

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



**EC-XVII & CoP-X**

*June 2-5, 2003*

*Boulder, USA*

**7\_ECXVII/CoPX/DID/English/April 2003**

**Report of the 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)**  
***January 29-30, 2003 Mendoza, Argentina***

The 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) was held 29-30 January 2003, Hotel Aconcagua, Mendoza, Argentina.

**Participants:**

SAC: Luiz Bevilacqua (Brazil - SAC Chair), Maria Assunção Silva Dias (Brazil), Mike Brklacich (Canada), Rene Capote (Cuba), Alejandro Castellanos (USA), Walter Fernandez (Costa Rica), Lynne Zeitlin Hale (USA), Luiz F. Legey (Brazil), Silvia Garzoli (USA), Julia Paegle (USA)

Absent: Gary Wynn Yohe (USA)

Observers: Paul Filmer (NSF), Antonio MacDowell (EC Chair), Martin Rice (APN), Satyan Venkataramaiah (WCRP)

IAI Directorate: Gustavo Necco (Director), Gerhard Breulmann (Scientific Officer), Marcella Ohira Schwarz (Communications Officer), Eduardo Banus (CRN Program Manager) and Isabel Vega (Assistant to the Scientific Officer).

**Agenda**

The SAC Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

**Minutes of the 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the SAC**

The meeting commenced with a review of the minutes of the 17<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting held at UNAM, Mexico in May 2002. The Chair postponed the approval until later so that the SAC members have time to review the minutes in detail. After the introduction of each participant, the Chair proposed a change (approved) in the order of agenda items and suggested starting with a presentation about the Asia Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN) based in Kobe, Japan.

**Presentation by APN, joint APN-IAI activities**

Martin Rice, APN Programme Manager, presented an overview about the APN. Regarding a joint APN-IAI activity he introduced ENSO climate extreme being one possibility. The SAC (again) welcomed the idea of an APN – IAI collaboration and encouraged the IAI Directorate and APN Secretariat to further explore this idea. Other topics than the above mentioned might also be considered (no topics were given).

**Proposal by Louis Lebel, Chiang Mai University, Thailand (Asian & American nodes)**

The proposal “Integrating carbon management into development strategies of cities and their surrounds in the Asia-Pacific Region – establishing a network of regional case studies” seeking funding support from IAI for the American nodes (Asian nodes – submitted to APN) could be submitted under the next IAI regular call for proposal after adjustment to IAI requirements.

**Assignment of SAC advisors to each CRN project**

Maria Assuncao Dias raises the issue of Conflict of Interest of SAC members as she is Co-PI of one of the CRNs. The Chair clarifies the IAI Conflict of Interest Policy, which would request SAC members to declare such conflict in case it comes to discussions and/or decisions about the

respective project. The policy is also available on the IAI website. The advisory roles are decided as follows:

SAC Member	CRN No.	PI
Mike Brklacich	CRN 48 CRN 31	Ulisses Confalonieri Eduardo Franco
Rene Capote	CRN 9 CRN 47	Charles Wood Michael McClain
Alejandro Castellanos	CRN 12 CRN 40	Oswaldo Sala Juan Silva
Maria Assuncao Dias	CRN 1 CRN 38	Holm Tiessen Pilar Cornejo
Walter Fernandez	CRN 3 CRN 73	Brian Luckman Victor Magana
Silvia Garzoli	CRN 61	Edmo Campos
Lynne Hale	CRN 62	Tim Baumgartner
Luiz Legey	CRN 26	Maria Vernet
Julia Paegle	CRN 55	Mario Nunez
Gary Yohe	CRN 31	Eduardo Franco

In case a SAC member wants to take on the advisory role for additional projects, (s)he should contact the IAI Directorate. The role of the SAC members is advisory and not meant as a control function. The above assignments will be communicated to the CRN PIs. The Directorate will need to provide the SAC members with more information on their respective projects, e.g., reports, publications and any other relevant information to enable them to fulfill their advisory role. The CRN Program Manager should automatically forward this information to the SAC members. The advisors may also attend project meetings where possible/necessary and the Directorate will need to set aside some funds for this purpose.

### **External Evaluation of the CRN projects**

The external review of the CRN projects resulted in rather positive for all projects. The SAC noticed however that there were significant differences in the individual reviews. While some reviews were very detailed and comprehensive, others were very short-worded. The selection of competent reviewers was noted as very critical step in which the SAC could be consulted to provide support. It was also recommended that such evaluation include a rating scale similar to a mail/panel reviews. Concerning the list of publications provided by the CRN PIs questions were raised whether all publications listed are outputs of the CRNs. The SO explained that the PIs had been advised to list only those publications that acknowledge IAI. Following a survey by the CRN Program Manager, the rate of IAI acknowledgement varied from 8% to 80%. The SAC confirms that IAI must be acknowledged in all publications even if the CRN contribution to a specific publication might be little. Silvia Garzoli raised that also (co-)authorship of more than one PI needs consideration as one major goal of the IAI and the CRNs is collaboration.

The IAI Director summarized the current problems with CRN038. Although the IAI has a “Suspension and Termination Policy” in place, it is suggested that the SAC be consulted in such cases as the science is affected. The Chair stressed that in this context the SAC advisory role is crucial and could prevent similar problems.

## Review of the IAI Scientific Agenda

Due to the multiplicity of comments under this item, some parts are presented as dotted list. The Email comments received had been distributed to all SAC members before the meeting. The IAI Director briefly reflected on the development of the science agenda and those comments. The Chair stressed the need to think and focus on the future and not the past. The initial IAI agenda was tailored towards scientific excellence and although this is still the IAI priority there is a clear shift to impact studies. Excellent science is the foundation of IAI, however, it needs to be re-considered whether the initial IAI approach is still valid, e.g., should the agenda be narrowed or rather expanded. Specific themes, e.g. urbanization are not part of the current agenda. Ideally, the science agenda should also consider priorities of potential sponsors (e.g. The World Bank). Interregional integration needs consideration and the APN-IAI approach is a step into this direction. The Director stressed the importance to consider the ‘Strategies for the future’ proposed by the IAI Vision and Strategy Group (see IAI Biennial Report 2000-2002, page 23/24). Further comments given by the SAC are:

- Policy impact is missing in ‘strategies for the future’.
- IAI now has more participation of ‘weak’ countries and the regional distribution of proposals needs to be considered in the implementation of projects
- Contribution to global observing systems could open immense funding opportunities
- Theme 4 was clearly underrepresented in the CRN presentations, this theme needs to be presented better in the agenda - not only as a separate theme, but also under the three other themes. In the current form, Theme 4 does somehow not match the other three themes
- IAI has to be careful not to force interconnections (social science – natural science) where this could distract excellent science
- Synthesis and interrelation between the themes are important
- Important themes highlighted: Human vulnerability & GEC; GEC science in sustainable development; urbanization
- Brainstorm a little about the difference of e.g. IAI and IGBP. The difference is not in the themes, but in the way how these themes are approached. The specific character of IAI needs to be preserved
- Luiz Bevilacqua’s continued contribution to this item (and the SAC) is recommended – although his SAC affiliation is officially expired
- Revised agenda needs to be prospective not retrospective

The SAC confirms the validity of the current four themes of the Science Agenda. Special attention is required for theme 4 as it somehow does not match themes 1-3. This will need to be addressed by the respective working group (see below). It is decided to form two groups of SAC members to re-write the paragraphs under each theme. Group 1 (Maria Assuncao Dias, Walter Fernandez, Silvia Garzoli, Julia Paegle, Gary Yohe) will revise Themes I and III. Group 2 (Lynne Hale, Alejandro Castellanos, Rene Capote, Mike Brklacich, Luiz Legey) will revise Themes II and IV. The IAI Directorate will revise the introductory part, which should include more info on the aim of the IAI. The two groups will communicate by Email and prepare a draft to be distributed to all members. A suggestion to also distribute to the PIs is rejected. A revised agenda needs to be ready for EC/CoP approval in June 2003 to be published in time for the launch of the next IAI Call for Proposals (see section below).

The discussion shifts to a second call for CRNs and the future of the current CRNs:

- Some CRNs may need financial extension
- Could CRNs be partners of IAI? Some may have the potential, others may not
- CRNs are eligible to apply under a new call, but they have to go through the competitive process
- A quota regulation could be applied
- Matching funds should be requested from existing CRNs
- Support could be provided by IAI to go for external funds
- The ‘nature’ of each CRN needs consideration. E.g. some CRNs may look comparatively weak as they *created* needs, but those should not disappear
- Quotas would be a possibility, however, PIs have to be aware of this upfront
- CRNs need to evolve also in the context of country representation
- A second call for CRNs would need to address research gaps – could this be done through quota

### **Update on the Small Grant Program, ISP3 and PESCA**

The Scientific Officer presented an update on the above three programs. The Small Grant Program has started, funds have been transferred, the projects are in their initial phase.

ISP3 has been extended several times due to requests for no-cost extensions by individual projects. By now, all ISP 3 reports have been received by the Directorate and a final report to the NSF is due until 30 June 2003.

The Final report for the PESCA program has been submitted to the NSF. Considering the objectives of PESCA, the Directorate considers the outcome of the program as very positive. Although the funding provided to the individual projects has been rather modest, it has been possible to achieve very valuable results scientifically as well as in the context of capacity building. The number of publications and presentations clearly confirms the scientific success of the program. The program also was able to enhance the capacity building capabilities of some institutions through the purchase of some equipment. PESCA was specifically targeting scientists from IAI member countries so far underrepresented in previous IAI programs. Scientists from Cuba and Jamaica (besides others) participated in the program, however, it has not been possible to mobilize scientists from the Dominican Republic and Guatemala to participate. In order to achieve a better participation of those countries’ scientists in IAI programs, it may need an approach targeting specific institutions or even individual scientists from those countries and pointing them to appropriate IAI opportunities. This can partly be done by the IAI Directorate, however would greatly benefit from the support of the respective country representatives.

### **Summer Institutes**

The Communications and Training Officer presented the background on IAI Summer Institutes (SI): for the period 1999-2001 IAI launched 3 SIs together with the University of Miami. The purpose was to promote collaboration between natural and social scientists and foster multidisciplinary research. This experience was very successful and some indicators were: some participants successfully competed in the PESCA and SG programs and a number of organizations have followed our model of SI (START, IRI, etc). Based on this successful

experience we would like to continue promoting this activity, however, we are unable to do so due to the lack of financial resources. The funds necessary to support a SI is somewhat relevant. As we only have approximately \$70K (remaining funds from ISP and PESCA) to support capacity building activities in 2003, we decided to plan training courses this year and are also seeking complementary funding. The courses are: 1) 'Sustainable Practices of Land Use in Amazonia', course organized with Carlos Nobre from INPE/CPTEC in Cachoeira Paulista, Brazil; 2) 'Warming and Global Climate Changes: Origin and Mitigation Alternatives' course organized with Carlos Cerri from USP/CENA in Piracicaba, Brazil; 3) 'Vulnerability Associated with Climate Variability and Climate Change in Central America and the Caribbean' in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. There are no funds allocated for T&E in 2004.

### **Future (next) IAI Call for Proposals**

The NSF funds available for IAI programs to be applied for until 30 September 2003 (this is the date the funds have to be paid by NSF) are US\$300K. For the following year (until September 2004) the amount is US\$2.300 K – as the current round of CRNs receives funding for 5 years. IAI must provide opportunities for new groups to participate, the IAI should be able to keep support for some of the ongoing CRNs and the IAI should continue to fund training via summer institutes. It is therefore suggested to split the budget into approx. 80 % for the launch of another round of CRNs, while 20% are allocated for support of emerging groups and Summer Institutes. The SAC recommends to launch a second round of the Small Grant Program (SGP), total amount US\$600K, awards of up to US\$30K, participation of at least three IAI member countries, duration one year. Proposals will be accepted in the categories, research, technical report and workshop (incl. training workshops) under all four themes of the IAI science agenda. The program announcement should encourage linkages with other global change programs (e.g. ESSP) and involvement of policy makers where appropriate. Science in South America is often not well connected to the international programs. Although ESSP will usually not be able to contribute financially to the projects, such linkages are of great importance, as has been clearly shown by the CRN meeting. A proposal will be prepared by the Directorate for approval at the next EC/CoP in June 2003, Boulder, Colorado. The proposal will need to be submitted to the NSF in mid July at the latest.

The SAC recommends announcing a second round of CRNs in late 2004 or early 2005. Preparations should start as soon as possible as the process to launch a program of this dimension is very complex. The 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SAC supposed to be held in late October 2003 will discuss this issue.

### **Comments on Meeting with IGBP (and others)**

Immediate comments from PIs as well as reps of the other programs have been very positive. The Directorate will continue to invite ESSP reps to relevant IAI meetings and the SAC Chair may attend ESSP Scientific Committee meetings. Although the 'nature' of IAI and the other programs is different, it is of great importance to enhance collaboration, specifically as the science in Latin America is, in many cases, not well connected. Most of the actual collaboration will though need to be done at the PI level. The idea to publish under the IGBP series is very good, however, would need further discussion. The Director(ate) will follow-up on a more formal agreement with the IGBP (e.g. MOU). The meeting is very much along suggestion 1 of the 'IAI Vision and Strategy Group' which recommends to consolidate and enlarge the CRNs by .... fostering links and interactions with other regional and international projects.

## **Planning of the Science Forum, 4 June 2003, at the EC/CoP in Boulder, Colorado**

The Science Forum is supposed to provide a platform for interactions between scientists and governmental representatives. SAC input is sought for the preparation of the meeting agenda. A first draft agenda has been prepared as a basis for discussion. Luiz Legey volunteered to contribute to the Steering Committee on behalf of SAC and also to attend the meeting. It is recommended to arrange for a poster session.

### **Open SAC position**

The position of Walter Fernandez is scheduled for (re)election. As Walter is a candidate nominated by the EC, the Directorate needs to send a letter to all CoP representatives informing them about the vacant position and ask for nominations of candidates

### **Election of New SAC Chair**

Luiz Bevilacqua, outgoing SAC Chair proposed Walter Fernandez as new SAC Chair. Walter is the senior member of the current SAC. Lynne Hale was proposed as a Co-Chair. Both nominations were approved. The meeting recommended that Luiz Bevilacqua continues his involvement in the SAC and continues to attend SAC meetings as his background with the IAI is invaluable to the meeting and other SAC members. Luiz confirmed his willingness to support the IAI and the SAC whenever necessary.

### **Montevideo + 10**

It is matter of the Directorate to contact Uruguay on the possibility to organize a meeting Montevideo + 12 there. A commitment had been made by the Uruguayan President during the visit of Interim Director John Stewart & Silvio Bianchi to organize a meeting there, however, Uruguay had not been able to participate in the last EC meeting in Panama, December 2002. The Directorate needs to follow-up on this matter.

### **NGO eligibility**

According to the IAI rules, NGOs are eligible to apply for IAI grants. This is actually an issue of the EC/CoP to decide/modify.

### **Next Meeting**

SAC meetings should whenever possible be held back to back with international meetings relevant to the SAC. The Open Meeting of HD will be held in Montreal October 16-18, 2003 and would provide such opportunity. Mike Brklacich will contact Barbara Goebel, IHDP Director on the possibility to have the 19<sup>th</sup> IAI SAC after the Montreal meeting. In case this is not possible, Lynne Hale offered TNC facilities to hold the meeting.

The minutes of the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SAC are approved.

The Chair adjourns the meeting.

The meeting presents to outgoing SAC Chair Luiz Bevilacqua a picture exhibiting his IAI history and thanks him for his invaluable contribution to the creation and development of the IAI and its programs.

Luiz expressed his involvement in the IAI in the following words 'I planted and I was able to harvest'. Thank you very much again Luiz and we look forward to have you with us for many more years.