formulated around the end of the year in order to be able to take advantage of the next NSF funded call for small grants.

Dominican Republic was also present and expressed strong need for capacity building in proposal writing. Many small countries do not have a scientific community that is strong enough in this aspect. Since our selection of CRNs is based on scientific merit primarily, we have a problem to achieve geographic balance. The proposal from the Directorate to the group was to organize a Capacity Building event in the Dominican Republic on the best practices of writing interdisciplinary proposals which includes true integration between social and natural sciences.

EC Chair: There are other initiatives in the region like the European Union – Community for Latin America and the Caribbean (EU-CELAC) for scientific cooperation between both regions. It would be interesting to cooperate or establish links. Regarding the Caribbean, perhaps it is difficult to interact with one country alone but is easier with Caribbean communities like the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre that coordinates the region's response to climate change and has funds to support the participation of Caribbean countries in different activities.

The EC encouraged member countries to promote agreements for global change research between funding agencies, considering the funding model that is being developed by the group of funding agencies that met on August 11. Member countries can also participate in funding IAI science programs (Action 11).

10. Report from the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite IAI Directorate

Maria Uhle, chair of the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite IAI Directorate, reported on the implementation of the 3 offices in Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay (Document 8 in the Twiki site)

Integrated Operations and Finance Directorate (Montevideo, Uruguay): The host country agreement with Uruguay was ratified in November and came into force on December 13, 2013. Following this, the move of the office and families from Brazil was initiated and is complete. The office is largely operational. A problem arose in hiring local staff in Montevideo. To help with administrative and logistical tasks, IAI has hired one local logistics assistant who continued her employment beyond the move and will be in charge of travel and logistics for core, science and training activities etc. The contract issues between the Ministry and LATU have recently been resolved and LATU and IAI are

currently issuing a joint advertisement for the positions to be funded by Uruguay. It is hoped that staff will be hired within the next 2-3 months

Science-Policy Liaison Directorate (Buenos Aires, Argentina): The new science-policy liaison directorate of the IAI in Buenos Aires has its legal foundation in the new host country agreement signed on October 30, 2012 between IAI and Argentina. The Directorate has been provided with office space in the Ministry of Science, Technology and Productive Innovation (MinCyT) of Argentina. The IAI was permitted to renovate the office space ceded and conducted renovations December 2013 to March 2014. The office now has room for the Science-Policy Director and possibility of accommodating assistants and interns. Administrative issues caused a delay in the hiring of the elected Director, Dr Lindeman, because he has not finished the steps to legalize and homologize his foreign diploma in Argentina. Dr. Lucas continues to perform Science-Policy Liaison activities as consultant hired by the IAI Executive Directorate.

Science Development Directorate (São José dos Campos, Brazil): In reviewing the proposed Host Country Agreement between the Government of Brazil and the IAI, the Committee identified several concerns. As written, the agreement specifically mentions the Science Development Directorate rather than the IAI in many cases. If the agreement only pertains to the Science Development Directorate and not the IAI as a whole we may encounter difficulties when IAI staff from other Directorates or property from other Directorates is located in Brazil. The Committee is working with the counterparts in Brazil to resolve this issue. Jean Ometto has offered to help to accelerate this process.

Regarding the other task of the committee of developing indicators to evaluate the success of the implementation, as the whole structure is not established yet, it is premature to start an evaluation.

Executive Director: In the case of Brazil it is not only a matter of the revision of the host country agreement but at this point there is also no agreement on the profile of the potential Director or on the modality of hiring the staff or on what staff would be necessary. In the absence of the new office in Brazil, we currently still have 3 IAI staff there; two of these are positions that will be soon announced in Uruguay. Once the staff in Uruguay is hired, the staff from Brazil will interact with and train the new staff and eventually all current Brazilian staff will not be in the IAI office any longer. The current host country agreement between the IAI and Brazil stipulates various conditions under which the host country agreement will lapse and one of them is if the IAI is dissolved or the IAI abandons Brazil. IAI could be seen as abandoning Brazil and will have an automatic lapse of the agreement. So the slow progress over the last two years may come to an abrupt stop if it does not accelerate.

Argentina: The Science Policy Liaison Directorate is already operative, with one full time person. There have been problems in the hiring of the Director due to the delay in the revalidation process of his Mexican degree. If there is no solution soon, we will find an alternate. On the other hand, Argentina would be pleased to host the first meeting of the IAI Science-Policy Liaison Committee.

Uruguay: The host country agreement was unanimously ratified by the parliament and is in force. and additional agreement that permits the work of staff family within the country is ready to be signed. Additionally, the calls for support personnel have been issued (trilingual executive secretary and an accountant).

Executive Director: Uruguay has taken the step for first time in Uruguayan legislation to draft an agreement of work permits for dependents that is appropriate for an international organization.

The EC decided to recommend that the CoP renew the term, and allow for a possible modification of the structure and terms of reference of the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite Structure of the IAI (*Action 9*).

11. Reports on Science and Capacity Building

The *Executive Director* presented the underlying trends and ideas in Science and Capacity building (more details on the report of the IAI Directorate in Document 10, twiki site)

It has taken the Directorate and the SAC 2 years to implement the CRN3 that integrates human and natural sciences in a cohesive and credible way, that projects true collaboration, and that frames the problems of global change from the viewpoints of different disciplines. It was a long and rigorous process to put the program in place. The excellence of science breaks down quite regularly today when the scientific community is asked to address in a truly interdisciplinary way the problems that we have in global change.

Policy relevance of the research: science has to be communicated and geared towards the users, decision makers, policy makers. There is a tremendous opportunity for the CoP and for the new SPAC to think about these issues. There is a dialogue and an information flow between science and policy, but it is not well understood and it is often driven by headlines in newspapers rather than titles in scientific publications or outcomes in scientific workshops. Therefore 10% of the CRN budget was reserved for smaller projects that specifically address such topics as: how interdisciplinary teams are built, what are good practices to framing scientific approaches to real world problems, what are the social and scientific processes that we require for joint capacity building across the disciplines without diluting the scientific excellence of the proposals.

UNESCO has initiated a program specifically on science policy dialogue. Together with UNESCO, IAI will analyze some of the workshops planned for this year. IAI will also analyze its own programs, other programs such as IDRC programs and hopefully will be able to translate this into better knowledge and better practices of how to do science. That is the main concern of the science program at this point, which is also reflected in the capacity building programs that engage the scientists of our projects, policy makers and practitioners. Initially, IAI funded programs like any other funding agency: if a proposal was good, it was funded. However, it no longer does this. Now the Directorate and the SAC work with the teams to improve proposals. It is a learning process.

Argentina commented that many scientists feel it is difficult to get IAI funding because it is for people that is already in projects. He also asked about the timing of the small grants.

Executive Director: On the CRN 3 we received over 150 proposals of which we funded 10 major projects and seven small projects. There is always a difficult decision: if to fund new groups or maintain the investment in the previous ones. If a successful project reinvents itself it might be refunded. In some instances, especially in the small grants, we provide guidelines (only for people who have never been involved, or for regions that are underrepresented). The last call for small grants was specifically for developing further some of the best ideas in the collaborative research networks. The previous call for small grants was specifically for human dimensions because we thought it was underrepresented. There isn't a predictable framework in which calls will appear. The main reason for that is that the science of the IAI is funded basically by one country. We have the limitations of that funding to consider. The CRNs are for 5 years, there may be a small call every year, but we also need to accommodate the Capacity Building Program. The only way to go beyond that is to broaden the funding base. The

attempts to increase the funding have implied an overload on the IAI Directorate staff, for example the case of the IDRC project that had to be implemented by Directorate staff. It is very difficult to broaden the base and that is why we called the Funding Agencies Meeting.

USA: it is difficult to justify funds outside USA, especially for developed countries. With developing countries it is much easier. With the Belmont Forum scheme it is possible to leverage funds two or three times the national investment. I encourage us to think of this as a potential funding model as we move forward especially for larger projects. I am confident we can accommodate small projects but for larger projects we should bring funding agencies together.

Costa Rica: Costa Rica has as an objective to be carbon neutral towards 2021. We are asked to include tasks towards this goal in our budgets and our participation in the IAI is one of them. However, sometimes IAI assigns funds to research issues that are not close to our governmental priorities and Costa Rica is not well represented in Committees. We are also concerned about how to develop projects with developed and developing countries, since developing countries do not only need funds but also the expertise of the developed countries. Will Costa Rica have access to resources?

USA: We are envisioning that the funds that come from NSF to IAI would not necessarily go to fund developed countries scientists; that would be more in partnerships with their funding agencies to support those participants within an IAI project. However, the IAI funds could be used to support researchers from developing countries, so they can be part of a consortium, part of a research project, and we would expect a contribution from that country, and contributions can be people (their salaries can be considered a resource); if they have access to facilities to do some of the research, they could get funds directly from the IAI for travel for example We have been trying to do this in Asia Pacific Network as well. You can contribute with people, facilities, access to research sites, etc.

Executive Director: Right now the SAC has no member from Central America but some time ago it used to have two Cuban members and a chair from Costa Rica; we need some movement to have a balance and maintain representativeness, therefore we have to consider the longer term. Now there is a deficiency as we have nobody from the Caribbean and that has to be improved. Regarding CRN programs and policy relevance for member countries, IAI made a consultation some years ago. In the case of Costa Rica there is a very successful project, with a PI from Canada, which resulted in the project to design the first Earth Observing Satellite of Costa Rica that has been signed by the president and will be implemented by the Technological Institute. We see a lot of usable science that can be used for collaboration in the continent. The comments were very good because they highlight that the principal problem that we have is the lack of cohesion and the activities with funding agencies hopefully will improve that. The National Committee in Uruguay is an excellent opportunity; make a recommendation to the CoP to copy that example.

Uruguay: like other countries of the Americas we were not eligible to receive funding any more, and we were worried about that. However, new spaces of cooperation were generated and we now are a country that has to co-fund our researchers in international projects. We have set a structure for horizontal funding to cooperate with other countries. Tomorrow at the CoP we should re-think our way of participation and coordinate the activities of the IAI internally.

12. Initiatives with conventions and international organizations, collaborations of the IAI

Executive Director: Part of the mandate of the IAI is linking its science to global science initiatives. The IAI is continuing its engagement in the Research Dialogue of the *Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)* to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

(UNFCCC). IAI has been present with specific themes that grew out of its science programs, giving scientists the opportunity to present their own science.

The IAI has encouraged the participation of young researchers in meetings of the Conventions whenever possible, to develop a new generation of policy-aware scientists, to showcase the importance of IAI capacity-building, and to provide opportunities to young scientists from Latin America to present their research in international policy fora.

We now have 3 IAI people engaged in the working groups of the new *Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)*. Our engagement is not on behalf of the IAI but on behalf of the scientists of IAI programs

As recognition of all these activities we were chosen as the lead organization to link this continent to the *Future Earth* endeavor. We will make sure that this continent is represented equitably in this initiative.

13. Report of the Standing Committee of Rules and Procedures

Lou Brown: The committee has completed the task assigned by CoP 20 of reformatting CoP Rules. Those rules have been posted on the IAI website. We worked in English and we have to adjust the Spanish version to match the English version. We feel that is probably necessary that the EC Rules match the CoP rules in areas where they interact. We also provided some guidance and assistance to the Directorate in the preparation of the host country agreements.

14. Report of the SAC

The SAC Chair, reported on the main accomplishments of the SAC over the last year (document 12 in the Meeting Twiki site):

The **CRN3 process** has been moved forward with implementation of its 10 grants, the additional 7 Science Integration Projects, 6 Argentine CONICET-funded projects, and the continuing 9 SGP-CRA grants. The review and feedback to the international CRN3 teams is an on-going process, and discussions on guidance to the CRN teams continue through the IAI Directorate.

SAC-34 meeting: Montevideo, 22 - 23 March 2014: The main items for SAC-34 were: 1) Evaluating science impact of IAI programs; 2) Possible directions for IAI (role in Future Earth, IPBES); 3) Support to ongoing IAI programs; 4) Outreach & IAI at international meetings; and 5) SAC membership

Science-Policy Advisory Committee (SPAC): The SAC has sought to maintain an active participation in the development of the framework for a SPAC. SAC members see the need for a close integration and communication between the SPAC and the SAC.

SAC membership: Per IAI statutes, the CoP needs to have a SAC with 10 members. We welcome action on the part of the CoP on nominations, appointments, and re-appointments as needed to maintain a fully populated SAC.

Implementation of the IAI Strategic Plan: The IAI SAC continues to make significant progress in implementing the IAI Strategic Plan. The implementation of the CRN3 teams and projects and IAI Training Institute activities provide a mechanism to implement the strategic plan.

Looking into Future Earth: (<http://www.icsu.org/future-earth>): The IAI SAC is actively engaged with the IAI Directorate in developing a strategy for using Future Earth as a theme for the IAI.

IAI Restructuring and the SAC role: The SAC continues to provide advice and support to the IAI Directorate and the Executive Council as needed in the process of developing and implementing the new IAI administrative structure. The SAC requests the active participation of the CoP in implementing a functioning structure for the IAI Directorate Office.

15. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP

| |
|---|
| The EC decided to forward the following items to the CoP: Actions 3, and 6 to13. (Action 14). |
|---|

16. Adjourn

The EC Chair thanked Mexico for hosting the meeting. He also thanked all representatives from countries and local embassies, the IAI staff and the interpreters.
The meeting was adjourned.

ANNEX I

**37th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council
12 August 2014, Mexico City, Mexico**

Action List

1. The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Seventh Meeting with the following modifications:
 - The report of the Scientific Advisory Committee was postponed to the end of the afternoon session.
 - Maria Uhle, representative of the US will present the report of the Financial and Administrative Committee instead of William Smith.
 - New item: report of the meeting of Funding Agencies, held on 11 August 2014.
2. The EC approved the reports of its 35th and 36th meetings.
3. The EC decided to create a committee to recommend candidates to the Science-Policy Committee (SPAC). Members of this committee are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, and the US. This committee will recommend 6 candidates from an original list of 24 candidates suggested by the Directorate. According to the ToRs, the SPAC will be composed of 9 members (3 elected by the Directorate, 3 by the CoP and 3 by the SPAC itself). However, in this first occasion, since the SPAC does not exist yet, 6 positions will be nominated by the CoP and appointed for only one-year term. This will allow an additional year for all IAI member countries to identify candidates and participate in the nomination process. Members of the SPAC can be renominated.
The three SPAC members nominated by the Directorate nominations are: Luis Basterra (Chamber of Deputies, National Congress of Argentina), Yolanda Kakabadse (International President of WWF) and Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz (Science Director of FAPESP, São Paulo, Brazil). Their term of appointment is three years.
4. The EC decided that the members of the committee to review the CVs of nominees to the Scientific Advisory Committee would be Argentina, Chile, USA, and the SAC Chair and the Director for Science Programs as members ex officio. The committee will take into consideration the need for extraordinary extension of the terms of appointment of the SAC Chair and one SAC member to maintain continuity on the SAC.
5. The EC decided to renew the charter and composition of the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC) for the next two years.
6. The EC accepted the Core Budget request for 2014-2015 and will forward it to the CoP for approval.
7. The EC accepted to forward the proposed changes in the level of Country Contributions for 2014-2015 to the CoP for approval.
8. The EC accepted the Financial Report and the Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, and will forward them to the CoP.
9. The EC decided to recommend that the CoP renew the term, and allow for a possible modification of the structure and terms of reference of the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite Structure of the IAI.

10. The EC strongly encouraged that all IAI member countries broaden the representation of the groups of interest beyond the representatives' institutions, following the example of Uruguay's National IAI Committee.
11. The EC encouraged member countries to promote agreements for global change research between funding agencies, considering the funding model that is being developed by the group of funding agencies that met on August 11. Member countries can also participate in funding IAI science programs.
12. The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SAC members recommending the reelection of José Antonio Marengo Orsini and Rodolfo Dirzo for a second term, and the election of Trevor Platt (from SAC nominations); and Carlos Joly (from CoP nominations) The committee also recommended that the term of Frank E. Müller Karger be extended for two years to help with the continuity of SAC activities. The report will be forwarded to the CoP.
13. The EC accepted the report of the Committee to recommend 6 candidates for the SPAC. The nominated members are: Boris Graizbord, Bob Corell, Brigitte Baptiste, Emilio Moran, Walter Baethgen, Maria Netto Schneider, and alternates Janet Ranganathan, Anthony Clayton, and Max Campos. The report will be forwarded to the CoP.
14. The EC decided to forward the following items to the CoP: Actions 3, and 6 to13.

ANNEX III

Acronyms

| | |
|---------------|--|
| CoP | Conference of the Parties/ Conferencia de las Partes |
| CRN | Collaborative Research Network Program//Programa de Redes de Investigación Cooperativa |
| CONICET | Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas (Argentina) |
| DIVERSITAS | International Programme for Biodiversity Science/Programa Internacional para la Ciencia de la Biodiversidad |
| EC/ CE | Executive Council / Consejo Ejecutivo |
| FAC | Comité de Finanzas y Administración (del CE) / Financial and Administrative Committee (of the EC) |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization / Organización para la Alimentación y la Agricultura |
| FAPESP | Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (Brasil) / Foundation for Research Support of the State of São Paulo |
| INPE | Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais – Brazil |
| LATU | Laboratorio Tecnológico del Uruguay / <i>Technological Laboratory of Uruguay</i> |
| IHDP | International Human Dimensions Programme of Global Environmental Change/ Programa Internacional de Dimensiones Humanas del Cambio Ambiental Global |
| ICSU | International Council for Science / Consejo Internacional para la Ciencia |
| IGBP | International Geosphere/Biosphere Programme / Programa Internacional para la Biosfera y la Geosfera |
| ISSC | International Social Science Council / Consejo Internacional de Ciencias Sociales |
| MinCyT | Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Argentina / Ministry of Science and Technology, Argentina. |
| MOTVA | Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente (Uruguay) /Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment |
| NSF | National Science Foundation – USA |
| OAS / OEA | Organization of American States / Organización de Estados Americanos |
| PI | Principal Investigator / Investigador Principal |
| ROLAC | Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean / Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe |
| SAC | Scientific Advisory Committee / Comité Asesor Científico |
| SGP-HD | Small Grant projects for the Human Dimensions/Programa de Pequeños Subsidios par alas Dimensiones Humanas |
| SCRP | Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures (of the CoP)/Comité Permanente de Reglas y Procedimientos |
| UNFCCC/CMNUCC | United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change / Convención |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| | Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme / Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente |
| UNESCO | United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization / Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura |
| UNU | United Nations University / Universidad de las Naciones Unidas |
| WCRP / PMIC | World Climate Research Programme / Programa Mundial de Investigaciones Climáticas |
| WCRP / PMIC | World Climate Research Programme / Programa Mundial de Investigaciones Climáticas |