

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



**EC-XXVI & CoP-XV**  
*June 17-20, 2008*  
*Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Minutes of the CoP-XV**

**5\_CoPXIV/DWD/English/**

**Minutes of the Fifteenth Meeting of the IAI Conference of the Parties (CoP)  
Buenos Aires, Argentina, 19-20 June 2008**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
Action List CoP-XV (day 1).....	2
Action List CoP-XV (day 2).....	2
Resolutions.....	2
<i>Agenda</i> .....	3
CoP Country Representatives.....	4
SAC Members.....	4
Observers.....	5
1.Lou Brown (APN).....	5
2.Victor Arrua Maidana (IICA).....	5
3.Jorge Grandi (UNESCO).....	5
IAI Directorate Staff.....	5
1. <i>Opening Session</i> .....	5
2. <i>Election of Bureau</i> .....	5
3. <i>Approval of the Agenda</i> .....	5
4. <i>Approval of the Report of the 13th CoP Meeting</i> .....	5
5. <i>Presentations by member countries and observers</i> .....	5
6. <i>Report of the Credentials Committee</i> .....	11
7. <i>Progress report of the IAI Directorate</i> .....	11
8. <i>Progress Report of the EC</i> .....	19
9. <i>Report of the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures</i> .....	20
10. <i>IAI Strategic Planning</i> .....	24
11. <i>Approval of the Action List of Day 1</i> .....	25
12. <i>Other issues from EC 25 and 26</i> .....	25
13. <i>Donor's session</i> .....	26
14. <i>Election of SAC Members</i> .....	26
15. <i>Election of EC Members</i> .....	29
16. <i>Future sites and meetings</i> .....	29
17. <i>Adjournment</i> .....	30
<b>Action List CoP-XV (day 1)</b>	
<b>Action List CoP-XV (day 2)</b>	
<b>Resolutions</b>	
<b>Acronyms</b>	

Note: This report is not 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.

---

**15<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the IAI Conference of the Parties (CoP)  
June 19-20, 2008 – Buenos Aires, Argentina**

**Agenda**

Thursday– June 19, 2008	Day 1
-------------------------	-------

**- Morning session (08:30 – 12:00)**

08:30 - 09:00 Registration

Opening ceremony

Organizational Issues:

- *Election of the CoP Bureau*

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 14th Meeting of the CoP

10:30 – 10:45 Coffee Break

Presentations:

- *Parties to the Agreement*
- *Observers*

Report of the Credentials Committee

12:30 Lunch

**- Afternoon Session (14:00 – 18:00)**

Progress report of the IAI Directorate:

*Holm Tiessen*

- *Summary of the presentation made during the 25th EC meeting;*
- *Annual Program for FY 2008-2009;*
- *Core Budget for FY 2008-2009;*
- *Country Contribution for 2008-2009*

Progress report of the EC:

*EC Bureau*

- *Activities charged to the EC by the CoP at its last meeting;*
- *EC activities, actions, and decisions;*
- *Issues brought forward from the 25th and 26th EC meetings*

15:30 – 15:45 Coffee Break

Review process of the EC and CoP Standing Rules

*Lou Brown*

IAI Strategic Planning

Welcome reception

Friday – June 20, 2008 Day 2
---------------------------------

**- Morning Session (09:00 – 12:00)**

Approval of the Action List of Day 1

Approval of the Core Budget for FY 2008-2009 and Country Contribution for 2008-2009

Approval of the other items forwarded from the 25th and 26th EC meetings

Donor's session

- *Country contributions to:*
  - *Program and Project Activities;*
  - *Core Budget*

10:30 – 10:45 Coffee Break

Election of new SAC members

Election of EC members (\*)

Future meetings and sites

Adjourn

Debriefing session – IAI CoP Bureau and the IAI Directorate.  
Meetings of Working Groups, as necessary.

(\*) After the CoP meeting the new EC will meet to elect its Bureau.

---

Participants at the meeting were:

CoP Country Representatives

- Argentina: Carlos Ereño
- Bolivia: Álvaro Seda Reyda
- Brazil: Maria Virginia Alves
- Canada: Louis Grittani
- Colombia: Álvaro Restrepo
- Costa Rica: Gabriela Sanchez Arrieta
- Cuba: Bárbara Garea Moreda
- Ecuador: Gustavo Velazquez
- Jamaica: Enrique Banuchi
- Mexico: Gerardo Arroyo O'Grady
- Panama: Diana Laguna
- Paraguay: Miguel Angel Vazquez
- United States: Paul Filmer, Will Smith, Lou Brown, Norman Barth, Chester Ropelewski, Vanessa Richardson
- Venezuela: Gladys Maggi

SAC Members

Michael Brklacich (Chair)

### Observers

1. Lou Brown (APN)
2. Victor Arrua Maidana (IICA)
3. Jorge Grandi (UNESCO)

### IAI Directorate Staff

- Holm Tiessen (Director)
- Gerhard Breulmann (Scientific Officer)
- Marcella Ohira (Capacity Building Officer)
- Rafael Atmetlla (Administrative and Financial Officer),
- Luciana O. Queiroz Ribeiro (Assistant to the IAI Director)
- Tania Sánchez (Assistant to the IAI Director)
- Elvira Gentile
- Paula Richter

### Local Support

Magdalena Alvarez Arancedo, Romina Iuso

## **1. Opening Session**

Alejandro Ceccatto, Viceminister of Science, Technology and Innovative Production and Secretary of Science and Technology Coordination opened the meeting and wished participants a fruitful meeting.

Paul Filmer thanked Argentina and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovative Production for the support the country has given to the IAI since its creation.

## **2. Election of Bureau**

The CoP elected the following members as the Bureau for its Fifteenth Meeting: Carolina Vera from Argentina as the Chair, Gladys Maggi from Venezuela as the First Vice-Chair, and Paul Filmer from USA as the Second Vice-Chair.

*(Action 1 – Day 1)*

## **3. Approval of the Agenda**

The CoP approved the agenda of its Fifteenth Meeting without modifications.

*(Action 2, Day 1)*

## **4. Approval of the Report of the 13<sup>th</sup> CoP Meeting**

The CoP approved the report of its Fourteenth Meeting with the following modifications:

- Point 12: Election of SAC members, remove the names of the candidates for SAC positions in the English and Spanish versions.
- Other minor corrections to be sent to the Secretariat directly

*(Action 3, Day 1)*

## **5. Presentations by member countries and observers**

**Argentina:** Argentina has been involved in the IAI since the signing of the Montevideo Agreement in 1993. In 1992, the Government established the Global Change National Commission. A general overview of climate change effects was provided. Impacts of

climate warming are already affecting Argentina mainly in the agriculture sector. The second national communication is completed, and is available on the Internet. The Ministry of Science and Technology has approved about ten programs for strategic action. One of those is on climate change and aims at improving the understanding and quality of regional climate change forecasts, mainly related to the hydrologic system (the Plata basin and the Andean region). The program is also aimed at strengthening computational capacities. Vulnerability studies are under way of different aspects of the climate system, land-use changes, changes in biodiversity and ecosystems, health. Though the country has experts in many areas, international cooperation continues to be important. Five countries are part of the Plata Basin and the IAI has been instrumental in strengthening the networks and contacts among them. This initiative is leading to an intergovernmental management of the basin. The satellite program of Argentina will also make it possible to provide information on key variables for the study of climate.

**Bolivia:** The delegate expressed the interest of his country in the activities that are being developed by the IAI. Bolivia is part of different IAI funded projects and has a strong commitment with the environment, not only from the political perspective, but also from the cultural and social ones. Because of budget restrictions, large national initiatives cannot be undertaken without the help of other sources. Therefore, knowledge and technology transfer as well as collaboration with other partners are highly beneficial to Bolivia. However, despite the difficulties, the country has paid some past contributions to the IAI.

**Brazil:** Collective global change activities and research are being developed by several institutions with the coordination of the Ministry of Science and Technology. Experts come from the energy, industry, forestry, agriculture, livestock, and waste management sectors from all Brazilian regions. The national communication aims at preparing the Brazilian inventory of anthropogenic emissions by source and removals by sinks, as well as a general description of the steps taken or envisioned by Brazil to implement the Convention. To carry out the activities an inter-ministerial commission was established by the Government. Information is available on the web site of the Ministry of Science and Technology. As a contribution to the GEO effort China offers free real time high-resolution satellite imagery to developing countries. Brazil and China also offer on demand geographic information system tools and training. Images are already available for Brazil, China and some countries in South America. The installation of antennas that will allow distribution of images to Africa is also in progress, and strategies to freely distribute images to Central America and the Caribbean are on the agenda. INPE has just installed a new research center, the Center for Earth System Sciences to foster research on the complex dynamics of the interaction between natural and social systems and at providing information for the sustainability of the systems. An investment of above one million US dollars has been approved for a super computer that will allow the new center to develop high-resolution complex Earth system models, including global climate models to generate scenarios of future climate. The new super computer system will also be used in the Brazilian climate change network.

**Canada:** The global change science in Canada is conducted by a number of governmental departments. In the Atmospheric Sciences and Technology Directorate of Environment Canada, science focuses on climate, ocean, atmosphere, land, health, ecosystems and disasters. Various regional and global climate models are being further developed to achieve better forecasts of climate change. Models are also used to improve the accuracy of weather forecasts, particularly those of extreme weather events that are increasing in number in Canada (effects of hurricanes and tornados touching down in Canadian territory). The radar network is being improved and an aircraft furnished with measurement equipment is used for national and international field studies. A health-air quality index has been matched recently in collaboration with Health Canada. Despite budget cuts, the monitoring network that expands across the country is being preserved (with measurements of acid deposition, particulate matter and ozone depletion). Water quality and quantity are also being monitored, in the recognition of the importance of water

resources in the future decades. The area of adaptation and impacts is the most heavily involved in IAI activities. Canada has helped the IAI to obtain funds for several initiatives, such as the Conference on Climate Change and Biodiversity in the Americas that was held in Panama in February 2008, and a number of workshops that took place shortly after that. The group in Canada considers that adaptation is not an admittance of defeat, but the recognition of the need to be prepared to reduce vulnerability in private property and other areas. The initiatives that Environment Canada is carrying out are not possible without the involvement of partners within Canada and in the world at the municipal, provincial and federal levels.

**Costa Rica:** The country has implemented the national strategy on climate change and a unilateral international strategy called Paz con la Naturaleza. The main objective of the national strategy is to avoid carbon emissions with the ultimate goal of achieving climate neutral activities. The idea is that this strategy be applied in countries of the region with similar characteristics. The national development plan focuses on climate change and involves all sectors. The national climate change strategy addresses mitigation, adaptation, mediation, development of technological capacities, public awareness, education and funding and is aimed at transforming risk in opportunities of change for the wellbeing of societies. Reforestation is included in the strategy. The idea is that sustainable activities must be a value added to the industry sector instead of being an obstacle. Standards will be established for the different national activities.

**Colombia:** No report from the country by the time of the presentations. Colombia is aware of the climate change problem and committed with the different national and international initiatives that are under way.

**Cuba:** The Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment addresses global change from both the research and the capacity building aspects in collaboration with the Ministries of Education, Communication and Outreach in different levels. Last year, Cuban researchers with the guidance of the Cuban Environment Agency, made an assessment that is being used in the different governmental areas in the understanding that many of the problems countries are facing are related with global and climate change. The Cuban hydrometeorological system is being modernized, a process that will end in 2010. Cuba is working on three fronts, hydrometeorology, climate change, and sustainable energy development. As to the science program, a national workshop was held in March 2008 to plan future research directions. The School of Meteorology was created in Cuba. The Ministry of Education is working to include elements of global change in all graduate careers. The Second National Communication is under way, including a chapter on technology transfer. Cuba will continue supporting the IAI and strengthening relationships among IAI member countries.

**Ecuador:** The country is facing a change in the Constitution. Direct links between the Secretariat of Science and Technology, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism are under discussion to address global change issues (use of electric energy, fuels, mining, agriculture and pesticides, environmental protection, conservation and biodiversity). Ecuador aims at a long-term plan.

**Jamaica:** Jamaica has embarked in a national development plan aimed at achieving developed country status by 2030. Several strategic priorities have been identified as critical elements in fulfilling the objectives of the plan. One of the priorities includes proactive initiatives to mainstream climate change into the national development processes and mechanisms. The initiatives include task forces focusing on climate change, hazards, natural resources and environmental management, among others. The Meteorological Service is preparing the Second National Communication (expected to be completed in 2009), which will update the communication presented in 2000. The communication will set up vulnerability and adaptation options in the water resources, coastal zone, human health, human settlement and agriculture sectors. A draft inventory of greenhouse gases has been

prepared. There are CDM project opportunities for Jamaica led by the Ministry of the Environment in the area of wind, solar, gas co-generation, afforestation, and land-field gas recovery. The wind farm in Manchester is Jamaica's first CDM project. Jamaica has an integral adaptation plan to address the impacts of climate change in several sectors including coastal management, water resources, and the building code (construction of hurricane resistant buildings). Jamaica is implementing a community based adaptation project under the GEF Small Grants Program aimed at reducing vulnerability and enhancing the capacity of selected communities to adapt to climate change and variability. The Government of Jamaica is unable to provide adequate funding for climate change adaptation activities, so the support of bilateral and multilateral funding sources is required. The GEF is currently the main funding channel for climate change activities in developing countries. Financial support is also expected from the Adaptation Fund established under the Kyoto Protocol and UNDP for adaptation activities, development and implementation of national programs to address climate change. The government is also committed to implementing no regrets mitigation measures. A few private companies are involved in climate change mitigation efforts. The Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica has made a commitment to increase the contribution of renewable energy sources. The Ministry of Environment in association with the Meteorological Service and other partners has been involved in a series of public education programs concerning climate change. The Jamaica Hotel and Tourism Association plans to hold conferences and workshops to sensitize the industry on both mitigation and adaptation activities related to climate change. However, more comprehensive public awareness activities are needed. Climate change communication strategies are being developed by the National Environmental Education Committee with financial support from the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica. The Caribbean Community Climate Change Center is providing support to Jamaica to conduct a study on the vulnerability and capacity assessment of the water sector through a pilot study in the south of the country.

**México:** The National Institute of Ecology (INE) has been charged with the responsibility of fulfilling the commitments of the Mexican government related to the UNFCCC. As non-Annex 1 Party, Mexico has addressed the preparation and periodical update of greenhouse gas inventories and mitigation, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change and the preparation of National Communications. INE has a Climate Change Program, which has been recently promoted to the national coordination level. In addition, several management and policy structures exist in the Secretariats of Energy, Environment and Natural Resources. Capacities were built in universities, though they are still mostly concentrated in a few institutions and specific areas. Local and State capacities are still limited, though progressively improving. The Government has established an Inter-Secretariat Commission on Climate Change with a crosscutting approach to formulate and implement national policies on prevention and mitigation of greenhouse gases and adaptation to the effects of climate change. The Commission is composed by the Secretaries of Foreign Relations, Social Development, Environment and Natural Resources, Energy, Economy, Agriculture, Communications and Transport, and Treasury. In the last years, a national strategy on global change was developed, which will make it possible to establish a special climate change national program. The strategy will allow identifying opportunities for the reduction of emissions and developing mitigation projects, recognizing the vulnerability of the different sectors and areas and launching projects to develop local and national response and adaptation capacities. Climate change is also considered in the national development plan, one of whose goals is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through clean technologies, efficient use of energy in households, industry, agriculture and transport; international standards for vehicle emissions; and energy recovery from waste and the fostering of adaptation measures. Challenges for the future are improving human wellbeing without increasing gas emissions and reverting current deforestation processes. This will be made by taking advantage of the assessments under way and implementing a greater number of CDM projects in Mexico. Development of national governmental and societal capacities is also a goal for mitigation and adaptation actions.



**Panama:** Eight years ago, the Ministry of the Environment only had one small research project on climate change. Currently a Climate Change Unit has been established, which is the framework for research and capacity building in the institutional, inter-institutional and national levels. Land use and land cover studies are being carried out as well as mitigation projects funded by international sources. An example is the Project for the Reduction of Vulnerability and Environmental Degradation, which develops capacities among citizens. Clean production capacities are also being built in the private sector. Panama has 17 CDM projects already approved, almost all devoted to clean energy production. Environmental education has been a major focus, from elementary school onwards. CATHALAC has been active in monitoring environmental changes using satellite derived information, which allows a daily follow-up of environmental information and is used in climate change scenarios and modeling.

**Paraguay:** Environmental issues will be a priority for the newly elected government. The Secretariat of the Environment has a Climate Change Unit, which is responsible for preparing the Greenhouse Gas Inventories and the National Communications to the IPCC. Global warming awareness rising activities are being held with decision makers. The country needs support to continue with these activities. The IAI has been of help to develop small projects related to this issue.

**USA:** The climate change science goals will remain unchanged. These are to improve the knowledge of the climate and the environment, to improve the quantification of the forces driving changes to climate, to reduce uncertainties in the projections of future climate changes, to understand the sensibility and the adaptability of natural and man-made ecosystems, and to explore the uses and limits of managing risks and opportunity. Climate change and variability are addressed on time scales that are relevant to society. In the last years, greater emphasis was put on the sensitivity and the adaptability of different natural and managed ecosystems, as well as on trying to identify the limits of managing risks and looking for opportunities that are related to climate variability. The Climate Change Science Program has different research elements: atmospheric composition, elements of variability and change (water cycle, land use and land cover change, the carbon cycle, ecosystems) as well as human contributions and responses. Program crosscutting elements are international research and cooperation (the area where the IAI interfaces with CCSP), strong effort in modeling, observations and data management, and communications. In the area of communications, each of the research elements is tasked with issuing reports, which the representative of US made available to country representatives upon request.

**Venezuela:** Actions related to minimizing the effects of climate change are taken in the policy, public management, international cooperation, research and development areas. In the policy area, the country is participating more actively in all the national and international forums; high-level committees are being established related with climate change and chemical security. The protection of forests against deforestation for the production of biofuels is being addressed as well as the eradication of fuel containing lead. Education campaigns for society are being implemented (e.g., electricity saving and the replacement of yellow light by white light). Reforestation and the control of small mining activities in the south of the country to protect river basins in the area, promotion of environmentally friendly agricultural practices, ordering and control of sensitive environmental units such as national parks and coastal areas. Projects are being developed to recycle solid waste and to use wastewater for irrigation in agriculture and secondary uses. Projects on environmental impact, restructuring and recovery of affected areas have made great progress, particularly in relation with industrial waste. As to international cooperation, great emphasis was put on the Amazonia. The first expedition was carried out to Antarctica with the support of the Uruguayan Navy. Venezuela is working together with China on a satellite program (first satellite to be launched by the end of 2008). The partnership with China has also been beneficial in terms of professional training. The satellite will be used for telecommunications and observations. Science and technology programs are focused on networking and capacity building in all the organizations involved (private sector and the

government). Research programs also have to present results that will be useful to society in any aspect. The Organic Law for Science, Technology and Innovation, includes now an article that obliges industries to contribute 0.5 to 2% of their gross incomes to the science and technology sector. Research is being done in the area of biotechnology, biodiversity, increasing productivity of different autochthonous crops, development of production models that adapt to climate change. Progress has been made in natural resource inventories, monitoring, impacts, vulnerability, risk management (seismology, rain gauge network) and modeling of future scenarios. The retreat of Andean glaciers in Venezuela is also being addressed.

**IICA:** The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture is a hemispheric institute specialized in agriculture and rural livelihood of the inter-American system. Authorities of IICA are the 34 Ministers of Agriculture of the Americas and the Caribbean. IICA acts on demand and has defined that the major areas to be addressed are innovation and technology, agriculture and livestock health, rural development and environment, trade and agro-business, training and education, with strong emphasis on issues of bioenergy and climate change. A meeting has been held recently to define the situation of the environment, public, animal and vegetation health; impacts of trade. Countries are submitting proposals about this issue for funding.

**UNESCO:** The central issue to be strengthened is dialogue (among sciences, crosscutting issues, interdisciplinary, inter-sectoral, and inter-institutional). Concrete global actions were established for the mid-term strategy. Education has been given priority, as an interaction with all educational levels. The same was done with information and outreach.

**APN:** The Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research is an intergovernmental network of 21 member countries to foster global change research in the Asia-Pacific region. It provides financial support for scientific research (ARCP) and capacity building activities (CAPaBLE). Lou Brown is the national focal point and member of the Steering Committee of APN. US interactions with APN and IAI are coordinated through the same inter-agency group (State, NOAA, NASA, EPA, US Geological Survey, USAID) under the Climate Change Science Program. APN is more flexible than the IAI regarding membership. They have decided that scientists from Pacific Island Countries and Singapore are eligible for APN awards, even when those countries are not full APN members. APN shares with the IAI (and the NSF with other national agencies) the goal of finding effective ways of transferring the results of research to policy makers for them to develop and improve national policies related with global change. The institutional framework of APN is similar to that of the IAI. By "global change" APN means the set of natural and human-induced changes in the Earth's physical and biological systems that, when aggregated, are significant at a global scale. Global Change Research also includes the study of global change implications for sustainable development in the Asia-Pacific region. Key activities planned for 2008-2009 are APN and GEOSS/AWCI Joint Scoping Workshop in Tokyo (April); Calls for Proposals for funding from April 2009, including the 'once-in-three-years' Call for Comprehensive Research Projects (June); Joint Side Event with IAI and Informal Discussion with the Parties on research at SBSTA 28 in Bonn, Germany (June); Joint Side Event with IAI and Informal Discussion with the Parties on research at SBSTA 28 in Bonn, Germany (June); 3<sup>rd</sup> Southeast Asia Sub-Regional Committee Meeting in Bangkok, Thailand (August/September); Proposal Writing Workshop back-to-back with EMECS 8 in Shanghai, China (October); evaluation of the CAPaBLE Phase 1 Program; preparation for the Evaluation of the Second Strategic Phase (2005-2010); 14<sup>th</sup> IGM/SPG Meeting in Malaysia (March 2009). 2008 calls for proposals have been issued for ARCP and CAPaBLE. Although, the number of proposals has declined over the years, their quality has increased, and the number of scientists and institutions involved in the proposals has increased as well. Proposals intended for submission under the ARCP must involve actions or contributions by three or more APN member and/or approved countries, at least two of which should be developing countries. Proposals intended for CAPaBLE submission must involve action or contributions by at least one developing country from the APN region.

Discussions on how closely the IAI and APN can work together have been held in both organizations. It is important to note that while this is not formally on the agenda, a number of scientists from Africa are very actively involved in a well-established process to plan for a regional network or institute for regional cooperation for global change research in Africa. They have developed the scientific plan for regional cooperation in global change research in the region. The plan has been approved by the ESSP at the IGBP Open Science Conference in Cape Town. In the opinion of Lou Brown, the quality of global change science and research across the African continent has improved dramatically over the past decade.

## 6. Report of the Credentials Committee

Argentina, Panama and the US are part of the Credentials Committee.

The Credentials Committee informed the CoP that 14 delegations had submitted the official credentials to participate in the meeting: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, the United States, and Venezuela. Majority in case a vote is needed is eight.

*(Action 4 – Day 1)*

## 7. Progress report of the IAI Directorate

### 7.1 Summary of the presentation made during the 25<sup>th</sup> EC meeting

The Scientific Officer reported on the Science Programs (CRN II, SGP-HD), the IDRC grant – La Plata Basin, the 2nd NCAR-IAI colloquium and the participation of IAI at UNFCCC SBSTA 28.

Science programs:

- CRN II projects are finalizing Year 2, next reports due in August 2008
- New CRN II project on climate change (*mandate to complete the CRN II portfolio*). The portfolio of the 12 approved projects did not include any project with a specific focus on climate change, though most of them have climate change components.
- The six projects approved under the SPG-HD started in September 2007. This program has been launched to complement the CRN II portfolio in the human dimensions area.
- CRN II – SGP-HD PI meeting was held in Panama, CATHALAC local support, back to back with TI on 'Data and Information Management'

The new CRN II project on climate change is "The Impact of Land Use and Cover Changes on the Hydroclimate in the La Plata Basin", PI Hugo BERBERY, CONICET & U. of Maryland. US\$ 459,500, Apr. 08 – Jun. 11; ARG, BRA, USA. The main objectives are to develop 25 year (1980-2005) datasets from a Land Data Assimilation System; assess the impact of LCLU changes on the hydro-climate and regional hydrology of the La Plata Basin including the intensity and length of extreme events (floods, droughts). The project is closely linked to the "La Plata Basin Regional Hydroclimate Project (LPB)" of CLIVAR, GEWEX (WCRP).

The CRN II – SGP-HD PI meeting was held in Panama City, Panama on 21-23 February 2008 with the local support of CATHALAC and back to back with TI on 'Data and Information Management'. The meeting focused on networking opportunities, challenges and strategies; the different approaches to developing and maintaining science – stakeholder/policy dialogue. Initial discussions were held on the CRN II synthesis process which is a responsibility of the IAI as a whole (*not only Directorate*). The process will need incremental steps along the way until 2011. The audience for the synthesis products also needs to be defined (scientists, funders, development agencies, decision makers), this means that multiple products will have to be issued (high visibility journals, (policy) briefs,

education materials, presentations at major events (science & policy events)). The synthesis can be done on thematic and/or regional nodes (e.g., La Plata Basin; Environment & Human well-being; GEC & Biodiversity). Another recommendation was that the IAI develop a “slide bank” (similar to IPCC, MA); IAI PPT presentation (inst. & sci.). “Fact Sheets” will be prepared, i.e., two page documents highlighting the main aspects of the projects to be distributed to interested parties.

The IDRC grant on “Land Use Change, Biofuels and Rural Development in the La Plata Basin” started in March 2008 and will end in September 2010. Countries involved are Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay and Bolivia. The level of funding is CAD 425.310. Strong stakeholder involvement since the project planning (AACREA, APRESID, IPNI). The project aims at understanding the interactions of *natural and human* components in agro-ecosystems in the LPB to provide guidance to actors and decision makers on the processes of land use and rural development. The five project components are coordinated by the IAI: 1) LU & Hydro (CRN & IDRC) 2) Data (IDRC) 3) Modeling (IDRC) 4) LU & rural development (SGP-HD & IDRC) 5) Climate & LU (CRN only). The objectives of the project are to document and analyze LUC over the past 25 years in the context of regional climate variations; analyze the social and economic drivers and impacts of this LUC; make socio-economic analyses of rural development and markets for industrial crops and biofuels; and prepare a synthesis, identify connections between climate – LU - development patterns; forecast trends in cooperation with and for use of land users and decision makers; gap analysis for future needs.

Following up on the Boulder 2006 colloquium on ‘Policy planning and decision making involving climate change and variability’, the 2nd NCAR-IAI colloquium, “Seasonality and Water Resources in the Western Hemisphere”, is planned for 6 – 17 October 2008 in Mendoza, Argentina. The local host will be IANIGLA, CRICYT (Pepe Bonisegna, Ricardo Villalba). The issues addressed are changes in seasonality under climate change and regional impacts, considering the policy process under different modes of governance and legislation in the local, national and international context. The announcement was delayed due to the closure of NCAR-SERE Director’s Office (May 2008), the NCAR counterpart for the event. It was finally launched on 12 June 08. A maximum of 25 participants (scientists and practitioners) is expected.

In the beginning of June, the IAI participated in the UNFCCC SBSTA meeting. The Institute has Observer status since 2006 and has continued inputs since then. A side event on ‘Building joint capacities in science and policy sectors for environmental decision making’ was held on that occasion jointly with APN. During the side-event presentations were given on science: interdisciplinarity (natural and social), science – decision making; decision support/management tools and governmental perspectives (by representatives from New Zealand, Brazil, Mexico). There was also an informal research session (ESSP, APN, IAI) – research update.

## *7.2 Annual Program for FY 2008-2009*

Following the presentation of the SO, the Director provided an overview of how the described activities fit into the overall IAI strategy and how they fit in with the capacity building activities that the IAI is undertaking.

Since climate change and land cover changes are a major issue in the La Plata Basin, the La Plata Basin project was developed to concentrate on issues of climate change, regional hydrology and agriculture. Great changes in agriculture have been observed in that region, about 15 to 20 million hectares of land use conversion in northern Argentina, Paraguay, lower parts of Bolivia and increasingly in central-western Brazil. So, agriculture is very closely interacting with climate change, and it is forced to adapt, but also has great opportunities associated with climate change. Those opportunities are related with mitigating greenhouse gas emissions. Several of the countries are aiming at applying “best

practices” in the management of the land, energy use and agriculture (direct emission reductions -conservation tillage, N-fixation-; terrestrial carbon sink expansions -conservation tillage, productivity increases). The major issue is the replacement of fossil fuels by biofuels and the impact that has on land cover.

Biofuel production is being discussed around the world and in the countries that have advantages and disadvantages from producing biofuels. Those discussions should be trans-sectoral (agriculture, society, international markets, rural development, social justice). To evaluate the potential benefits of biofuels, an analysis has to be made of the co-products that might be produced from biofuels. There are initiatives on sorghum and on maize, which have co-products, differently from sugar cane in Brazil, which essentially produces carbon which replaces fossil carbon. Food crops have been bred and selected for many years to be nutritious, to contain nitrogen. Nitrogen is a contaminant in the biofuel process, but if the nitrogen can be diverted to other uses (animal nutrition), then there will be a diversification in rural production patterns, bringing new industries into rural areas.

Evaluations of biofuel policy must include co-product credits and measure performance relevant to policy goals: reduce greenhouse gas emissions; reduce petroleum inputs; maintain land quality & ecosystem services; maintain food affordability; diversify rural income. Several technological questions are associated with these issues: the high nutrient content of food crops; cellulosic alcohol: cost-effective depolymerization of celluloses is a challenge; biodiesel needs suitable oil crops or refining; oxygen-rich biomaterials create opportunities for biorefineries to extract high-value chemicals. Many regions lack an industrial scale production of the microorganisms needed for the conversion into alcohol, even from maize or sugar cane. Soybean needs refining to obtain biodiesel and the question arises where to refine it (move to coastal regions like traditional petroleum refineries or settle refineries in the producing regions making them more autonomous in terms of their energy demands). The biorefining sector will benefit from the by-products of refining of biological materials.

Technology has been excluded from the IAI agenda, and it is time now to consider the role that technological research may play (if any) in the strategic planning process of the IAI. Representatives were requested to think how and if technological challenges can be incorporated into the science agenda of the Institute.

In contrast to mitigation, adaptation needs much more integrated research as well as legal and programmatic frameworks for integrated management of water basins, protection of fragile zones and biodiversity; policy measures that go beyond subsistence; and raise the standard of living of the poor. Are national parks or biological corridors the solution to protect fragile zones? What kind of research do we need on climate change and biodiversity protection in terms of giving guidance to the policy decisions needed in relation with national park conservation, preservation, land use, biological corridors? Policy measures should go beyond what is seen in many member countries in terms of subsistence agriculture and rural regions. Conservation measures will not be taken in countries that still need development unless conservation policies are combined with a clear policy for further development.

Another issue related to the Plata basin are floods. Increased rainfall in the interior of the Plata basin causes floods downstream, which shows interconnectivity among the countries in the basin. In the province of Buenos Aires, flooding occurs not only in the areas around the river, but also in areas located away from the river. This indicates that land use change together with climate change causes infiltration problems and other problems that are not related with the average kind of flood. Rather than crop field management, landscape management is needed in order to avoid such situations in the future.

On the other hand, intense drought and fires are taking place in North America (though not only there). Droughts also affected the SE of USA where water supply in cities was in

danger, which points to the need of prudent water management and intersectoral considerations. Water rights in the west of the US were determined in the period 1910 to 1930, a period that was wetter than present. Thus, the legislation determines the distribution of water that is no longer there, which causes problems among the different US states. Similar problems can be foreseen in several regions in South America in the future.

The Director presented an example of an irrigation network planned in La Pampa (Argentina), where a river that drains outside the La Plata basin into the Atlantic Ocean will be diverted northwards to create irrigation nuclei in the agriculture area of a semi-arid region. On the other hand, a similar irrigation network has been working for 80 years in Alberta (Canada). Communication between the two regions is vital in order to be able to build on the experience of 80 years of such a project.

In the context of global change, policy needs scientifically-informed decisions, founded on understanding and knowledge. The scope of decisions should go beyond legislative periods to harmonize development with life-support systems for present and future societies. This is difficult to achieve in the political sector. At the same time, it is difficult for the scientific sector to interact effectively with that kind of decision-making process. Making decisions becomes a learning process linked to science. The IAI together with other organizations may be one of the motors of that learning process.

As to biodiversity, societies have benefited from the conversion to managed ecosystems but losses in biodiversity and ecosystem services have reduced well-being, increased poverty and stifled development of some regions and groups.

The biodiversity assessment in the La Plata Basin is a PETROBRAS-funded initiative which is carried out jointly with SCOPE and with the participation of PETROBRAS ecosystem scientists. The initiative will analyze the impact of crop expansion on ecosystems and ecosystem services, under the scenario of increasing land use change and biofuel production in the LPB. Issues addressed will be biodiversity; quality and availability of water; land quality and landscape function; greenhouse gas budgets, and the feedback to social and economic wellbeing. This is the first industry-led project that the IAI has engaged in. The environmental record of PETROBRAS and other industries should not be taken into account if the idea is to foster dialogue across the sectors. The process of development is not driven by individual communities, but by large industries and large countries.

The example was given of the implementation of decision-making aids in South America. Those were developed in Europe and imported recently into the La Plata basin through SENSOR (a European Union funded project), and originally geared at governments. However, in South America the role of industry is much greater because it is much less regulated or less effectively regulated than in the EU.

A project the IAI is working on, under the leadership of the Capacity Building Officer is the assessment of climate effects on Andean biodiversity. The pilot project funded by the MacArthur Foundation is a basis for future science programming, and will assess (with SCOPE) the current knowledge, research capacities, institutional opportunities and constraints. The project will evaluate the institutional capacities of tropical Andean countries to deal with these issues in the future in order to guide future investment by the MacArthur Foundation for further studies and implementation in the region.

Another capacity building initiative in the current portfolio of the IAI is the IAI-INPE/CPTEC Research Internship Program. One Peruvian student has completed her internship on the adaptation of a global climate model to Andean agriculture. One Argentinean student is working on mesoscale models over the LPB. A Colombian student has already been selected for the second year of the program. Another three students will be selected to complete the contract. This is an example of how the IAI can help internationalizing

institutions in individual countries. This jointly funded effort between the IAI and INPE will facilitate a long-term interaction of students from other countries with researchers in Brazil.

A workshop was held with INSP (National Institute for Public Health, Mexico) and IDRC in Mexico in January 2008. Among the 18 climate and health professionals from 6 countries were researchers from a CRN I project on human health and climate change (vector-borne diseases). The aim of the workshop was to disseminate CRN I results and establish links with other climate and health programs. IAI investigators were invited to submit proposals to IDRC's Ecohealth program 2008/2009 and to attend the IDRC-INSP Ecohealth Conference. The initiative is a demonstration of how the IAI tries to re-engage or maintain the engagement of scientists who participated in projects that are closed now. CRN I has been closed for a year, but the IAI is following up, generating additional opportunities, helping researchers to make new contacts with other funding agencies and keep generating activities and programs.

In order to do science for informed action, information has to be processed in a way that it can be used. Information needs to be linked in time and space. The IAI has to be able to present complex climate gradients, observations, models, scenarios; present information on a spatial scale, across maps (risk maps, overlaying agriculture development with climatic risk maps, and perhaps with political decision processes). All aimed at providing information on a given decision that is needed, i.e., evaluate trends, communicate risks and point towards opportunities. The IAI has not really made that integration process yet. This task should build upon the excellent science achieved to make it more available to decision makers.

One of the first steps in this direction was the workshop held in Panama in February 2008. The workshop brought together investigators and data managers of IAI projects and representatives from institutions dealing with data (CODATA, Oak Ridge NL, CPTEC/LBA) to develop a data and information management policy for the IAI for the future. This activity should lead towards the mandate of free and open access to and use of data and information. The meeting established a working group that will now advise the IAI on an on-going basis on improving data integration, discovery, interconnectivity; defining protocols for data sharing among projects; developing metadata display and visualization tools; exploring interdisciplinary thesaurus; considering data policy and intellectual property issues; providing input to Strategic Planning.

There is still a great resistance to data exchange. Many of the climate observing networks in Latin America need to sell the data in order to supplement their budgets. The IAI needs to overcome those obstacles and Brazil can play a significant role in this area since INPE in particular had the same attitude 10 years ago. They have changed their policy and now they are having economic benefits from sharing data. By making satellite information freely available to all sectors in Brazil, there has been enough commercial activity based on sharing of data to exceed many times the income that would have been generated by selling those data.

The relationship with Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) has been renewed and the Mercury Consortium will also participate in the new phase of the internal management of data (DIS) at the IAI. Metadata editors are being developed and access tools to take better care of some of the socioeconomic data generated by IAI projects. External data repositories are being assessed and -LBA has kindly offered a temporary repository.

The IAI followed the recommendation of Mexico to become an observer to UNFCCC. Once that status was obtained, the IAI actively engaged in the SBSTA sessions. One year ago, SBSTA called for the global and regional organizations to present their visions on how SBSTA could contribute towards the development of climate science and its incision in the policy sector (how to increase policy relevance of research in the region? How can communication of global change research be improved from the research to the policy

community? How can developing country researchers get involved in policy?). The only two presentations made at that time were from ESSP and the IAI. In the last session in June 2008, the IAI organized a side event to promote the science policy dialogue, already mentioned by the SO. Participants in the side event were representatives of the governments of Mexico, Brazil and other countries (APN members), scientists from the IAI and APN as well as scientists and information managers from the EU. Visions were presented for intersectoral dialogue to facilitate the insertion of scientific information in the policy sector.

Though the IAI has moved forward into the dialogue that is needed, progress is now limited, as IAI scientists are not involved in the political process. The scientific side of the IAI has expressed its message at SBSTA and now the support of the political side is needed to move forward. The Director asked Member Countries for a political statement or recommendation, through their representations at SBSTA, UNFCCC and UNESCO towards advancing the science-policy dialogue, and increasing the visibility and utility of science.

The CoP approved the Annual Program for FY 2008-2009.

*Action 5, Day 2*

### 7.3 Core Budget & Country Contribution for FY 2008-2009

The Finance and Administration Officer presented on the Core Budget Status and the country contributions for FY 2008-2009. Funds collected as of 31 May 2008 represent 88% of the Core Budget for 2007/2008. Peru maintains its commitment to pay pending contributions. Chile and Brazil paid their contributions in advance. US is expected to pay at least half of its contribution in June.

Table 1: Core Budget 2007/2008 - Status of Contributions of Member Countries as of May 31, 2008 (Amounts in US\$)

	Due as of	Contribution for FY 07/08	Paid - in 2007/2008 to be applied to:			Due as of
	30-Jun-07		Arrears	Current year	Advances	30-Jun-08
Argentina	51,957	50,000	(50,000)			51,957
Bolivia	25,000	5,000				30,000
Brazil	(80,000)	85,000				5,000
Canada	-	125,000		(125,000)		-
Chile	(5,000)	5,000	-	-	(15,000)	(15,000)
Colombia	40,000	10,000				50,000
Costa Rica	6,992	5,000				11,992
Cuba	20,067	5,000				25,067
Dominican Republic	50,000	5,000				55,000
Ecuador	30,000	5,000				35,000
Guatemala	50,000	5,000				55,000
Jamaica	15,000	5,000				20,000
Mexico	-	60,000		(60,000)	-	-
Panama	-	5,000		(5,000)		-
Paraguay	55,000	5,000				60,000
Peru	35,000	5,000	(26,649)			13,351
Uruguay	45,000	5,000				50,000
USA (*)	595,000	595,000	(595,000)			595,000
Venezuela	184,521	30,000	(12,500)			202,021
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,118,537</b>	<b>1,015,000</b>	<b>(684,149)</b>	<b>(190,000)</b>	<b>(15,000)</b>	<b>1,244,388</b>
						<b>Total Revenues:</b> (874,149)
						<b>Total Advances:</b> (15,000)
						<b>Contributions not received:</b> (140,851)
						<b>Difference:</b> -

Historical country contributions present significant peaks and troughs, but as from FY 2006/2007 a leveling of is observed. The Directorate expects to reach a level similar to that of 2001/2002 by the end of 2007/2008, by collecting about 130% of the contributions (in arrears, current and advanced).



As to the performance of the Core Budget, the Directorate was about 3% above budgeted expenses at the time of the meeting. There were very specific issues that increased costs and that will be considered in the next budget. Nevertheless, the Directorate expects to close the fiscal year with this 3% extra expenses only.

Table 2: Budget performance – July 2007/ May 2008 (amounts in US\$)

Category	Actuals 2007/2008	Budget (*) 2007/2008	Difference	%
Salaries & Benefits	682,852	692,937	(10,085)	-1.5%
Travel & Training	76,196	73,333	2,863	3.9%
Equipment	2,652	11,000	(8,348)	-75.9%
Operational Costs	149,023	80,300	68,723	85.6%
Dissemination & Outreach	14,001	39,417	(25,416)	-64.5%
Director's Fund	32,976	33,367	(390)	-1.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>957,700</b>	<b>930,354</b>	<b>27,347</b>	<b>2.9%</b>

(\*) 11 months of budget

Cash balance at the end of May 31, 2008 was 35.7% lower than the ending balance at the end of March 2007. This was done to avoid having high reserves at the end of quarterly periods, as agreed with the US. At the end of the year reserves will be at the level of last year. The level of reserves (IAI CB Funds) would cover 4 months of operations with the current annual budget level of \$1,015,000. Considering other expected contributions for 2007/2008, the IAI Core Budget Funds would cover 9.8 months of operations.

Continuous effort is made to increase funds by broadening the country base. Alternative funding has been obtained by the Directorate, with the MacArthur Foundation and the IDRC projects. One challenge is to engage more member countries for participation and funding; increase reach within the Americas by including more countries in IAI; extend current external projects after completion and get more external financing.

In the administrative area, an update of the Host Country Agreement is key to define the relationship of IAI and Brazil and to lay the path for the future of the Institute. The Host Country Agreement is ambiguous. For a future guarantee of operations in Brazil, it must be updated to reflect new laws and realities of both IAI and Brazil.

Cash management has been reviewed and new solutions were considered. IAI cash is currently withdrawn from Citibank (recently authorized to handle US\$ cash) and other parallel options are being analyzed.

The external audit for 2006/2007 was conducted by BDO in Sep. 2007 with positive results in terms of accounting practices, internal controls and legal compliance. The next audit (2007/2008) is scheduled for August/2008.

The Core Budget Request for FY 2008/2009 reflects the increase in the budget with respect to the past three years. As shown in Table 3 the request for FY 2008-2009 proposes a change of 14.6% from the previous fiscal year.

Table 3: Budget Comparison 2008/2009 - 2007/2008 (amounts in US\$)

Summary by major category	Fiscal Year 2008/2009	Fiscal Year 2007/2008	Differences
Salaries & Benefits	826,932	755,931	71,001
Travel	84,200	80,000	4,200
Equipment	26,000	12,000	14,000
Operational Costs	138,330	87,600	50,730
Dissemination & Outreach	43,000	43,000	-
Director Fund	45,000	36,400	8,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,163,462</b>	<b>1,014,931</b>	<b>148,531</b>

The budget requested will make it possible for the IAI to maintain the current operational level. Part of the increase in the costs is due to the weakening of the US dollar with respect to other currencies, particularly the Brazilian real. An increase in country contributions is also requested, which was estimated trying to maintain contribution percentages as in the OAS table.

Table 4: Current and Proposed Contribution to CB by country (amounts in US\$)

Country	Part. %	Current US\$	Proposed US\$
Argentina	5.01%	50,000	57,000
Bolivia	0.07%	5,000	5,000
Brazil	8.73%	85,000	100,000
Canada	12.63%	125,000	143,000
Chile	0.55%	5,000	6,000
Colombia	0.96%	10,000	11,000
Costa Rica	0.13%	5,000	5,000
Cuba	0.00%	5,000	5,000
Dominican Republic	0.18%	5,000	5,000
Ecuador	0.18%	5,000	5,000
Guatemala	0.13%	5,000	5,000
Jamaica	0.18%	5,000	5,000
Mexico	6.21%	60,000	70,000
Panama	0.13%	5,000	5,000
Paraguay	0.20%	5,000	5,000
Peru	0.42%	5,000	5,000
United States	60.75%	595,000	691,000
Uruguay	0.27%	5,000	5,000
Venezuela	3.27%	30,000	37,000
<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,015,000</b>	<b>1,170,000</b>

(\*): 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. The 26th EC approved contributions in multiples of US\$1,000, was confirmed and implemented in 2007

Venezuela expressed some problems with paying contributions. The payment is made through the Ministry of Science and Technology and the Ministry of the Environment. In the last years, the contributions have not been paid completely because the Ministry of the Environment has not included the payments to the IAI in their budget. The representative of Venezuela committed herself to contact their Ministry of Foreign Affairs to have a joint meeting to clarify the situation.

Mexico: Given the current situation of the Core Budget of the IAI, the rise in country contributions is fully justified. Mexico recognizes the work that is being done at the IAI as to fundraising, and congratulated the Director for his efforts and achievements. However, at present Mexico is not in the best situation to endorse without reserve the increase in the contributions, because of budget cuts in the Secretariat of the Environment and National Resources (SEMARNAT). In addition, SEMARNAT suggests that the IAI continues to explore ways to reactivate the participation of other member countries and expanding the membership of the IAI and to normalize pending payments as an alternative to the increase in the country contributions. However, if most IAI member countries decide to endorse this rise in the contributions, Mexico will make the effort to follow this decision.

Argentina: The previous increase in country contributions affected Argentina and Mexico proportionally more than other countries. This was because of the US\$ 5,000 increments and the result was that with a general increase of 5%, countries having intermediate coefficients experienced a rise of about 9%. However, since most of the countries approved the rise in the contributions, Argentina continued to pay them at the past level. The debt accumulated was gradually paid when the situation in the country changed. On the other

hand, the depreciation of the US dollar with respect to other currencies, particularly the Brazilian real has increased operational costs of the Directorate, which is something that has to be addressed.

USA: Based on the presentations from the AFO and the FAC at the EC meetings in 2007 and EC 26, and the careful analysis carried out by the FAC, the US is committed to support the IAI at the recommended contribution level. The US joins Mexico in congratulating the Directorate in their capacity to capture external funds, hoping that this will continue and that the additional products and projects can be carried out to leverage the funds that the Parties contribute to the Core Budget of the IAI.

The CoP approved the Core Budget Request for FY 2008-2009.
--

*Action 2, Day 2*

The CoP approved the Country Contributions for FY 2008-2009.
--

*Action 3, Day 2*

The CoP accepted the Auditor's report as of June 30, 2007.
--

*Action 4, Day 2*

## **8. Progress Report of the EC**

The second vice-chair of the EC, Paul Filmer, informed that the EC Chair and first vice-chair had left their positions.

### *Issues brought forward from the 14<sup>th</sup> CoP*

Unanimous approval was given for the re-election of the IAI Director for six years, and the FAC drafted a new contract.

Paul Filmer represented the IAI at the 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the OAS Inter-American Committee on Science and Technology (COMCyT) (September 2007, Washington DC). He also requested some of the representatives at that meeting to take the results of the AAAS external review to the appropriate authorities in their countries, knowing that this was in the context of the Summit of the Americas series in which the IAI had featured several times, starting at the first of such meetings. The plan of action of Lima that came out of this process explicitly mentioned hemispheric support for the IAI, and therefore, they were interested in the progress of the Institute. This meeting aimed to feed information to the second meeting of ministers of science and technology within the framework of the American States Science and Technology System, which in turn feeds into the presidential summit series.

At the 25<sup>th</sup> EC, the charter for the FAC was renewed until January 2010, with membership by Brazil, Canada, and the US.

The principal item on the agenda at EC 25 was the development of concepts for a strategic plan. Terms of reference were drafted (doc.13), the Strategic Planning Committee held a meeting with the SAC, and a writing group was formed. Members of this group are Argentina, Mexico, Panama, US, three members from the SAC and the Directorate. At that time, the Dominican Republic extended an invitation to host a workshop to continue developing the strategic plan. During the 26<sup>th</sup> EC discussions on the strategic plan continued, a document was distributed to CoP representatives for discussion.

As to the issues from the EC 26, the proposal of the Director for a IAI-SCOPE-UNESCO program on interdisciplinary and intersectoral capacity building. Members of the CoP are requested to contact the appropriate UNESCO representatives in their countries to advance this program.

The EC recommended that the CoP draft a letter to the Brazilian Ministry of Science and Technology and to the Director of the IAI, copying the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Director of INPE commending Brazil for their support of IAI and endorsing the negotiations to resolve the issues that remain for Brazilian staff and headquarters.

The EC also recommended that the CoP invite member states to nominate additional volunteers to the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRP). This is in fact a long-standing invitation. The result of a process that was initiated at the last CoP is a recommendation stemming from that CoP and the two intervening EC meetings that a full review of the rules of procedure for both bodies be conducted by the SCRP. In order to address issues of quorum at meetings and attendance and the ability for scheduling, the EC recommended that the CoP approve a rule stating that the invitations to CoP meetings be sent at least five months in advance, and that the invitations include a list of key issues to be discussed during the meeting.

The EC discussed the Auditor's report and the Financial Statement of the IAI as of 30 June 2007 and forwarded it to the CoP for approval. The FAC had analyzed those documents and recommended the approval.

The Core Budget Request has also been reviewed by the FAC, and both the EC and the FAC recommend that the document be approved.

## **9. Report of the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures**

The SCRP Chair indicated that there were two separate items to discuss: the first was a set of recommendations (summarized in document 15) on changes to the Rules to be approved by the CoP. The second reflects the discussion at the EC 26 about the need of a complete rewrite of the rules for the CoP and the EC. Another point is the advance notification for meetings, which would actually require another change to the rules that the EC recommended to the CoP for approval.

The changes proposed to the rules in document 15 do not represent a consensus from all those involved in the process. Consultations were held with Antonio Mac Dowell from Brazil and Diego Malpede from Argentina. The SCRP also interacted with the Directorate and with Gladys Maggi from Venezuela.

The most important task that was assigned to the SCRP at the 14<sup>th</sup> CoP meeting was to consider possible ways to reduce the quorum for the Conference of the Parties, to avoid the difficulty faced on that occasion. A recommendation from Diego Malpede who is currently part of the Argentinean mission to the United Nations regarding the quorum issue is included in the document. His statement was that the UN operates on the policy that sessions are opened and allowed to conduct their business only in the presence of a quorum of one third of the respective members.

The SCRP can find different formulas to reduce the quorum as was requested. The most important point is that if the size of the quorum is reduced, the size of the majority needed to pass measures will also be reduced. So, if the IAI has 19 members, one third would mean that a quorum would be made of seven and that measures would be approved by a majority of four. The document contains a very strong point raised by the representative of Venezuela, in the sense that the IAI's primary objective should be not to reduce the

quorum, but to try to find ways to encourage more countries, particularly smaller countries with less resources to participate in IAI CoPs.

Venezuela: The IAI should find mechanisms to guarantee the quorum instead of reducing it. If the success and strength of the IAI is high participation, it is not logical that important decisions be taken only by four IAI members. The fact that the CoP 14 was held in Manaus was crucial in the participation. The difference is seen with the current CoP in a capital city, where member countries whose official representatives are not able to attend the meeting can be represented by diplomatic delegates.

Argentina: Agrees with Venezuela in that reducing the quorum is not the best solution. The CoP may recommend that countries hosting CoP meetings organize them in cities where most member countries have diplomatic representation. Another option is that even without quorum, the meeting be held, the issues addressed and then informed to countries for comments and decisions. Participation is also possible via Skype or conference calls at the moment of voting.

IAI Director: Agrees on trying to maintain the quorum as high as possible, as the philosophy of the IAI is its inclusiveness. The possibility of a session moving forward without the presence of a quorum and deferring the decision taking to a later time already exists under the Vienna Convention which states that a minority of the countries present of an international treaty may take decisions which can be confirmed later by the other countries. So, if recognition of the applicability of the Vienna Convention were inserted in the rules of procedure of the IAI, the problem would be solved.

Jamaica: Many Caribbean countries do not have diplomatic representation in many countries. Jamaica is one of the countries that has, because steps were taken to at least name honorary consuls in different countries. The representative requested information on the ways a country can engage with the IAI (membership, associate, etc.).

Cuba agrees with Venezuela and Argentina and finds the application of the Vienna Convention in exceptional cases logical. However, who in each country would be informed on the decisions to be approved? The simple answer would be "the country representative", however, each country representative has to be accredited to vote during the CoPs. This issue has to be considered during the review of the rules of procedure.

Argentina: The possibility exists that countries have permanent representatives with long-standing credentials.

SCRIP Chair: There is a recommendation to modify the rules in order to encourage each member country to designate a permanent representative and an alternate to the permanent representative. Designations of permanent representatives should be for a fixed period to avoid the problems that may arise in relation with having a representative that is no longer part of the government of a given country.

Cuba: The IAI used to receive letters designating representatives from the Ministries representing the country in the IAI. However, credentials are requested not from the ministries representing the country, but from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs. Therefore, in the case of Cuba, the letter from the Ministry of Science and Technology designating the representative is not enough for full participation of Cuba in the CoP.

Venezuela: Considering all the issues that are being discussed, the proposal is to undertake a complete review of the rules of procedure, as discussed in EC 26.

The CoP decided to maintain the rule regarding the size of the quorum of the CoP, however a change was introduced to Rule 24, as follows:

The CoP approved the amendment to Rule 24 (Chapter V) in the Rules of the CoP. The rule changed to read:

“Plenary sessions and sessions of the committees shall be convened and shall conduct their proceedings only in the presence of a quorum of one half of their respective members. In the event that the quorum is temporarily upset, no action shall be taken until the quorum is restored.”

*Action 5, Day 1*

The CoP expressed the need for a way to assure that future meetings of the CoP are convened in cities in which a large majority of IAI member countries maintains diplomatic missions. This does not mean a change to the rules, but a decision of the CoP. In addition, since the time needed for country representatives to make travel arrangements in their countries, or nominate alternate representatives is more than 60 days, invitations sent out more than 60 days in advance will also have a positive effect on the quorum.

Argentina: Countries hosting IAI meetings may need the four months prior to the meeting to make the local arrangements for the meeting. So, maybe invitations can be sent out indicating the country and the date of the meeting, without necessarily defining the city where it will take place. This would make local arrangements easier and give countries more flexibility.

IAI Director: The Rules state that the Directorate has to send advice of a meeting 60 days in advance. This advice is useless since the majority of the countries will only act upon official invitations. That is why the new wording of the rule indicates that invitations should be sent by the Directorate and the host country. Venue information needed at the time of sending the invitations is the country (for visa and travel cost) and the exact date, as well as an approximate idea of the issues to be addressed at that meeting.

The CoP approved the amendment to Rule 10 (Chapter II) in the Rules of the CoP. The rule changed to read:

“The Director and the appropriate representative of the host country shall extend joint invitations for each Conference of the Parties to the Parties and all other expected participants within one month of the previous EC, but no later than four months prior to the starting date of the Conference. This invitation shall include a list of the key issues to be discussed, with the understanding that this list shall serve as the basis for the provisional agenda for the Conference as described in Rule 14.”

It was also suggested that countries hosting a CoP meeting set the venue in a city where a majority of IAI countries have diplomatic representation.

*Action 6, Day 1*

The CoP invites Member States to consider nominating members of the Standing Committee on Rules of Procedure (SCRIP), keeping in mind the possibility that the SCRIP may be assisting the CoP to undertake a complete rewriting of the rules of procedure for both the CoP and the EC in the coming years. The chair of the SCRIP suggested that an optimal size for the committee would be five. This would require adding two members to the present membership of three. He further suggested that a Latin American expert in law as it relates to international organizations and someone whose native language is English would be especially valuable.

*Action 8, Day 1*

Lou Brown indicated that the report of the SCRIP includes the suggestion of Venezuela, regarding the need to encourage as much as possible the participation in IAI activities of scientists and institutions in smaller countries. The SCRIP suggests that the IAI scientific and outreach programs staff be asked to consider such possible actions, to better enable

smaller countries to have a more active participation in IAI activities, and to present recommendations along these lines for consideration and action by the next CoP.

IAI Director: The main point in this is funding for travel, which has been discussed at previous CoPs, and the suggestion there was that if travel support was to be given upon application by such countries, a Trust Fund or a specific fund would have to be generated.

SCRIP Chair: Although a recommendation appears in the report of the SCRIP that Rule 12 applying to EC meetings be modified accordingly to Rule 10, given the more active participation of countries that are elected for the EC, such change is not perceived as necessary. However, at the request of the CoP, this can be further considered.

IAI Director: Provisions for extraordinary EC meetings will also have to be taken, in case the Executive Council needs to convene in between schedules, because the EC is expected to take greater participation and organize itself *ad hoc* if needed. Therefore, in case the Rules of the EC were to be changed, this would also need additional consideration.

Venezuela: The fact that there are many changes proposed to the Rules of Procedure indicates the need for a full review of the document. The changes approved at this meeting are to improve operational function of the IAI bodies in the meantime.

The CoP decided to initiate a process to conduct a full review of the Rules of Procedure for the EC and the CoP.

*Action 7, Day 1*

Cuba: Provisions should be taken for replacements in the EC Bureau, given that in the period between CoP 14 and 15, the EC Bureau operated with only one member.

The CoP requested the Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures to consider ways to effectively fill vacancies on the EC Bureau and to report to the EC on its results.

*Action 9, Day 1*

SCRIP Chair: The Agreement Establishing the IAI includes material that does not belong to an Agreement (e.g., the Science Agenda). Consequently, some issues that are addressed in the Agreement should be able to be changed without a formal amendment to the Agreement, which requires ratification by Member States. Most organizations like the IAI have three documents: a very brief charter, which states the principles under which the organization is established, then it has a set of statutes which really define the principles under which the organization operates and finally it has rules of procedure to deal with day to day operations. The IAI has only two such documents. This is because the agreement includes some issues that should be able to be dealt with less formally, and the Rules of Procedure include issues that should be dealt with more formally. If the IAI is to undertake a complete rewrite of the Rules, it will need time to analyze all these aspects, since the rules are interrelated. According to the Vienna Convention, if an amendment to the Agreement is needed, and if there is unanimous support for that amendment, it can be implemented before the ratification process is complete.

Jamaica: After the talks held during the EC regarding which institutes should be contacted by the IAI, the representative of Jamaica identified the Caribbean Community Climate Change Center, Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology. Jamaica is more concerned about the participation of the Caribbean as a whole in the IAI. Jamaica encouraged the IAI to make its presence known in the Caribbean, maybe through participation in or contacts with the Ministerial meetings through the agencies. The Caribbean would like to also have more IAI projects based in the Caribbean, and to be much more involved in IAI activities.

## 10. IAI Strategic Planning

The Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Mike Brklacich, gave a presentation on the progress made by the Committee. Members of the SPC are Argentina, Mexico, Panama and USA (CoP members), IAI Director, Scientific Officer and Program Manager (Directorate), SAC Chair and two SAC members as well as Jerry Melillo and Mike Brklacich. The SPC met in May 2007.

Science is the main asset that the IAI has. The External Review of the IAI by the AAAS provides a good starting point for the Strategic Planning (SP). The IAI has to build on the successes it had in integration, capacity building as well as science and society. The scope of the SP should be within the spirit of the IAI Agreement (Article III and V,4), which implies an effective interpretation of the existing agreement. The SP is an opportunity to engage usual and new collaborators purposefully. The SP should be completed by the end of 2009, which is a shared responsibility of the SPC and all the IAI bodies.

The purpose of the SP is to guide IAI science & programmatic decisions over the next 5-10 years; to further develop IAI's capacity and expertise on inter-governmental perspectives on GEC; and to enhance engagement in GEC dialogues within the Americas and abroad. The idea is to help the Directorate set priorities and decide what to pursue with the resources available.

The Strategic Planning process provides an opportunity to engage other communities to inform and disseminate the IAI message. The SPC proposed to hold a workshop in November 2008 to obtain further input on GEC challenges over the next 10 years; to assist with defining an IAI vision statement. About 30 people will be invited to the 2-day workshop selected from IAI PIs, CoP representatives, development agencies, foundations, national environmental agencies, etc. A 1-day meeting of the SPC will follow the workshop. GEC science, knowledge dialogue, GEC governance for the IAI, cross-cutting issues are among the potential workshop themes.

SPC Agenda: Assessment of fit (i.e. the current Science Plan & the next generation of GEC Science) (January); Revised science agenda & setting priorities (March); IAI governance & delivery of the revised science agenda (June); Draft SP & review (September); Final SP (December).

The EC 26 held a wide-ranging discussion on the SP, which revealed a number of issues that the SPC had not brought to the agenda. The development of a SP is an important and urgent task for IAI. The SP needs to (a) articulate guidelines that will assist the IAI with responding to funding, capacity building and alliances with other stakeholders and (b) present a clear statement of IAI's vision and scientific agenda to its current and potential collaborators. Scientific excellence is and must continue to be IAI's major asset but the IAI needs to be transformed into an institution that is a GEC knowledge broker (in the sense of developing the promotion of informed action as stated in the IAI mission) at national through regional scales for the Americas. The SP needs to be a flexible and living document, with periodic reviews (perhaps after 2 and 5 years) to assess progress and allow for updating and revisions. The SP should promote the building of alliances on several fronts including (but not limited to): scientific collaborations, training opportunities, data management and sharing and national and regional environmental and science institutions. The SP must be built on a consultative process that deliberately engages traditional and non-traditional stakeholders. This process must include a communication strategy that facilitates the sharing of information and dialogue among all SP participants. EC and SAC meetings provide an opportunity for the SPC to update those bodies and continue dialogue.

USA: Regarding the discussion held at the EC, one of the points raised by Cuba was the need to have a continued process of dialogue between the SPC and the member countries in order to make sure that the member states remain engaged in the process. The result of that discussion was the opportunity for individual countries to indicate whether they wanted



to be explicitly engaged in the process, countries that are willing to participate in an exchange of information and to provide input and to participate in the SP workshop.

Brazil: To indicate the adequate people from member countries (maybe not necessarily the official country representative), it would be good to know the idea behind the workshop to see the area of expertise needed.

SPC Chair: The final purpose of the workshop has not been defined yet. The main purpose is to have a broader engagement in order to refine the list of global environmental challenges that IAI can be expected to address over the next ten years, and identify the areas with which the IAI is not involved yet. As part of that, the process can start by defining the vision for the IAI and analyzing the impact the IAI may have on society. The SPC will meet in August to try to further develop the purpose of the workshop. The idea is to open the workshop to have the right participants to stimulate the discussion, maintaining the number up to 30 people.

Mexico: One of the issues discussed at EC 26 is the scope of the SP. If it is going to be 10 years, then the time for periodic reviews can be also set more precisely. Cuba had mentioned the need of including progress indicators. Maybe the SP should include the scope of the plan, will there be an implementation plan? Will the SP be a 5 or a 500 page document?

SPC Chair: One of the strong points that came out from the discussion was that the plan should probably look out perhaps only 5 years, recognizing that some issues can be addressed that will need more than 10 years. The SP would be a 15-page document providing the basic guidelines to help the Directorate and the Institute make wise decisions about priorities and what to pursue. An implementation plan is something much more concrete, and the SPC Chair does not think that such level of detail will be reached in this process. The Committee will not only report at the EC, CoP and SAC meetings on the progress, but will also engage in a dialogue with those bodies to identify gaps.

IAI Director: There was also a recommendation at the EC to increase communication in between meetings by using the Twiki site, where the interim reports of the SPC can be posted for consultation and input. A mechanism will be devised to make this possible.

The CoP requested the Secretariat to prepare an extract of the SP process discussions held during the EC and the CoP, to be presented as a separate document for the Strategic Planning Committee. Documents will be made available for consultation of member country representatives through the Twiki web site or other tools.

*Action 10, Day 1*

The CoP thanked Mike Brklacich for volunteering to lead the Strategic Planning Committee and for serving on the Scientific Advisory Committee for six years and for the last couple of years as the Chair of the SAC, when he has moved the Committee to become a very effective organ of the IAI functions.

## **11. Approval of the Action List of Day 1**

The CoP approved the Action List of day 1 with some modifications already included in it.

*Action 1, Day 2*

## **12. Other issues from EC 25 and 26**

The CoP decided to draft a letter to the Brazilian Ministry of Science and Technology and to the Directorate with a copy to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the INPE Director

commending the Brazilian Government for its support of the IAI and endorsing the negotiations to solve the issues related with the contract of IAI Brazilian staff and the Directorate headquarters.

*Action 6, Day 2*

SCRIP Chair: One of the objectives of the letter is to stress the need for local staff to be assured stability in their work (salaries, length of contracts, benefits).

Brazil: The country is working on that and sees no problem in including this issue in the letter to make sure it will be solved.

### *12.1 UNESCO Cooperation*

There are several ways to formalize an agreement with UNESCO to initiate joint capacity building with the assistance of SCOPE for scientists from different disciplines and politicians from different ministries and secretariats on issues of global change. This activity may take the form of an agreement, a MoU, or a joint project. The establishment of joint projects does not imply signing any agreement or MoU (the easiest way). Agreements and MoUs can be signed with UNESCO headquarters, and go through several formal mechanisms, involving the Executive Council of UNESCO and other bodies, as well as with the Regional Bureaus for Science. In the case of signing the agreement with the Regional Office in Uruguay (Latin American and Caribbean countries), a practical solution can be found for the US and Canada, which are not under the scope of that office. This way is more practical, and has the same strength as if it was signed with the headquarters. Marcio Barbosa is the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, and has long been involved with the IAI, so he knows the Institute. Almost all the resources for 2008-2009 are committed, but many of the activities proposed by the IAI may be covered with regular resources. The planning of the budget for 2010-2011 will take place in the week after the IAI CoP meeting in Panama, and may consider allocating funds for joint UNESCO-IAI activities. Addressing the budget for a joint program at that meeting will be facilitated if IAI representatives contact the National UNESCO Commissions in their countries before that. UNESCO is willing to cooperate with the IAI, since there are many issues of common interest in both organizations.

The CoP requested member countries to approach UNESCO to initiate joint capacity building with the assistance of SCOPE that brings together scientists from different disciplines and politicians from different ministries and secretariats on issues of global change.

*Action 11, Day 1*

## **13. Donor's session**

The US is very pleased to continue its support to IAI programs and projects through the grant for the Collaborative Research Network Program, and the IAI-NCAR collaboration which includes the colloquia and the internships which are offered through the Advanced Studies Program. The US is also working with the Directorate to elaborate other capacity building activities, which will be offered in the form of the different courses that have been presented in the Annual Plan. The US offers an additional amount beyond the CRN of about US\$ 500,000 annually towards these activities and it is the intention of the country to maintain those contributions.

## **14. Election of SAC Members**

A committee ad hoc was established at EC 26 to evaluate CVs of nominees presented by the CoP and the SAC to fill the four vacancies in the SAC membership. Members of this

committee were Mike Brklacich (former SAC Chair), Carolina Vera (local scientist), Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, USA and Venezuela (EC), and Gerhard Breulmann (IAI Directorate). The election of SAC members is a very important decision of the CoP, since it makes it possible for the SAC to make its job. Therefore, it is important to have the right set of people on the Scientific Advisory Committee.

The process consisted of reviewing the CVs of the nominees; identifying the best nominee for each open position and developing the “best available slate” relative to identified science gaps on the SAC and addressing a broad range of balances. The proposed slate was as follows:

Drawn from SAC nominations

Physical oceanography: Frank Muller-Karger (1<sup>st</sup> 3-year term)

Land cover, land use change, land management: Walter Baethgen (1<sup>st</sup> 3-year term)

Human vulnerability/adaptation to GEC: Luis Mata (2<sup>nd</sup> 3-year term)

Drawn from CoP nominations

Anthropogenic emissions & urban dimensions of GEC: Telma Castro (2<sup>nd</sup> 3-year term)

Electing the recommended slate will imply that key science themes which the SAC needs bolstering will be addressed. The regional balance will be improved slightly (South: Castro, Pichs, Vera; North: Fine, Mooney; South-North: Baethgen, Carmen-Lemos, Mata, Muller-Karger, Valdes). Linkages to other GEC constituencies (IRI, IPCC, etc) will be reinforced and/or improved.

All the recommended candidates are enthusiastic and mid to late career scientists. There will be slight reductions in gender balance (6:4), socio-economic – biophysical balance (2:8), but the science - policy linkages will be strengthened. The representation of social sciences on the SAC is decreasing and it would be advisable not to let this tendency to continue.

The election of the slate will allow for an effective SAC renewal and for continued favorable EC –CoP and SAC relations. The Committee recommends that the CoP and the SAC present larger pools of nominees. The Selection Committee recommended that the CoP vote the list of the names suggested as a whole in order to achieve the desired balance. █

Cuba requested that the recommendation of a more active participation of CoP members in the nomination process to fill SAC vacancies be considered as an action and a resolution by the CoP. The SAC has improved and it can be seen it works as a team, and this has to be maintained.

Argentina agreed with Cuba and expressed that countries can also nominate foreign scientists to the SAC.

Mike Brklacich agreed with both country representatives, since the SAC needs to work as a team in order not to become dysfunctional. In addition, the SAC is in the best position to identify the sort of scientific expertise that it needs. A point of importance is that the EC and the CoP have taken on those recommendations on scientific areas of need very sincerely and responded very effectively in Manaus. There are multiple balances on the SAC that have to be achieved (e.g., gender, region, scientific area).

SCRIP Chair: The CoP has developed a set of traditions as to the election of SAC members that improve the existing rules of procedure. A precedent was established in Manaus when a slate was recommended that fitted exactly the number of vacancies to be filled and the CoP approved it as a whole. If the CoP finds the slate acceptable, there is no need to go through secret ballot.

Cuba: Though taking the recommendation of the Selection Committee into consideration, the CoP has always voted individuals for the SAC membership. All candidates have to go to the election. Country representatives have already evaluated their candidates, and they may have the mandate to vote for certain nominees. On the other hand, the Selection Committee recommends the best option in their opinion. How can the CoP be requested to nominate a large number of candidates if there is no possibility of voting for them? This used to be the procedure, if it has changed in Manaus, then the Rules of Procedure are being modified.

CoP Chair: Procedures have not changed. In Manaus, the CoP approved the recommendation of the Selection Committee, based on the motion that accompanies that recommendation. The motion can be approved by consensus.

Venezuela: Voting the motion means binding the decision of the CoP to the recommendation of the Selection Committee and making the election public. On the other hand, voting on individuals does not mean the recommendation will not be considered. The CoP values the work of the committee

Jamaica: When countries send representations to the CoP with the mandate to vote for a certain person, representatives cannot accept blindly all that has been proposed, because that would inhibit them from fulfilling their mandate. Independently from how good a recommendation can be, voting is necessary to comply with the mandates.

IAI Director: Although representatives may have the mandate to vote for a certain person, the proposal of the Selection Committee is based on the realization that if one particular person is voted in first, a change in the slate of the following candidates may be needed to maintain the balances required on the SAC. This means that the considerations go beyond voting for or against a specific person. They go for a balanced construction of the SAC with respect to a number of criteria. Based on this, it is legitimate to vote on the motion.

Argentina: If the CoP accepts what the Director says –which is valid–, the Rules of Procedure will have to be modified. The current Rules establish only one procedure, which is the one that has to be followed. The SCRIP should analyze the SAC member election process, and present a proposal at the next CoP so that the CoP can decide if it legitimates the process of approving slates recommended by the Selection Committee. Approving the motion at the present CoP would imply violating the secret of the election, which the representative expressed he was not willing to do.

Cuba: In the future, if countries present more candidates for the SAC, the list will be longer and better. In that case, there might be more than one candidate in one area of expertise. The Selection Committee may consider that one of those candidates is the best option, but will the few people on the Selection Committee think better than the 19 member countries? The work of the Committee is valid as a recommendation, but it should not limit the will of country representatives.

USA: A somewhat different tradition was established in Manaus, which consists of delegating some of the CoP's authority and responsibility in this area to a committee. The Committee was asked to consider the nominations that have been submitted in detail. The reason for delegating the task to the Committee is that it represents an exceptional set of capabilities and experience to better enable the CoP to make its decision. If the US put forward two or three nominations for members of the SAC, and agreed that a subcommittee could consider these, then even if the US delegation was instructed to vote for their candidates, they will support the slate recommended by the Selection Committee. Going to secret ballot would completely reopen the process. The US delegation moved the motion to accept by acclamation the slate that has been proposed by the Selection Committee.

Panama: The Selection Committee has made an exhaustive analysis of the nominees to arrive at the slate proposed. Both the EC and the CoP are aware of the requirements of the SAC to continue working effectively. However, country representatives have instructions to follow. To solve this problem in the future, the CoP should know what are the needs of the SAC in order to nominate scientists that might fit the needs more adequately.

Cuba: The analysis of Article 51 made long time ago showed that the Article did not provide enough information to country representatives for a correct election. This is why Selection Committees are established. Elections were made considering the recommendation of the committee, though also considering the SAC is an advisory body to the CoP. If the CoP considers that a rule is not adequate, then it must change it.

CoP Chair: The motion presented is not against the rules, since the CoP establishes the rules and has the power to make decisions by consensus. Until rules are corrected, organizations normally take actions by consensus, as was the case in Manaus.

Mike Brklacich: The CoP has the formal responsibility of electing SAC members. The discussion should be about enabling the SAC to be the intellectual motor of the IAI. The CoP is being asked to privilege the best team selected from the nominees over the expertise of individuals. The SAC is a team of 10 people who work together. If the CoP wants to vote for individuals, then it runs the risk of building a SAC that will not be balanced or able to work effectively and will imply a step backwards to what was achieved in Manaus.

Brazil: The CoP represents the countries but it also wants the best for the IAI. The CoP should consider the recommendation of the Selection Committee in order to have the SAC working as a team. It is not possible to select a number of people who are expected to work together without considering the relationship they will have or the expertise needed. The CoP should give value to the work done by the Selection Committee.

The motion was voted and rejected. SAC members were elected individually by secret ballot. The Chair of the SCRIP read the Rules and Articles applying to the election of SAC members. USA requested that the nominees recommended by the Selection Committee be identified on the list of candidates on the screen.

The CoP elected Frank Müller Karger, Walter Baethgen and Luis Mata (SAC nominations) and Telma Castro (CoP nominations) to fill the vacancies on the SAC. Tellers of the election were Argentina and Jamaica.

*Action 7 – Day 2*

## **15. Election of EC Members**

The Chair of the SCRIP clarified that the number of members on the EC can be up to nine according to the Agreement Establishing the IAI, so that the CoP may decide the size of the EC. The rule is somewhat contrary to the Agreement.

The CoP elected the members of the EC for the next two years: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Panama, USA and Venezuela. Tellers of the election were Argentina and Jamaica.

*Action 8, Day 2*

## **16. Future sites and meetings**

The CoP urged all members to consider the next venue of the meeting and inform the Directorate in order to send out the invitations in time. In case no country volunteers to host

the next meeting, the meeting will be held in Brazil (IAI host country). Countries willing to host the next EC meeting will have to communicate their will within one month from the CoP 15. The next meeting of the EC will be held as usually in late November or early December. The EC-CoP has to be held before the end of the IAI's fiscal year (end of June), so that the IAI can function with an approved budget.

## **17. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned. The newly elected EC met to designate the Bureau.