

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



EC-XXI
September 8-9, 2005
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico

Minutes of the EC-XX

2_ECXXI/DWD/English/July 2005

**Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
Montreal, Canada
May 2-3, 2005**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda

- 1. Opening Session**
- 2. Approval of the Agenda**
- 3. Approval of the Report of the Nineteenth EC Meeting**
- 4. Composition of the Nominating Committee for the election of SAC members**
- 5. Report of the Executive Council Chair**
- 6. Report of the IAI Directorate**
- 7. Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)**
- 8. Report of the Rules & Procedures Standing Committee (RPSC)**
- 9. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee (FAC)**
- 10. Ad Hoc Committee on the Relation with Member States**
- 11. Ad-Hoc Group on the IAI Newsletter issue**
- 12. Items to be forwarded to CoP**
- 13. Future Sites and Meetings**
- 14. Adjournment of the Meeting**

Action List EC-XX (day 1)

Action List EC-XX (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.

th
20 Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
Montreal, Canada, May 2-3, 2005

AGENDA

Monday – May 02, 2005	Day 1
------------------------------	--------------

Morning session (08:30 – 12:00)

08:30 - 9:00 Registration

Opening ceremony

Representative of Canada
EC Chair: Adrián Fernández

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 19th Meeting of the EC

Report of the EC Chair:

Adrián Fernández

- *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.*

Nomination of the Committee to recommend final candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members

Adrián Fernández

10:30 – 10:45 Coffee Break

Report of the IAI Directorate:

Interim Director and the IAI Staff

- *Overview from the IAI Interim Director (**John W. B. Stewart**);*
- *Overview of the Science Programs (**Gerhard Breulmann**);*
- *Overview of the Training, Communications, and Outreach Areas (**Marcella Ohira**);*
- *Overview of the financial status of the Core Budget for FY 2004-2005 and Auditors Report as of June 30, 2004 (**Silvio Bianchi**).*
- *Overview of the IAI Data Information System (DIS) and other Information Technology (IT) matters (**Luis Marcelo Achite**)*
- *Overview of the Core Budget for FY 2005-2006 and Country Contribution for 2005-2006 (**John W. B. Stewart**);*

12:00 Lunch

Afternoon session (02:00 – 06:00)

Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) Chair

Walter Fernandez

Report of the Working Groups/Task Forces/Committees:

- *Standing Committee for Rules & Procedures..... Louis Brown*
- *Financial and Administrative Committee..... Vanessa Richardson*

04:30 – 04:45 Coffee Break

- *Ad-Hoc Committee on Relations with Member States.....Adrián Fernández*
- *Ad-Hoc Group on the Newsletter issue.....Carlos Ereño*

Welcome Reception

Morning session (09:00 – 12:00)

Approval of the Auditors Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2004

Approval of the items to be forwarded to the CoP

Adrián Fernández

Approval of the Action List of day

Adrián Fernández

10:15 – 10:30 Coffee Break

Future sites and meetings

Adjourn

12:00 Lunch

1. Opening Session

The EC Chairman, Adrián Fernández Bremauntz, opened the meeting and thanked the government of Canada for hosting the 20th EC meeting in Montreal. He introduced the two EC Vice-chairs, Michel Béland from Canada and Bárbara Garea from Cuba, and the IAI Interim Director, Dr. John W. B. Stewart.

Michel Béland, Director of the Meteorological Service of Canada, made an opening remark 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, Marcela Nicodemos
- Canada: Michel Béland, Louis Grittani, Don Maclver
- Cuba: Bárbara Garea Moreda
- Jamaica: Michael Taylor
- Mexico: Adrián Fernández Bremauntz, Arnoldo Matus Kramer
- United States: Margaret Leinen, Paul Filmer, Vanessa Richardson, Louis B. Brown
Bárbara de Rosa-Joint
- Venezuela: Nuris Orihuela

Observers:

- Panama: Zoila Aquino
- AAAS: Sherburne Abbot, Lars Bromley, Elvia Niebla

Special Invitees

Walter Fernández Rojas (IAI SAC Chair)

IAI Directorate:

John W. B. Stewart, Gerhard Breulmann, Silvio Bianchi, Marcella Ohira, Luis Marcelo Achite, Luciana Queiroz Ribeiro

Support staff: Elvira Gentile

Local Staff:

Serge Nadon, Milly Cayo, Martin Chartrand, Bernard Cloutier, James Scharf

2. Approval of the Agenda

The EC approved the agenda of its Twentieth Meeting with only one modification in the item corresponding to the presentation of the Ad-Hoc Group on the Newsletter issue (Carlos Ereño would present the report instead of Bárbara Garea) (*Action 1–Day 1*).

3. Approval of the Report of the XIX EC Meeting

The EC approved the Report of its Nineteenth Meeting with no modification. (*Action 2 – Day 1*)

4. Composition of the Nominating Committee for the election of SAC members

The EC approved the composition of the Committee to recommend final candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members:

- SAC Chair: Dr. Walter Fernández
- EC Member: Dr. Paul Filmer (USA)
- EC Member: Dr. Bárbara Garea (Cuba)
- Local scientist: Dr. Don MacIver

The group would present a report during the CoP meeting. (*Action 3 - Day 1*)

The EC Chair announced that Maria Assunção Faus da Silva Dias had kindly withdrawn her nomination to the SAC to prevent any possible conflict of interest in view of the fact that she was the new representative from Brazil to the EC.

5. Report of the Executive Council Chair

The EC Chairman, Adrián Fernández, informed about the issues pending from the EC-XIX and the CoP-XI (Buenos Aires, Argentina, June 2004) and referred to the status of the Action Lists:

Action	Status
The EC recommended the IAI Directorate to make a last effort to recover the CRN 038 project funds before initiating legal action against CATHALAC and inform the EC about the efforts made.(Action 12 – day 2, EC XIX)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Initial contact between the previous IAI Director, Gustavo V. Necco, and the CATHALAC Director, Dr. Sempris, during AIACC meeting in Buenos Aires. CATHALAC agreed that the remaining funds of the IAI should be returned.▪ EC Chair sent a letter to Dr. Sempris in December 2004 reminding him of his informal agreement with Dr. Necco and asking him to contact the new Interim Director, Dr. John W. B. Stewart▪ Dr. Stewart has received 50 % of the total amount of funds (25.000 USD). He suggested to explore the initiative to proceed legally against CATHALAC if the rest of the funds are not received by the end of June
The IAI Director informed the EC that he would resign on December 31, 2004. (Action 7 – day 1, EC XIX)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The EC Chair received a formal resignation letter from Dr. Gustavo V. Necco on August 2, 2004 effective December 31, 2004.▪ On September 20, 2004, the EC Chair sent a letter to Dr. Necco accepting his resignation.▪ On November 24, 2004, the EC Chair sent

	<p>an announcement to the CoP informing about the election of Dr. John W. B. Stewart as the IAI Interim Director, who took office at the beginning of 2005.</p>
<p>The EC approved the reduction in the frequency of the IAI Newsletter (from 4 to 3 issues per year) for the current year. The EC asked a group composed of the IAI Newsletter Editorial Board, the Financial Officer and a CoP member to analyze this issue and report back to the next EC (action 1 – day 2, EC XIX)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ad Hoc committee on the Newsletter submitted a document for the consideration of the EC and the CoP (Document 14).
<p>The EC requested the FAC to study different alternatives for the calculation of Country Contributions (Action 4 - day 2, EC XIX)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EC Chair received the document with the proposal of the FAC in April 2005 (Document 13b)
<p>The EC will forward to the SAC the proposal submitted by the delegate of Brazil requesting that the IAI consider accepting CPTEC/INPE as an Affiliated Institution (Action 8 - day 2, EC XIX)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SAC discussed this issue during SAC-XXI (November 2004) and recommends its approval to EC/CoP.
<p>The EC asked the IAI Directorate to inform the IAI national representatives about the proposals submitted to IAI calls by scientists from their countries. (Action 9 - day 2, EC XIX)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The IAI Directorate has informed the IAI national representatives on the proposals submitted under the CRN II. ▪ The IAI Scientific Officer has sent the representatives details of the 93 pre-proposals and the final 37 full proposals (proposal number, PI name and country, proposal title, other countries involved, and funds requested).
<p>The CoP decided that the delegates from Canada, Cuba, and the US would draft a letter to be submitted to the EC about the problem with the IAI local staff salaries. The letter will then be sent by the EC to the appropriate Brazilian authorities. This action will be taken within 2 months from the meeting. The delegate from Brazil did not take part in the discussion of this issue. (action 14 – day 2, CoP XI)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On October 26th 2004 a letter was sent to the Minister of Science and Technology from Brazil (Mr. Eduardo Campos) respectfully asking him to find a solution to this problem. ▪ The letter was drafted by Michel Béland (Canada), Bárbara Garea (Cuba), and the EC Chair. ▪ A copy of the letter was also sent to Dr. Moura Miranda, Director of INPE, and the Minister Everton Vargas, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Itamaraty)
<p>? The CoP endorsed the proposal of Canada, seconded by Mexico, about reviewing the voting rules and mechanisms during the EC and CoP meetings in order to make them more clear, efficient and democratic. The Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures was requested to submit the appropriate documents electronically to the member country delegates, who would send their comments to the Chair of the Committee. (Action 15 – day 2, CoP XI)</p> <p>? The CoP asked the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures to draft rules pertaining to nomination procedures for the Scientific Advisory Committee and to present them to the EC at its next meeting (Action 5 – day 1, CoP XI)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SCRIP has submitted a report for EC consideration (Document 12) ▪ The document aims at eliminating (or at least minimizing) the risk of having an endless series of elections for any IAI vacant post. ▪ The CoP could apply these new rules in its Montreal meeting if they were approved unanimously.

6. Report of the Directorate

The IAI Interim Director, Dr. John W. B. Stewart, explained that the IAI Directorate Report covered the period from the 19th EC Meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina (June 2004) and that it would be presented by himself and the IAI Officers: Gerhard Breulmann (Science activities); Marcella Ohira Schwarz (Communications, Training and Outreach activities), Marcello Achite (Information Technologies, IT, and IAI-DIS matters) and Silvio Bianchi (Financial and Administrative activities).

The Powerpoint files of their presentations are available at: www.iai.int/meetings/institutional, 20th meeting of the EC – 12th meeting of the CoP

6.1 Overview from the IAI Director

The IAI Interim Director gave an overview of his report to the EC (Document 6). He also explained that the IAI Directorate report had been prepared by Dr. Gustavo V. Necco (July - December 2004) and himself (January-May 2005).

Dr. Stewart stressed that it had been a very developmental period for the IAI in spite of the hiccups in management.

He said that up to now the IAI has examined the quality of scientific output and has evaluated training programs and summer institutes. Both science programs and outreach training courses have been successful and outstanding. Therefore, according to him, the next challenge for the IAI is to assess *how relevant the IAI science and training program were to society (politicians and stakeholders in general)*.

He also referred to the concept of *Science for sustainable development (by Gilbert Glasser)*, which is defined as a "Balance of Three Pillars": social well-being, economic prosperity, and environmental protection for the benefit of present and future generations. In this sense, scientific knowledge is needed to underpin sustainable development policies; decision makers need policy relevant research that provides applicable results; and research agendas must be defined through broad based participatory approaches involving those in need of scientific information and advice (those in need range from farmers, through business/industry and national legislators and ministries, to regional and global organizations and bodies).

As to the ***Recommendations from the previous EC/CoP meetings*** the IAI Interim Director mentioned the following points:

Newsletter Frequency (Action 1, day 1, EC XIX). This issue had been addressed by the Editorial Board in December 2003 and was discussed again in March 2005 by an ad hoc group consisting of the Editor, a CoP/EC member, and the Directorate staff. The recommendation was made to plan on 3 issues of the newsletter in the current year. This decision was based on content and workload reasons rather than financial considerations.

Calculation of Country Contributions (Action 4 – day 2, EC XIX). The FAC would report on this issue.

Efficiency of the Institute (action 7 – day 2, EC XIX). The EC asked the FAC to make an analysis of the efficiency of the Institute as regards funds management. The FAC would report on this issue.

Proposal that CPTEC/INPE be an Affiliated Institute (Action 8 – Day 2, EC XIX). The SAC has accepted this proposal and would forward it to the next CoP.

EC asked the IAI Directorate to inform IAI countries about the pre-proposals for CRN-II submitted under IAI calls by scientists from their countries (Action 9 day 2, EC XIX). This was carried out in Nov 26 2004 (IAIDIR-223/04)

The EC asked the delegations from Canada and the United States to draft a letter asking them and the IAI Directorate to find a solution to the problem of local staff salaries (Action 11, day 2, EC XIX). Letter sent on October 26, 2004, to the Brazilian Minister of Science and Technology and copied to the INPE Director and the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The EC recommended that the IAI Directorate make a last effort to recover CRN 038 project funds before taking legal action against CATHALAC and inform the EC about the efforts made (Action 12- Day 2, EC XIX). See EC Chair report above.

The CoP asked the standing committee on Rules and procedures to draft rules pertaining to nomination procedures for the SAC and present them to the EC at its next meeting (Action 5 – Day 1, CoP XI). The Chair of the Rules Committee would report about this issue.

Regarding the **Visibility of IAI**, the IAI Interim Director reported that the IAI maintained close contact with major Global Change committees and participated in the organizing committees of many of them. He also said that attempts were made to invite Officers of key committees to IAI Science meetings and that the IAI Directorate Officers had tried to visit as many countries and PIs as their working schedule permitted. (Please, see Brief Account of visits and participation in events as well as lectures delivered in Appendix I of document 5).

He then summarized the **Directorate Activities during July-December 2004** (Dr. Gustavo V. Necco):

- Launching of the second Round of the IAI Collaborative Research Network (CRN-II): development and strengthening of procedures and rules to adequately manage the second round of the CRN.
- IAI Manuals and administrative procedures reviewed and updated (Project Management Manual and improved Grant Agreement in process)
- Two successful IAI Institutes were implemented, one in Mexico (on urbanization and global environmental change) and one in Costa Rica (on food systems and globalization)
- Agreements with other Institutions:
 - Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with CIIFEN (Centro Internacional de Investigación sobre el Fenómeno de El Niño, Ecuador) and DIVERSITAS
 - Discussions with CPTEC/INPE to have this center as an Affiliated Research Institution to IAI.
- Exhibit at the Tenth Conference of the Parties of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Buenos Aires: thanks to the collaboration of the Mexican delegation, the IAI had the opportunity to present an exhibit to distribute information materials
- Revision of the IAI Web Page
- Publication "The First 10 Years of IAI: Observing, measuring, understanding and documenting changes in the Earth environment of the Americas"(Eng. Spa. Port.)
- Synthesis and Publication of the ISP results: draft version under review
- Lecture series at INPE
- Administrative Workforce problems: discussions with local authorities about the new contractual transaction that affected negatively their salaries. An interim arrangement was agreed to temporarily palliate the situation.

As to the **Directorate Activities during January - May 2005**, he mentioned the following topics:

Directorate management efficiency

- A team of Senior Managers from NSF visited the IAI in mid-January 2005. The IAI Officers were able to take advantage of their experience to reorganize personnel and project manuals and procedures.
- The IAI Interim Director thanked the FAC members for their support to the IAI Directorate

Science activities

The Interim Director said Dr. Gerhard Breulmann, IAI Scientific Officer, would report on this. (see item 6.2. below)

Training, Communications and Outreach activities

The Interim Director said Ms. Marcella Ohira, IAI Training, Communications and Outreach Officer, would report on this issue. (see item 6.3 below)

Information Technology activities

The Interim Director said Mr. Luis Marcelo Achite, IAI IT Manager, would report on this issue. (see item 6.4 below)

Financial matters

The Interim Director said Mr. Silvio Bianchi, IAI Financial and Administrative Officer, would report on this issue. (see items 6.5 and 6.6 below)

6.2. Overview of the Science Programs

The IAI Scientific Officer (SO), Gerhard Breulmann, reported on the progress of the scientific area since the last EC Meeting (June 2004). He made an update on the following IAI programs: SGP I, SGP II, CRN I and CRN II.

6.2.1. First Round of the IAI Small Grant Program (SGP I)

The SO reported that the total grant for this Program was US\$ 380 K and that it supported 16 one-year projects (*max US\$ 30K each*). The Final Report to NSF was submitted in January 2005 and approved on 9 Feb. 2005.

6.2.2. Second Round of the IAI Small Grant Program (SGP II)

The SO reported that the total grant for this Program was US\$ 628,000 and that it supported 22 projects with a duration of 12-18 months. He informed that three Final Reports had been received in April 2005 and that the project completion was estimated for February 2006. He also mentioned there were two 'inter-regional' projects IAI-APN.

6.2.3. First Round of Collaborative Research Network (CRN I)

The SO informed that the projects were in their final year and that NSF had approved a no-cost extension until May 2006 (all projects requested no-cost extensions).

He said that two Final Technical Reports had been received and were under review (*CRN 009 C. Wood; CRN 047 M. McClain*).

He mentioned that Document 8 contained one-page summaries of the projects and that a highlight progress could be found in the IAI Annual Report 2003-2004, p. 67-77

Regarding *CRN-I Synthesis*, he explained that IAI had made an application to one of ICSU committees, the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) for assistance in synthesizing and assessing the CRN-I program. It was decided to bring the CRN PIs and some other projects PIs to a synthesis meeting in November 2005 under the title of "Bridging the Gap between Science & Decision Makers, integrating lessons from 10 years of IAI science projects"

6.2.4 Second Round of Collaborative Research Network (CRN II)

The SO then reported on the status of the CRN II. The IAI Proposal (US\$ 10.4 Mio.) was submitted to NSF on 13 August 2004 and the Call for Proposals was launched on 13 September 2004

He explained that the CRN-II application process had two Phases:

1. Pre-proposals – Deadline 20 October 2004

- Online submission system via IAI website.
- 93 pre-proposals received requesting a total of US\$ 80.14 million.
- Pre-proposal information sent to Country Delegates.
- *Evaluation Criteria*: 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.
- After SAC review: 35 pre-proposals were formally invited to submit full proposals (*original plan was to invite 25*).
- Results communicated to pre-proposal PIs in late November 2004.

2. Full Proposals

- Call launched on 14 December 2004, deadline 23 March 2005.
- 37 full proposals received (*34 invited; 3 non-invited*) requesting a total of US\$ 33.3 million.
- 13 proposals came from SGPI & SGPII.
- Full 3-step peer review process (mail, panel, IAI SAC):
 - At the time of the EC meeting, they were under mail review (20 June 2005)
232 reviewers approached, 152 replies (55 negative; 97 positives);
 - Panel Review scheduled for 19-22 July 2005;
 - SAC evaluation scheduled for (26-28 July 2005).

The SO also presented information regarding country involvement in the CRN II. Taking into account full proposals, the distribution of number of PIs per country was as follows: Argentina (4); Brazil (5); Canada (6), Chile (2), Ecuador (1), Guatemala (1), Mexico (6), Uruguay (2), USA (9) and Venezuela (1). There were no PIs from Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Panama, Paraguay and Peru; however these countries had Co-PIs excepting Panama.

Finally, the SO mentioned that regarding the Program Manager Hire, 68 applications had been received and 5 personal interviews were held on 25 April 2005. The potential starting date for the Program Manager is July 1, 2005.

Mexico, the USA, and Cuba congratulated the SO for the progress in the Science Program, especially in terms of policy relevance.

6.3 Overview of the Training, Communications and Outreach Area.

The IAI Training, Communications, and Outreach Officer (TCOO), Marcella Ohira, reported on IAI Training Institutes; IAI support to other capacity building activities; and IAI Communications and outreach.

6.3.1. IAI Training Institutes

She presented a table of the IAI Training Institutes held so far:

Institute Year	Theme	Participants	IAI Countries
IAI/UM 1999	El Nino/Climate Variability	20	12
IAI/UM 2000	LUCC	18	11
IAI/UM 2001	Water Resources	22	14
2003	Climate Vulnerability	24	13
2003	LUCC/Amazon Region	21	5
2003	Global Warming/Climate Change	18	11
2004	Urbanization and GEC in LA	24	11
2004	Food Systems/Security & Globalization	25 (14 LA)	9
Total		172	

The TCO Officer explained that IAI's special concerns in training and education were: Scientific Excellence; Policy Awareness; Integrated Multidisciplinary Research; Multinational Collaboration and IAI Human Network.

She also mentioned that the items considered in the design of the IAI Training Institutes were: Themes of Regional/Political Relevance; Needing both natural and social sciences perspectives; 1-2 Coordinators (science leaders); Invited Guest Lecturers; Practical Exercises; Duration: 2 weeks; Location: IAI member countries; Participants: average of 20; Based on Partnerships; Flexible and Dynamic.

She then referred to the ***IAI Institute on Urbanization and Global Environmental Change in Latin America (September 27-October 8, 2004, Mexico City, Mexico)***, which received a financial support from IHDP (\$10K, which were transferred directly to IAI) and Mexico's National Institute of Ecology (INE) (approximately \$10K) in addition to complementary in kind contributions of the latter. Other fundraising efforts were undertaken through contacts with UNEP in Mexico to co-sponsor this activity. The TCO Officer informed that UNEP participated in the closing ceremony of the Institute and that was interested in co-sponsoring the publication of this IAI Training Institute. The total of financial resources leveraged were US\$20,000.

The IAI resources (US\$80,040.60) funded the development of the program (science coordinator), scientists, decision-makers and guest-lecturers from several IAI member countries, in addition to logistical arrangements and the production of a book of the Institute. INE paid for some of the meals and lodging costs of foreign participants, in addition to the participation of local participants, support staff, equipment, material and supplies. IHDP covered the cost of some of the participants. Furthermore, important in-kind contributions were obtained, particularly from INE. These contributions were mainly for support of staff salaries, communications, equipment, welcome reception-ice breaker event, local transportation, etc.

The second Institute was ***IAI-IHDP Global Environmental Change Institute on Food Systems and Globalization: Scientific Workshop and Science-Policy Forum (October 24-November 5, 2004, Nicoya, San José, Costa Rica)***, which received a considerable financial support from IHDP (US\$20,000), Research Council of Norway (US\$18,800), APN (US\$15,000), ISSC (US\$ 5,000) and IICA (US\$3K). The IAI resources (US\$50,000) funded the participation of scientists, decision-makers, and guest-lecturers from IAI member countries, in addition to logistical arrangements and the production of a book. This book will include the proceedings of the Training Institute in addition to some papers on the theme of Food Systems and

Globalization. The financial resources of the partner organizations paid for the work of the two science program coordinators, participants from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and several guest lecturers from all over the world, in addition to other local costs. Total of financial resources leveraged were US\$61,800.

The TCO Officer added that important in-kind contributions were obtained from other partner organizations and collaborators. These contributions were mainly for staff salaries, communications, facilities, equipment, materials and supplies, etc). An estimation of the in-kind contribution is as follows: IHDP (US\$ 44,000), CICERO (US\$22,000), Rutgers University (US\$10,000), NEF and OdD/UCR (US\$1,600), FAO (approximately US\$4,000) and CRRH (approximately US\$3,000). Total of estimated in-kind contributions were US\$84,600.

Other institutional collaborators of the IAI in the organization of this activity were the University of Costa Rica - Foundation for Research (FUNDEVI); The National Center of Advanced Technology Foundation (FUNCENAT); The National Academy of Science of Costa Rica (NAC-CR); the Centro Mesoamericano de Desarrollo Sostenible del Trópico Seco (CEMEDE) of the National University of Costa Rica (UNA).

As regards the **Science Policy Forum**, the TCO Officer mentioned that the main objectives of the Forum were: address the science-policy interface and use of science information into the policy and decision-making processes; discuss science information available and its translation to non-science community; discuss policy issues that should be incorporated into modern research agenda; promote dialogue with policy makers. The audience included participants of the Training Institute, representatives from governmental agencies, NGOs, private sector, international organizations, universities, etc. The Forum exposed participants to multiple aspects of interaction of science-policy; fostered communication with policy makers and the reactions were highly positive. The future outcome of the forum would be the publication of a book on Food Systems/Security and Globalization in English, Spanish (with remaining resources).

According to the TCO Officer, other results of this Training Institute were: potential collaboration with international organizations: e.g. meeting with the Deputy Director of FAO/LA in Chile with the IAI SAC Chair; discussion with IICA about joint activities in the Caribbean; engagement of participants in IHDP scientific networks and broader exposure to international community; etc.

Some of the excellent immediate results from the 2004 IAI Training Institutes included:

- All participants ranked the two IAI Institutes "Excellent" or "Very Good";
- Reached out to new people (49) from IAI member countries (13 countries) + non members (2);
- Developed institutional, financial, programmatic partnership with other organizations (e.g. IHDP, IICA, FAO, CRRH, INE);
- Encouraged Human network development, multidisciplinary research, multinational collaboration and Science/Policy Interface;
- Liaised with IAI member countries and national organizations (e.g. Mexico and Costa Rica);
- Participants have reported successes in their career, for example: exchange of communication and data, publications, etc. (e.g. Book: "Seqüestro florestal de carbono no Brasil: Dimensões políticas, socioeconômicas e ecológicas by Man Yu Chang, participant of the Food Systems Training Institute).

The TCO Officer then informed that the scheduled Institutes for 2005 were:

1. Vulnerability Associated with Climate Variability and Change in the Americas (October 17-28, 2005, Asunción, Paraguay)

Local organizer: National University of Asunción (country representative: Genaro Coronel)
Program Coordinator: Luis José Mata, ZEF, IPCC (Venezuela/Germany)

2. Climate and Health (November 7-18, 2005, Kingston, Jamaica)

Local Organizer: West Indies University (country representative: Anthony Chen)
Program Coordinator: Joan Aron, USA (CRN);

Funding Availability: US\$ 330K from an NSF grant. Other fundraising efforts would be carried out throughout the year. She also announced that the IAI planned to launch a Seed Grants Program at the end of the Institutes (up to 10 awards to groups of Institute participants) to support a follow up and assessment of impact activity.

6.3.2. IAI Support to Other Capacity Building and outreach Activities:

The TCO Officer reported that the IAI was also engaged in the following activities either supporting the participation of Latin American researchers, or participating in the planning committees, or disseminating information about the IAI through exhibits and lectures:

- IAI-NCAR Training Workshops
- 2005 Summer School on Integrated Resource Management in the Tropics: Discussions with the University of Goettingen regarding a multi-year summer school to be held in Germany mainly for students and researchers from South and Central America
- 2005 Open Meeting of the Human Dimensions Community (October 10-14, 2005, Bonn, Germany)
- First Diversitas Open Science Meeting (November 9-11, 2005, Oaxaca, Mexico)
- AGU Meeting (May 23-27, 2005, New Orleans, USA)
- CoP UNFCCC (December 7-17, 2004, Buenos Aires, Argentina)

6.3.3. IAI Communications & Outreach:

The TCO Officer reported that the recent publications of the Institute were:

Newsletter # 35 and 36

Annual Report 2003-2004: Published in April, 2005

The following communication mechanisms were updated:

Listserv: distribution of about 52 announcements in the last 10 months (July 2004-April 2005) to over 3000 people.

Website: periodic update of its content

IAI Training Institute Website: specific website set up

She also presented details on the distribution of IAI publications:

Annual Report 2002-2003: 1500 reports distributed

IAI Anniversary Book: 1600 (English) and 1200 (Spanish) books distributed

Summaries of IAI Anniversary Book: 350 (English), 350 (Spanish), 30 (Portuguese) books distributed

New IAI Brochure: 1200 (English) brochures Distributed

She announced the following New Materials:

New layout IAI Website: (December 2004)

New IAI Brochure (Spanish): 1500 (March 2005)

Mini-CDs: 1000 (April 2005)

She finally mentioned the Future Publications:

Annual Report 2004-2005: 1500 by the end of 2005

Training Institute Books on Urbanization in LA and Food Systems/Security and Globalization by October 2005

Mexico and the **USA** congratulated the TCO Officer for her work. Given the results of the Science-Policy Forum, USA suggested making a strategic plan for the policy-science interface.

Mexico also commented on this relevant science-policy activity and announced that INE had committed some funds for the Diversitas Meeting. He stressed that the Training Institutes were a very good example of leveraging of funds.

Canada expressed its appreciation to the very strong effort of bringing the IAI message forward. He also suggested bringing the IAI message to other training courses (for example mentioned courses in Canada about climate change scenarios).

Mexico suggested the other delegates asking the CoP to explore the possibility of having one policy-science event every year. He also proposed to enhance the IAI presence in the UNFCCC meetings. IAI should be a registered Institution and try to organize side events within this framework.

The EC endorsed the proposal of Mexico to ask the IAI Directorate to schedule a science-policy activity (for example a meeting or a training institute) on an annual basis (*Action 7 – day 2*)

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 (*Action 8 – day 2*).

5.4 Overview of the IAI Data Information System (DIS) and other Information Technology (IT) matters

The Information Technology Manager (IT Manager), Luis Marcelo Achite, gave a presentation on IT matters, IAI DIS update, and future plans about Information Technology issues:

5.4.1. IT Matters

As regards to IT matters, he mentioned the daily activities for system maintenance, general security, and reliable IT environment (anti-Spam/Virus solution, Intranet, general logs for statistics and control, system updates, Website maintenance and updates, hardware purchases and maintenance, on-line registration system for the EC and CoP Meetings, other business.); the CRN2 on-line submission system; and the update of the IAI Website and IAIDB System.

5.4.2. DIS Update

He reminded the delegates that IAI had contacted the ORNL (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA) to upgrade the IAI DIS and announced that the new DIS website was running since April 14th, 2005. He also said that the IAI-DIS was fully integrated with the LBA-DIS and could be also integrated with other groups as requested.

He explained that the new system is structured in 3 main mechanisms: DIS Metadata Editor, DIS Search Process and DIS Harvest Process. There is an easy integration with other “actors” of the Mercury Consortium (it is a Consortium for the Mercury Project, a web based metadata search and data retrieval system, used by different institutions for data dissemination.) and the cost for the IAI is US\$15K per year to participate in the Consortium.

According to the IT Manager, the DIS can:

- provide a single portal to information produced within the IAI scientific programs;
- provide fielded, spatial, and temporal search capabilities;
- Allow individuals and database managers to distribute their data while maintaining complete control and ownership;
- leverage investment in existing information systems and research; and specially
- manage knowledge (organize pieces)

He also talked about the responsibilities of the PIs within this context (for example, the PI is responsible to make sure that all data generated within the project is referenced as metadata in the DIS; the PI must appoint the person who will contact the ITM in order to create metadata for the project Reports)

He added that under CRN II there would be a contractual obligation for all projects to contribute metadata and real data to the IAI DIS.

5.4.3. IT and DIS Future plans

Finally, he listed the following future plans for his area:

DIS

- Update the GCMD DIS Portal with new metadata.
- Finalize the DIS Data Policy document.
- Prepare documents for the DIS Portal (Tutorial, User’s Guide, etc).
- Prepare a new brochure for the DIS.
- Create two DIS posters.
- Organize a DIS training session for the current CRN PIs.
- Work with PIs in order to create metadata for current projects.
- Organize a DIS Workshop for the CRN2 PIs.

IT

- Seek a Video/Tele Conference Solution.
- Have a better Control of Potential Reviewers.
- Have a better Control of Events (redesign the process).
- Migrate the US newsletter subscribers to the IAIDB platform.
- Improve the Proposal Submission process.
- Report submission system for scientific programs.
- Integrate the IAIDB system with other components.
- Keep Improving the IAI website

5.5. Overview of the financial status of the CB for FY 2004-2005 and Auditors report as of June 30, 2004

The IAI Administrative and Financial Officer (AFO), Silvio Bianchi, gave a report on the Audit report as of June 30, 2004, the Financial Status Report as of March 31, 2005, and the IAI Manuals.

5.5.1. Audit Report as of June 30, 2004

The AFO mentioned 3 highlights from the Audit Report:

- Fair Value of the Accounts Receivable and Payable (3rd paragraph of Audit Report, that makes reference to CRN projects). The AFO explained that when the IAI registered all CRN projects 3 years ago, assumed that the Institute was making a contribution to the beneficiary research institution in order to perform a research activity (this means that the IAI was giving the funds and not expecting an equivalent value in goods and services for the amount given). The auditors approach regarding this point was that the IAI was making a transaction (expecting the same value in goods and services, e.g. an annual report). After discussions with the auditors it was decided that the fair value would not be calculated as of June 2003. For 2004 this adjustment would not be necessary.
- Expenses not recognized proportionally to the development of the research activity. This is another comment related to CRN program. The AFO explained that the Grant Agreements prepared in 1999 did not have any clause related to a schedule of reports and payments, milestones that should be achieved in order to receive further payments, nor any budget associated with the project. Therefore, at the time the IAI made the registration of the CRNs it was not able to make a differentiation by year in order to have the amount recorded according to the progress of the project. Then they recorded the whole grant against the amount the IAI should transfer. The AFO said that this problem would only be solved for the next CRN because they were preparing a new grant agreement and a new manual. For the CRN I, the IAI would receive the same comment from the auditors as of June 30, 2004.
- The financial statements represent fairly the financial position of the IAI as of June 30, 2004. The AFO stated that in spite of the previous 2 warnings in paragraphs 3 and 4, the financial report represented the financial status of the IAI as of June 30.

USA (Margaret Leinen) stated that her delegation sympathized with IAI dealing with the first two highlights mentioned by the AFO (fair value of receivables and payables and lack of proportionality of the disbursement to the research activity) because IAI is a granting agency and not a procurement one. She hoped that IAI could continue to be able to operate in the old way and that the dialogue with the auditors went on so they understand that this view is not a view of granting but of procurement.

The EC approved the Auditor's Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2004 (*Action 2-Day 2*).

5.5.2. Financial Status Report as of March 31, 2005

The AFO presented the table of Contributions from Member Countries as of April 18th, 2005. He added that he had just received the contribution from Jamaica, which was not in the table.

	Due as of 30-jun-04	Contribution for FY 04/05	Paid Jul/04 - Apr/05	Due as of 18-abr-05
Argentina	155.025,00	45.000,00	-75.000,00	125.025,00
Bolivia	10.000,00	5.000,00		15.000,00
Brazil	-21.735,88	80.000,00	-39.100,00	19.164,12
Canada	0,00	115.000,00	-115.000,00	0,00
Chile	15.000,00	5.000,00	-10.000,00	10.000,00
Colombia	40.000,00	10.000,00	-9.920,00	40.080,00
Costa Rica	-8.008,36	5.000,00		-3.008,36
Cuba	10.066,56	5.000,00		15.066,56
Dominican Republic	35.000,00	5.000,00		40.000,00
Ecuador	15.000,00	5.000,00		20.000,00
Guatemala	35.000,00	5.000,00		40.000,00
Jamaica (**)	5.000,00	5.000,00		10.000,00
Mexico	-373,49	55.000,00	-108.866,06	-54.239,55
Panama	5.000,00	5.000,00	-5.000,00	5.000,00
Paraguay	40.000,00	5.000,00		45.000,00
Peru	30.000,00	5.000,00		35.000,00
Uruguay	30.000,00	5.000,00		35.000,00
USA (*)	0,00	550.000,00	-550.000,00	0,00
Venezuela	141.829,34	30.000,00	-12.500,00	159.329,34
	536.803,17	945.000,00	-925.386,06	556.417,11
% Received		98%		

The AFO clarified that the table did not follow any accounting rule; it was only a list of the money received in the Fiscal Year. For example, in the case of Mexico and Costa Rica, they had paid in advance and those funds could not be considered for the current fiscal years.

He also showed a graph representing the Composition of contributions: 79% of the Core Budget is paid by 3 countries, 15 % of the CB in paid by 4 countries and 12 countries pay only 6% of the Core Budget. He stressed the importance of timely contributions so as not to extinguish the reserves of the Institute.

The AFO then showed the Table of Expenses for 2005/2006:

	Budget	EXPENSES			Difference
		Actual	Forecasted	Total	
Salaries & Benefits	601,883	399,827	149,003	548,830	53,053
Travel	79,100	31,111	20,329	51,440	27,660
Equipment	10,000		10,000	10,000	-
Other	115,336	109,941	12,320	122,261	(6,925)
Dissemination	72,000	27,966	35,033	62,999	9,001
Director Fund	60,000	60,241	-	60,241	(241)
Contingency (5%)			11,334	11,334	(11,334)
	938,319	629,086	226,685	867,105	71,214

The AFO explained the differences between the total forecast of expenses and the budget (71,214):

- Salaries & Benefits: the Interim Director had a lower salary than a permanent Director and the Program Manager had not been hired yet.
- Travel: savings of 27,660 due to the cancellation of travels because of the workload at the IAI Directorate.

- Dissemination: EC Chair travels on behalf of IAI required no support. Savings in representation in international meetings.

He then showed the IAI Directorate's estimate of **Cash Flow for 2005-2006** with the "Most Probable" scenario based on Core Budget Contributions of 90 percent:

Reserves as of June 30, 2004	\$567,000
Incomes July/04 - March/05	\$880,386
Expenses July/04 - March/05	(\$629,086)
Commitments as of June 30, 2004	<u>(\$35,000)</u>
Reserves as of March 31, 2005	\$783,300
Expected Incomes (Apr-Jun/05)	\$60,000
Expected Outcomes (Apr-Jun/05)	<u>(238,019)</u>
Anticipated Balance in June/05	<u>\$605,281</u>

The AFO said that with the new budget (to be presented later by the IAI Interim Director), the amount of US\$ 605,281 represented about 5-6 months of operation and stressed it was the minimum reserve that any Institution needs to have a secure cash flow.

USA (Margaret Leinen) expressed its concern about the characterization of the Mexican pre-payment as an extra voluntary contribution that appeared included in a reserve forecast. She recalled the EC meeting in Costa Rica where they saw a situation of continuing decrease in reserves to the point that the IAI was in danger of not being able to manage the cash flow.

Mexico recommended that when presenting that information to the CoP it would be better to have an additional column for pre-payments or even better place a footnote, so there would be no misunderstandings.

5.5.3. Manuals

The AFO talked about the efforts made by the IAI Directorate in order to streamline the administrative processes.

He announced that the **Employee Handbook** was in its final stage of revision. Its contents are: Recruiting and General Employment Provisions; Staff benefits, Compensation; Performance Appraisal Review; Travel Policies and Procedures

As to the **Project management manual**, its contents are: funding mechanisms; proposal process; the Peer Review process; the grant agreement; grant administration; project monitoring; project closure. He explained that the manual is the result of the experience of the Institute after CRN I, and thanked NSF for its support. An especial issue in this manual is the Institutional Risk Assessment (assessment of grantees in order to reduce IAI exposure to the risk of irregular management of its grants)

He also mentioned the new **Grant agreement**, which would include the following titles:

- *Project Objectives*
- *Administering Institution*
- *Principal Investigator*
- *Contacts*
- *Availability of the Grant*
- *Special Conditions*
- *Amendment*
- *ANNEX A - Additional Terms and Conditions*
- *ANNEX B - Schedule of Reports and Payments*
- *ANNEX C - Project Budget*
- *ANNEX D - Report Guidelines and Forms*

Regarding the **Contracting and procurement manual**, he said that the original manual was thought for a big organization (and not for a structure of 11 people as the IAI Directorate is). Therefore, the IAI Directorate simplified processes with focus in transparency and documentation of decisions. The First draft had been circulated to the FAC on April 27, 2005

Finally, as to the **Accounting manual** he explained that the IAI had an accounting manual approved in 1996 but as all the accounting policies had changed, it was time to update it. The AFO announced it was planned for November 2005.

5.6. IAI Director Core Budget request for FY 2005-2006 and Country Contributions for 2005-2006

The IAI Interim Director made a presentation on the Core Budget Request for FY 2005-2005 based on Document 9. He began by summarizing some of the achievements of the IAI already described in the IAI Directorate report (such as a strong and successful training and outreach program, an equally successful science program) and the future plans to further these activities. He also mentioned that the IAI would have a full complement of Officers, Managers, and Staff at IAI in 2005-2006 (after the hire of the Program Manager in July 2005).

Afterwards, the IAI Interim Director mentioned the *features affecting the IAI Budget*, namely: program costs; salaries & benefits; staff and SAC travel; equipment replacement; dissemination activities. Other influences are: appointment costs; local inflation and US\$ exchange rate.

As to the *effect of salaries & benefits on the budget request*, he explained that during 2005 the IAI would have to face the relocation costs of the new IAI Director and the Project Manager and the home leave of 2 Officers. Besides, he pointed out that the host country (Brazil) had experienced a cost of living inflation of 12.4 % in 2004. Therefore, the costs incurred by the IAI Directorate for living costs (i.e. rentals and food) and transportation (i.e. airfare and gasoline) had increased while the purchasing power in terms of the U.S. Dollar had fallen due to the lower exchange rate of the U.S. currency (~ 10-15% change in terms of local currency)

The IAI Interim Director explained that the IAI Directorate had a total of six international positions and two locally hired Staff. He stated that although IAI contracts provided for up to 5 % increase annually, salaries had remained level in terms of US dollars and had been adjusted only once by 3% in July 2002 in the last 5 years. Thus he proposed a base salary 2% increase in 2005-06. In addition, to account for the high rate of local inflation and the tremendous loss of purchasing power, the IAI Director -after consultation with the FAC- proposed to the EC a 13% Post Adjustment (temporary measure that will be reassessed each year as the US\$ value could increase and local inflation decrease).

As to the other influences on Core Budget, staff travel costs showed no changes in the budget request since it was planned to use more conference calls and IT linkages for help in reduction of meeting costs. Regarding dissemination costs, it showed a reduction of US\$ 11,536 in the budget request because the Newsletter was reduced to 3 issues per year and Training and Outreach programs would use more IT output. As to miscellaneous costs (staff training, professional services, Executive Council Working Groups & and SAC travel) they would be reduced where feasible and alternate funding would be sought.

The Table with the **Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2005/2006** presented by the IAI Director is as follows:

Category	Forecast 2004-2005	Request 2005-2006	Difference
Salaries & Benefits	601,883 (*)	694,505	92,622
Staff Travel	79,100	79,100	0
Other Costs	115,336	103,800	(11,536)
Dissemination Activities	72,000	65,000	(7,000)
Director's Fund	60,000	60,000	0
Equipment	10,000	10,000	0
	\$ 938,319	\$1,012,405	\$74,086

(*) The 11th CoP meeting originally approved 564,431 for Salaries and Benefits. The increase to 601,883 is due to the termination costs of Dr. Gustavo V. Necco.

When the IAI Interim Director presented the proposed change in **Member Country Contributions**, he clarified it was for one year only and not for a three-year term as in previous submissions. This was deliberate in that it would allow the new Director greater flexibility for planning activities for the next three-year cycle.

The table showed by the IAI Interim Director illustrated both the present level of contribution approved by the CoP in Mérida, Mexico (with the later addition of the newly-ratified country of Bolivia) and the new request for 2005-2006 (overall increase of 7.4 % in the Contribution level).

Table of Contributions for 2005-2006

	% (*)	Present Contribution	New Contribution	Difference
Argentina	5.01%	45,000	50,000	5,000
Bolivia	0.07%	5,000	5,000	0
Brazil	8.73%	80,000	85,000	5,000
Canada	12.63%	115,000	125,000	10,000
Chile	0.55%	5,000	5,000	0
Colombia	0.96%	10,000	10,000	0
Costa Rica	0.13%	5,000	5,000	0
Dominican Republic	0.18%	5,000	5,000	0
Ecuador	0.18%	5,000	5,000	0
Guatemala	0.13%	5,000	5,000	0
Jamaica	0.18%	5,000	5,000	0
Mexico	6.21%	55,000	60,000	5,000
Panama	0.13%	5,000	5,000	0
Paraguay	0.20%	5,000	5,000	0
Peru	0.42%	5,000	5,000	0
Uruguay	0.27%	5,000	5,000	0
USA	60.75%	550,000	595,000	45,000

Venezuela	3.27%	30,000	30,000	0
Cuba		5,000	5,000	0
	100%	945,000	1,015,000	

(*): 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. As per Art. XIII of the IAI Agreement, the contributions shall be in multiples of US\$5,000. Actual participation rate relative to the budget total may be different.

The IAI Director reported he had brought the *salary system issue* to the attention of the FAC and asked the FAC to recommend an alternative salary system. According to the IAI Interim Director, any new system ideally should have the following features:

- Positions within a Rank category should have a range of steps to allow for experience and good work;
- Local inflation issues and exchange rate issues can be dealt with through a post adjustment mechanism that can be positive or negative (Many systems exist that compensate for fluctuating currency and local cost inflation);
- IAI had not needed this system until recently when exchange rates and local inflation worked together to effectively demote staff from appointed ranks to lower categories.

Argentina asked for the opinion of the IAI Interim Director about the lack of engagement of many countries in the IAI even though the Institute proved to be very successful in scientific and training and outreach programs.

The **IAI Interim Director** stated that perhaps there was not complete success in communication through the countries, although many countries could see this success and the benefits of being part of the IAI. He thought that the problem with the constitution of IAI is that contributions were voluntary. He expressed that the IAI tried to involve all countries in grants and in capacity building. He stated that the amount of money required by country was small, but the point was the interest of the Minister of Science and Technology and the influence of the IAI focal point. According to him, it seemed that Governments were not as interested as the scientific community was. He thought the IAI had been serving well the Americas and that was all it can do for the time being.

Venezuela stated that as a policy representative, she thought that the answer to the lack of country commitment was in the pertinence of the Science Agenda. She gave the example of Venezuela, where they had been revising research lines and concluded that there had been a dispersal of funds in themes that were not so relevant for society. She stressed the importance of assuring the link between science and policy and thought that there had been a kind of dispersal of themes within the IAI that had led to the nucleus of the Institute. She emphasized that only through products with direct application for society it was possible to attract investments in the IAI Science.

The EC approved and will forward to the CoP the Core Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2005/2006 (*Action 3 – Day 2*)

7. Report of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)

The Chair of the SAC, Walter Fernández, reported on the 21st meeting of the SAC held in Santiago, Chile on November 9-11, 2004 (document 7). The main topics in his presentation were the following:

Evaluation of CRN II pre-proposals

The SAC Chair explained that the SAC had decided at its 20th meeting that the committee itself would do the review of the pre-proposals. However, due to the large number of pre-proposals received and the thematic spread, some “external” reviewers were consulted.

Each pre-proposal was assigned to two reviewers (primary and secondary), who ranked them against the evaluation criteria as outlined in the CRN II Pre-proposal General Guidelines (see item 6.2.4). Applying a top-down approach under consideration of regional and thematic distribution, the SAC selected 35 pre-proposals to be invited for submission of full proposals.

Proposal for Joint IAI-NCAR activity

The SAC Chair informed that NCAR had received a NSF grant to support joint activities between NCAR and the IAI. In general, the NCAR proposal has been received very positively by the SAC, which recommended that the proposal be further developed and modified according to the needs of IAI. The SAC Chair announced that a first meeting of the Steering Committee created to further discuss and develop this activity would take place at NCAR in Boulder on 23-25 May 2005.

External review by AAAS

The SAC has received the report of Shere Abbott from AAAS on the IAI External Review. This review is intended to focus on the IAI institutional and programmatic development and impacts. Shere Abbot asked for the collaboration of the SAC members during the review, as they are a very important source of information in regard to IAI's scientific programs and its future development.

CRN II Full Proposals

The SAC requested the Scientific Officer to distribute the CRN II Full Proposal General Guidelines to SAC members for comments before launching. This request was made as it should be very clear to the PIs that there had been major changes in the guidelines concerning sections to include, format, budget etc.

Mechanism of CRN-I Synthesis

The SAC Chair mentioned that the SAC had decided to use the SCOPE mechanism for the CRN-I synthesis. He added that the funds for the CRN I synthesis included a working meeting of about 50 persons. As for the final technical project reports, it was stressed that policy relevant outcomes needed to be highlighted.

CPTEC proposal of becoming and IAI Affiliated Institution

This proposal had been presented to the IAI EC/CoP in Buenos Aires, which decided to seek a SAC recommendation on the proposal before taking a decision. The SAC Chair informed that the SAC had considered the proposal very positively and had made an according recommendation to the CoP.

Joint EC-SAC meeting

The SAC recalled that during the EC and CoP meetings in Buenos Aires he had confirmed to the EC/CoP that the SAC would greatly welcome a joint meeting with the EC and stressed the need to receive the results of the survey of national priorities in global change research.

IAI Institutes

The SAC Chair stated that the SAC was very pleased with the training activities organized by the IAI.

Finally, the SAC Chair said that the next SAC meeting would be held in Santos, Brazil, on July 26-28 2005.

As recommended by the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), the EC approved and will forward to the CoP the CPTEC/INPE proposal to become an Affiliated Institution of IAI for the Program on Climate Variability in the Americas. (<i>Action 5 – Day 2</i>)

The EC requested the IAI Directorate to schedule a joint EC-SAC meeting during the last quarter of 2005 or the first quarter of 2006. (<i>Action 6 – Day 2</i>)

8. Report of the Standing Committee of Rules & Procedures

The Chair of the SCRIP, Louis Brown, reported on the tasks assigned by the CoP XI to his group (Document 12).

These tasks were:

“draft rules pertaining to nomination procedures for the Scientific Advisory Committee and to present them to the EC at its (the EC’s) next meeting.” (Action 5 - day 1)

and

“review the voting rules and mechanisms during the EC and CoP meetings in order to make them more clear, efficient and democratic ... to submit the appropriate documents electronically to the member country delegates who would send their comments to the Chair of the (Standing) Committee.” (Action 15 - day 2)

He explained that the CoP had decided to streamline the voting procedure after the experience of the last voting in Buenos Aires, when the delegates faced an almost endless series of elections to fill some vacant posts in the SAC and the EC.

After a careful analysis of the issue, the SCRП Chair recommended to amend Rule 49, 50 and 64 of the Rules of Procedure for the Conference of the Parties and suggested different options for resolving runoff elections in case of tie votes or no candidates receiving the majority votes.

He also reminded that according to Rule 74 (that states that Amendments to these Rules shall enter into force on the date established by the Conference of the Parties), the Conference could adopt amendments to its Rules of Procedure as recommended above or otherwise and apply the amended Rules to elections to be held at this Conference of the Parties.

All delegates agreed on the amendments to Rule 64 and 49 and 50 but there were different opinions regarding proposed Rule 50A for resolving runoff elections that result either in tie votes or in no candidates receiving majority votes. For example, **Canada** (*Don McIver*) said that in his country, in case of tie, sometimes they selected the candidates randomly, i.e. the winning candidate was selected “from the hat”. Therefore, the EC recommended the CoP to convene a meeting of the SCRП to propose final recommendations.

The EC received with appreciation and discussed the report from the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRП). This report focused on simplifying the CoP voting process. The key points included:

- a) a recommendation that the SAC be invited to present a slate for nominations of twice the number of vacancies to be filled;
- b) a proposal that, when an election does not fill all vacancies, a runoff election be held, with the remaining nominations limited to the number of vacancies to be filled plus one; and
- c) Various options for resolving runoff elections that result either in tie votes or in no candidates receiving majority votes.

The EC generally supported points a) and b) but did not express a preference regarding the options presented under c), after also having received an interesting proposal from Canada for resolving the votes. The EC recommended that the CoP convene an ad-hoc meeting of the SCRП early during the CoP to propose final recommendations regarding these proposed improvements to the Rules so that they can be adopted by the CoP and implemented in the elections to be held during this CoP (*Action 4 – day 2*)

9. Report of the Financial and Administration Committee

The Chair of the FAC, Vanessa Richardson, reported on FAC activities (Document 13) since the last EC meeting. She began her report by describing the membership of the FAC: Argentina (Carlos Ereño); Brazil (Antônio Mac Dowell); Canada: (Louis Grittani); Chile (Renato Quiñones); Cuba (Bárbara Garea), the USA (Vanessa Richardson), and the EC Chair (Adrián Fernández Bremauntz).

The FAC Chair informed that the FAC had met formally on one occasion during the past year – in São José dos Campos, Brazil in February/March 2005 and one day before the EC meeting in Montreal. In addition, Vanessa Richardson and Louis Grittani participated in the two site visits made by KPMG (in July and August 2004) as part of the IAI External Review.

The FAC Chair mentioned that the FAC had worked, in collaboration with the IAI Directorate, in the following issues:

- 2003/2004 External Audit and Planning for future External Audits

- Employee Manual
- Project Management Manual (and CRN2 contracts)
- FY 2005/2006 Core Budget Request
- Alternative Core Budget Contribution Levels (as requested in Action 4 – day 2, EC XIX)
- Review of FY 2004/2005 financial situation -- contributions and expenditures
- Banking Situation
- Analysis of Indicators of Efficiency of Core Budget (as requested in action 7 – Day 2, EC XIX)
- Management Checklist
- Situation with Local Staff Contracts
- Salary Determinations for IAI Staff

The FAC Chair said that the FAC strongly endorsed the need to increase to the IAI Core Budget to address salary adjustments of the staff.

She finally mentioned that the FAC charter, which was from June 2003, was expiring because it was for a 2-year period. She then requested that the Charter be renewed by the EC. She said that the FAC was also looking for new members.

The EC renewed the Charter of the FAC (*action 10 – day 2*)

As to the **alternatives for Core Budget Contribution levels**, Carlos Ereño made a presentation to the EC (Addendum to Doc 13).

He explained that the FAC had considered the following scales in its study:

- Quota Assessment for 2005 of the Organization of the American States (OAS)
- Scale of Assessments of the United Nations (UN) for the period 2004-2006
- Scale of Contributions of International Council for Science (ICSU) members for the period 2002-2005

He presented some tables showing the differences of using the different scales for calculating Country Contribution Levels. Some observations of this analysis were:

- The use of either scale instead of OAS's would favor Argentina, Colombia, Cuba and Venezuela;
- Brazil and Canada would benefit from the use of the UN scale but not from the ICSU one;
- The US and Mexico would benefit from the use of the ICSU scale but not from the UN one;
- Chile would have to pay more only if the ICSU scale is applied; and
- There is minimal effect on Bolivia, Peru and Uruguay.
- In summary: *any change of contribution scale would benefit some member countries and affect negatively others.*

As he continued with the analysis, he explained that they had disregarded the ICSU scale because several IAI countries did not contribute to ICSU and the scale was not directly related to the payment capacity of the countries (e.g., Mexico was in the lowest level of contributions). Therefore, the FAC focused its analysis in the OAS and UN scales

He then mentioned some considerations for the comparative analysis of UN-OAS scale:

- The UN scale is periodically updated. Last update: 2004;
- Since 1981, OAS quotas have ceased to be determined on the basis of objective criteria and, for most of this time, they have been frozen;
- The current OAS scale does not adequately reflect the member states' ability to pay;
- OAS Resolution 1746 (2000) express the need for adopting a quota assessment scale which is fair and equitable and which adequately reflects the member states' ability to pay; and recommends that the scale of quota assessments for the OAS for 2002-2004 shall be determined by using as a basis the scale approved by the United Nations for 2001-2003.
- This Resolution of the OAS has not been applied and the member country contribution scale is still frozen;

- Many OAS member countries are in arrears with their contributions to this organization while few American countries are in arrears with contributions to the UN.

Mr Ereño then concluded that the OAS scale did not represent accurately the member countries' ability to pay; and that the OAS itself had considered that an appropriate correction would be the adoption of the UN scale.

As to how country contribution would be affected if the IAI scale were modified by a formula that would bring it closer to the UN scale, he stated the following:

- The only contribution that would rise was that of the US;
- Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba and Venezuela would have lower contributions; and
- the rest of the countries would not be affected.

According to the FAC analysis, some possible alternatives for the IAI were:

- to create a new scale based on the UN; or
- an intermediate formula between both scales.

He then showed an example which contained the calculation of the contribution scale for the FY 2004/2005 Core Budget, using: the OAS scale (current); a mix of the two scales 2 OAS-1 UN; a simple average OAS-UN; a mix of the two scales 1 OAS-2 UN, and the UN scale.

He concluded his presentation saying that he had tried to show the EC the different options for the IAI member country contribution scale and that, as indicated, the OAS and UN scales could be applied separately or a combination of both could also be considered. He explained that the FAC did not recommend the endorsement of any scale in particular and the decision on future steps regarding this issue was left to the EC.

After this presentation, the EC delegates had a lively debate about this issue:

USA (Margaret Leinen) thanked the FAC for its hard work and raised two points about the notion of going into the UN scale:

- a) *at the UN the representation is global rather than hemispheric and that means that the UN has the benefit of being able to call on the resources of several very substantial economic partners including Japan, Germany, France, UK, who substantially support the operation of the UN. That allows the UN to be able to operate and have lower assessments of other partners. In the Western Hemisphere those are not represented and that is why OAS scale is applied, since it is based in the ability to pay in the Western Hemisphere.*
- b) *According to the percentages of contribution level that are reflected in the UN scale applied to IAI, the % of the US raises to a percentage that is above the State Department ceiling for contribution to International Organizations. Therefore the US would have to contribute less than the % stated in the table due to the policy of the State Department ceiling. The final result would be that the contributions would not raise and this would not match the budget.*

Venezuela thanked the FAC for its analysis and suggested that the delegates consult this issue in their respective countries and come back with a country position for the next meeting in order to forward it to the CoP. **Cuba** and **Argentina** agreed with Venezuela. **Argentina** suggested including the CoP members as well, since they also had the right to offer their views about contributions.

Mexico agreed with Argentina and suggested to forward this issue (the FAC analysis + the considerations of the US) to the CoP so that all members have a chance to review it while in their respective countries and come back in the upcoming meeting with their opinions. He added that this issue should not be separated from country commitment and the relevance of IAI science for countries.

USA objected to forwarding the proposal to the CoP as it was. She thought that sending forward a document with a suggested scale that was not policy-achievable was not a responsible action of the EC. If the FAC document was to be forwarded, it should include the information that the proposal to use the UN scale was not achievable in terms that the budget would not be achieved. She also added that if that information was to be sent to policy makers, there was another very important item missing; the financial benefits received by the individual participants. She stressed that it was irresponsible to send an incomplete document.

Mexico clarified that when talking about sending the document forward, he was also talking about all policy implications and agreed with the US that the proposal should not be sent isolated. He stressed that it was important to see the issue in a broader context and try to get renewed commitments from countries to pay their past contributions and provide some assurance that they are willing to contribute in the future.

USA agreed that it was time to take back the message to countries that IAI is very valuable in terms of research, capacity building, network formation, etc. and welcomed any action that would bring to the CoP the necessity for each country to look at that cost-benefit. Concerning the specific proposal of distributing the costs, she repeated that the FAC document was flawed and incomplete because it did not state that the UN scale could not be implemented because of the US policy limit and expressed that the US would not accept the proposal of sending it as it was to the CoP

Venezuela proposed that an improved document be forwarded to the CoP. She thought it was very important to know the opinion of each country regarding the IAI Science Agenda and its usefulness for them. She then expressed, as in her previous intervention, that it was necessary to improve the pertinence of scientific results (for policy) in order to improve contributions.

Panama agreed with Venezuela and thought it was very important to send information about the importance of their participation in the IAI to every country.

Argentina said that the scale for contributions should have some sensitiveness in face of economic ups and downs. He agreed with the delegate of the US about the incompleteness of the document, but he was sure the FAC could improve it with the input from the EC and the CoP.

The **FAC Chair** clarified that there was no indication to pass the document to the CoP and that perhaps it was premature to go forward to the CoP in that stage. The document could go back to the FAC for further analysis or an ad-hoc group could be formed to study this issue.

Canada (Michel Béland) reminded that national representatives always discuss the same issue every meeting. He said it would be more creative to discuss ways of interesting countries and leverage funds, etc. He also stated that the scenario that increases even further the contribution of the USA would create a balance of power that is not positive for the future of the IAI. It would be better if all countries share the financial burden. Canada would not be in favor of generating such unbalance. He suggested putting the issue aside for the time being.

Canada (Don McIver) stated that the report was not ready to go to the CoP. He suggested that the FAC enter into dialog with the respective countries and bring a document back to the EC for further discussion. The FAC should then be in a position to make a recommendation.

Venezuela said that it would be convenient to get the opinion of the 19 IAI Member Countries since this issue was vital to the sustainability of the Institute (of course taking into account all the inputs expressed so far).

The **EC Chairman** asked the delegates about the proposal of asking the FAC or a comparable committee to help in defining the scope of an analysis that attempts to include all other implications of the review on country contributions (and not to do it in isolation).

Cuba said that the EC was not forced to forward this matter to the CoP because it was not stated in a CoP Action List, but she thought that they had the obligation to inform the CoP about what had been done so far (perhaps through the report of the EC Chair) since the issue of contributions was always brought to the floor in CoP meetings. She also stressed that the financial aspect could not be the only one in the mentioned document as was already stated by other delegates.

Canada (Don McIver) made an additional suggestion about challenging the new Director, with the help of the ad-hoc committee, to analyze this issue and report back to the next EC meeting.

USA supported the suggestion of Canada to involve the IAI Director in the ad-hoc group since it would be a tremendous message of vitality. Regarding what to convey to the CoP, mentioned that the study should also include consideration of the: a) increased financial needs of the IAI Directorate, b) relevance of IAI activities to the global change research needs of the Member Countries, c) benefits of the IAI activities to the member

countries, and d) sensitivity of IAI contribution schedule to changing financial situations in the member countries.

Venezuela also supported the proposal of including the IAI Director and asked that the approach be done in an integrated fashion, aiming at the science-policy link.

The EC received with appreciation and discussed the report from the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC). The EC decided to establish a group to be led by the New IAI Director to further analyze member country participation. This study would not consider financial aspects only. This analysis should also include consideration of the:

- a) increased financial needs of the IAI Directorate,
- b) relevance of IAI activities to the global change research needs of the Member Countries,
- c) benefits of the IAI activities to the member countries, and
- d) sensitivity of IAI contribution schedule to changing financial situations in the member countries.

It is expected that the IAI Director will lead efforts together with member representatives to complete this analysis (*Action 1 – day 2*)

10. Ad-Hoc Committee on Relations with Member States

Adrián Fernández, Chairman of the Committee, explained that the ad-hoc committee had been established one year and a half ago and had developed its activities at the beginning of 2004. The aim of the committee was to help the IAI community to make some progress in addressing the problems the IAI was facing in terms of the difficulties for interacting with some member countries. The committee worked with the previous IAI Director, and among other activities, sent letters to many countries explaining why was important to get them engaged in the work of IAI.

As the IAI was about to have a new Director, he considered that the Committee had fulfilled its task and was not necessary any more.

11. Ad-Hoc Group on the IAI Newsletter Issue

Carlos Ereño made a presentation about the analysis of the ad-hoc group. He began with background information of the IAI Newsletter, which is one of the institutional outreach activities of major importance, and included a continuous updated view and information about the IAI's programmatic and institutional activities, plans and offers; and the results of the IAI scientists' work in the different areas of the Science Agenda. The first issue of the IAI newsletter was issued in December 1992.

He explained that from 2004, some financial concerns due to escalating costs led the IAI Directorate to promote, as a measure with minimum damage, to reduce the frequency from 4 to 3 numbers per year, maintaining the same structure and keeping the number of pages up to 28. The decision was informed to the EC in its nineteenth meeting in Buenos Aires, June 2004, for comments and possible endorsement. The Council agreed to this reduction for the year 2004 and recommended a group to analyze the issue and report to the EC at its twentieth meeting. The CoP 11 had supported this recommendation.

The ad-hoc committee was composed of the IAI Newsletter Editorial Board; IAI Financial Officer, and Bárbara Garea as CoP member.

Mr. Ereño informed that most of the members of the group held a meeting on May 1, at the IAI Directorate. The participants were J. W. B. Stewart, C. Ereño, B. Garea, SO, FAO, TCO. The main conclusions of that meeting were:

- The 2005–2006 budget required for 4 issues of the newsletter is US\$ 45,067. If it were reduced to 3 issues the budget would be US\$ 33,977
- J. W. B. Stewart expressed his concern on the workload put on the Directorate staff as to support the needs of input for the Newsletter because the staff was reduced and had several other responsibilities and duties
- The Editorial board has not provided much guidance about the content of the Newsletter (particularly the SAC members).

- Independent on the number of issues per year it was important to strengthen the content of the Newsletter and go more in depth in its substance.
- To develop an annual plan handy to design their content in advance and in a balanced way, and to have a stronger participation of PIs and co-PIs and country representatives.
- To have the next issue highlighting the IAI Training Institutes, and also special issues on results of the IAI science programs (e.g. CRN or SGP) in the future .
- It was agreed not to take any permanent decision at that time as a new Director and Program Manager would be starting soon at the IAI and new SAC members would be elected at the CoP XII.
- It was agreed to have 3 issues of the Newsletter produced in 2005.
- A new composition of the editorial board was needed, with one member of the SAC, one representative of the CoP.
- The role, tasks and membership of the board needed to be clearly defined.

Carlos Ereño stated that the final conclusions and recommendations of the ad-hoc committee were:

- To maintain the production of 3 issues of the Newsletter in 2005;
- To modify the composition of the Editorial Board, adding a CoP representative in replacement of one of the SAC representatives;
- To approve the recommendations made by the ad-hoc group as to improve its content and plan on a yearly basis the edition of issues devoted to relevant IAI activities;
- After this year, the new Editorial Board would evaluate the advisability of maintaining the production of 3 issues per year and report back to the EC.

The EC endorsed the proposal of the Ad-Hoc Group on the IAI Newsletter issue to have 3 issues of the Newsletter produced in 2005 and a new composition of the editorial board (adding a CoP representative in replacement of one of the SAC representatives). (*Action 9 – Day 2*)

12. Items to be forwarded to CoP

The EC Chair summarized the items that would be forwarded to CoP XII:

- IAI Budget Proposal and Country contributions for 2005/2006;
- the CPTEC/INPE proposal to become an affiliated Institution of IAI, as recommended by the SAC;
- the EC recommendation that the CoP convene an ah-hoc meeting of the SCRIP early during the CoP to propose final recommendations regarding the improvement to the voting process in the Rules;
- the request of authorization to approve CRN-II proposals in the next EC meeting.

The EC would also inform the CoP about the following issues:

- the composition of the Committee to recommend final candidates for the election for the SAC members;
- the EC decision of asking the Director to chair a group to further analyze the issue of country contributions in the context of relevance and merits of participating in the IAI;
- the proposal to register the IAI in the UNFCCC;
- the proposal to schedule a science-policy activity on an annual basis;
- the proposal to schedule a joint EC-SAC meeting;
- the proposal of the Ad-hoc group of the IAI newsletter to have 3 issues of the Newsletter produced in 2005 and a new composition of the Editorial Board.

13. Future Sites and Meetings

The EC delegates agreed on having the next EC meeting as soon as possible in order to approve the CRN-II projects. They also discussed about the most suitable date to hold the joint EC-SAC meeting, either during the last quarter of 2005 or the first quarter of 2006.

The EC will hold its next meeting in September 2005 in a location to be defined. EC Member Countries interested in hosting the EC-XXI should contact the IAI Directorate (action 11-day 2)

14. Adjournment of the Meeting

The EC Chair thanked the host country for organizing the meeting and thanked all the delegates for their attendance and invited everybody to the Scientific Symposium that would be held the following day.

The meeting was adjourned.

th
20 Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
May 02 and 03, 2005 – Montreal, Canada

Action List

Day 1: May 02

1. The EC approved the agenda of its Twentieth Meeting with only one modification in the item corresponding to the presentation of the Ad-Hoc Group on the Newsletter issue (Carlos Ereño would present the report instead of Bárbara Garea).
2. The EC approved the Report of its Nineteenth Meeting with no modification.
3. The EC approved the composition of the Committee to recommend final candidates for the election of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) members:
 - SAC Chair: Dr. Walter Fernández
 - EC Member: Dr. Paul Filmer (USA)
 - EC Member: Dr. Bárbara Garea (Cuba)
 - Local scientist: Dr. Don MacIverThe group will present a report during the CoP meeting.

20th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)
May 02 and 03, 2005 – Montreal, Canada

Action List

Day 2: May 03

1. The EC received with appreciation and discussed the report from the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC). The EC decided to establish a group to be led by the New IAI Director to further analyze member country participation. This study would not consider financial aspects only. This analysis should also include consideration of the:

- a) increased financial needs of the IAI Directorate,
- b) relevance of IAI activities to the global change research needs of the Member Countries,
- c) benefits of the IAI activities to the member countries, and
- d) sensitivity of IAI contribution schedule to changing financial situations in the member countries.

It is expected that the IAI Director will lead efforts together with member representatives to complete this analysis.

2. The EC approved the Auditor's Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2004

3. The EC approved and will forward to the CoP the Core Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2005/2006

4. The EC received with appreciation and discussed the report from the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRIP). This report focused on simplifying the CoP voting process. The key points included:

- a) a recommendation that the SAC be invited to present a slate for nominations of twice the number of vacancies to be filled;
- b) a proposal that, when an election does not fill all vacancies, a runoff election be held, with the remaining nominations limited to the number of vacancies to be filled plus one; and
- c) Various options for resolving runoff elections that result either in tie votes or in no candidates receiving majority votes.

The EC generally supported points a) and b) but did not express a preference regarding the options presented under c), after also having received an interesting proposal from Canada for resolving the votes. The EC recommends that the CoP convene an ad-hoc meeting of the SCRIP early during the CoP to propose final recommendations regarding these proposed improvements to the Rules so that they can be adopted by the CoP and implemented in the elections to be held during this CoP.

5. As recommended by the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), the EC approved and will forward to the CoP the CPTEC/INPE proposal to become an Affiliated Institution of IAI for the Program on Climate Variability in the Americas.

6. The EC requested the IAI Directorate to schedule a joint EC-SAC meeting during the last quarter of 2005 or the first quarter of 2006.

7. The EC endorsed the proposal of Mexico to ask the IAI Directorate to schedule a science-policy activity (for example a meeting or a training institute) on an annual basis.

8. 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.

9. The EC endorsed the proposal of the Ad-Hoc Group on the IAI Newsletter issue to have 3 issues of the Newsletter produced in 2005 and a new composition of the editorial board (adding a CoP representative in replacement of one of the SAC representatives).

10. The EC renewed the Charter of the FAC.

11. The EC will hold its next meeting in September 2005 in a location to be defined. EC Member Countries interested in hosting the EC-XXI should contact the IAI Directorate.

ACRONYMS

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
AFO	Administrative and Financial Officer
AGU	American Geophysical Union
APN	Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CIIFEN	Centro Internacional de Investigación sobre “El Niño” (Ecuador)
CEMEDE	Centro Mesoamericano de Desarrollo Sostenible del Trópico Seco (De la Universidad de Costa Rica)
CPTEC/INPE	Center for Weather Forecasting and Climate Studies / National Institute for Space Research (Brazil)
CRN	Collaborative Research Network
CRRH	Comité Regional de Recursos Hídricos de América Central (Costa Rica)
EC	Executive Council
DIS	Data and Information System
FAC	Financial and Administrative Committee (of the EC)
FUNDEVI	University of Costa Rica Foundation for Research
FUNCENAT	National Center for Advanced Technology Foundation
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Program
IAIDB	IAI Data Base
ICSU	International Council for Science
IHDP	International Human Dimensions Programme
IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura
INE	Instituto Nacional de Ecología (México)
ISSC	International Social Sciences Council
IT	Information Technology
ITM	Information Technology Manager
LBA	Large-scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAC	National Academy of Science – Costa Rica
NCAR	National center for Atmospheric Research (USA)

NSF	National Science Foundation (USA)
OAS	Organization of American States
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory (USA)
PI	Principal Investigator
RPSC	Rules and Procedures Standing Committee (of the CoP)
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
SGP	Small Grants Program
SO	Scientific Officer
TCO	Training, Communications and Outreach
UM	University of Miami (USA)
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
UCR	Universidad de Costa Rica