

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



**EC-XVI**

*December 02-03, 2002*

*Panama City, Panama*

**3\_ECXVI/DID/English/November 2002**

## **Report of the Directorate to the 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the EC in Panama City Panama - Dec 2-3, 2002**

### **I – IAI Directors Report**

*(This first part was prepared by the outgoing Interim Director, John Stewart, in October 2002.)*

Although just 5 months since there was an opportunity to report to the EC in São José dos Campos, there is considerable activity and progress to report on all fronts. You will hear directly from the Officers responsible later in this report and comments here will just mention some highlights.

Perhaps before we report on the details of our work and progress we should define the discuss the aims of our work in a global context. The world leaders, who gathered recently in Johannesburg at the World Summit for Sustainable Development, called for “the reorientation of science towards higher priority to identifying solutions for pressing environmental and developmental challenges”. This type of research builds on the excellent work carried out by IGBP, IDHP, WCRP and Diversitas but pushes these programs further by asking for more concentration on solutions. Indeed reading the recent publications of these programs we see significant changes. The IGBP newsletter of June 2002 defines a new and evolving IGBP II that requires it to strengthen the linkages with the major world programs such as IHDP, WCRP and Diversitas which comprise the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP). As these programs move into their second phase after 15 years of significant scientific achievements their challenge is to apply their findings at the local and regional level while continuing to advance the basic science. Other publications developed for the World Summit stress “Sustainability Science”

It is interesting that this challenge is one that IAI has always attempted to address. Our scientific program developed slowly from 1994, initially with much more concentration on understanding science rather than solutions, but by the time we reached the CRN programs in 1999 we clearly understood that these programs should develop solutions as well as developing capacity and understanding. By 2002 we find that in some cases CRN work already has spawned implementation programs that have been taken up and funded by NGO's, industries and governments at the regional levels. However, before we get too complacent about a small success, we must be honest enough to state that we are only “scraping the top of the barrel” and that the gap between understanding and solutions is huge. In discussions within the Directorate we realize that we have to develop more programs that explore how we blend science with policy. We think that the Summer Institutes will be important in developing this capacity as well as funding more Collaborative Research Networks that demand an equal science and human dimension focus. We must learn from the experience of our CRN projects and understand from their PI's which strategies that work well and those that do not. Similarly, we must keep in touch with other regional networks such as START and APN as they face very similar challenges with the implementation of global science at a local level. Equally we will attempt to maintain contact with the science progress in the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP). Finally we must reexamine the four Themes that comprise our Scientific Agenda to make sure that we have covered major global change problems.

Gerhard Breulmann has in addition to his work as Scientific Officer been instrumental in maintaining links with other regional networks such as APN and START. He will report on the scientific area. Briefly the peer review at the mid point of the CRNs is in progress and will be

discussed at the next SAC meeting to be held in February 2003. The next SAC meeting was delayed until this date to allow for peer reviews to be completed and to combine this meeting with the third meeting of the CRN PI's. As well we will have input from some IGBP Scientific Committee members who will be meeting in South America just prior to our meetings. Individual SAC members and some IAI officers have participated in specific CRN planning meetings. The Small Grant Program approved at the last EC and CoP meetings has been started and contracts have been signed with all successful applicants.

Marcella Ohira Schwarz will report on a host of activities that fall into her portfolio, which now is labeled "Human Dimensions and Communications". This title more accurately reflects on her duties and gives a signal to others that IAI is concentrating on social issues and policies related to Global Changes as well in its role as a capacity builder in the Americas. Marcella has always maintained an interest in this area from her graduate training onwards. She has built up good relationships with IHDP Officers and is on the planning committee for the next IHDP Open meeting to be held in Montreal in 2003. She also heads our efforts in planning and developing Summer Institutes. In this capacity she will report on efforts to restart our successful liaison with the University of Miami, to develop more activity in the Central America region (hopefully with input from IACD), to plan for other SIs in 2003 while participating in this year's SI. This one focused on Biodiversity and was organized by one of our CRN PIs. In the communications area, we are attempting to make this a priority for all Officers and Staff. Newsletters, Annual reports have to be supplemented by all sorts of media releases, a well-organized Web Site and popular articles. In addition we have hired a science writer to chronicle the success of the first 10 years of IAI

Silvio Bianchi, Financial Officer, will as usual report on Finances and on the report from our Auditors. He is from one of those professions that is the subject of a lot of adverse attention when finances are low but little appreciation when things are going well. We have all been pleased by the response by countries to make up past debts. Silvio has been working tirelessly in this area, and in addition was responsible for organizing a visit of the Director to meet with the President of Uruguay and with CONICYT in Chile. He also handles a lot of the Administration and has been responsible for overseeing all administrative details regarding our change in personnel (from support staff to Directors). He is currently developing better financial controls for CRNs. He is currently developing better controls for Financial Institutes managing CRNs.

Luis Marcelo Achite, Manager of Information Technology, is in the process of changing the system that is used in the DIS system. We hope that the new system, when inaugurated will make it easier and more efficient to share information. As well he has been active in developing data systems for use within and without the Directorate.

Eduardo Banús, CRN Manager – the role of the CRN Manager is changing. Initially we required most attention being placed on basic administration and starting up projects. Now CRN PIs need assistance in synthesis of the generated scientific products. In year 3-4 we see substantial restructuring in several projects and both Scientific Officer and Financial officer input is needed. We are hoping to be able to attract senior academics and researchers to work with us to assist with synthesis

For information, a figure depicting the Organization of the current Directorate is attached. In the more traditional figure you will note that, if our emphasis on Summer Institutes is supported as planned, that we plan to appoint a SI Manager. This change will probably coincide with the completion of the CRN Manager's term. To finish up the CRN we plan to

obtain help from university professionals on a type of sabbatical leave and from hired post doctorate fellows.

The Directorate still aims to visit as many countries and organizations involved in Global Change planning as possible. For instance, during his 6 month appointment John Stewart visited 7 countries as well as attending the ICSU and SCOPE General Assemblies. It is interesting to record some of the contacts made in each country. Ideally we would hope to have the opportunity to meet with Academies and Offices of Global Change in each country at least once a year to be informed of local programs and to discuss IAI programs.

Argentina	Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica – ANPCyT (Dr Armando Bertranou and Dra. Agueda Menvielle)
	University of Buenos Aires (to meet with 2 CRN PIs: Osvaldo Sala and Mario Nuñez)
	UBATEC (Dr. Alberto A. Boveris)
Brazil	Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – CNPq (Dr. Alice Rangel de Paiva Abreu, Vice-President and Dr. Deiza Maria Corrêa Lara Pinto, Coordenadora Geral de Ciências da Terra e Meio Ambiente)
	Ministry of Science and Technology (Dr. Carlos Américo Pacheco)
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Sec. Pedro Henrique Eduardo)
	Agência Espacial Brasileira – AEB (Múcio Roberto Dias)
	Fundação de Ciência, Aplicações e Tecnologia Espaciais – FUNCATE (Dr. Moura Fé)
	University of Brasilia
Canada	CENA/ESALQ/USP (met with 3 CRN PIs)
	Environment Canada (John Stone and Bruce Angle)
	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Eric Bertram)
	University of Victoria Canadian Global Change Centre
	University of Saskatchewan (to meet with CRN PI)
Canada also hosted a meeting attended by representatives of all Ministers of the Environment and Health of the Americas in March where IAI was represented by John Stewart.	
Chile	Meetings with Maria Cristina Lazo V. (CONICYT Executive Director), Ximena Gómez de la Torre V. (CONICYT Director International Relations Department), and Renato Quiñones (Universidad de Concepción) at CONICYT.
Mexico	SAC meeting hosted by Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM (presentations from 2 CRN PI's)
	Meeting with Adrian Fernandez (Director General de Investigacion sobre la Contaminacion Urbana, Regional y Global – Instituto Nacional de Ecología) – the newly appointed Mexican Representative to the CoP.
Uruguay	President Batlle
	Minister of Environment (Carlos A. Cat)
	IDRC (Dr. Federico Burone – Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean and Dr. Merle D. Faminow –Program Officer)
USA	Meeting with Margaret Leinen and Paul Filmer from NSF and Jonathan Pundsack and Lisa Farrow from NOAA at NSF.
	Meeting with Jim Mahoney Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere (NOAA) and Margaret Leinen (NSF)
	State Department (Daniel A. Reifsnyder and Andrew Dowdy)
	IACD – American Agency for Cooperation and Development (Ronald Scheman)

	University of Florida ( to meet with a CRN PI)
	START (Ronald Fuchs and Hassan Virji)

CoP delegates arranged all of these visits and in most occasions they accompanied the Director. EC Chair Antônio Mac Dowell accompanied the Director in visits to Canada, Mexico, and United States organizations. Assistance with all these visits is gratefully acknowledged.

### *Organization of EC and CoP meetings*

At the last EC/CoP meeting there was considerable discussion and comment both by delegates and by Officers on the amount of time required for EC and joint EC/CoP meetings. This has been discussed in the Directorate and the following suggestions are made for your consideration.

Presently IAI regulations mandate that the CoP meets once a year with the EC and the EC meets separately once more. Reports to these meetings have to be presented in both Spanish and English and posted on the website at least 30 days before the meetings. In effect this means that the Directorate staff has to start preparing material in September or by latest October for the December meeting. We therefore are reporting on material that was discussed as recently as 3-4 months ago. In addition the EC/CoP have created a whole set of Working Groups that met in between meetings or just before meetings and most involve IAI Officers or staff. Past EC/COP meetings have been very repetitive. Material is first presented to the EC and then virtually the same material later in the week to a broader audience at the CoP. The EC comprises of 9 members selected from the total of 18 delegates. It is rarely that CoP attendance includes representation from all 18 countries. This means that the material is repeated albeit in slightly amended form, for the benefit of maybe an extra 4 to 9 delegates.

- 1 We suggest that the EC/CoP continue to meet once a year at which time annual reports are presented on all IAI activities. At that time, the Directorate will be expected to report on activities in the Directorate and get approval from the delegates of annual financial statements composition of the SAC, scientific programs and training programs. The EC and CoP should meet together and could complete their business in a maximum of 2 days. At some time during the meeting the EC may need to meet in separately in camera. This requirement could be managed in the same manner that it was handled at the last CoP. The CoP recessed for half an hour while the EC convened and made a specific decision that was then reported back to the CoP when the meeting resumed.
- 2 The EC Chair may wish to convene an extra meeting of the EC each year if in his/her opinion it is required. We suggest that it may be unnecessary for reports to be prepared for these meetings by the Officers on items that have been dealt with at the annual EC/CoP meeting. Exceptions would be specific items that the EC Chair or Director decide require special discussion. It will not be necessary to provide overviews on subjects that have been discussed at the annual EC/CoP meeting. Instead these meetings will provide opportunities for Working Groups to work with officers and staff on specific problems. We also assume that the number of working groups will be substantially reduced as there is presently substantial overlap in their mandates. The committee of one, which was appointed to look at mandates, will no doubt report at the Panama City EC meeting – hopefully this will reduce the number of working groups considerably. At present there is only one permanent Working group FAWG. This working group remains necessary – it has helped the IAI Administration considerably as they develop procedures and administrative procedures. In the interim Directors opinion, all other working groups should aim to become unnecessary

by finishing their work and reporting. It appears unnecessary to prolong their activities after the report is presented and their task has been completed. New working groups should as far as possible involve officers and staff only if it is absolutely necessary.

- 3 The Directorate would greatly benefit if at the EC meeting there was an opportunity for delegates to network more and share ideas on bilateral, trilateral etc. scientific and training programs that either are being planned or already in place. It is difficult trying to keep up with these types of developments as well as the host of IGBP, WCRP, IHDP, and Diversitas happenings. However at our meetings we would greatly benefit from a sharing of new ideas on Global Change programs and initiatives. We should be able to contribute as well.

*(This second part was prepared by the IAI Director, Gustavo V. Necco, in November 2002.)*

At the moment of holding this EC meeting, it will be less than one month that I am heading the IAI Directorate. Notwithstanding, I would like to present and share with the EC my views and feelings regarding the present and future of this important Institution in the hope of getting valuable feedback and guidance.

First of all, I want to thank the IAI Member Countries that entrusted to me the direction of IAI and I wish to assure them that I will discharge the assigned duties to the best of my capabilities.

I would also like to pay tribute to the outgoing Interim Director, Dr. John Stewart, for his very capable and active handling of the Directorate in his provisional assignment. He made enormous contributions in a very hectic and short-term period by strengthening and consolidating several activities and by making concrete efforts to enhance the visibility of the IAI through many visits to countries and organizations involved in Global Change in the Region, as detailed in his report.

The section of Dr. Stewart's report on the "Organization of EC and CoP meetings" contains, in my view, sound and substantive proposals aiming at the improvement of the effectiveness and efficiency in the running of these constituent bodies in order to help them to provide a more complete, firm, and targeted guidance. I fully support Dr. Stewart's proposals.

The relation of IAI's aims, mission, and targets to the call of the recent World Summit for Sustainable Development (Johannesburg) for reorientation of science towards solutions and its stressing of science and technology for sustainable development is also very properly called to mind. I should mention that other universal declarations related to global change produced recommendations supporting IAI's mayor aims, namely the Millennium Declaration in the year 2000, and the recent Amsterdam Declaration on Global Change, released by IGBP, IHDP, WCRP, and DIVERSITAS at the Global Change Open Science Conference in July 2001. It is also appropriate to recall that UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, in his Millennium Report to the General Assembly, expressed that "... freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to sustain their lives on this planet" are the three grand global challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

The Summit in Johannesburg highlighted that it is time to create a "new social contract" between science and society. This concept is based on previous views from ICSU President Jane Lubchenco, stating that "...urgent and unprecedented environmental and social changes challenge scientists to define a new social contract... a commitment on the part of all scientists

to devote their energies and talents to the most pressing problems of the day, in proportion to their importance, in exchange for public funding.”.

The general idea is that, in return for continued financial support from the public purse, scientists should commit themselves to working on topics of direct value to society, rather than just seeking to satisfy their intellectual curiosity or providing the basis for new technological breakthroughs. The ambitious and pioneering IAI's mission and scientific agenda articulated a decade ago and the consequent creation of a very active collaborative research network addressing highly relevant regional issues from the science agenda with implications to social and economic activities are totally in line with these concepts. This updated contract between science and society will require from our scientists that full integrity should be demonstrated and maintained not only for the projects' scientific work, methodologies, and approaches but also in the administration, handling, and reporting of the funds provided, if they expect the society to continue to trust on them.

It is generally agreed that the complexity and interactive nature of global environmental change imply that actions have to be based on scientific projections; that to solve global environmental problems “end-of-pipe” and efficiency approaches will not be sufficient; that systems change requires mutually reinforcing societal, institutional and technological changes and that, while there are many technologies available to properly handle changes, the human dimension is critical for their adoption.

It is also recognized that providing useful integration of sectoral expertise, disciplinary science, technical know-how, and informal knowledge in response to priorities of development stakeholders is a very complex process often left to local decision makers and managers who “make do” with limited skills, experience, and competencies. The need to have regional centers and institutions integrating science for sustainability is then evident, these regional entities helping with such integration by building experienced teams in trusted institutions, networked to global systems. Another advantage of regional groupings is that they have the appropriate scale for assembling capacity to integrate across different disciplines and sectors in response to specific decision needs.

The IAI in its very short period of life clearly demonstrated the value of the above-mentioned concepts by making enormous progress in the establishment of regional scientific networks, guided through regional governing and advisory bodies, with the administrative support of the Directorate. The 2000/2002 IAI's biennial report of activities fully documents the recent achievements. A lot has been done and a lot has to be done to sustain the present efforts and to build on this foundation. The mentioned report includes an illuminating and inspired text from some members of the Scientific Advisory Committee proposing a vision and strategy for the IAI. It recognizes the difficult challenges that IAI has faced and acknowledges some weaknesses that the Institution has to address in the immediate future. Six major strategies are proposed to address the challenges and to overcome the present weaknesses. In a few words they are related to the:

- 1) consolidation and enlarging of the CRNs by encouraging integration, by increasing funding through external sources or in-kind support and by fostering links and interactions with other regional and international projects;
- 2) regular renewal for project requests and the definition of new science agenda giving priority to projects clearly focusing on integrating global change research with sustainable development;
- 3) targeting of scientifically weak member countries for more sustained and focused capacity-building efforts;

- 4) facilitation of studies synthesizing and assessing the state of knowledge of issues vital to the region and to under-studied sub-regions;
- 5) improvement of IAI's capabilities to disseminate research results – through more publications and media ensuring their regional availability to decision makers and the public;
- 6) increase of IAI profile by expansion of its activities to include offering of expertise, information contacts to other institutions in the region and offering to administer appropriate projects for outside agencies and organizations.

We plan to use the above guidance to base our present and future activities. In fact, several of our present actions already follow one or more of the proposed strategies. For instance, as reported by the Scientific Officer, the next 3<sup>rd</sup> CRN meeting in Mendoza will have the input and presence of many IGBP members as well as from other organizations (strategy one) and it is expected to be covered by the (Spanish-speaking network of) Weather Channel at no cost to IAI (strategy five).

Regarding IAI's visibility and interactions with other institutions and projects (strategy one), we made and will continue to make efforts to follow-up the valuable contacts initiated by the Interim Director, Dr John Stewart, during his visits to different countries. In the international arena, I can report that I have attended, as observer, the last IGFA meeting held at Norwich, UK, from October 23-25, 2002. This participation gave me the opportunity to personally discuss with Dr. J. Stewart matters related to IAI before his departure. I also met, among others, Drs. Margaret Leinen, Lou Brown and Tom Spence, NSF; Dr. Jim Mahoney, US Climate Change Program Director; Dr. Roland Fuchs, START; Dr. C. Patterman, European Union; Dr. S. Yamamura, APN Director; Dr. A. Larigauderie, DIVERSITAS, Dr. Uno Svedin, Sweden, elected chair, IGFA. In Geneva, I had the opportunity to discuss, before my departure from WMO, with Dr. D. Carson, WCRP Director; Dr. K. Davidson, WCP Director; Dr. A. Thomas, GCOS Director, Dr. G. Love, IPCC Secretariat and (during a visit) Prof. Mohamed Hassan, TWAS/TWNSO. They all voiced interest to strengthen their activities with IAI.

In Brazil I had my first official meeting with the INPE Director, Dr. Moura Miranda, during my very first day on duty (at 8 a.m.), accompanied by the EC Chair, Mr. A. Mac Dowell. Dr. Miranda expressed great sympathy to IAI. So much so that he suggested financing a new building to share with a neighboring Institution (the UN Centres for Space Science and Technology Education) and using land offered by INPE and CTA (Brazilian Air Force). We met immediately with our neighbors and produced in a week, with the help of an architect, a pre-project that was presented to and discussed with Dr Miranda. He accepted, with some modifications, the project (a total surface of about 2,200 square meters of which 675 belong to IAI) and he committed to allocate 1.5 Mega Reais from INPE's 2003 budget to this building. External funding will be required to complete the furniture, computer systems, and other facilities. We will follow up this interesting offer in order to consolidate the project, to finalize the costing, and to explore possible external financial sources. I have had also talks with Dr. Carlos Nobre, INPE/CPTEC, on possible common activities and telephone contacts with Dr. Gylvan Meira, AEB, and Mr. A. Dowdy, US Dept. of State, US Embassy, Brasilia. I plan to travel to Brasilia on my return from Panama to meet the Minister of Science and Technology and to pay a visit to the AEB, the US Embassy, and other institutions involved in global change issues. Preliminary contacts are being made with the University of São Paulo (USP) on a possible IAI interaction/partnership regarding an USP proposal to the state-funding agency FAPESP to



open calls for proposals in the area of global change, including economic, social science and geosciences components.

Next year will offer IAI the opportunity to evaluate and review some of its activities, not only in the science, but also in its structures through an external review process (strategy two). We hope that these exercises will provide IAI with new and sound ideas and suggestions for improvement.

Regarding internal Directorate matters, we plan to initiate a full review of the present job descriptions of the staff to adjust them to a proper implementation of the above mentioned strategies. In parallel, a set of annual Directorate objectives will be designed for the year 2003 to be cascaded-down to the staff annual objectives and the related annual tasks and duties. In other words, we propose to apply a classical (perhaps out-dated for some theoreticians) “management by objectives” approach, that we feel will be quite appropriate for a small organization such as the IAI Directorate. The staff annual objectives and related tasks will form the basis for an annual performance appraisal scheme (PAR) that we plan to be simple but complete enough to allow for a proper evaluation of the staff performance. In this context, I request the EC to consider the Directorate structure presented by Dr Stewart as provisional, as it will possibly be somewhat modified as a result of this exercise.

As most of the CRN projects are currently at mid-term (year 3), the IAI is conducting an external scientific review. The deadline for this review is Friday, November 29, 2002. The SAC will analyze the results of this review and a full report will be presented to the EC/CoP in Boulder, Colorado, in June 2003. I wish to inform you, however, that the Directorate took very recently some immediate actions in connection with project CRN-38. Long and unacceptable delays in presenting financial reports required fact-finding missions from the IAI Financial and Scientific Officers. Although the scientific aspects of the project were proved to be sound and valuable, the administrative aspects required actions from the Directorate aimed at assuring a proper administration to protect and insure the continuation of the scientific work.

Finally, as expressed in my first paragraph, I am totally open to EC’s suggestions and recommendations on the above issues as well on any point that the EC may consider appropriate for the improvement of IAI, particularly regarding the implementation of policies.

## **II – IAI Officers Report**

### **1) Report of the IAI Scientific Officer**

#### *18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the IAI SAC*

The 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IAI SAC will be held 29-30 January 2003 in Mendoza, back-to-back with the 3<sup>rd</sup> CRN/IAI-IGBP Meeting “Building Global Change Networks in the Americas”. The meeting had been delayed until January 2003 to allow for the CRN external review to be completed and to have input from members of the IGBP Scientific Committee and other organizations (APN, DIVERSITAS, IHDP, NOAA, NSF, START, WCRP).

*Science Programs:*

*Program to Expand Scientific Capacity in the Americas (PESCA):* Finalized. Final report to be submitted to NSF in December 2002

*Initial Science Program Round 3 (ISP3):* All but one project (ISP3-132, Jim Jones) finalized. Final Report to be submitted to NSF in June 2003.

*Small Grants Program (SGP):* Contracts signed, funds transferred, projects started

*Collaborative Research Networks (CRN):* Mid-term External Evaluation ongoing with a deadline of 29 November. The results will be discussed at the 18<sup>th</sup> SAC in Mendoza and then presented to the EC/CoP in Boulder, Colorado, June 2003.

*Review of the IAI Science Agenda:*

So far rather few comments from SAC, likely due to the fact that 5 (out of 10) SAC members are newly appointed.

*Others:*

SO attended START SSC meeting in Hanoi, Vietnam, 12- 16 October 2002. Very promising discussions on future collaboration. Several START opportunities have now been opened for applications from the Americas. START is considering to include a section on the Americas (by IAI) in their annual SSC meeting. Preparations for the Young Scientists Conference, November 2003, TWAS, Trieste, Italy are on schedule (IAI contributes up to US\$40K for regional participants).

Talks continue with the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN) about joint meeting to discuss options for over-regional collaboration between the two networks.

## **2) Report of the IAI Training and Education and Communications Officer**

### *TRAINING AND EDUCATION (T&E)*

The IAI has discussed with a number of organizations the possibility of working jointly to plan and develop some training activities (e.g., summer institutes, short courses, workshops). Below are a few examples of potential collaborative activities:

#### *IAI–Inter-American Agency for Cooperation and Development (IACD)/OAS*

The IAI is in the planning phase of a course “Dealing with Vulnerability Associated with Climate Variability” (proposed location is the Dominican Republic or Jamaica and the tentative timeframe is October, 2003), which will be co-sponsored with IACD/OAS. The IAI has also approached other potential collaborators, which may be interested in joining forces to plan and support this activity (NOAA, USAID, WMO). We expect this initiative to be a truly collaborative one, and one that will be fruitful in several respects: strengthening institutional linkages, contributing to capacity building, promoting human dimensions, and increasing the participation of the Caribbean countries in the IAI. In addition, the IAI is discussing with the IACD/OAS the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding to set up the legal framework for the development of joint activities.

#### *IAI–INPE/CPTEC*

Currently, the IAI is working with Dr. Carlos Nobre, of CPTEC/INPE, in the planning of a training exercise in the Amazon. The IAI is interested in promoting multidisciplinary and multinational collaboration among the Amazonian countries and fostering discussion and application of sustainable practices in the region. The title of the proposed course is, "Scaling up Sustainable Land-Use Practices in the Amazon (micro to macro)." The location will be CPTEC/INPE, in Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil, and the proposed timeframe is October/November 2003. Funding is also expected to come from the State of São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP).

#### *IAI–University of São Paulo*

Another training course under discussion, this one between the IAI and Dr. Carlos Cerri of the University of São Paulo (USP)/Center for Nuclear Energy in Agriculture (CENA), is on the theme of Climate Change and Carbon Sequestration. Its purpose is to educate young Latin American scientists concerning the greenhouse effect, carbon sequestration processes of the soil and vegetation, and potential mitigation strategies. The ten-day course will be held at USP/CENA in Piracicaba, Brazil, tentatively in July 2003. The IAI is currently working with Dr. Cerri to plan the program and to prepare a proposal to be submitted to the National Research Council of Brazil and to FAPESP.

#### *IAI–University of Miami (UM) Summer Institute*

The IAI has discussed potential sources of funding with Drs. Otis Brown and Guillermo Podesta of UM for a fourth SI. Sources initially explored include foundations and the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) Program of the NSF, which supports graduate training of US students. We will continue to explore potential sources of funding.

#### *IAI–University of Buenos Aires (CRN Project)*

The IAI supported the course "Biodiversity and Global Change: the Human Impact in Ecosystems of the Americas" (November 11–24, 2002, in Chamela, Mexico), co-sponsored by the Red Latinoamericana de Botanica (RLB). This course was organized by Osvaldo Sala, a CRN PI of the University of Buenos Aires.

#### *Opportunities for CRN Summer Institutes*

On July 12, 2002, the IAI communicated to the CRN PIs its interest in organizing SIs or other T&E activities. IAI informed the CRN PIs about some limited resources available and our desire to look for partners to co-plan/fund such initiatives. The goal of contributing to CRN training is to strengthen the capacity-building and human-dimensions components of the projects and to advance the integration of science and policy. We have not yet received a response to this offer.

## COMMUNICATIONS

#### *IAI Annual Report*

The IAI Biennial Report 2000–2002 was recently published. The report is distributed by mail and is also available in electronic format on the IAI website.

#### *IAI Anniversary Book (1992–2002)*

The Directorate is working on a book to celebrate 10 years of IAI. NSF is supporting the production of this book, which will be in two languages: English and Spanish and will be distributed at the Conference of the Parties meeting in June, 2003.

## *HUMAN DIMENSIONS (HD)*

### *2003 Open Meeting of the Human Dimensions Community*

The fourth open meeting of the HD Community took place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, October 6–8, 2001. Over 250 participants from 50 countries participated in this event. The IAI played an important role in the organization of this meeting and ensured the strong participation of scientists from the Americas, and increased its visibility with the social sciences community. The next Open Meeting will take place in Montreal, Canada, October 16–18, 2003. Again, the IAI has been invited to help in the planning of this meeting, as part of the International Scientific Planning Committee.

### *IAI–IHDP Collaboration*

Last September, Sylvia Karlson, from IHDP met with Marcella O. Schwarz to exchange information about IHDP and IAI and discussed some potential collaborative activities. To continue with this discussion, Ms. Karlson will ask the IHDP’s Scientific Advisory Committee to prepare a list of potential themes of interest for future joint IAI-IHDP SIs (she could not make an institutional commitment before consulting with the new Director of the IHDP, who took office Nov. 1st, 2002).

### **3) Report of the Financial Officer**

#### Financial Report as of June 30, 2002

On October 10, 2002, IAI received the report from KPMG (IAI’s external auditors) with the audit report of the Financial Statements of IAI as of June 30, 2002 (4.ECXIV/DID/Eng/November 2002).

According to their opinion (paragraph 3 of their report), “... the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research – IAI Not for Profit Organization as of June 30, 2002, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.”

Even though a deeper analysis of the figures will be presented by the Financial Officer at the time the document 4 is presented to the EC, we can highlight the following facts:

- The superavit for the period 01/Jul/2001 – 30/Jun/2002 amounted \$586,483
- The incomes for the period amounted \$1,628,654, including an in-kind contribution from Brazil of \$205,450.
- The expenses amounted \$1,042,171

This is the first year that the auditors do not make any recommendation with regards to the internal controls of the Institute.

#### Financial Status as of September 30, 2002

Please, refer to document 5.ECXIV/DID/Eng.

# IAI Directorate

