

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



EC-XXII & CoP-XIII

May 22-24, 2006

Venezuela

Minutes of the EC-XXI

3_ECXXII/DWD/English/April 5, 2006

Minutes of the Twenty-First Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico
8-9 September 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda

1. Opening Session
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the Report of the Twentieth EC Meeting
4. Report of the Executive Council Chair
5. Report of the IAI Directorate
6. Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)
7. Approval of CRN II Proposals
8. Vision from the IAI Director
9. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee (FAC)
10. EC Committees
11. IAI Newsletter
12. Items to be discussed at the next EC /forwarded to CoP
13. Future Sites and Meetings
14. Adjournment of the Meeting

Action List EC-XXI (day 1)

Action List EC-XXI (day 2)

Acronyms

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

Twenty-first Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)

Puerto Vallarta, México

8-9 September 2005

Agenda

Thursday – September 08, 2005

Day 1

Morning session (08:30 – 13:00)

08:30 - 9:00 Registration

Opening ceremony

EC Chair: Adrián Fernández

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 20th Meeting of the EC

Report of the EC Chair:

Adrián Fernandez

- *Activities charged to the EC and its Bureau;*
- *Activities, actions and decisions of the EC Bureau or its members;*
- *EC items to be forwarded to the CoP.*

10:30-10:45 Coffee Break

Report of the IAI Directorate:

Overview from the IAI Interim Director
Vision from the new IAI Director

John Stewart
Holm Tiessen

13:00 Lunch

Afternoon session (15:00 – 18:00)

Report on the CRN 2 review process, IAI Scientific Officer

Gerhard Breulmann

Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) Chair

Walter Fernandez

- *Approval of CRN 2 proposals*

New membership of the IAI Financial and Administrative Committee

Adrián Fernández

16:30 – 16:45 Coffee Break

Report of the Working Groups/Task Forces/Committees:

- *Standing Committee for Rules & Procedures*
- *Financial and Administrative Committee*

Louis Brown
Vanessa Richardson

Welcome Reception

Friday - September 9, 2005

Day 2

Morning session (09:00-13:00)

Approval of the items to be forwarded to the CoP

Adrián Fernández

10:30-10:45 Coffee Break

Approval of the Action List of day 1

Adrián Fernández

Future sites and meetings

Adrián Fernández

Adjourn

13:00 Lunch

1. Opening Session

The EC Chairman, Adrián Fernández Bremauntz, opened the meeting and wished the participants a successful meeting.

Participants at the meeting were:

EC Country Representatives

Argentina: Carlos Ereño

Brazil: Maria Assunção Faus da Silva Dias

Canada: Michel Béland, Louis Grittani

Cuba: Bárbara Garea Moreda

Jamaica: Anthony Chen

Mexico: Adrián Fernández Bremauntz, Israel Laguna Monroe, Arnoldo Matus Kramer, Andrés Flores

United States: Margaret Leinen, Paul Filmer, Vanessa Richardson, Louis B. Brown, Barbara de Rosa-Joint

Venezuela: Nuris Orihuela

Observers:

Zoila Aquino, Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente, Panama

Special Invitees

Walter Fernández Rojas (IAI SAC Chair)

IAI Directorate:

Holm Tiessen, John W. B. Stewart, Gerhard Breulmann, Silvio Bianchi, Marcella Ohira, Luis Marcelo Achite, Ione Anderson

2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty First Meeting with the following three modifications:

- Argentina proposed an item in the Agenda to better define the IAI Newsletter.
- The IAI Interim Director, John Stewart, suggested that the presentation by the new IAI director should follow the presentation by the SAC.
- Cuba suggested leaving the membership of the IAI FAC as the last point of the Agenda.

(Action 1 – Day 1)

3. Approval of the Report of the XX EC Meeting

The EC approved the Report of its Twentieth Meeting with three observations:

- Argentina underlined that point 9 of the Twentieth Meeting Report (“9. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee”) could be unclear. The EC approved the following change: replace the word “*participation*” by the word “*contributions*” in the last paragraph of point 9.

- Argentina also asked for a change in the Action List of Day 2 of the Twentieth Meeting, point 1: the substitution of the word “*participation*” by the word “*contributions*”. The change was approved by the EC.

- Canada asked for more clarity in the 3rd paragraph of point 5.2.2 about Contributions in 2005-2006. The EC approved the following modification in the 3rd paragraph:

“He also showed a graph representing the Composition of contributions: 79 % of the Core Budget is paid by the 3 largest contributors; 15 % of the Core Budget is paid by the next 4 largest contributors; and the remaining 12 countries (those assigned US\$ 5K/year) account for 6 % of the Core Budget.

He stressed the importance of timely contributions so as not to extinguish the reserves of the Institute.”

(Action 2 – Day 1)

4. Report of the EC Chair

The EC Chair declared his report would consist of two issues (Document 3). One was the signing of the Employment Agreement between the IAI and Dr. Holm Tiessen, new Director of the IAI, on 6th May 2005. The Agreement would be valid for a three-year term which could be extended for another three years upon mutual agreement.

He added Dr. Tiessen’s appointment was an inflection point to the IAI, after two years of transition. It was time for the Parties to renew their commitment with the IAI, to involve the participation of more countries, to increase the visibility of the Institute not only in member countries but in global change related institutions/organizations, to build capacities in the region, and to build and strengthen research networks across the Americas. The EC Chair added the IAI should find an appropriate balance among disciplines that would be relevant, applicable, and close to the decision makers’ agendas. He also asked participants to provide ideas to further develop the functioning of the Directorate, the EC Working Groups, and Committees.

The second issue was related to Action 8 – Day 2 – EC XX – Montreal, Canada, which stated:

“The EC endorsed the proposal of Mexico to register IAI in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and to guarantee that IAI be represented at the annual CoP with side events and exhibits.”

Following this recommendation, the Directorate submitted a formal application for admission as an observer to sessions of the Climate Change Convention on 27th May 2005. The UNFCCC Secretariat would contact the IAI before COP 11 (28 November – 9 December 2005, Canada) to inform about the progress of the procedure and further steps.

Canada provided details on the COP 11 and explained there would be a number of parallel events including a look at climate change and impacts, and short presentations on national and international initiatives. He said he would try to have a presentation on the IAI CRN I and the upcoming CRN II, as a highlight to global change research activities in the Americas. He stressed there were funds to create international centers of excellence on impacts and adaptation in three or four parts in the world and suggested the IAI could be one of them. Michel Beland asked the EC members to inform representatives to COP 11 from their countries on this issue.

Mexico offered their cooperation to the Director in the activities related to the presence of the IAI in the COP 11.

The EC discussed different alternatives to increase the visibility of the IAI, in particular the participation in international organization meetings.

Brazil suggested the IAI could attend the annual AAAS meeting in Brazil.

Cuba said that visibility had many aspects; one of them was the possibility of countries applying IAI research results. The second was related to the number of people involved in IAI activities; the Small Grant Program besides contributing to the CRNs, gives the opportunity to many scientists to get involved in the IAI. The third was human capacity building. The fourth was about showing the results of the IAI: country representatives giving presentations on the IAI at the meetings they attended. In her view, low visibility implies limited funding sources.

The IAI Director, Holm Tiessen, thought it would be better to make the CRN more flexible rather than launching new rounds of the Small Grant Program. Improved cooperation between the social and natural sciences would increase the visibility of the IAI, he added.

The US mentioned several events in which the IAI would be featured: an international workshop in the US on the application of global environmental change research to decision support to be held in November 2005, with the participation of PIs of IAI CRN-I; the plenary meeting of IGFA, late October 2005 in the US, where one of the invited speakers would be an IAI CRN PI. She concluded these would be opportunities to highlight the success of the IAI in a broader international context.

Panama invited the IAI and its member countries to the Latin American meeting on sustainable development that would be held in that country in November 2005.

Argentina said the IAI should continue and enhance its participation in other initiatives such as IGBP, IHDP, and WCRP that were active in the region, and in many cases involved the

same institutions and researchers as the IAI. He added the participation of the IAI had been uneven in VAMOS and other CLIVAR panels on climate in the Americas. He invited the IAI Director to the VAMOS Panel meeting to be held in Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil in April 2006.

Mexico informed the first meeting of DIVERSITAS would be held in Oaxaca, Mexico on November 10 –11, 2005, and that the IAI could also interact with the Commission on Sustainable Development, the new agenda of which would address environmental issues.

5. Report of the IAI Directorate

5.1. Overview from the IAI Interim Director

The former IAI Interim Director, Dr. John Stewart, informed he would report on the activities of the Directorate (Document 4), Gerhard Breulmann would report on the CRN II evaluation process (mail and panel reviews) and Walter Fernandez, on the SAC meeting. The IAI officers present at the meeting could answer questions on their activities if needed.

In the 4 months before the meeting, there had been several changes in the Directorate staff, starting from the Director. The new Program Manager was hired, one experienced assistant was leaving (not because of salary differences), and a new one was hired.

As to the IAI Science Program, Dr. Stewart informed PIs were submitting CRN I and SGP II the projects final reports to the Directorate.

He informed the Directorate was involved in the organization of the synthesis process on the science and governance of CRN I, that would take the format of a SCOPE Rapid Assessment Process titled “Bridging the Gap between science and decision makers – integrating lessons from 10 years of IAI science projects”. The IAI /SCOPE meeting was planned for 26 November – 2 December 2005 in Ubatuba, Brazil. During this meeting, CRN I PIs would present their results for decision makers and stakeholders. The meeting outcomes were planned to be integrated into the new CRN II projects. Dr. Stewart invited IAI member country representatives to attend the meeting, as their advice from the country perspective would be very useful.

He then referred to the observer registration process at UNFCCC. Interim information from UNFCCC suggested that IAI would be granted provisional admittance in September prior to formal confirmation of observer status at the COP 11 and COP/MOP 1, where the final decision would be made (see point 4, Report of the EC Chair for further details).

Dr. Stewart reported on the participation of the new IAI Director, Dr. Holm Tiessen in the IGFA/ICSU meeting in Stockholm on 16-20 May 2005. Invitations were also received to important meetings with major national and international funding agencies and ICSU scientific committees (e.g., IGBP, DIVERSITAS, IHDP, WCRP, NSERC, NSF, EU, etc.). Country representatives and PIs were asked to attend these meetings, as the Directorate staff would be otherwise entirely devoted to attending meetings.

The EC Chair observed attention should be paid to the setting of dates for IAI meetings to avoid overlapping with other important meetings.

Training, Communications and Outreach Programs

Publications on the 2004 IAI Training Institutes (“Food Systems and Globalization”, and “Urbanization and Global Environmental Change”) were in their final stages.

The organization of the two Institutes planned for 2005 was also in its final stages. One of them, on Vulnerability Associated with Climate Variability and Climate Change in the Americas would be held in Asuncion, Paraguay, on 17-28 October 2005. The other on Climate and Health in the Americas would take place in Kingston, Jamaica on 7-18 November 2005. Dr. Stewart informed the Training Communications and Outreach Officer had obtained co-sponsorship for these events.

IAI Data and Information System (DIS)

The former Interim Director explained the IAI-DIS continued to expand to handle new capabilities. An improved application/reporting system including peer-review had been implemented. As a result, applications to 2005 IAI Institutes were received electronically. The DIS Manager was working on the integration of other data systems with the IAI DIS (e.g., Amazon Andean GIS Web Portal, CRN 047) and metadata from CRN I were being processed. Among other activities of the DIS area he mentioned the planning of the DIS training for new PIs and the upgrade of the Directorate staff computer systems.

Financial and Administrative Matters

Dr. Stewart informed invoice letters had been sent to all IAI member countries on 5 August 2005 and that CATHALAC had paid the second and last installment of the outstanding CRN 038 funds.

He also declared that though the IAI had received some prepayments and past payments, there were countries that did not pay. In consequence member country contributions for 2004/2005 were still a matter of concern.

5.2 Report on the CRN II review process

The Scientific Officer (SO) made a presentation on the CRN II process (document 5). A Proposal requesting US\$ 10.4 Million was submitted to NSF on 13 August 2004. The idea was to allocate US\$ 9.4 to subgrants and the rest of the amount requested would be administrated by the IAI Directorate for other activities related to the CRN program, such as annual CRN PI meetings.

The CRN II Application process was held in two phases:

1. Call for Pre-proposals
2. Call for Full Proposals.

The Call for Pre-proposals was launched on 13 September 2004 -deadline on 20 October 2004- through different dissemination media. Pre-proposals were 4-page documents describing the objectives, methodology, expected results, collaboration, capacity building, policy relevance, relevance to IAI, budget, and collaborator list. The SO informed that by the deadline 93 pre-proposals had been received requesting a total of US\$ 80.14 million and that the pre-proposal summary information had been sent to Country Delegates.

The criteria for CRN II pre-proposal evaluation were the following:

- Scientific Excellence & Technical Soundness
- Relevance to the IAI Science Agenda
- Policy relevance of the proposed activity
- Capacity Building potential of the proposed activity

- Research Gap/New topic (new, emerging issues; issues not (fully) explored in earlier IAI grants)
- Integration of natural & social science
- Budget and In-kind contributions

The evaluation was carried out by the IAI SAC (9-11 November 2004, Santiago, Chile). As a result, 35 pre-proposals were formally invited to submit full proposals, although the original plan had been to invite 25. This change was introduced by the SAC because of the high quality of the pre-proposals received. Results were communicated to all pre-proposal PIs in late November 2004. The SO highlighted the fact that 13 out of the 35 selected pre-proposals came from SGP-I & SGP-II groups which would be an indicator of the success of the Small Grant Program.

The Call for Full Proposals was launched on 13 December 2004, with deadline on 23 March 2005. Proposals consisted of 15-page documents plus Annexes (detailed budget, collaborator list, commitment letters, workplan & timetable, short CVs). By the deadline, 37 Full Proposals had been received (34 invited, 3 non-invited) (all eligible) requesting a total of US\$ 33.63 million and involving PIs from 10 IAI member countries (see table below).

Country	PIs	CO-PIs	Proposals involved
Argentina	40	60	20
Bolivia	0	9	5
Brazil	5	57	28
Canada	6	25	11
Chile	2	35	13
Colombia	0	5	3
Costa Rica	0	17	9
Cuba	0	14	7
Dominican Rep.	0	1	1
Ecuador	1	6	4
Guatemala	1	1	1
Jamaica	0	2	1
Mexico	6	38	16
Panama	0	0	0
Paraguay	0	4	4
Peru	0	12	7
Uruguay	2	9	7
USA	9	69	34
Venezuela	1	11	6
Others	0	2	2
TOTAL	37	377	

The thematic distribution of the proposals, according to the IAI Science Agenda, was somewhat uneven, as happened in previous IAI program calls, which is reflected in the following table:

Agenda Theme	Primary Proposal Theme	Secondary Proposal Theme
I. Understanding Climate Change and Variability in the Americas	9 (24,3%)	5 (13,5%)
II. Comparative Studies of Ecosystems, Biodiversity, Land Use and Cover and Water Resources in the Americas	14 (37,8%)	6 (16,2%)

Approved

III. Understanding Global Change Modulations of the Composition of Atmosphere, Oceans and Fresh Water	6 (16,2%)	5 (13,5%)
IV. Understanding the Human Dimensions and Policy Implications of Global Change, Climate Variability and Land Use	7 (18.9%)	17 (46,0%)
V. Cross-Cutting issues	1 (2,7%)	4 (10,8%)
Total	37 (100%)	37 (100%)

The CRN II Full Proposal Peer-Review was performed in 3 steps:

Mail review (April – July 2005)
 Panel Review (20-22 July 2005)
 IAI SAC Review (26-28 July 2005)

The IAI policy on "Conflicts of Interest and Standard of Ethical Conduct" was strictly applied during all the review steps.

For the mail review, 152 replies (97 positive and 55 negative) were received out of 232 possible reviewers approached. Finally, 108 reviews were received at the Directorate and 9 agreed reviewers did not provide their reviews.

11 panelists from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Mexico, USA, Uruguay, and Venezuela were selected by expertise for the panel review. The process consisted of assigning one lead panelist to each proposal. Proposals with conflicting mail reviewer ratings were evaluated again over-night by one or more panelists. Considering the mail reviews and applying the review criteria as outlined in the CRN II General Guidelines, the panel produced a ranked list and comments for the IAI SAC.

The SAC Review took place on 26-28 July 2005 (see paragraph 6).

The following table shows the CRN II Timeline as published in the Full Proposal General Guidelines.

	Action	Date
<i>Phase 1</i>	Call for pre-proposals	13 Sep. 04
	Submission deadline for receipt of pre-proposals at IAI Directorate	20 Oct. 04
	IAI SAC pre-proposal evaluation. SAC invited 35 pre-proposals to submit full proposals in Phase 2 Santiago, Chile	9-11 Nov. 04
<i>Phase 2</i>	Guidelines for preparation of Full Proposals on IAI website	13 Dec. 04
	Full proposal submission deadline	23 Mar. 05
	Mail Review	April – May 05
	Panel Review	Early July 05
	IAI SAC Review	2-4 Aug. 05
	IAI Executive Council (EC) meeting	Sep./Oct. 05
	Award Notification to PIs & AIRs	Oct. 05 (depending date of EC)
	Start of project activities	1 Nov. 05 – 1 Mar. 06

The EC members, the SAC Chair and the IAI Director agreed that the social sciences and human dimensions components were underrepresented in the proposals.

6. Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) Chair

The SAC Chair reported on the 22nd meeting of the Committee held in Sao Jose dos Campos, on 26-28 July 2005 (Document 6) with the attendance of all the SAC members, the new IAI Director; the NSF, and the assistant to the EC Chair. Dr. Fernandez informed that during the SAC meeting the elect Director gave a presentation showing his ideas and plans for the IAI as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the IAI in his view. The SAC was pleased with this presentation and it is the hope of the Committee that the Director will be able to implement them for the sake of the IAI.

Evaluation of Full-Proposals Received under the Second Round of the IAI Collaborative Research Network (CRN II) Program

After the introduction of the matrix with final Panel and mail review ratings by the SO the SAC discussed first which proposals were fundable (F) or not (N) and which needed further discussion (D) according to the rating given to each of them. Proposals with “FF” ratings from the SAC primary and secondary reviewers were moved to a Fundable category. Proposals that offered strong components to be considered for funding but not to be funded under CRN II were moved to a “SEED” category.

Then the SAC analyzed the proposals under “D”, using the following criteria:

- Advancing CRN II criteria (not just fitting under a criterion)
- Engaging in policy relevance
- Interdisciplinary
- New team
- Geographic, study area specifically as well as location of institution
- Outreach, education
- Capacity-building
- Budget (including salaries, overhead, appropriate distribution of funds across participating institutions)
- Geographic distribution (researchers from IAI different countries)
- Gender
- Life after CRN II
- Policy relevance side, institute wide issue, the words in the Call, talking about regional relevance, regional context to it
- Link to other initiatives in the Americas
- Thematic distribution
- Regional relevance

The SAC recommended that 80% of the funds available be committed to CRN II and 20% to new strategic areas at lower level and to a reserve fund. The proposals recommended by the SAC for funding under the CRN II were:

Proposal #	PI	Project Title	Budget (K US\$)	PI Country
5	Sarmiento		930.8	Venezuela
14	Berbara		938.9	Brazil
15	Diaz		995.3	Argentina
17	Klenner		799.2	Chile

21	Sanchez		999.0	Canada
31	Jobbagy		998.7	Argentina
48	Raga		483	Mexico
50	Biu Liu		1.000	USA
60	Castellano		781.7	Guatemala
76	Piola		948.1	Argentina
TOTAL			8,875	
If reduced 10%			7,987.674	

The Committee requested that the budget of projects be cut by 10% in a strategic way and that the IAI Director allot this amount in an efficient way, after the EC.

The SAC recognized there was still a misbalance in the thematic distribution of proposals and that the “Seed” funding should be used to address the themes that were underrepresented (themes 3 and 4 of the Science Agenda).

Dr. Fernandez also reported on a presentation by Dr. Jose Marques da Costa, Secretary General of the CRECTEALC about the activities of this regional center. The IAI and CRECTEALC might develop joint activities in the area of remote sensing.

The SAC Chair informed that during the SAC meeting Holm Tiessen had reported on the organization of the IAI-SCOPE RAP Meeting, which would address topics underdeveloped in CRN I. SAC members were disappointed to know that this activity would not be a synthesis of CRN I as agreed by SAC.

The SAC Chair thanked Alejandro Castellanos (SAC member) and Isabel Vega (assistant to the Scientific Officer) who were departing, with deep appreciation for their valuable work over the years.

Argentina stated that the IAI-SCOPE meeting could be a first step for a synthesis of CRN I. The synthesis should be useful to decision makers.

Venezuela said both the SCOPE assessment to show the weaknesses of the IAI in bridging the gap between science and policy relevance, and the synthesis of the CRN I were necessary. She added the IAI had to make sure that research products be translated into concrete recommendations to public policy.

Canada suggested that an external institution should select SAC members, instead of the CoP.

Lou Brown, Chair of the RPSC, reminded the EC there was a vacancy in the IAI SAC. This position was normally filled from nominations of the associates of the IAI, which had not presented nominations at the CoP meeting in Buenos Aires or at the meeting in Montreal. According to the rules of the CoP, the EC can fill this vacancy.

It was decided that the EC should fill the Associates vacancy on the SAC before the next CoP with the objective to enable SAC to operate with a full membership of ten. The new member should reflect the needed changes and balance in the IAI’s program direction.
(Action 6 – Day 2)

7. Approval of CRN II Proposals

After the presentations by the IAI SO and the SAC Chair, the EC analyzed the list of proposals recommended by the SAC for funding. The Director reminded the EC that the rules of confidentiality and conflict of interests had to rule the decision process.

Argentina stated that having detailed information on the selection process would be helpful to inform researchers whose projects had been rejected on the reasons for such decision. This would prevent these researchers from having a negative vision of the IAI.

Cuba suggested that once the projects were approved, official letters be sent to the PI home countries. She added that contacting scientists from the member country academies of sciences in the related areas would improve the transparency of the evaluation process.

Brazil asked for clarification on the decision of splitting the CRN II funds into 80% for projects and 20% for other purposes and added this 20% could give some flexibility to approve more proposals.

USA reminded that at the SAC meeting in Mendoza in 2003 the split 80% - 20% had been discussed, recommended, and reported on to the EC and CoP by the SAC Chair. Funding was needed for a number of CRN related activities (PI meetings, synthesis activities, etc.).

The Director asked for advice and permission to use part of the remaining funds to launch a second CRN call with very specific requirements, out of which one or two projects or additions to existing projects could be financed to address the lack of the human dimensions component in this program. Leaving the 20% aside would make financial flexibility possible. He noted new mechanisms had to be found to promote proposal submission in the area of Human Dimensions, as scientists were not generating the responses required to build a well-defined program. In his opinion the process of project approval should be more based on a dialogue with the scientists, and the projects should not be approved as is. In order not to discourage scientists, the IAI would inform why their projects were rejected but highlighting the valuable components to be developed. A possibility to approve fundable projects rejected because of lack of funds was to search funding jointly with the proponents and the IAI.

Cuba and Mexico suggested that the Director prepare a document describing the way he planned to use the 20%.

The EC approved the package recommended by SAC for implementation of the CRN II program.

(Action 6 – Day 1)

8. Vision from the new IAI Director

The IAI Director started his presentation saying that the IAI was about scientific excellence, networking, interdisciplinarity, regional development and integration, and policy relevance. Scientific excellence has already been achieved in past programs. He added the mechanisms, procedures, and support structures needed to be maintained but this area did not need new efforts.

Networking –an aspect that is improving- was and is not seen as an opportunity but as a chore and imposition by many scientists. Networking has the potential to detract from scientific excellence, but it also has the potential to improve the overall scientific efforts. Networking is a crucial process that sets the IAI apart from the other funding agencies.

Because of the still limited acceptance but tremendous importance of this issue, networking needs steering mechanisms in the implementation of CRN II, in capacity building - both for training and strengthening institutions.

Interdisciplinarity is also seen as a chore and imposition, not as an opportunity. Integration between science disciplines has improved and is improving but it has not (enough) in the co-disciplinarity between social and natural sciences. This would have the potential to improve science and is crucial as global change science becomes regional and impact-oriented. The IAI can be of global importance rather than only regional. Interdisciplinarity needs active encouragement, direction and steering mechanisms for CRN II implementation, training and with new program initiatives targeting these aspects specifically.

In the first phase of the IAI, stress was put on building a profile of excellence in science without necessarily defining policy relevance. Although global change by definition is policy relevant, a large number of points on policy relevant issues had to be defined in the projects. Scientists need to engage in a dialogue that can be relevant to policy and policy makers. This is a task of education. Hopefully the IAI/SCOPE meeting would give some ideas on bridging the gap between science and policy.

Regional integration is very closely linked to policy relevance and needs to be developed. Although scientists may know some scientific issues/results are important, they still have to "pass on" this information to policy makers in a way they can 'understand' and apply. The other point is to make this relevance visible.

A policy orientation will generate resistance from scientists. The IAI needs to define policy relevance in a regional and national context distinguishing it from maintaining a political presence in an international organization. The Director stated the IAI had not tackled this task at all and that it had been accomplished only in individual projects and activities (training!) in countries that were underrepresented (2005 Training Institutes in Jamaica and Paraguay). The IAI needs regional and national dialogue. Representatives should play a dual role, not only represent the countries at the IAI, but also represent the IAI in their countries. He added this was the only vehicle that could improve and increase the visibility of the Institute in the countries. The Director expressed his desire to see an evolution of the role of the EC and the CoP.

Finally, the Director said it had been a tremendous achievement to get the IAI to be where it was, and that the strategy for the next 10 years had to be defined and developed, which would be a task of the SAC, the EC and the CoP.

Venezuela held the IAI would be representative in the countries as long as the IAI science was in line with the research needs of the countries and the region.

Mexico noted there was no obligation in the CRN II to have policy relevant recommendations in the project results or to identify the pertinent actors for a policy relevant dialogue.

Cuba reminded that the Science Forum during the EC/CoP meetings in Buenos Aires had been devoted to define the IAI science agenda taking into consideration the member country global change research needs. Countries had sent documents on this issue to the Directorate before those meetings. The new IAI Science Agenda was then defined, but the information submitted by the countries was not taken into account in the final document.

Venezuela put forward the idea that the political position of member countries in global change science and technology related issues had to be discussed at high government levels. A meeting with the scientists would be the next step. She suggested that the day

usually devoted to the Science Forum be used to discuss the member country policy interests/needs in global change research.

USA said the integration of scientific results and policy making needed to take place amongst all the components of the IAI, i.e., the SAC, the EC, the CoP, the scientists, the Directorate as well as within the science the IAI provides funds for and that every high level discussion should also involve the SAC. The next CoP has to address the issue of resolving the perspectives from the scientific and national communities.

Brazil declared the IAI was not visible even in its host country. Although the Institute's headquarters was at the INPE facilities, many people there did not know what the IAI was. She told participants, the INPE was also host to other international organizations such as IGBP Brazil, and that strong actions by the Directorate were crucial in order to have a response from member countries.

Argentina asked several questions to the Director about: a) his plans to expand the IAI funding resources and his opinion the budget situation of the IAI in relation to country contributions, b) the internal aspects of the Directorate, i.e., functioning, number and quality of staff c) his vision of the IAI Programs.

Mexico continued the issue raised by Argentina about funding sources. He said there were many multilateral organizations that could be approached by the IAI and that the IAI should develop a marketing strategy looking at what the Institute could offer to its possible partners. He also pointed that some member countries did not attend IAI meetings or pay their contributions because they were not interested in the Institute. He added that knowing the Director's strategy to enhance country commitment would make it possible for country representatives to contribute in the process. As to the link between the scientific and the decision maker communities, maybe member countries should map their research capacity in global change.

The Director replied that engaging member countries in a dialogue for the formulation of a policy relevant science program would be a step to increase the funding basis of the IAI. The IAI could be a broker of multinational programs with regional relevance (e.g., a La Plata Basin initiative). The good profile that the IAI has developed in terms of scientific excellence and an improved profile in terms of regional integration and policy relevance together with the fact that the IAI is filling a niche that is unique could be used to look for counterparts for funding initiatives. He added that at the IGFA meeting in Sweden, it had become evident that politicians had realized global change was an issue that affected the future of the world. The general perception there was that well-designed targeted relevant global change science may see an increase in funding opportunities (land use, vulnerability, security, etc.).

Regarding deficiencies in the functioning of the Directorate, the Director expressed a team needed to be forged that would see clear balance and a common goal.

As to visibility, the Director acknowledged that it was a shame that the IAI was not known even at its host institution and country, where it should be very visible and active.

As suggested by Mexico, CRN II PIs should write a policy relevant executive summary. An educational effort has to be done in this regard. Proposals have to be improved together with the PIs and CoPIs, in a way that helps to forge the science profile of the IAI. Use the funds left for flexibility of the program to launch additional initiatives to round off the whole program. The Director added that timing had not been ideal, as the CRN had come in the middle of a crisis of the IAI. He suggested that even when the IAI was not able to fund projects based in

every member country, Pls of projects on subjects of interest to a given country (not belonging to their projects) could be requested to visit this country thus creating new links.

Panama repeated the request made during the last EC meeting that the IAI inform the countries on the importance of their commitment to the Institute as well as on the support countries can receive from the Institute.

9. Report of the Financial and Administrative Committee

Vanessa Richardson, Chair of the FAC, opened her presentation informing that although the FAC had not met during the period following the EC and CoP meetings in Montreal in May 2005, progress had been made on several important issues (Document 7).

On July 1 2005, the revised "Employee Handbook" and the new "Project Management Manual" became effective upon approval by the FAC, and acceptance by the IAI. The FAC and the IAI Directorate continued to work on the revised draft version of the "Contracting and Procurement Manual". She also reported that progress was being made on the language for the CRN II grant agreements to make assure that it was consistent with the text in the Project Management Manual and that accounting of advances and other funds addressed the provisions of the sponsors of CRN II.

The Accounting Manual has also to be revised and approved, which the FAC is not sure to have ready by the next EC-CoP meeting.

The Core Budget that had been approved had a provision for a one-year post-adjustment for the international Directorate staff, saying also that an analysis would be done of the benefits of the staff. Vanessa Richardson informed she had contacted a consulting company in New York which was also working on a project in Brazil. She said that before taking further steps she would like to have a meeting with the FAC and the Director.

The FAC Chair informed that the FAC membership for the next two- year term would be finalized at the EC XXI meeting and that the FAC would convene a brief meeting at that time to review the actions and issues for the coming year.

The EC Chair reminded that during the meetings in Montreal, some countries had expressed their interest in being part of the FAC, i.e., Costa Rica and Colombia.

Cuba declared that although the groups have to renew their members, there were countries that had to be represented in the FAC, as this committee was responsible for proposing the level of country contributions, which was not only a financial but also political and strategic issue. In her view, all the countries that were interested in participating should be part of the FAC. She said Cuba would no longer be member of the committee, so there would be a vacancy.

Argentina said some countries were particularly interested in being part of the FAC, as this was a major link between the EC and the Directorate. Each country can decide who would represent them at this committee. He suggested that the EC Chair send a letter to the member countries asking for nominations.

Brazil expressed the willingness of this country to be part of the FAC through an INPE administrative officer, with a background in economics.

The EC thanked Barbara Garea for her work in the FAC.

The EC agreed that the EC Chair will make a call for nomination by the IAI member countries for the new membership of the FAC, encouraging them to propose candidates with a legal, financial, and administrative background. Nominations should be sent to Adrian Fernandez (afernand@ine.gob.mx) and Arnaldo Matus (amatus@ine.gob.mx) by October 20, 2005.

(Action 2 – Day 2)

10. EC Committees

Jamaica said the IAI Regional development and integration for climate change was weak for the Caribbean islands, especially the small islands, and that there was concern for sea level rise, storm surges, and hurricanes. He reminded the audience a meeting had been held in about 1995 in Puerto Rico between the CARICOM countries and the IAI. No further results were seen from this meeting. He stressed the current moment seemed to be an ideal time to engage CARICOM countries, but that this would be more difficult now as these countries had received a 7 mln USD grant from the GEF for research on impacts and adaptation. Maybe the IAI can engage them as it has the basic science which they could apply to their research on impacts and adaptation.

As follow-up to Action 1 from Day 2 of the 20th Meeting of the Executive Council, the formation of a new ad hoc Committee, led by the new Director, was discussed. EC members should send expressions of interest, with ideas for addressing the topics outlined in Montreal, to Holm Tiessen and Carlos Ereño by October 20, 2005. The EC Chair will forward the invitation to all Members of the CoP.

(Action 4 – Day 1)

The EC Chair mentioned the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures had been composed of only one member for years and that this committee was very important to the functioning of the IAI.

The 21st EC agreed that the membership of the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures is open and expressions of interest to serve on the committee should be sent to Adrian Fernandez (afernand@ine.gob.mx) and Arnaldo Matus (amatus@ine.gob.mx) by 20 October 2005.

(Action 3 – Day 2)

The 21st EC agreed that the membership/composition of the three committees (i.e., Action Item 4 Day 1, Action Item 2 Day 2, Action Item 3 Day 2) will be determined by the EC Bureau in consultation with the IAI Director.

(Action 4 – Day 2)

11. IAI Newsletter

The IAI Newsletter Editor, Carlos Ereño, informed that during the EC XX a document had been presented analyzing the situation of the Newsletter. It was then approved that 3 issues of the Newsletter would be published in 2005. The new composition of the Editorial Board was also discussed at that meeting. It was decided that a CoP member would be part of the Board in replacement of one of the SAC members. Having a CoP member on the Editorial Board would make it possible to have a closer vision of budget issues of the Newsletter.

The terms of reference for the Editorial Board state that the Board deals with aspects related to the contents and quality of the Newsletter. Carlos Ereño recalled that when those terms of reference were drafted an EC Communications Task Force was actively involved with the Newsletter. The dissolution of this task force, which was the link between the EC and the Newsletter, left the Newsletter administrative issues unaddressed. However, he added that the Directorate had asked the Editorial Board to ratify the decision of reducing the frequency of the Newsletter due to budget restrictions. This could be the background for expanding the terms of reference of the Board so that they include administrative matters as well. Prof. Ereño also asked the SAC Chair to nominate a SAC member to replace Alejandro Castellanos on the Editorial Board. The new Editorial Board would have to present its analysis on the frequency of the newsletter at the next CoP.

The IAI Director found the IAI Newsletter a very important element of IAI communications. In his opinion, having a web-based Newsletter rather than a printed one should be considered. As to the contents, he said it would be important to have an issue driven newsletter. Such an action would help to promote the IAI in the future and consolidate its image.

Cuba suggested that the Directorate present an analysis of the different IAI communication tools together with their cost-efficiency balance at the next CoP, which was a task the Communications Task Force used to carry out. She also invited EC members with ideas/experience on this issue to contact the Director.

The EC received with appreciation and discussed the proposals from the representative of Argentina, responsible for the Newsletter (Carlos Ereño), about the IAI Newsletter. The EC took the four following decisions:

- The editorial board of the IAI Newsletter should be composed of a member from the SAC and a member from the CoP, whose names should be suggested before the next CoP Meeting.
- The EC Chair will send a letter to all the representatives to invite them to express their interest to serve on the editorial board.
- The SAC Chair will inform the editorial board of the Newsletter on who will be the new representative of SAC (to replace Alejandro Castellanos) on the editorial board.
- All the EC members will exchange ideas about how to improve the communication tools of IAI, especially the format and content of the Newsletter and the Annual Report. All suggestions will have to be communicated to the representative of Argentina and responsible for the Newsletter (Carlos Ereño), the TCO Officer (Marcella Ohira) and the members of CoP.

(Action 5 – Day 1)

12. Items to be discussed at the next EC /forwarded to CoP

Mexico suggested that a group (composed of the EC Bureau, the Director and the SAC Chair) be in charge of defining the agenda for the next EC meeting, with the input of all member countries. He added draft proposals would be sent to CoP members before the meeting. The proposal was endorsed by Cuba.

As a result of the discussions on the integration between science and policy and on the duties of the IAI bodies and the interactions among them, the EC and decided the following actions:

The EC decided to invite selected CRN II Lead PI's to the next EC/CoP/SAC Meeting in Venezuela to interact and discuss with them the science projects and their impact on policy and strategic actions in the region.

(Action 5 – Day 2)

The next CoP should discuss how management and reporting structures of the IAI might be improved to advance the development of a strategic, balanced science program.

(Action 7 – Day 2)

13. Future Sites and Meetings

Venezuela, as in the last EC Meeting, renewed its offer to be the host of a joint EC/CoP/SAC Meeting in May 2006.

(Action 3 – Day1)

The joint EC/CoP/SAC Meeting will be held in May 2006 in Caracas, Venezuela. The Bureau will work with the host country in the preparation for this meeting.

(Action 1 – Day 2)

14. Adjournment of the Meeting

Adrian Fernandez closed the meeting and thanked Dr. John Stewart for his help during the transition stage of the IAI. He also thanked the participants at the meeting and the translators for their work and in particular Arnoldo Matus Kramer for his involvement in the IAI activities.

The Director thanked Adrian Fernandez for hosting the meeting.

**21st Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
September 8 and 9, 2005 - Puerto Vallarta, Mexico**

Action List

Day 1: September 8

2. The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty First EC Meeting with the following three modifications:
 - Argentina proposed an item in the Agenda to better define the IAI Newsletter.
 - The IAI Interim Director, John Stewart, suggested that the presentation by the new IAI director should follow the presentation by the SAC.
 - Cuba suggested leaving the membership of the IAI FAC as the last point of the Agenda.

3. The EC approved the Report of its Twentieth Meeting with three observations:
 - Argentina underlined that point 9 of the Twentieth Meeting Report (“9. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee”) could be unclear. The EC approved the following change: replace the word “*participation*” by the word “*contributions*” in the last paragraph of point 9.

 - Argentina also asked for a change in the Action List of Day 2 of the Twentieth Meeting, point 1: the substitution of the word “*participation*” by the word “*contributions*”. The change was approved by the EC.

 - Canada asked for more clarity in the 3rd paragraph of point 5.5.2 about Contributions in 2005-2006. The EC approved the following modification in the 3rd paragraph:
*“He also showed a graph representing the Composition of contributions: 79 % of the Core Budget is paid by the 3 largest contributors; 15 % of the Core Budget is paid by the next 4 largest contributors; and the remaining 12 countries (those assigned US\$ 5K / year) account for 6 % of the Core Budget.
He stressed the importance of timely contributions so as not to extinguish the reserves of the Institute.”*

4. Venezuela, as in the last EC Meeting, renewed its offer to be the host of a joint EC/CoP/SAC Meeting in May 2006.

5. As follow-up to Action 1 from Day 2 of the 20th Meeting of the Executive Council, the formation of a new ad hoc Committee, led by the new Director, was discussed. EC members should send expressions of interest, with ideas for addressing the topics outlined in Montreal, to Holm Tiessen and Carlos Ereño by October 20, 2005. The EC Chair will forward the invitation to all Members of the CoP.

6. The EC received with appreciation and discussed the proposals from the representative of Argentina, responsible for the Newsletter (Carlos Ereño), about the IAI Newsletter. The EC took the four following decisions:
 - The editorial board of the IAI Newsletter should be composed of a member from the SAC and a member from the CoP, whose names should be suggested before the next CoP Meeting.
 - The EC Chair will send a letter to all the representatives to invite them to express their interest to serve on the editorial board.
 - The SAC Chair will inform the editorial board of the Newsletter on who will be the new representative of SAC (to replace Alejandro Castellanos) on the editorial board.
 - All the EC members will exchange ideas about how to improve the communication tools of IAI, especially the format and content of the Newsletter and the Annual Report. All suggestions will have to be communicated to the representative of Argentina and responsible for the Newsletter (Carlos Ereño), the TCO Officer (Marcella Ohira) and the members of CoP.
7. The EC approved the package recommended by SAC for implementation of the CRN II program.

Action List

Day 2: September 9

1. The joint EC/CoP/SAC Meeting will be held in May 2006 in Caracas, Venezuela. The Bureau will work with the host country in the preparation for this meeting.
2. The EC agreed that the EC Chair will make a call for nomination by the IAI member countries for the new membership of the FAC, encouraging them to propose candidates with a legal, financial and administrative background. Nominations should be sent to Adrian Fernandez (afernand@ine.gob.mx) and Arnoldo Matus (amatus@ine.gob.mx) by October 20, 2005.
3. The 21st EC agreed that the membership of the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures is open and expressions of interest to serve on the committee should be sent to Adrian Fernandez (afernand@ine.gob.mx) and Arnoldo Matus (amatus@ine.gob.mx) by 20 October 2005.
4. The 21st EC agreed that the membership/composition of the three committees (i.e., Action 4 Day 1, Action 2 Day 2, Action 3 Day 2) will be determined by the EC Bureau in consultation with the IAI Director.
5. The EC decided to invite selected CRN II Lead PI's to the next EC/CoP/SAC Meeting in Venezuela to interact and discuss with them the science projects and their impact on policy and strategic actions in the region.
6. It was decided that the EC should fill the Associates vacancy on the SAC before the next CoP with the objective to enable SAC to operate with a full membership of ten. The new member should reflect the needed changes and balance in the IAI's program direction.
7. The next CoP should discuss how management and reporting structures of the IAI might be improved to advance the development of a strategic, balanced science program.

ACRONYMS

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
CATHALAC	Centro del Agua del Trópico Húmedo para América Latina y el Caribe
CIESIN	Center for International Earth Science Information Network
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CLIVAR/ VAMOS	Climate Variability & Predictability/ Variability of the American Monsoon Systems
CPTEC/INPE	Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos / Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais
CRECTEALC	Centro Regional de Enseñanza en Ciencia y Tecnología del Espacio en América Latina y el Caribe
CRN	Collaborative Research Network Program
DIS	Data and Information System
DIVERSITAS	International Programme of Biodiversity Science
EC	Executive Council
EU	European Union
DIS	Data and Information System
FAC	Financial and Administrative Committee (of the EC)
ICSU	International Council for Science
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme
IGFA	International Group of Funding Agencies for Global Change Research
IHDP	International Human Dimensions Programme
NSF	National Science Foundation
NSERC	Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
PI	Principal Investigator
RPSC	Rules and Procedures Standing Committee (of the CoP)
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
SO	Scientific Officer
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
WCRP	World Climate Research Program