

## *The Science-Policy Advisory Committee*

### *Report from the Director to CoP22*

#### **I. Terms of Reference for SPAC**

##### ***a) Background: mandate and process as agreed by CoP21 and EC 36.***

At the twenty-first Conference of the Parties (Montevideo, Uruguay, 12-13 June 2013), IAI members decided under the Action List for June 13 the following:

*7. The CoP approved the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison. The committee will provide advice to the CoP and the IAI Directorates on ways to effectively strengthen the relevance of the Institute's science programs for policy development and decision-making.*

*8. The CoP charged the EC and the Directorate with the drafting of the terms of reference for the Advisory Committee on Science-Policy Liaison (which will begin its work as from the next CoP) as well as the preparation of a list of possible candidates to be considered by the next CoP. The SAC will be part of the process.*

Following CoP 21, the 36<sup>th</sup> EC approved the following action Items:

*3. The EC established an ad hoc committee to elaborate the Terms of Reference for the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. Members of this committee are Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Uruguay, the USA. The Chair of the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures, the Assistant Director for Science-Policy Liaison and the Chair of the SAC will participate as ex officio members. The EC decided that the ToRs should be ready by the end of 2013. The ToRs and a list of candidates nominated to the Advisory Committee will be presented at CoP 22. The Rules for operation for this committee will be also presented at that time.*

*4. The EC debated ideas for the Terms of Reference of the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison. The main ideas to guide the design of the ToRs were: provide input to the IAI on effective science-policy integration on global change without interference in internal political processes of member states; help the IAI to make science useful for decision and policy making in global change related issues from multiple sectors; members of the Advisory Committee should be representative of multiple sectors and regions, membership in the committee should be by invitation and should not involve a voting process.*

These decisions follow prior decisions to create the Science-Policy Liaison Directorate at CoP 20 (*Strengthening Governance of the Inter-American Institute: Tripartite Governance Structure*, approved by the Twentieth Conference of the Parties of the IAI) and are conducive to the objectives of the tripartite governance structure of the IAI.

***b) Terms of Reference for SPAC as agreed by the ad hoc committee to elaborate the Terms of Reference for the CoP Advisory Committee for Science-Policy Liaison.***

1. Rationale

The Science-Policy Advisory Committee (SPAC) will assist in developing the IAI's strategy to improve and broaden the links between its scientific work and policy-making communities, and thereby provide support and guidance to the Directorate. The SPAC will advise the IAI on how to (1) effectively present its scientific results in a format that is most useful for decision making; (2) build institutional capacity to facilitate the dialogue between scientific research and decision-making; and (3) effectively engage policy stakeholders in the Institute's programs and other activities.

The SPAC should complement and not duplicate CoP and SAC discussions, working with these bodies as appropriate.

2. Composition, duration and functioning.

The SPAC shall be composed of NINE members invited by the CoP from a list of candidates established as outlined below; members will serve in their personal capacity and not represent their institutions. In addition, the SPAC will include the Chairs of the Executive Council and Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) and the IAI Executive Director, who will serve as ex-officio members.

SPAC members shall serve for TWO years and shall be eligible for a second term, but only on an exceptional basis.

Members are expected to be internationally recognized experts and/or practitioners in science-based decision making or science-policy liaison in areas relevant to the objectives of the IAI. The composition of SPAC shall ensure geographic balance, it may include members from outside the Americas, and should provide broad sectoral and thematic representation, including members from the government, private and civil society sectors.

The Conference of the Parties shall select SPAC members through a consultative process and make every effort to do so by consensus. THREE members shall be selected from nominations received from the Parties; THREE from nominations received from the SPAC itself; and THREE from nominations received from the Directorate. However, in the initial selection of the SPAC, since the SPAC will not yet exist and be able to present nominations to the CoP, the CoP will select SIX SPAC members from nominations received from the Parties.

The SPAC shall meet as necessary and possible according to budget, but at least once a year. The SPAC shall decide if meetings are to be held back to back with SAC and CoP meetings or separately.

The SPAC shall choose a Chair and Vice-Chair from among its elected members. The Chair and/or Vice-Chair may be invited by the SAC to share their work and engage in discussions about scientific programs. The Chair will report regularly, on behalf of the SPAC, to the CoP.

The Directorate shall act as Secretariat for the SPAC.

3. Mandate

The SPAC shall:

- a) Provide advice to the IAI Directorate and the Conference of the Parties regarding the policy relevance of IAI's work, and planning. In its consideration of policy relevance, the SPAC should explore channels of communication between science and policy, and assist science and capacity building projects to address issues facing decision-makers.
- b) Help define themes around which the IAI can develop science and policy programs and funding strategies.

- c) Serve as a consultative forum for IAI's science-policy liaison strategy, and advise on establishing two-way dialogue between policy/decision-makers and the science community to ensure the policy relevance of IAI's networks, where appropriate.
- d) Engage with the Scientific Advisory Committee to strengthen the policy relevance of IAI's scientific work.
- e) Organize, with the Directorate, policy forums around particular issues. In doing so, SPAC shall not advocate any policy decisions.
- f) Assess the policy relevance of the Institute's scientific results and emerging science programs and provide advice to the SAC and CoP on how to strengthen the link between science and decision-making .
- g) Advise the CoP and the Directorate on fundraising for SPAC-related activities.
- h) Assist in developing strategic alliances with other institutions engaged in science-policy dialogue
- i) Develop and adopt its rules of procedure and normally operate by consensus.
- j) Perform any other functions entrusted to it by the Conference of the Parties.

## II. Director's consultation with policy-makers on SPAC design

On May 29 and June 2, 2014, the IAI Director requested the opinion of four leading policy-makers from different sectors and significant experience in science-policy relations. The purpose of the consultation was to assist the Director in drafting his contribution to the design of the integration of the Science-Policy Advisory Committee. The opinions do not always reflect the suggested Terms of Reference but may offer alternatives to be considered.

The four interviewees have participated in IAI activities, know IAI well, and as a group they represent diverse and complementary perspectives, all of them relevant to science-policy liaison. The interviewees have contributed to the science-policy dialogue organized on the occasion of CoP20, where the creation of Directorate for Science-Policy Liaison was decided. The consultation was conducted with:

- ✓ Walter Baethgen, Uruguay and USA. Director, Regional Program for Latin America and the Caribbean, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, Columbia University. IAI SAC member.
- ✓ Luis Basterra, Argentina. President, Commission for Agriculture, Chamber of Deputies, National Congress of Argentina. Former Minister of Production and Environment, Province of Formosa, Argentina.
- ✓ Carlos H. Brito Cruz, Brazil. Scientific Director, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Sao Paulo (FAPESP).
- ✓ Yolanda Kakabadse, Ecuador. President, WWF International. Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador.

Consultation revolved around two sets of questions:

1) *Profile of Committee members*. What profile for SPAC members should the IAI seek? Of all the possible balances (regions, disciplines, sectors, gender, etc.), which are the most important to keep? Should we aim for thematic biases in SPAC composition that change over time (e.g. start with agriculture, next period focus on energy, etc.) or attempt to balance themes too? What partnerships could we establish for this with other, similar organizations?

2) *Functioning of Committee*. What procedure should the IAI seek for selection and invitation of SPAC members? How long should SPAC membership last? How many times should they be re-electable?

The main points that resulted from the consultation are:

### 1. Profile of Committee members

- The current state of the capacity in the region to understand and engage with global change issues is such that a nine member Committee should allow an integration that balances different regions, sectors and other representations.
- The two main **balances** are sectoral and geographic:
  - It is important that the Committee balances representation of different levels of governments, private sector and civil society organizations. Public policy is made with the contribution of different perspectives and interests that go beyond government, and it is important to have these perspectives represented. In aiming for this sectoral balance, however, IAI must ensure the legitimacy of the Committee.
  - Geographic balance is important and can be sought at the level of regions, such as North America, Central America, Andes or Southern Cone. Within this regional balance, it might be useful to include local authorities, today strengthened

throughout the region. However, such representatives should have a regional/hemispheric perspective.

- Within these balances, it is important to incorporate a **diversity** of perspectives. It would be useful if Committee members had strong connections with substantive issues of policy relevance, rather than merely contribute to a more generic sectoral representation. The composition of the Committee can change over time to reflect changes in IAI priorities. It is important that member profiles are complementary among the membership.

Committee members that come from governments should not have similar profiles to representatives already present in the CoP, but rather include representation of other branches of government such as the Legislative, or local governments. The participation of civil society organizations poses the question of their representativity and their inclusion should consider their legitimacy. The participation of private sector entities will be important, especially those active in scientific and technological development.

- Regarding the **profile** of individuals, more than their current professional activity, what matters is their record in (i) issues of interest to IAI, and (ii) in policy- and decision-making. This last point is especially important. Members should be fundamentally “practitioners” that understand the implications of proposing policy to avoid contributions made lightly and without due regard to their consequences.

Committee members should also have a record of acknowledging the role of science in decision making, without competing with other IAI committees (in particular scientific) in formulating recommendations to IAI - that is, members should have a profile that reflects science-based policy and decision-making not a specific scientific agenda.

- The composition of the Committee should set high quality **standards** in terms of the profiles selected and perspectives that are regional, long-term and relevant above strictly national interests. Also, if the goal of the Committee is to support the impact of IAI research on public policy, it is important to allow the policy-making community to provide feed-back on the scientific program.
- The process to constitute the Committee should combine formal criteria that provide it with **legitimacy** with pragmatic criteria that make it **efficient**. Experience shows that formal mechanisms are not necessarily the most effective and it might be best to invite individuals with proven experience in science-policy liaison. However, a group of individuals may not be vested with sufficient legitimacy in the eyes of national delegates unless they also carry institutional credentials. Pragmatism in composing the Committee is very important.

From a formal perspective, one possible way to proceed might be to engage the committee with regional policy organizations (e.g. Sica, Caricom, Mercosur, IDB, CAN, OAS, etc.) that already have science and technology divisions, which often have links with national science and technology areas. This approach has the advantage that those organizations already represent some sort of regional balance and a regional perspective. However, the Committee should itself also include a significant number of individuals selected for their experience and leadership.

- CoP should play a role in proposing Committee members but not a dominant role, especially because it is this body that ultimately will elect Committee members. Normal CoP procedures are not the best mechanism to select candidates.
- Some suggestions to consider for procedures to select candidates:

- Task one individual, who could be the first Chair of the Committee, with the elaboration of a short list of candidates for consideration by IAI. This would be a highly efficient process, but lowers its legitimacy.
- Task the IAI Director with the elaboration of a list of candidates, requesting input from SAC, for consideration by IAI.
- Task a group of individuals (such as the group here consulted) with the elaboration of a list of candidates for consideration by CoP.
- Request a broad group of selected organizations to suggest candidates on the basis of previously set terms of reference, to produce a pool of candidates for consideration by IAI.

Selection of candidates could be guided by thematic priorities set by IAI.

## 2. Functioning of the Committee

- Some experiences show that it is best that the Committee be chaired by a person that does not represent the interests of any specific science community nor of any governmental delegations that make up the institution's governing body. This, to avoid bias towards special interests. The chair should be able to look evenly at all interests represented in the Committee.
- The Committee should be able to establish relations with other policy entities from which information useful to IAI can be drawn. For instance, Fapesp has a tradition of engaging in dialogue once a year with the State Senate of Sao Paulo which, while not resulting in specific requests for research, is very useful in shaping calls for proposals.
- Dialogue with policy-makers results in the identification of problems, but generally yields little guidance as to how the scientific community can help to solve them. In the case of IAI, this is compounded by the additional challenge of its regional perspective, that goes beyond national agendas. In this sense, the contribution of national agencies that already have an established practice of dialogue with policy makers can be useful to shape regional strategies. Legislatures normally have science commissions that, although focused on regulatory frameworks, are good at identifying policy priorities. There are regional parliamentary organizations that can be engaged in the process of establishing the Committee.
- In the future, some calls to submit proposals could be thematically oriented, and these themes should have been previously debated with policy makers. The work of the Committee and its liaison with other organizations can help identify priorities.
- Rather than establish direct links to help IAI influence policy-making, the Committee could recommend IAI strategies to connect with key public policy instances – the Committee could help IAI in the design of its science-policy liaison strategy rather than undertake specific liaison activities.
- The review of existing models for similar Committees might yield useful lessons (e.g. Future Earth, UN multi-stakeholder committees, Mercosur, IPBES, etc.).
- Nine is an adequate number for the Committee. A 3-year mandate with one re-election could be appropriate because it takes a year for members to get to know the organization and each other well enough to generate useful input to IAI. Two year mandates might also be adequate. Up to two annual working meetings could be sufficient to generate results.
- The first Committee should have staggered mandates (e.g. renovating a third on the first year, another third the second year and another the third) to ensure continuity and institutional memory.

### **III. Director's proposal to CoP**

Taking into account the CoP21 mandate, the output of the ad hoc committee established by EC 36, and the Director's consultations made with third parties, the following is the Director's proposal to CoP on how to proceed for the conformation of the first SPAC.

The conformation of the first SPAC is a unique opportunity to address the key challenges of diversity, legitimacy and efficiency. The process to identify candidates (different from the process of actually selecting them) should be efficient and ensure that the most relevant balances are achieved, that high level policy perspectives, complementary to CoP's, are represented, that the SPAC has a strong legitimacy and that leading and proactive members are engaged.

Following consultations with the ad hoc group mentioned in Section II, the Director explored the availability of four additional potential candidates, and requested from those eight people suggestions of an additional two names each to complete the list of potential candidates, presented below.

It is the Director's opinion that this list offers a very sound pool of potential candidates for CoP delegates to consider for SPAC. However, the list does have one significant weakness that we trust CoP delegates will be able to solve: some regions, notably Central America and the Andean nations, are under-represented while some countries and institutions appear over-represented.

With this caveat, the Director submits to CoP delegates the following list as a useful basis for the identification of SPAC members during CoP23.

1. Walter Baethgen, Uruguay and USA. Director, Regional Program for Latin America and the Caribbean, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, Columbia University. IAI SAC member.
2. Prof. Boris Graizbord. México. Coordinador, Programa de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo Sustentable y Medio Ambiente, LEAD-México y El Colegio de México
3. Giampiero Renzoni. Colombia. Ex- Director del Programa de Medio Ambiente y de Emergencias, Departamento Nacional de Planeación. Actualmente dando clases en Cali.
4. John Furlow. USA. Climate Change Team Leader on Impacts and Adaptation, USAID.
5. Luis Bastera, Argentina. President, Commission for Agriculture, Chamber of Deputies, National Congress of Argentina. Former Minister of Production and Environment, Province of Formosa, Argentina.
6. Carlos H. Brito Cruz, Brazil. Scientific Director, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Sao Paulo (FAPESP).
7. Emilio Moran. Brazil. Director, ACT, Distinguished Professor and Rudy Professor of Anthropology, Professor of Environmental Sciences, Adjunct Professor of Geography, Indiana University and FAPESP São Paulo Excellence Chair (SPEC) Professor at the University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas.
8. Roberto Gomes de Souza Berlinck. Brazil. Associate Professor at the Institute of Chemistry at São Carlos, USP, University of São Paulo and Member of the Program Committee for the FAPESP BIOTA Program.
9. Carlos Alfredo Joly. Brazil. Full Professor at Botany Department, Institute of

Biology, Unicamp, State University at Campinas; and Member of the Program Committee for the FAPESP BIOTA Program.

10. Yolanda Kakabadse, Ecuador. President, WWF International. Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador.

11. Steven Cohen. USA. Executive Director of Columbia University's Earth Institute and a Professor in the Practice of Public Affairs at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

12. Pedro Letaõ. Brazil. Bacharel em Administração Pública, Mestre em Planejamento Urbano e Regional e Doutor em Engenharia de Produção. Atuou como Diretor Executivo do Fundo Brasileiro para Biodiversidade FUNBIO, foi membro do Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) e atualmente é o Diretor Executivo do Instituto Arapyaú de Educação e Desenvolvimento Sustentável.

13. Don Melnick: Thomas Hunt Morgan Professor of Conservation Biology and Director of the Center for Environment, Economy, and Society at Columbia University.

14. Maria Netto Schneider, Markets and Climate Change, Inter American Development Bank.

15. Brigitte Baptiste, Colombia. Director General, Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt

16. Bob Corell, Principal, Global Environment and Technology Foundation, USA.

17. Javier Gracia-Garza, Director General, Science Program Branch at Canadian Forest Service, Natural Resources Canada.

18. Janet Ranganathan, Vice President, Science and Research, World Resources Institute, USA.

19. Marcos Jank, VP for Gov and Sust, BRF-Brazil Foods and founder of ICONE, a Brazilian AG think tank, with which WRI's partners with

20. Prof. Jose Goldemberg, former minister of Brazil 3 times (energy, education and science-technology), former Rector (Presidente) of Universidade de Sao Paulo, very well respected scientist internationally, member of IPCC, etc.

21. Mario Gustavo Costa, Argentina. President, Aves Argentinas. Former Circuit Judge in Buenos Aires.

22. Carlos Alberto Paz, Argentina. Current member of the National Directorate and former President of the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA) and former Vice President of the Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria.

23. Homero M. Bibiloni. Argentina. Former National Secretary for Environment and Sustainable Development.