



INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH

**Minutes of the 39th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
23 June 2015 – Lima, Peru**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Opening Remarks.....	2
2. Approval of the Agenda	3
3. Approval of the Report of the 37th and 38th Meetings of the EC.....	3
4. Committee to recommend candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) and the Science Policy Advisory Committee (SPAC) members	4
5. Report of the EC Chair.....	5
6. Report from the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite IAI Directorate	5
8. Financial and Budgetary Matters.....	7
8.1. Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2014-2015 and Audit of 2014	7
8.2. Core Budget and country contributions for FY 2015-2016	9
8.3. Financial and Administrative Committee Report	11
13. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP	16
14. Adjourn	16

Annex I: Decisions and Actions of EC XXXIX

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 – June 2015

39th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
23 June 2015 – Lima, Peru
AGENDA

Morning session (08:30 – 12:30)

Registration

Welcome by Representative of Peru

Welcome by EC Chair

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 37th and 38th Meetings of the EC

Establishment of a committee to recommend candidates for the Science Advisory Committee (SAC) elections

Establishment of a committee to recommend candidates for the Science-Policy liaison Advisory Committee (SPAC) elections

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

Report on the Implementation of the Tripartite Agreement: *Implementation Committee*

Report of the SPAC: *SPAC Member*

- Advances and future plans of the SPAC

- Terms of Reference for the SPAC

- Criteria for the membership of the SPAC

Financial and Budgetary matters:

- Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2014-2015 and Audit of 2014 - *Rafael Atmetlla*

- Core Budget and Country Contributions for FY 2015-2016

- 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

Afternoon session (02:00 – 06:00)

Reports on Science and Capacity Building: *SAC Chair*

Collaborations with conventions and international organizations - *IAI Directorate*

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

Recommendation to the CoP

Report of the committee to recommend candidates for the election of SPAC members –

Recommendation to the CoP

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

Adjourn

1. Opening Remarks

Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Vice-Minister for the Strategic Development of Natural Resources of Peru, welcomed the participants and talked about the importance of the IAI in supporting the countries of the region to face global change. He wished a successful meeting.

Maria Ulhe, 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 Vice Chair)
Brazil:	Jean Pierre Ometto, Sergio Carvalho de Toledo Barros
Canada:	Eric Gagné (EC Vice Chair), Rebecca Plumadore
Chile:	Gladys Santis
Costa Rica	Embajador Melvin Saenz Biolley
Paraguay:	Fernando Méndez Gaona, Decano Constantino Nicolas Guefos Kapsales
Peru:	Viceministro Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Claudia Figallo de Gheresi, José Macharé
Uruguay	Juan José Arteaga Saenz de Zumarán, Maria Noel Beretta Tassano
USA:	Maria Uhle (EC Chair),

Observers – Member Countries:

Panama:	Anselmo MacDonald
---------	-------------------

Observers – Other Institutions

APN:	Yukihiko Imanari (Division Head, Development and Institutional Affairs)
CIIFEN:	Jose Daniel Pabón (International Director)
UNESCO	Lidia Brito (Director, Regional Office for LAC)

IAI Directorate:

Holm Tiessen (Executive Director), Marcella Ohira (Deputy Executive Director, Director, Capacity Building), Rafael Atmetlla (Director, Finance and Administration), Elma Montaña (Director, Science Programs), Ana Murgida, (Director, Science-Policy Liaison Office), Jorge Grandi (Advisor), Soledad Noya (Assistant to the IAI Director), 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 SPAC Member

Walter Baethgen

2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Ninth Meeting. (<i>Action 1</i>).
--

3. Approval of the Report of the 37th and 38th Meetings of the EC

The EC approved the reports of the 37th and 38th Meetings of the Executive Council (<i>Action 2</i>).

4. Committee to recommend candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) and the Science Policy Advisory Committee (SPAC) members

The EC Chair explained that according to the letter sent by the SAC Chair in June 2015, two (2) SAC members would have their terms expire, therefore the CoP would have to elect 2 scientists to fill these vacancies (nominations by Parties).

Regarding the SPAC, the nine members would have to be elected in this occasion.

The EC decided that the members of the Committee to recommend candidates for the election of members to the IAI SAC and SPAC would be Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Peru, Paraguay, and the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Committee, and the Director of the Science-Policy liaison Office as Secretary of the SPAC (*Action 3*).

Report of the Committee (recommendation to the CoP):

SAC

During lunch-break the Committee reviewed the CVs of 6 candidates nominated by the Parties to fill 2 SAC vacancies.

The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SAC members recommending Alicia Fernandez Cirelli and Edwin Castellanos from nominations by the Parties. The report will be forwarded to the CoP (*Action 9*).

SPAC

The Committee reviewed the CVs of 5 candidates nominated by the Parties, 3 nominated by the SPAC and 3 nominated by the IAI Directorate to fill 9 vacancies.

Apart from taking into account the geographical, gender, thematic and sectorial balance, the committee considered five different criteria:

- 1) Science Policy expertise and ability to effectively communicate scientific information in a policy relevant manner
- 2) Experience leveraging research use
- 3) Experience related to global change (especially climate change)
- 4) International Committee Experience
- 5) Knowledge and cultural awareness of the Americas

The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SPAC members recommending

- Javier Gracia Garza, Luis Basterra, Maria Netto, and James Rusak from nominations by the Parties;
- Walter Baethgen and Yolanda Kakabadse from nominations by the SPAC;
- Brigitte Baptiste, Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz, and Nicolas Lucas from nominations by the Directorate.

Alternate candidates are Heather Conley (nominated by the Parties) and Robert Corell (nominated by the SPAC). The report will be forwarded to the CoP. (*Action 8*)

This action item was supplemented with a recommendation to ask Robert Corell to act as an extraordinary member during the coming year.

5. Report of the EC Chair

The EC chair, Maria Ulhe, reported on the activities charged to the EC by the CoP (document 7 of the Meetings Twiki site). Based on the recommendations from the 22nd Conference of the Parties (CoP) in Mexico City, the Executive Council (EC), during its 38th Meeting took the following actions:

- The EC established a committee to draft a statement on the importance of adaptation to the UNFCCC CoP-20. The statement for *UNFCCC COP-20* expressed that adaptation is an important concern in Latin America and decision-making needs to be based on sound science and technology. Jorge Rucks, Uruguay's Vice-Minister of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment and head of delegation, delivered the message to the plenary on behalf of the IAI and called upon the international community to make efforts for finding and implementing viable adaptation strategies with the participation of the peoples of the region and through the development of regional capacities and support to the development of new technologies.

- The EC discussed issues and guidelines for the initial *Science Policy Advisory Committee* established at CoP 21: the term of all nine members was for one year; the EC asked Bob Corell to be the convener of the first meeting of the SPAC in conjunction with the Directorate. While progress is slower than expected, the SPAC has made significant developments toward their goals.

- The EC accepted to introduce the use of Research Gate to connect IAI scientists. The progress on this action has been limited over the past several months and needs to be addressed.

She also mentioned the following recommendations from the CoP:

- The CoP 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.

- The CoP approved the renewal of the term of the Implementation Committee for the Tripartite Structure of the IAI (see following item).

- The CoP encouraged member countries to promote agreements for global change research between funding agencies. We are working to find a multilateral funding mechanism for research in the Americas. Brazil and the US are part of the Belmont Forum. This group has been taking steps for providing a streamline approach for funding global environmental change research.

6. 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 9 in the Twiki site)

The Implementation of the IAI tripartite governance continues. As the IA Directorate reported the Montevideo office is operational. Both assistants have been provided by the Uruguayan government and have integrated well with the team.

As of May 2015, a director has been hired in the Science-Policy liaison office in Buenos Aires and the IAI is looking forward to enhanced operations there.

In Brazil the IAI is working with the Government of Brazil to finalize the Host Country Agreement to support the Science Development Office. To this end, the Chair of the Implementation Committee met with representatives from the government of Brazil, including Science and Technology ministry (MCTI), the host institution (INPE) and the External Relations ministry (DCTEC - Itamaraty) to refine a proposed Agreement. Jean Ometto was there as well and they went through a draft of the Brazilian Host Country Agreement. A general draft was provided yesterday to the Ministry and hopefully will be signed soon.

7. Report of the SPAC

Walter Baethgen presented the report on behalf of the Committee. The SPAC started to function in August last year. Unfortunately it was not able to meet in person and held four teleconferences, however without all the members at the same time. The Committee discussed the profiles of potential members of the SPAC. These should be people from the policy sector with demonstrated interactions with the scientific community and vice-versa, people from the scientific community with demonstrated interactions with the policy sector. The issue of conflict of interests was discussed, in the case of people serving in government administration during their SPAC appointment. There is not consensus on that issue yet.

One of the first activities the SPAC identified is establishing social validation of the IAI science. To do this, they proposed to establish national groups representing ministries or agencies from the different communities (public health, agriculture, energy), and have these groups interacting with IAI projects.

The SPAC identified the need for ensuring good interactions with the SAC and with the Directorate and is still discussing details of the terms of reference and the profile of SPAC members.

The Committee thinks that the best way to ensure continuity and achieve balance is renewing three of the nine members every year.

Canada: When we talk about governmental representation we make a strong distinction between those who are politically elected and public servants. The later know how to translate science into governmental policies, and take science to the elected representatives. How does the SPAC distinguish between governmental officials that were democratically elected or appointed versus the public servants?

Walter Baethgen: Everybody in the SPAC agrees that a person who was elected to an active position is not a very good candidate for the SPAC. On the other side, if there is someone working as an advisor to a ministry or an agency and has a scientific background or expertise in scientific communication, that is an ideal profile. We should be able to detect a "conflict of interests" threat, but it would be a lot easier if we had not to go through that process.

Executive Director: Concerning national committees, the link you mentioned between national working groups and the SPAC, neither the Directorate nor the SPAC have any influence on the way that national working groups have been formed. This is a decision of the countries themselves and depends to a large degree on the structures that countries have. The National Committee on Climate Change in Uruguay is coincident to a large degree with the group that interacts with the IAI. In the case of the US interactions are broad but the contact is more informal. This does not interfere with national representations. We would like to see more initiatives of this kind. It serves as a signal from the

countries to the IAI in what sector (agriculture, industry, public health, etc.) lies the main interest. We encourage countries to think about these committees in these terms: points of contact, flow of information, and potentially in the context of the idea (from the SPAC), for a social validation that helps us to provide social context and social relevance to the IAI science. I think it is solely an advisory role; it should not mirror the CoP. That is one of the reasons why I am not personally concerned with conflicts of interests. It advises and brings expertise.

8. Financial and Budgetary Matters

Rafael Atmetlla (Director, Finance and Administration) made a presentation on the financial status for FY 2014-2015 and Audit of year 2014 (further details in the Addendum of Document 12 in the Meetings Twiki site).

8.1. Overview of the Financial Status for FY 2014-2015 and Audit of 2014

Status of the Core Budget

As of 31 May 2015 the funds collected (cash incomes) represent 95% of the approved contributions for the fiscal year 2014/2015. Table I shows the status of the contributions received as of May 31, 2015.

Table 1. Core Budget 2014/2015
Status of Country Contributions as of May 31, 2015 (Amount in US\$)

	Contribution for FY 14/15	Paid in 2013/14 to be applied to:			Due as of 30-Jun-15
		Arrears	Current Year	Advances	
Argentina	69,000	(126,000)			147,957
Bolivia	5,000				45,000
Brazil	120,000				340,000
Canada	173,000		(159,000)		14,000
Chile	8,000		(5,000)		-
Colombia	13,000				13,000
Costa Rica	5,000				22,631
Cuba	5,000				55,067
Dominican Republic	5,000				90,000
Ecuador	5,000				5,000
Guatemala	5,000				90,000
Jamaica	5,000				55,000
México	85,000	(77,000)			85,000
Panamá	5,000		(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Paraguay	5,000	(6,914)			44,457
Perú	6,000				33,694
Uruguay	5,000	(5,000)	(5,000)	(300)	(300)
USA (*)	831,000		(588,797)		242,203
Venezuela	45,000	(352,521)			45,000
Totals	1,400,000	(567,435)	(762,797)	(5,300)	1,322,710

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. Brazil has three pending contributions for a total of US\$340,000 with a fourth contribution due after July 1st, 2015. The impact of these missing contributions is critical as the funds missing at the close of the fiscal year amount to US\$ 460,000, which creates a difficult financial environment for IAI. Mexico paid the contribution for

2013/2014, however we have not received payment for the current year. There are still issues with countries that continue to accumulate unpaid contributions. Guatemala and Dominican Republic have never paid contributions.

Positive news from Argentina that paid extra to compensate the previous year and especially from Venezuela that has now paid all dues to IAI until 2013-2014. The new award for the US contributions is expected to be in place by October 1st, 2015.

Expenses

The following table shows the expenses at the close of February 2015 (eight months into the fiscal year). This comparison shows the status of the core budget compared to the actual expenses in the corresponding period (75% of the total approved budget).

Budget Performance

July 2014 - April 2015

Amounts in US\$

Category	Actuals 2014/2015	YTD Budget 2014/2015	Difference	%
Salaries & Benefits	653,698	660,609	(6,911)	-1.0 %
Travel & Training	24,728	66,187	(41,459)	-62.6 %
Equipment	12,095	7,133	(4,962)	69.6 %
Operational Costs	181,010	117,423	63,587	54.2 %
Dissemination & Outreach	24,440	26,000	(1,560)	-6.0 %
Director's Fund		36,000	(36,000)	-100.4 %
Total	895,971	913,352	(17,381)	-1.9 %

- At the close of April 2015, the expenses were 1.9% lower than the 8-month budget, due to the effect of Salaries, Travel, and Director's Fund (DSF frozen due to contribution status).
- Savings partially offset by Operational Costs – Uruguay implementation and systems.
- Total annual performance is expected at -4% under the full-year budget.

Cash balance and CB Reserves

The cash balance at the end of February 2015 was 30% lower than the balance at the end of April 2014. Program Funds from NSF have been requested and the balance of Cash-on-hand for these funds is close to zero, consistent with the change of policy in NSF from 2014.

The Cash reconciliation reflects a slightly decreased position in the core budget, with reserves covering 3.1 months of operations. If the committed funds by the US are taken into consideration, the current available funds cover 8.7 months of operations, slightly lower than last year.

Cash Reconciliation at the end of Feb-15 (Amounts in US\$)

	Apr -14	Feb-15	Variance
Program Funds	114,854.73	38,785.95	-33.8%
IAI CB Funds	421,038.14	337,003.88	-20.0%
Total Cash	535,892.87	375,789.83	-29.9%

Administrative Area

Local staff hired by MVOTMA - LATU: Staff hired – office in Uruguay performing as expected

Tripartite Agreement Implementation:

- Offices in Montevideo fully operational
- Argentina placed a coordinator for the Science-Policy office.
- Brazil not implemented – high risk situation compounded with lack of payments of contributions.
- Brazil contribution status creates complication for financial management of IAI.

Internal controls and Audit

- No pending items on internal controls from the FAC or External Auditors.
- External Audit report delayed for current year
- A clean audit report is expected.
- Once received it will be forwarded to the Executive Council, FAC and will be included in the next CoP meeting documents.

Executive Director: The change in the budget (expenditures in travel and equipment) can be explained by the following: of the move to Uruguay and the better connectivity we have in the new offices and the recurrent problems with funding travel, has taken me to install a new communication system. We have also explored an open source system of videoconference.

I would like EC to think about how to manage all the information generated in IAI programs. We have no infrastructure to do so now.

Peru: I am pleased to announce that the Ministry of the Environment will cancel its debt this year.

The EC accepted the Financial Report and the Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, and will forward them to the CoP (*Action 6*).

8.2. Core Budget and country contributions for FY 2015-2016

Rafael Atmetlla presented the core Budget Request for FY 2015-2016 (further details in Document 17 in the Meeting Twiki site). The proposed FY 15/16 budget amount increases the operational budget of the Institute by 4% as proposed over the previous year. New budget will not require changes in the contribution amounts by the member countries and maintains the participation percentages as per the OAS Schedule of Country Contributions. The proposed budget allows IAI to maintain operational expenses at a minimum despite an increase in activities. The budget reflects savings for the relocation of the Directorate in Uruguay. It considers operations for a full year of operations in Uruguay.

Table 4: Core Budget Request Comparison 2015/2016-2014/2015 (*Amounts in US\$*)

Amounts in US\$	Fiscal Year 2015-2016	Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Difference
Salaries & Benefits	920,230	977,702	(57,472)
Travel	99,280	99,280	-
Equipment	10,700	10,700	-
Operational Costs	296,854	189,346	107,508
Dissemination & Outreach	39,000	39,000	-

Director's Fund	54,000	54,000	-
Total	1,420,064	1,370,028	50,036

Member Country Contributions to the Core Budget

For fiscal year 2015-2016, the IAI Directorate is proposing to maintain the level of contributions from the previous fiscal year.

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

Country	% (*)	Contribution
Argentina	5.01	69.000
Bolivia	0.07	5.000
Brazil	8.73	120.000
Canada	12.63	173.000
Chile	0.55	8.000
Colombia	0.96	13.000
Costa Rica	0.13	5.000
Cuba	0.13	5.000
Dominican Republic	0.18	5.000
Ecuador	0.18	5.000
Guatemala	0.13	5.000
Jamaica	0.18	5.000
México	6.21	85.000
Panamá	0.13	5.000
Paraguay	0.20	5.000
Peru	0.42	6.000
Uruguay	0.27	5.000
USA	60.75	831.000
Venezuela	3.27	45.000
Fund Total	100.00	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 2015/2016 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.

Three-year Core Budget (FY 15-16 / 16-17 / 17-18)

The budget for 16/17 and 17/18 are for reference and planning purposes, and each year a three-year budget will be presented, however approval for each one is made yearly

Amounts in US\$	Fiscal Year 2015-2016	Fiscal Year 2016-2017	Fiscal Year 2017-2018
Salaries & Benefits	920,230	946,842	1,029,128
Travel	99,280	93,909	93,909
Equipment	10,700	15,000	5,000
Operational Costs	296,854	260,365	210,404
Dissemination & Outreach	39,000	40,000	40,000
Director's Fund	54,000	60,000	40,000
Total	1,420,064	1,416,116	1,418,441

The EC accepted the Core Budget request for 2015-2016 and will forward it to the CoP for approval (Action 4).

The EC accepted the unchanged level of Country Contributions for 2015-2016 to the CoP for approval (Action 5).

8.3. Financial and Administrative Committee Report

Maria Uhle presented the report of the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC) on behalf of William Smith (See document 16 on the Meetings Twiki site).

Budget Request: The FAC found the budget request to be responsive to the evolving nature of IAI operations, and properly reflects the headquarters relocation and establishment of additional offices. It represents efforts to maintain operational expenses at a minimum. The last increase in country contributions was last year (2014-15 budget year).

Audit Report: The 2013-2014 audit report has not yet been received. Past reports have found that the IAI's financial statement presented fairly in all material respects the financial position of the IAI. The FAC will review the Audit Report once it is submitted and provide further advice, as required.

Country Contributions: As an international organization, the IAI relies on the voluntary contributions of its members to support day-to-day operations and oversee research activities. At the end of the last quarter, the total arrears of all countries was US\$1.33 million; an amount sufficient to support IAI operations for a full year. The accumulation of arrears (contributions due but not received in a given year) has put the IAI into a more difficult operating position where important activities such as outreach and oversight cannot be firmly scheduled and are subject to cancellation.

FAC Membership: The FAC is a subcommittee of the Executive Council. Membership on the FAC is established by country instead of by individual, and all countries are invited to participate.

9. Collaborations with conventions and international organizations

The *Executive Director* summarized the main activities with other international organizations and conventions (more details in document 11 in the meetings Tiki site)

The IAI is currently working with ICSU on a proposal to implement a very large science research and capacity building program that promotes interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinary, i.e. the science that is produced by different disciplines for the application to policy and development and that is expected to be funded by SIDA, the Swedish International Development Agency, at the level of approximately 10 million dollars. The IAI will act as the implementing agency for the Americas.

That morning the Executive Director received the last revised version from Paris of the proposal and reported the integration of the International Social Science Council into that program on demand by the Swedish Agency. The original separate training events have now been integrated in IAI training events. Therefore there is a tremendous opportunity to provide capacity building to those who applied for a research grant. As a result of this capacity building, they will be able to write their full proposals and do

better interdisciplinary science. The SAC has been reconfirmed by ICSU as part of the team that will look at the final selection of the Latin American Program.

The IAI continues to be active in the new IPBES (Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services) activity. In addition to Assessments, IPBES has a mandate of research. . The IAI is participating in several of the working committees of IPBES. To explore the complementarities in the objectives of the IAI and IPBES, the IAI is promoting cooperation on biodiversity and ecosystem services to support the IPBES work programs in IAI member countries. The IAI is also strengthening the participation of scientists and member country delegates in IPBES. We are currently drafting a memorandum of understanding with IPBES.

We continue to collaborate in the UNFCCC and its subsidiary body SBSTA. IAI has developed input to the *UNFCCC SBSTA* meeting in 2015, in response to the invitation by SBSTA to provide lessons learned and good practices for knowledge and research capacity-building, in particular in developing countries, the IAI presented examples from an institutional perspective and conclusions from several of its investigators.

The Ministry of the Environment of Peru, together with the IAI, the German Cooperation for Development (GIZ) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) held an International Symposium on Biodiversity and Climate Change in Lima, Peru, prior to the UNFCCC-COP20. The IAI and Peru's Ministry of Environment (MINAM) co-organized a side-event at UNFCCC-COP20: "From science to policy: Contributions from science to cope with climate change". Challenges and gaps in research agendas and information needs from policy-makers, that had been identified at the pre-COP Symposium were presented to an audience of about 100 UNFCCC-COP20 delegates.

It has been IAI policy of the IAI director not to attend large conventions meetings himself but, instead, provide opportunities for IAI scientists to go and present their science outcomes. At the Peru COP20, in addition, there was a clear mandate from the IAI-CoP to bring a message forward on the importance of adaptation presented by Uruguay on behalf of the IAI.

We have signed an agreement of cooperation with UNESCO LAC. There is a Center for Decision Making that will have an event in two months time with our participation. As our SPAC and the Buenos Aires office becomes more active, we will have an opportunity to expand our activities of collaboration with UNESCO. We also have a new counselor on science policy liason, Jorge Grandi, who retired from UNESCO LAC, and will help build institutional liaisons. All member countries have representatives to UNESCO and representatives to the Conventions on Biodiversity and Climate Change, and it will be useful if the representatives to UNESCO with the representatives to the IAI make the dialogue more fluid between these different organizations.

Future Earth: The global Global Change programs for bio-geo, human dimensions, biodiversity and climate are in the process of merging. As part of the consolidation into the programme of Future Earth (FE), a distributed global secretariat is being formed, and executive director has been appointed, and a governance structure is being developed. The IAI had offered to become point of dialogue and mutual collaboration of FE in Latin America. After that offer was accepted we engaged in discussions with FE on a policy paper about the organization of FE and its regional representation. That document was entirely command-and-control, treated regional hubs of FE essentially as representations. To us, that was totally unacceptable. Our vision of the presence of FE in the region is that of a well defined point of dialogue and a mutual understanding between the global organization and an independent regional presence. This vision has now prevailed. The way the IAI organized this originally was based on the idea that the funding agencies in different countries know the scientists, know what science is needed, know the channels of funding; so we called on a number of funding agencies from 3 different countries

initially: FAPESP from Brazil, CONICET from Argentina and CONACyT from Mexico and we have drafted an Agreement between funding agencies that will allow us to look at the feasibility of the links with FE in the region.

The interaction with FE is a great opportunity, however it has to be discussed broadly. I hope that our SAC, SPAC as well as the Science Policy and the Science Development offices play a very important role in the next step of the development of the IAI - FE relationship.

UNESCO LAC: I hope we can go on working together. It is a great opportunity because our Secretariats are in the same city and we also participate in FE, IPBES, etc.

I invite you to a meeting we are organizing in Montevideo on August 18-20 about Climate Change, Science and Decision-making, which will include different sectors: policy makers, universities, private companies, etc. There will be also a very large meeting on Climate Change in UNESCO Headquarters in Paris as a contribution to the CoP 21 and hopefully IAI will also participate.

Brazil: We have made a substantial progress to solve some problems we have been facing with the host agreement and I look forward to have every resolved soon. The opportunity of having the Science Development office in Brazil is huge and we fully understand that importance. FE is also an opportunity and we hope we can engage in that discussion regarding how can we act, as a region, in this global initiatives

Argentina: Is there a call already scheduled within the Agreement with FE and which will be the funding mechanism?

USA: Concerning calls for proposals for supporting active research, the main group that is providing funding opportunities is the Belmont Forum. Right now we do not have any formal agreement with anyone in Latin America other than FAPESP from Brazil. Therefore we are limited on how we can include support for Latin American scientists participate in these funding opportunities that are actually directed at FE. I think that this idea of bringing Latin American funding agencies together in a group is the way to do that. We have several initiatives, on food, energy, water and urbanization and they are along the lines of integrating natural sciences, social sciences and stakeholders. It would be great if representatives here could contact their national funding agencies to come and talk with us. Holm has initiated a first initial dialogue. Funding agencies could work together. We would be able to really expand the interaction of Latin American countries with projects like IAI's CRNs or small grants. Countries would invest some money but would also to take advantage of investments from other countries (e.g. Germany, France, Japan are also doing that). We would like to streamline this process. The idea of the BF is leveraging member's domestic investment in their research by providing some extra money so that researchers in their country can work with international counterparts.

Executive Director: I will mention the initiative with funding agencies that the IAI has initiated in Mexico last year. Currently we have a declaration of intent of the Funding Agencies that were present in the meeting of Mexico and the Argentinean CONICET has provided us with a draft of an Agreement between Funding Agencies based on their own experience of international collaboration and we have combined this with the documentation from the Belmont Forum to make a draft document that would be signed by agencies and the IAI towards such a Consortium of funding agencies. The document is currently being reviewed by FAPESP lawyers and by the group within FAPESP that has its own experience with the Forum. Hopefully we will come up with a Belmont-like consortium of agencies within the Americas in order to facilitate international science funding. We ask that member countries indicate which agencies could be involved.

Argentina: We should suggest the CoP to ask member countries identify agencies interested in subscribing a Belmont-like funding agreement.

As follow up to IAI-COP22 Action 15, that reads: “*The CoP encourages 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*”, the EC decided to suggest the CoP that country representatives identify funding agencies in their countries that might be interested in subscribing a Belmont-like agreement to fund international and IAI research projects (*Action 7*).

10. Report of the SAC

Frank Muller-Karger, SAC Chair, reported on the main accomplishments of the SAC over the last year (document 13 in the Meeting Twiki site). The SAC met in person in Quito, Ecuador, on May 20-22, 2015, to review the progress of the CRN3 projects. Concrete recommendations were transmitted to the IAI Directorate for strengthening each team. One recommendation referred to the integration of social and natural sciences in IAI Projects so that the successful projects in this area could transmit their experience to those that have difficulties. The IAI Directorate is planning a PIs meeting on this issue for December this year. The SAC also recommended that capacity building workshops continue.

Linkages between the IAI and other international programs: The SAC assists the IAI in improving its strategies for better-integrated science and innovation. During the SAC meeting in Quito, SAC members discussed the possible role of the IAI in the following programs: Future Earth, IPBES, Group on Earth Observations (GEO), Belmont Forum, and Ramsar Convention. The SAC has been formally invited to be part of the Science and Technology Review Panel of the Ramsar Convention, and there is a possibility to develop joint workshops.

SAC membership: Per IAI statutes, the CoP needs to have a SAC with 10 members. Two (2) vacancies need to be filled by the CoP in 2015.

The SAC notes to the CoP that there is at present no regional framework or infrastructure to host and serve data and other products to countries, decision makers, or the public of the region. There is no ‘service’ that distributes products to communities that may benefit from the knowledge generated by IAI programs, other than through each individual IAI CRN project. A data and products services framework needs to be planned and built in partnership between members of the CoP, the IAI and other regional and local entities. Such a facility would serve data, products and results beyond the CRN projects or the life of these projects. The CoP should plan and assist in developing the solution for this serious shortcoming in our region.

Executive Director: We have implemented all CRN 3 projects and in its last meeting the SAC has reviewed the reports from the projects and commented back. This is important because many of these projects need more integration between natural and human sciences. We will keep on monitoring these projects so that they can achieve this integration. In this context we have prepared a proposal to extend the CRN 3 program by another six smaller projects in which we take the theme that rose both from the last CoP and Peru UNFCCC that is adaptation and to really integrate natural and social sciences and at the same time point the importance of ecosystems: the role of ecosystem services in adaptation.

11. Discussion on open science and science impact measurement

Canada suggested two items for discussion at the CoP: how to measure IAI science impact and open science.

Canada: In Canada we are anticipating some changes because we will be going through an election process this year and we have to evaluate our programs and activities in order to explain them to our government. Part of the challenge lies in explaining how the IAI's contributions, research, collaborations, partnerships, etc. are having an impact in Canada. We have asked Holm whether the Secretariat had enough data to build the case. Even getting data sometimes cannot help in the analysis. For example how many Canadians were identified in the programs, the level of funding, etc. does not really say which is the impact. Collaboration leads to access to data, periodic publications, postgraduate students who can study abroad are examples of our idea of impact. Citations lists where we can identify authors, affiliations, institutions, countries, are useful. We know that we are collaborating with South America, but not necessarily through the IAI. Having that kind of information is essential to explain our participation in the IAI and even to leverage funding and take profit of other opportunities in Canada. Measuring impact is not only about how much money goes back to the scientists but mainly what are they able to accomplish. Measuring science and its impacts is difficult; we have been trying for years in Environment Canada. Linking science to policy is very difficult.

I would also like to talk about open science. Canada is moving towards open access to all the information generated in public funded research. In Environment Canada we are developing standards to make sure scientists open their science. How open is IAI research data? IAI funded research would also benefit from being more open.

Argentina: We are through an electoral process as well. The country profiles we receive have always been very useful, but in this context we need more information and that is why we have also made a request for detailed information. I agree on having access to the data and information produced in the IAI projects. The information available in the IAI website is limited.

Science Policy Liaison Office Director: We are trying to get the information from IAI science. Following the request from Argentina we are also working on the systematization of information and make an analysis of the impact in policies. We need help to find an adequate platform to do so and it would be better to do this in collaboration.

Peru: We are also entering an electoral process and we have to justify our support to the IAI. I would ask if the Institute could have more information available in its website, otherwise it seems it fades against the other conventions or institutions.

Executive Director: We have a system of metadata, which is available, but the access and the use have been very limited over years. The IAI website has recently been updated, it is more attractive but of course there is a huge amount of data that is not there. Regarding the statistics on the science (how many students for exchange, how many collaborations can be inferred from publications, etc.), the IAI science staff can obtain that information from the reports. They have to be analyzed in another way systematically to get a comprehensive picture of the science promoted by the IAI. It is a hard work, but possible. We already have a Citeulike list and we will highlight it in the website so that people can access IAI projects' publications. Regarding the impact of policy; that is more difficult. In some cases, there are clear examples. We need more intelligence in the processes of synthesizing the science on policy impact, educational impact etc. There is a whole range of levels of intervention and interaction that has to be evaluated. We cannot do that alone. IAI needs help on those aspects and needs the input from parties. We have a committee on the tripartite agreement. Perhaps it would be also important to have a committee in open science and data management as well.

SAC Chair: The need of a regional framework or infrastructure to host and serve data and other products to countries, decision makers, or the public is highlighted in the SAC report to the CoP. There is a GEO summit in Mexico. We could take the opportunity to take countries to this framework.

UNESCO LAC: we work with the countries. They make their profiles. No organization can systematize data without the help of member countries.

Executive Director: I see a convergence of a number of initiatives and I am happy to see that. The suggestion from the SPAC for social validation of the IAI output, the request by Canada and Argentina to look with more detail at the impact of the IAI science, a need to use those analyses to shape future science, a need to find solutions to have information available updated, etc. That comes together with a proposal for national working groups that should interact with the IAI national representatives and the IAI. If we want to know what the IAI is doing in the different countries and in the region as a whole, we need feedback and we need structures by which we can get that feedback. We need the help of people who know how to run platforms and data repositories in their countries and who the representatives can indicate to us as our partners in this conversation. Meanwhile, internally we can work to satisfy the specific requests. We need to expand the organization of the IAI, we have to grow together and work together.

The EC identified the need for improving the availability/visibility of information on IAI science projects. This includes expanding the website to include links project metadata, activities, publications, a link to Citeulike, which contains a list of the papers published by the projects in peer-reviewed journals, and also going beyond the science to include impact on policymaking and capacity building in the countries (*Action 10*).

The EC decided to request the CoP to address the issue of open access data and look at ways to centralize the information (*Action 11*).

The EC decided to request the CoP to discuss and identify ways to measure the impact of IAI science with the help of IAI member countries and Associates (*Action 12*).

13. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP

Decisions and actions to be forwarded to the CoP are 4 - 12. (*Action 13*).

14. Adjourn

The EC Chair thanked Peru 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

**39th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council
23 June 2015, Lima, Peru**

Decisions and actions

1. The EC approved the Agenda of its Thirty Ninth Meeting.
2. The EC approved the reports of its 37th and 38th meetings.
3. The EC decided that the members of the Committee to recommend candidates for the election of members to the IAI SAC and SPAC would be Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Peru, Paraguay, and the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Committee, and the Director of the Science-Policy liaison Office as Secretary of the SPAC.
4. The EC accepted the Core Budget request for 2015-2016 and will forward it to the CoP for approval.
5. The EC accepted the unchanged level of Country Contributions for 2015-2016 and will forward it to the CoP for approval.
6. The EC accepted the Financial Report and the Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, and will forward them to the CoP.
7. As follow up to IAI-COP22 Action 15, that reads: "*The CoP encourages 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*", the EC decided to suggest the CoP that country representatives identify funding agencies in their countries that might be interested in subscribing a Belmont-like agreement to fund international and IAI research projects.
8. The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SPAC members recommending
 - Javier Gracia Garza, Luis Basterra, Maria Netto, and James Rusak from nominations by the Parties;
 - Walter Baethgen and Yolanda Kakabadse from nominations by the SPAC;
 - Brigitte Baptiste, Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz, and Nicolas Lucas from nominations by the Directorate.
 Alternate candidates are Heather Conley (nominated by the Parties) and Robert Corell (nominated by the SPAC). The report will be forwarded to the CoP.
9. The EC accepted the report of the Committee for the election of SAC members recommending Alicia Fernandez Cirelli and Edwin Castellanos from nominations by the Parties. The report will be forwarded to the CoP.
10. The EC identified the need for improving the availability/visibility of information on IAI science projects. This includes expanding the website to include links project metadata, activities, publications, a link to Citeulike, which contains a list of the papers published by the projects in

peer-reviewed journals, and also going beyond the science to include impact on policymaking and capacity building in the countries.

11. The EC decided to request the CoP to address the issue of open access data and look at ways to centralize the information.
12. The EC decided to request the CoP to discuss and identify ways to measure the impact of IAI science with the help of IAI member countries and Associates.
13. Decisions and actions to be forwarded to the CoP are 4 - 12

ANNEX II

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)
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
IPBES	Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services/Plataforma Intergubernamental sobre Biodiversidad y Servicios Ecosistémicos
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
Ramsar Convention	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
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
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency/Agencia Sueca de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
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