

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



**EC XXVI & CoP XV**  
*June 17-19, 2008*  
*Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Minutes of the EC-XXV**

**3\_ECXXVI/DWD/English/18.June. 2008**

**Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)  
Arlington, VA, USA  
November 28-29, 2007**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

*Agenda* ..... 3  
*1. Opening Session* ..... 4  
*2. Approval of the Agenda*..... 6  
*3. Approval of the Report of the XXIV EC Meeting* ..... 6  
*4. Report of the EC Chair*..... 6  
*5. Report of the IAI Directorate*..... 6  
*6. Report of the FAC Chair* ..... 15  
*7. Update on relations with Member Countries* ..... 17  
*8. Report of the Committee established to analyze ways to solve the problem of quorum for the CoP meetings* .....17  
*9. Report of the SAC Chair*..... 18  
*10. Presentation of the Report of the External Review Committee*..... 21  
*11. Terms of Reference for the IAI Strategic Plan* ..... 244  
*12. EC-SAC Joint Session on IAI Strategic Planning*.....30  
*13. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP* .....34  
*14. Future sites and meetings*..... 34  
*15. Adjournment*..... 34

Action List EC-XXV (day 1)

Action List EC-XXV (day 2)

Acronyms

Note: This report is not a strictly chronological record. For completeness, greater clarity and readability the IAI Directorate has grouped discussions of an agenda item together under the first occurrence of the topic.

---

**25th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council (EC)  
November 28-29, 2007 – Arlington VA, USA**

**APPROVED AGENDA**

**Wednesday – November 28, 2007**

**Day 1**

**- Morning session (08:30 am – 12:00 pm)**

08:30 - 09:00 Registration

Opening ceremony

*Representatives of the USA: Dr. Harlan Watson (US Department of State)  
Dr. Arden Bement (Director, NSF)  
EC Chair: Maria Assunção F. S. Dias*

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of the Report of the 24th Meeting of the EC

Report of the EC Chair:

***Maria Assunção F. S. Dias***

*Activities charged to the EC and its Bureau;  
Activities, actions, and decisions of the EC Bureau or its members.*

Report from the IAI Directorate:

*Overview of the IAI Director*

***Directorate Staff  
(Holm Tiessen);***

10:30 – 10:45 Coffee Break

*Overview of the Science Programs (Gerhard Breulmann);  
Overview of the Training, Communications, and Outreach Areas (Marcella Ohira);  
Overview of the financial status of the Core Budget as of October 31, 2007, and Auditors  
Report as of June 30, 2007 (Rafael Atmetlla).*

Report of the IAI Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) Chair

***Mike Brklacich***

12:00 Lunch

**- Afternoon session (01:30 pm – 08:00 pm)**

TOR of the IAI Strategic Plan

***committee***

04:15 – 04:30 Coffee Break

04:30 Travel from NSF to AAAS

05:30 Presentation of the External Review and Science-Policy Interactions at AAAS

06:00 - 08:00 Reception hosted by AAAS with representatives of Embassies, other Washingtonbased Institutions, and members of the IAI SAC.

08:00 Return to the hotel

**Thursday – November 29, 2007**

**Day 2**

**- Morning session (09:00 am – 12:00 pm)**

Approval of the Action List of day 1

Report of the Working Groups/Task Forces/Committees:

*Financial and Administrative Committee*..... *William Smith*

*Update on relations with Member States* .....*Holm Tiessen*

*Report of the Committee established to analyze ways to solve the problem of quorum for the CoP meetings*.....*committee*

10:45 – 11:00 – Coffee Break

11:00 – 02:30 IAI Strategic Plan, joint session with the SAC - Working lunch

**- Afternoon session (02:45 pm - 04:00 pm) -**

Approval of the Auditors Report of the Financial Statement as of June 30, 2007

Approval of the items to be forwarded to the CoP

***Maria Assunção F. S. Dias***

Future sites and meetings

Adjourn

Debriefing session – IAI EC Bureau and the IAI Directorate.

---

**1. Opening Session**

Dr. Paul Filmer, representative from the US, welcomed the participants to the Twenty Fifth Meeting of the Executive Council and introduced Dr Harlan Watson from the US Department of State and Dr. Arden Bement, NSF Director (as Dr. Bement could not be present in the morning, he gave his welcome words after lunch).

Both welcomed the participants and highlighted the importance of the IAI in the Western hemisphere in the support for global change research and social and economic impacts. They also mentioned several important roles that the IAI plays, 1) fosters international collaborations, provides a mechanism to identify where national projects intersect and where new partnerships can be forged; 2) promotes the open exchange of information, 3) increases the availability of shared scientific infrastructure, provides new ways of doing science; 4) builds scientific capacity.

For USA, the IAI projects contribute knowledge and advice that help advance the goals of the US National Global Change Research Program. USA strives to be a valued international partner that collaborates willingly and contributes its resources to the common advancement of knowledge.

Dr. Watson and Dr. Bement finished their respective introductory remarks by saying that the NSF and the US Department of State are committed to continue their support to the IAI and wished the participants a fruitful meeting.

Then, Dr. Paul Filmer introduced the EC Chair, Dr. Maria Assunção F. Silva Dias, who thanked the hosts for their continuous support to the IAI and the EC members and observers for their presence. She mentioned some of the IAI's milestones: the IAI team of multidisciplinary scientists, the cooperative projects, the formation of networks, the importance of human dimensions and public awareness. She also commented on two important achievements of the IAI; the termination of the report of the IAI external review committee and the beginning of the strategic planning process. She also wished the participants a successful meeting.

After the introductory remarks, the EC determined that the quorum was present and therefore decided to go ahead with its work.

Participants at the meeting were:

**EC Country Representatives**

Argentina: Carlos Ereño  
Brazil: Maria Assunção Faus da Silva Dias (*EC Chair*)  
Canada: Charles Lin  
Costa Rica: Ana Villalobos  
Cuba: Ernesto Plascencia Escalante, Michelle Abdo  
Mexico: Andrés Flores Montalbo  
Panama: Zoila Aquino

United States: Paul Filmer (*2<sup>nd</sup> EC Vice Chair*), Louis B. Brown, William Smith, Norman Barth (1<sup>st</sup> day), Vanessa Richardson, Margarita Conkright Gregg  
Venezuela: Gladys Maggi

**SAC Members:**

Michael Brklacich (SAC Chair)

**Observers – Member Countries:**

Colombia: Angela Duran  
Dominican Republic: Omar Ramírez Tejada, Ariel Ortiz Bobea

**Observers:**

David M. Allen (1<sup>st</sup> day, US Climate Change Science Program), Evan Notman (1<sup>st</sup> day, NSF-Americas Program), Jessica Robin (1<sup>st</sup> day, NSF-OISE), Cynthia Singleton (1<sup>st</sup> day, NSF-OISE), Harold Stolberg (1<sup>st</sup> day, NSF-OISE), Joyce Werking (1<sup>st</sup> day NSF- OIG)

## **IAI SAC – Joint Session**

Rana Fine, Silvia Garzoli, Maria Carmen de Mello Lemos, Luis José Mata, Harold Mooney, Juan Valdés, Carolina Vera

### **IAI Directorate:**

Holm Tiessen (Director), Gerhard Breulmann (SO), Rafael Atmetlla (FAO), Marcella Ohira (TO), Luciana Ribeiro (Assistant to Director), Elvira Gentile

### **Local staff**

Melanie Whitmire (UCAR/JOSS)

## **2. Approval of the Agenda**

The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty Fifth Meeting with the following modifications: 1) there would be a welcome speech from Dr Harlan Watson (US Department of State) and Dr Arden Bement (Director, NSF); 2) the report of the SAC Chair would be presented before lunch, immediately after the IAI Directorate report and; 3) the FAC report would be presented by William Smith instead of Louis Grittani. (*Action 1, Day 1*)

## **3. Approval of the Report of the XXIV EC Meeting**

The EC approved the Report of its Twenty Fourth Meeting with some minor modifications already communicated to the IAI Secretariat. (*Action 2, Day 1*)

## **4. Report of the EC Chair**

The EC Chair, Maria Assuncao Silva Dias, made reference to the action lists from the EC and CoP meetings in Manaus and reported on the following items:

- interaction with the La Plata Basin initiative;
- meeting with USA and Argentina regarding the VAMOS program;
- meeting on IAI Pan Amazonian Science;
- IAI-CPTEC Internship program has started;
- no particular activities of the EC Bureau to report;
- meeting with the IAI FAC to happen on the following day.

## **5. Report of the IAI Directorate**

Dr. Holm Tiessen, the IAI Director, made a summary of the activities, outcomes and initiatives since June 2007 (Document *4\_ECXXV/DID/English/November 19, 2007*).

He talked about the following issues:

### **Science program**

The principal investigators of the six projects approved for funding under the **Small Grants Program for the Human Dimensions** (SGP-HD) by the CoP in Manaus have been informed about the IAI's decision and grant agreements have been sent to them. Four agreements have been signed, funds have been transferred and activities have started. Two agreements are under review by the grantee institutions. In this context, there have also been considerable delays in grantee institutions signing the CRN II agreements and sub-agreements. The very elaborate IAI agreement (revised to avoid problems encountered during CRN I) has caused serious delays, particularly in US grantee institutions. As the IAI agreement has been elaborated jointly with the NSF and has its approval, an endorsement of the agreement by the NSF might be possible and helpful to facilitate the process in the future.

The next **CRN II & SGP-HD** Principal Investigator's (PI's) meeting will be held in Panama City, Panama, from 21-23 February 2008. Contact has been made with ANAM and CATHALAC and both will provide support with local arrangements. A main item to be addressed during the meeting will be the collaboration between the CRN II and the SGP-HD programs. A number of SAC members will also attend it. The meeting will be back to back with the IAI Training Institute on data and information management and an Environment Canada/Smithsonian meeting on climate change impacts on biodiversity. Several PIs will participate in both events.

The issue of **data and information** will be addressed both at the PI's meeting and the following training workshop. Both meetings have the mandate to advance the IAI agenda on "the full and open exchange of scientific information relevant to global change" and "promote ... informed action at all levels" since the IAI has not a clear policy on this issues yet.

The IAI obtained a grant from the Mc Arthur foundation *for* the proposal "An assessment of research and institutional needs to cope with the effects of Climate Change on Andean Biodiversity". The agreement letter is expected within the next couple of months.

The also IAI submitted a proposal to **IDRC** on land use, hydrology and climate in the La Plata basin. The proposal complements the work in the CRN II project of Esteban Jobbagy and the planned CRN II addition on climate to be led by Eduardo Hugo Berbery. The proposal, for CAD 440,000, is being evaluated by IDRC with first communications indicating that it will be funded.

The IAI Director stated it was the first time that the IAI Directorate searched for external funds and congratulated the SO and the TO for their participation in these projects.

### **Cooperation**

The IAI Director said it was necessary to review the IAI mandate in terms of the role of regional knowledge networks in global programs. He mentioned the following cooperations between the IAI and other organizations:

*For the IGFA meeting* (Oct. 27-30), the IAI Director had asked that the relationships and funding mechanisms of the international global change programs and regional institutions be put on the agenda. The ensuing discussions helped clarify funding mechanisms for events organized by global programs and avoid double funding. This clarification is important since it will avoid misunderstandings about the funding intentions of the IAI and its sponsoring agencies. At the

same time, it reassured global programs of continued IAI cooperation within the defined mandate of the IAI.

Planning for the second **IAI-NCAR colloquium** has been started with 2 phone conferences. Following on the first colloquium held in Boulder, Colorado, USA in September 2006 on 'Policy Planning and Decision Making Involving Climate Change and Variability', the second colloquium is tentatively planned for the second half of 2008 in Mendoza, Argentina on 'Seasonality and water resources in the western hemisphere: regional lessons shared'.

Jointly with representatives of the IGBP Brazil Regional Office and the LBA (Large Scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Program in the Amazon), the IAI is developing a session for the **4th IGPB Congress: Sustainable Livelihoods in a Changing Earth System**, 5-9 May 2008, Cape Town, South Africa. The session will address the roles of regional and global organizations, public policy and regional concerns with the goal to explore a mechanism to strengthen regional networks.

The IAI, IGBP (Brazil office) and ICSU (regional office Rio) have made a joint submission to the OTCA (**Amazon Treaty Organization**) meeting in Puerto Ayacucho (October) asking for recognition of the need for scientific cooperation amongst the Amazon countries that goes beyond the past largely national efforts.

Two meetings took place with representatives from the **UK Department for International Development** (DFID) on July 30 and Nov. 7. The contacts established may provide opportunities for cooperation as DFID expands its climate adaptation program to Latin America. DFID is cooperating with Canada's IDRC. Both the proposal to IDRC on land use change, hydrology and climate in the La Plata basin and the potential cooperation on priority identification in IAI member countries have developed in this context.

The IAI Director gave a presentation on climate change risks and opportunities at the final meeting of a World-Bank funded project led by **PROCISUR** for the La Plata basin. The meeting in Montevideo (Aug. 28-29) was also designed to explore future project opportunities.

In September 2007, the IAI Training Officer was invited by **IDRC**, Canada, to participate in a "Climate Change and Health Meeting" to discuss strategic directions for an ecosystem approach to climate change and human health research, and to exchange views on the challenges, gaps and opportunities for climate change and health research in Latin America and the Caribbean. The meeting was organized by IDRC in collaboration with the National Institute of Public Health (INSP) of Mexico. A discussion about future collaboration between IAI, IDRC and INSP of Mexico emerged. In October, 2007, INSP submitted a proposal to IAI to organize a meeting on "Variability and Climate Change Research in The Americas" to be held in Cuernavaca, Mexico, January 21-22, 2008. This initiative will bring together the positive results and the success of the IAI project "Diagnostics and prediction of climate variability and human health impacts in the tropical Americas" under CRN I program from 1999-2006, and link the synthesis of these activities to future health initiatives in the region, especially the IDRC's ECOHEALTH program.

The Director added that the potential of the agreements with affiliated/associated institutions foreseen in the Agreement Establishing the IAI has not been completely exploited and therefore it is an area that requires extra work.

### **Country contacts**



The IAI Director reported that on Aug 29 he visited the Minister of the Environment together with representatives from the Ministry of Education and the Agricultural Research Service of **Uruguay**. Following that meeting, the ministries were to communicate to resolve how and by whom the IAI core contributions should be paid. Uruguay has only made one initial payment upon joining the IAI and has never paid again. The potential involvement in a future World Bank project appeared to be an incentive but the IAI has received no feedback as yet.

In **Guatemala** (July 24-26), he visited several institutions to resolve the issue of non-payment of core budget contributions. Guatemala has never contributed, apparently because the senate's decision to join the IAI was not accompanied by a designation of a responsible institution. Eddy Hardie Sanchez Bennet (director INSIVUMEH - climate, hydrology) is ready to promote reactivation of IAI-Guatemala links and contribute science input but has no budget for contributions. INSIVUMEH has a mandate that fits IAI well. Roy Alex Bennet (Deputy Director CONAP – protected areas) will call a meeting of all interested to resolve the issue and share funding for a first contribution.

Taking advantage of a workshop in Lima, the TO visited several Peruvian institutions to strengthen the relationship between **Peru** and the IAI. The answer of Peru was very positive, they have paid a large proportion of its back dues and involved in science discussions.

### **Training**

*Research Internship:* Under the program between the IAI and Brazil's National Institute for Space Research (INPE)/Center for Weather Forecast and Climate Studies (CPTEC) two interns were selected in 2007: Jannet Sanabria, a scientist from the Servicio Nacional de Meteorología e Hidrología (SENAMHI), Peru, is the first intern to start her 6 months internship. The second intern, Ana Graciela Ulke, from the University of Buenos Aires/Department of Atmospheric and Oceans Sciences, Argentina, will start her program in January 2008.

The third and final summer school for Latin American students was held in Goettingen (Sept. 23 - Oct. 7) on "Strategies to react to Global Change Impacts on Land Use in Latin America". Five participants were sponsored by the IAI and 18 by the German DAAD. The IAI Director provided lectures during the second week of the event. Results from the student's discussions and workshops were highlighted in the 2007/2 IAI Newsletter.

*Planned training Institutes:* A proposal to support four training institutes at US\$ 300,000 for the period 2007-2009 was submitted to NSF on July 15, 2007. Partnerships and collaboration have been established with several institutions in the region and IAI is engaged in leveraging additional resources. This proposal is under review by NSF. Institutes planned are:

- Information Management: free and open access to, and use of data and information (with CATHALAC, February 24- March 1, 2008, Panama City, Panama). An aim of the Institute is to improve information management to generate knowledge and communication and develop a culture of information sharing in the IAI member countries.
- Risk - Adapting to Climate Change in Latin America: Trends and Challenges (with the World Conservation Union- IUCN, May 25-29, 2008, San Pedro Sula, Honduras). This activity will be held just before the Central American Presidential Summit (May 30, 2008, San Pedro Sula, Honduras). Objectives are to analyze the interactions between current and future climate risks, and natural and human systems; examine assessment tools and policy frameworks; and train

field practitioners and policy analysts to apply concepts of risk management and adaptation to their work.

- Managing Semi-arid River Basins: Multiple Use of Water Resources of the São Francisco River Basin (with the Federal University of Pernambuco and Canoa de Tolda (NGO), October 8-22, 2008, Aracajú and on the São Francisco river, Brazil). How does global change affect river resources in semi-arid regions: energy, agriculture, fisheries, tourism, human wellbeing and ecosystem function? The workshop will have participation of NGOs, local communities and industries.
- Cities' Responses to Climate Change (with the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean- ECLAC, March/April, 2009, Santiago, Chile) How and why cities respond or fail to respond to climate change with mitigation or adaptation. A forum to link scientific (urban studies, sustainability, and climate change) with practical knowledge, researchers with decision-makers, practitioners to use research results in policies shaping the construction and functioning of urban areas.

### ***Publications:***

The IAI-SCOPE book on the Synthesis of CRN I is available at USD 45. The book will also be published in Spanish and the IAI Directorate is looking for a publisher.

The book on "the application of ecological knowledge to landuse decisions" is now in the technical editing stage. Seventeen chapters provided for the CRN I synthesis in Costa Rica were reviewed J.W.B. Stewart (in addition to the authors reviewing each other's contributions) and edited by the IAI Director.

The report of the "IAI Meeting and Science & Policy Forum on Disaster Management and Risk Reduction associated with Climate Change and Variability" was published in July. This publication was produced in cooperation with the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), (CATHALAC), (CRID), (ANAM) and the Secretaría General of FLACSO. The training institute was held from November 19-24, 2006 in Panama City, Panama. Further information at <http://www.crid.or.cr/encuentroyforoengestiondelriesgoasociadoalclima/index.shtml>

### ***Comments:***

All the member States congratulated the IAI Directorate for the activities during the last six months, especially for the funds raised.

*IAI Director:* there is no universal recipe for raising funds from member countries. The only way is to give a clear message about the IAI and work on a case by case basis.

### ***Argentina:***

- As an old representative of the IAI I am pleased to see an invigorated IAI, especially regarding fund raising. The solid action on countries that do not pay or do not participate has given very good results. The presence of Dominican Republic is an example of success. We really missed this country because it had been engaged with IAI in the beginning. We are happy to share this table with it again.

- Data policy: the panel on Variability of American Monsoons (VAMOS) of the CLIVAR program has generated a large amount of data throughout the Americas as a result of its projects. Consequently, they developed an interesting data policy, which the IAI can use as reference.

- An agreement was signed between the University of Buenos Aires and the IAI. This cooperation agreement formalizes the presence of the IAI in Argentina (through the office in charge of producing the IAI Newsletter).

The *IAI Director* thanked Argentina for its continuous cooperation with IAI.

*SAC Chair:* The SAC would discuss data policy on the second day of its meeting (after the EC-SAC Joint Session). He invited the EC members to join them in that discussion in case they were still in Washington on that day.

*2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair:* I am concerned about the lack of data policy. I have been working on this issue for many years; integration with other organizations is essential.

*Panama:* We should improve the dissemination of information (for example internships) to the member countries focal points so that we can distribute it among all interested institutions. The IAI Director should also visit political institutions that could have an influence in the scientific ones. For example, in Guatemala the Ministry of the Environment is in charge of climate change issues. They have a strong interest in participating in the IAI but they do not have the political support to do it.

*EC Chair:* We can discuss IAI's dissemination mechanisms.

*IAI Director:* there are several functions in the IAI mailing list and IAI's announcements are always circulated through this list. When I went to Guatemala I visited several political institutions, however, the political changes and resulting new faces presented a problem.

*Venezuela:* I am pleased to see the results of the contacts with other countries. As to the relation of IAI with the International Meeting of Science and Technology for the Amazonian Region (October 2007) in which OTCA members would participate, unfortunately only two Amazonian countries were present. However, the meeting was useful to discuss different issues such as sustainable development in the region.

*Mexico:* the relationship with UN institutions and IPCC in particular brought much attention on climate change issues. In Mexico, the IAI's scientists participated in the national communications to these institutions. Perhaps IAI can help in the dissemination of the results of the IPCC in our countries so that the issue gains relevance.

### ***Overview of the financial status of the Core Budget as of October 31, 2007, and Auditors Report as of June 30, 2007 (Rafael Atmetlla)***

Rafael Atmetlla, IAI Administrative and Financial Officer, presented the highlights of the Financial Status as of October 31, 2007 (Document 6\_ECXXV/DID/English/November 20, 2007).

#### ***Status of Core Budget:***

As of October 31, 2007 the funds collected (cash incomes) represent 53% of the approved contributions for the fiscal year 2007/2008. United States is currently paying their contribution when requested by the IAI, therefore the contribution is shown as pending for 2007/2008 as funds for this fiscal year have not been drawn yet.

The funding requests have involved all senior members of the IAI staff, with different strategies depending on the situation of each specific country.

Table I shows the status of the contributions received as of October 31, 2007.

**Core Budget - 2007 / 2008**

Status of Country Contributions as of October 31, 2007

Amounts in US\$

	Due as of 30/jun/07	Contribution for FY 07/08	Paid - in 2007/2008 to be applied to:			Due as of 30/jun/08
			Arrears	Current year	Advances	
Argentina	52.889	50.000				102.889
Bolivia	25.000	5.000				30.000
Brazil	(80.000)	85.000				5.000
Canada	(2.717)	125.000				122.283
Chile	(5.000)	5.000	-	-	(15.000)	(15.000)
Colombia	40.080	10.000				50.080
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	(440.000)			750.000
Venezuela	184.521	30.000				214.521
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1.116.832</b>	<b>1.015.000</b>	<b>(466.649)</b>	<b>(60.000)</b>	<b>(15.000)</b>	<b>1.590.183</b>
					<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>(526.649)</b>
					<b>Total Advances:</b>	<b>(15.000)</b>
					<b>Contributions not received:</b>	<b>(488.351)</b>
					<b>Difference:</b>	<b>-</b>

(\*) The NSF has approved a grant for the fiscal years 2005-2008.  
The full grant is available and the funds are received by IAI upon request.

Table II History of member country contributions as of October 31, 2007, including expected contributions for 2007.

**Core Budget - 2006 / 2007**  
**Status of Country Contributions as of October 31, 2007**

	From Year	1994	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	To Year	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Outstanding
Argentina	Full	40%	40%	40%	40%	Full	70%	6%	30%	150%		200%		2,1 years
Bolivia														6 years
Brazil	Full	Full	Full	57%	162%	Full	Full	Full	46%	123%	194%	94%	07/08 Advance	
Canada	Full	Full	Full	41%	89%	148%	Full	Full	Full	Full	102%		1 year	
Chile	Full	Full	C	C	C	C	300%	C	200%	200%	Full	300%	08/09 Advance	
Colombia		Full	Full	Full					Full	Full	Full		5 years	
Costa Rica	Full	C	C	C	C	358%	405%	Full	Full	40%			2,4 years	
Cuba	Full	Full	Full	C	199%			Full	Full				5 years	
Dominican Republic													11 years	
Ecuador					C	Full	200%	Full					7 years	
Guatemala													11 years	
Jamaica		Full	Full		Full	Full	Full	Full	Full				4 years	
Mexico	Full	23%	29%	33%	41%	241%	C	179%	181%	110%	Full		-	
Panama	Full	Full	Full	Full	C	C	Full	Full	Full	300%	Full		1 year	
Paraguay													12 years	
Peru	15%	C	C	C	C	C	240%	C	C	33%	200%	533%	2,7 years	
Uruguay	Full	Full											10 years	
USA (*)	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full	Full		-	
Venezuela	Full	46%	53%	68%	8%				33%	42%	74%	42%	7,2 years	

Note: numbers represent a percentage of the current contribution, i.e. Colombia in 2007/2008 paid for the equivalent of 3 annual contributions

## Codes:

	= Not a member
	= Paid more than current year (arrears or advances)
	= Payment not received for year
C	= Contribution paid in other year (arrears)

**Expenses:**

The following table shows the expenses year-to-date October 2007 (four months into fiscal year 2007/2008). This comparison shows the status of the four-month core budget compared to the actual expenses in the corresponding period.

**Budget Performance**  
**July 2007 to October 2007**

Category	YTD Actuals	YTD Budget	Difference	%
	Jul-07 - Oct-07	Jul-07 - Oct-07		
Salaries & Benefits	231.731	249.457	(17.726)	-7,1%
Travel	19.768	26.400	(6.632)	-25,1%
Equipment	2.221	3.960	(1.739)	-43,9%
Operational Costs	34.216	28.908	5.308	18,4%
Dissemination & Outreach	213	14.190	(13.977)	-98,5%
Director's Fund	15.367	12.012	3.355	27,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>303.516</b>	<b>334.927</b>	<b>(31.411)</b>	<b>-9,4%</b>

Budget included at 0,33 ( 4 months of projected expenses)

Year-to-date expenses at the end of October 2007 are 9.4% below the four-month budget, with most of the variance coming in the categories of Salaries & Benefits (actual Housing and Education Allowance lower than estimated in the budget), Travel (staff travel has been more selective) and Dissemination & Outreach (expenses for the next issue of the Newsletter have not been fully incurred)

**Core Budget Reserves:**

The level of reserves (IAI Core Budget Funds) would cover 4 months of operations with the current annual budget level of \$1,015,000 (Fiscal Year 2007/2008 budget approved by the 14th CoP in

Manaus, June 2007). A verbal agreement was reached with NSF Finance, to get the contributions up-to-date within an 18-month period. If the funds for the U.S. contribution for 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 were taken into consideration in terms of reserves (there is another contribution approved for 2007/2008), the IAI Core Budget Funds would cover 13.3 months of operation. However the weakening of the US dollar in Real terms is likely to increase the level of expenses.

*Program Budget:*

The CRN I is officially closed. An extension was approved until November 2007 for outreach activities such as publications and translations.

CRN II is completely in place. Out of twelve projects, ten sent their Technical and Financial Reports on time, and eight of them received advances for year 2 based on the reported expenses, cash balance, and forecast for the following year. Two projects did not receive additional funds as their activities had been delayed due to problems and delays in signing the sub-awards with the institutions of the Co-PIs; additional funds will only be sent once they can prove the advance in the projects according to the approved work-plans and can provide a sound forecast for the remaining funds. The Directorate is expecting an updated work plan for these projects.

A control model for CRN II operations has been developed. This model includes all the relevant information by project, institution, country, as well as reported expenses, schedules of payment, annual technical reports to the NSF, contact lists, and other critical information.

Small grants for human Dimensions (SGP-HD): At the end of October 2007, four out of six project agreements were signed and the funds for the first year transferred. Two projects had some difficulties. Last week the IAI received one of these contracts signed.

*General administration:*

There are constant improvements in control processes. The assistance from the FAC and auditors was invaluable in this issue. There were also some adjustments in the finance system and personnel files.

*Brazilian staff issue:*

Currently the IAI is paying nearly 50% of the salaries of the staff provided by Brazil, as the funding provided for these three positions is no longer enough to cover salaries at current market rates for the level of qualification required and detailed in the Host Country Agreement. The situation has been discussed with INPE and the first steps towards a re-negotiation of the contract have been taken, however a final decision or outcome has not been attained. The president of the EC has been involved in the first contacts and discussion.

Recently, INPE informed IAI that the contract with Premiun was being cancelled and a new bid for contracts would be put in place beginning 2008 and IAI would get the chance to review the bid details before it is published.

*The US Dollar rate in Brazil* brought big problems for the international staff. Since July, the value of the Real has increased and therefore, the implementation of some adjustments was necessary. The Directorate is planning to set up a system for calculating adjustments that includes the rate but also a value for inflation.

*Audit Report:*

The *Audit report* has been concluded. As requested by the FAC in May 2007, emphasis was made in a more detailed Management Letter from the independent auditors, since the one provided for the 2005/2006 financial statements was overly summarized and did not provided details. The final report will be available within a couple of weeks. The IAI expects a clean report.

*IAI Director:* Yesterday the IAI received a communication that its INPE-provided staff, as all INPE staff, is going to be laid off as of December 31. This is expected to be followed up with a new contract with a new a subcontracting company as of January 1<sup>st</sup> but we are not aware of any progress in the solicitation process, so I just want you to be aware that while that might be a smooth transition we may have some problems in the new year. My only hope is that since this affects IAI's staff but also INPE's own staff as well, that resolution of the situation is forthcoming.

*EC Chair:* From what we have seen in these INPE's bids, usually there has been no problem with continuity, but if we do have a problem with continuity, there is also compensation according to Brazilian law.

The EC received the Financial Statements as of June 30, 2007 (Action 5, Day, 2)

## 6. Report of the FAC Chair

William Smith presented the report of the FAC (document 8\_ECXXV/DID/English/oct 30, 2007). He informed that the composition of the Financial and Administrative Committee (FAC) has remained unchanged over the last year and consisted of three members: Evair Sergio da Silva (Brazil), Louis Grittani (Canada), and himself.

The FAC formally met once since last reporting to the EC and CoP in Manaus, Brazil. The meeting took place at the IAI office in Sao José dos Campos, Brazil, in September 2007 during the week of the IAI's external audit.

The main issues addressed during that week were:

*Audit Report:* The FAC plus Rafael met with the audit team from BDO Trevisan prior to beginning the audit to discuss expectations. The FAC wanted BDO Trevisan to provide a much more detailed Management Letter.

*Contracts for local staff:* they had an extensive discussion on this issue. The EC Chair has been working to get the contract re-tendered, but the situation is difficult. The EC Chair met with the INPE Director during the last week of September to discuss the issue. There is no assurance that the old salaries will be reinstated, but bidders will be better informed about the positions to hopefully submit more reasonable (i.e. higher) bids. The host country agreement is for 4 full-time positions.

*Future Budget Requests:* The IAI used to present 3-year budget proposals to the CoP, however during a transitional period between the Interim Director, John Stewart, and the first couple years of present Director, Holm Tiessen, only 1-year budgets have been presented. Now that Holm has been approved to remain as the director for another 6 years, the FAC believes it is time to revert back to the 3-year budget proposal. The IAI Directorate will develop a 3-year budget proposal

beginning with the 2008/09 fiscal year. The budget will still be presented annually for approval to the EC and CoP, but showing tentative plans for years 2 and 3 will provide the EC and CoP an opportunity to see and comment on IAI's plans well in advance of the need to approve the funding for those activities. Also, if country contribution increases are anticipated, this will provide a mechanism for providing ample notice to the member countries.

The FAC anticipates the IAI requesting an increase in the core budget for the 2008/09 fiscal year and the FAC agreed that the increments for Member Countries would be in \$1K steps

*US dollar devaluation in Brazil:* the salaries of the international staff suffered a decrease of approximately 22%. The FAC is working with the FAO and the Director to come up with a plan to address this issue. They will make supplementary salary payments to the permanent staff. The total yearly amount required for this is about 50.000 USD. There is no special action needed from the EC since the Director has the authority to disburse these funds.

*FAC renewal:* the FAC's charter, effective for periods of 2 years, is up for renewal. The Executive Council should decide whether the committee would continue to operate, and if so, its composition.

Other *issues* considered by the FAC were: performance appraisals; reporting of cash flow and cash balance to National Science Foundation; CRN-II tracking system; time and attendance system; drawdown of US Core Budget Funds; and manuals (contracting & procurement, employees, accounting).

*Comments:*

*EC Chair:* the USD 50.000 for those who are paid in USD is an emergency measure? What would happen if this happens in a contrary direction?

*William Smith:* in the last approved budget there was an adjustment for this situation. We are working on a long term policy because it is a real emergency measure.

*IAI Director:* 1) From the rules of engagement it would be within my authority to authorize additional payments that may be required to make up for the fall of the last few months. As my salary is involved I would request that the FAC decide upon that and not leave the decision to me. 2) We are also aware that these measures for buffering currency fluctuations go both ways. According to the one that is in place right now, if there is an upward move in the value of the dollar, the compensation will also go down. That is already agreed. The current temporary measure is basically designed to make up for the short-fall over the short period since the FAC last decided a more permanent measure which was in July. We have seen a tremendous deterioration that can be illustrated with the new contract of the Scientific Officer. It was approved by the FAC, and then by the EC and the CoP, with a 5 % increase in his base salary for the first time in many years. By the time the contract was actually implemented on November 1<sup>st</sup>, that anticipated increase had been translated, through deterioration of the dollar value, into a 7 % decrease. That is the kind of emergency measure that we are talking about now.

*USA (Vanessa Richardson):* The IAI Director, the SO, and the FAO are paid in US dollars, but there are three international staff that, although their salaries levels were set in US dollars, are paid in Reales because they are Brazilian. This situation can also affect them negatively. Was this contemplated in this adjustment?

*IAI Director:* As they are Brazilian, it is illegal for the IAI to fix their salaries in US dollars. So, their base salary is based in Reales. Over several years they have seen shrinkage in the actual value



paid out to them until that threshold has been reached, probably in most cases that was a year ago, and since then, they automatically cost more in dollars terms already, so, we have no choice other than to adjust. What needs consideration in the future is how the previous devaluations are reflected and should be taken care of. At this point their salary in effect has reached rock bottom because it is in Reales and it would be illegal for us to reduce it any further so we have to compensate on a regular basis for the currency devaluation.

The EC approved the FAC charter for two additional years (until January 2010). Brazil, Canada and USA will continue as member of the FAC. (Action 4, Day1)

## **7. Update on relations with Member Countries**

The Director explained that in this point there was some overlap with his previous presentation. The IAI has excellent relations with many of its Members States; however, there are other cases where action is needed.

Talks with high-level government officials have taken place in Guatemala and Uruguay, but without tangible results so far. Guatemala has never paid its contributions, and Uruguay only once upon joining. There have been positive signals from Peru and Chile. Peru paid a large proportion of its back dues and got involved in science discussion. Chile paid its arrears and contributions in advance.

The IAI Directorate has received encouraging responses from other countries that are not actively participating in IAI, or that are not paying their contributions. This is the case of Bolivia where, after contacts with the local scientists involved in IAI, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has sent the request for payment to the Ministry of Finance.

The strategy to engage more countries is based on creating the local scientific content and then involving local scientists in the IAI's request for contributions. This encompasses not only current members of the Institute, but also potential members, with a focus on the Caribbean and the Central American countries.

Whenever the IAI Directorate had communications with member countries (or those not actively participating), a country profile sheet was provided to them in order to show the tangible benefits that the countries have obtained from participating in IAI. This creates a very positive impact.

The new grant from the Mc Arthur Foundation will be a good opportunity for country engagement because is targeted at the tropical Andes, principally Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru.

During his visit to Guatemala, the IAI Director also discussed about the possibility of asking Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Panama to lead a Central American initiative on scientific issues of the Caribbean, since it represents a micro universe of global change aspects.

## **8. Report of the Committee established to analyze ways to solve the problem of quorum for the CoP meetings**

During its meeting in Manaus, the EC established a committee to analyze ways to solve the problem of quorum for the CoP. Its members are Venezuela, the SCRP, and a member of the IAI Directorate (Director) (Action 1, Day 3, EC XXIV).

The *Chair of the SCRP* reported that the group had exchanged some e-mail correspondence, but it had not come up with any potential solutions yet. He mentioned that one possibility was to reduce the quorum for the CoP to a smaller number. Another one was to reduce the quorum but with the provision that actions taken by the CoP in the presence of such a smaller quorum would have to be confirmed only after the other countries agree. As these issues had not been discussed yet, he said the committee would prepare a report with possible solutions that should be approved at the next CoP. If necessary, the CoP could try to approve it by electronic means in advance to the meeting.

The IAI Director mentioned two other alternatives:

- No fixed reduction in quorum, but discounting of Member Countries that have shown no activities or no contribution for long periods. That would give a variable total
- Electronic communications should enable the CoP to ask for voting on action items that could take place remotely.

The EC members had a brief discussion on these alternatives and on the benefits and costs of remote communications (teleconference, videoconference).

Since the committee had not discussed the possibilities thoroughly, the members suggested taking extra time to analyze the pros and cons of each alternative and present a report with enough time to take a decision at the next EC/CoP meeting.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair said that in Manaus, as there had been a problem in establishing quorum at the CoP for part of the meeting, the CoP authorized the EC to take decisions on its behalf. Then the EC established this Committee. As it was an action on behalf on the CoP, it would be appropriate to report back to the CoP as well.

<p>The EC decided that the ad hoc Committee established to solve the problem of quorum for the Conference of the Parties will send a report with possible solutions in time for distribution to Member Countries to permit a decision at the next EC/CoP meeting. (Action 5, Day 1)</p>
---

## 9. Report of the SAC Chair

Mike Brklacich, the SAC Chair, focused his presentation in 2 main issues:

- 1) SAC Renewal
- 2) SAC 25th Meeting Report (Buenos Aires, August 2007)

### 1) SAC renewal:

The SAC Chair thanked the EC and the CoP for being part of the new process of SAC renewal implemented over a period of about 6 months, since December 2006. It started basically a year ago in the SAC meeting in Cuernavaca when the SAC provided a statement of its needs, in terms of where it wanted to see the IAI go, and also in terms of its current membership and the gaps to be filled. It was very important to define the themes needed to be covered instead of the individuals. This was discussed in the EC meeting in Panama (December 2006) and, finally, in Manaus (June 2007), a slate of candidates was selected rather than separate elections of

individuals for the SAC. That is very important because it has allowed the SAC to come together as a group to a greater extent. Therefore, the collaboration among the SAC and the other bodies has been very important in appointing members to the SAC and the result is that now the SAC is invigorated and balanced in many ways: geographically, in thematic areas of science, in terms of gender.

The SAC Chair announced it was time to start the renewal process again, which would begin in December 07 and conclude in June 08.

Departing members and members eligible for a possible second term:

- final terms: Garzoli & Brklacich (nominated by the SAC)
- 1st terms: Mata (by the SAC) & Castro (by CoP)

The process should be similar:

- SAC 26 & 27: Define & communicate needs
- SAC expects to have nominations in May
- EC26-CoP15 in June : Process & outcomes

## 2) SAC 25 Meeting report

The key issues discussed at the 25<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting (Buenos Aires, Aug 13-15, 2007) were:

### *External review*

Bob Swap (from AAAS) attended the meeting and the SAC had a very good discussion. Two points emerged:

- Some members of the SAC had been contacted and the input of the SAC was valued in the review
- The SAC fully endorsed the 3 key messages of the External Review Committee:
  - IAI's notable scientific contributions - The SAC believes that credible science is the foundation of this institution
  - IAI still has a number of unrealized opportunities
  - CoP & member state commitment needs to be addressed

### *Integration*

The SAC is trying to have a number of science activities at each of its meetings and at this one it brought together three funded projects in a workshop:

- CRN2076 (Piola)
- SGP-HD12 (Abdallah) new human dimensions
- CRN2047 (Bonisegna) hydrology

Two main conclusions of the workshop were: 1) the benefits of clusters and 2) Rio de la Plata Basin as a potential focal point. One that really stresses various forms of integration, where there is a complex set of jurisdictions with its 5 countries involved in the management of the watershed, there are many ecological regions, population growth is occurring very rapidly, and there are rapid changes in land use. In fact, it is a perfect setting for integrated studies.

The SAC Chair explained that "integration" is not universally defined. Within IAI there seems to be 3 types of integration:

- Interactive - coupled models
- Biophysical - social science collaboration

- Science - policy dialogue

There are a number of many legitimate perspectives. The IAI should discuss different types of integration in the context of its strategic planning.

#### *SAC Committees*

The SAC established thematic areas considered important for long term health of the Institute

- Strategic planning
- Science policy interface
- CRNII/SGP-HD & SAC relationships
- Integration
- SAC governance

#### *Science synthesis*

The IAI has applied two approaches:

- Post mortem: SCOPE 68 - It was very important and taught many lessons about CRN I, but it took place almost one year later than the projects were closed down.
- Concurrent process: it builds into science programs simultaneously. This is something that can start in the middle life of the projects as opposed to one year after its finalization.

#### *Strategic plan*

Key discussion points:

- Better balance across 3 IAI strategic areas (many accomplishments in integrated impacts and collaborative research but in terms of informed consent, it is an area that needs to be strengthened in the next period);
- Consistent with resources vs new resources;
- Enhancing collaborations with other GEC programs;
- Proactive communications plan;
- Shared process across IAI organs.

#### *Concluding comments*

- SAC Renewal: effective start but must maintain this effort
- Transition from External Review foundation to a Strategic Plan
- Integration: Many legitimate perspectives – IAI has to think about how to frame the area of integration

#### *Comments:*

*EC Chair:* The SAC has evolved in a very positive way and the committees are very interesting. As to the science policy interface, the EC needs a little of politics in such interface, not only science.

*SAC Chair:* The committees help spread responsibilities among SAC members and engage people. As to the policy issue, the SAC is scientific and does not want to become a political committee. High caliber science should be the foundation of the SAC. Some of the new members of the SAC come from the policy-science background. It is an area that can be studied and included. In the next 6 months before the end of my term, I would encourage the SAC to be more politically aware; however, I would not encourage the SAC to be politically active, in the sense of taking a particular stand. From my experience in policy processes, scientists make a routine error in thinking that they can make a strategic strike and provide their information that will have a strong policy impact in a country or region. Very seldom is that the case. It tends to be an ongoing process. That might be one of the messages that has to come through in strategic planning. The

real challenge for the IAI is to act in a process that moves along at a pace perhaps differently from the science agenda.

*2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair:* I am very pleased to see the SAC taking up the role envisioned for it in the IAI Agreement itself, of looking at long term planning and strategic planning. The EC is happy to notice that the SAC is involved in various levels, planning, and evaluation of past results. I agree with the recommendation that the EC and the SAC take into account the recommendations of the AAAS report in their discussions about strategic planning the following day. I take the opportunity, on behalf of the other delegates, to thank you for your work in the SAC and the leadership you provided in this new direction.

*Dominican Republic:* congratulated the SAC Chair for his presentation and his strategic vision. People in charge of national institutions really value pertinent scientific information that supports decisions about global environmental problems. IAI should strengthen its relation with political fora. The Americas have several important fora where decision makers are represented. One of the most important contributions of the IAI is to serve as scientific support of decisions that can have a regional and global impact. Under the umbrella of the UNEP, a meeting of the Foreign Ministries of Latin America and the Caribbean will be held in Dominican Republic at the end of January. Many issues that are also of interest to the IAI will be discussed: global environmental governance, climate change, vulnerable areas. There will be a special session for developing island countries which are some of the most vulnerable areas of the planet. As host of the meeting, I invite the IAI to attend the political forum as an observer. It is very important that institutions like the IAI attend these kinds of fora because they can provide inputs for decision making.

*The EC Chair* thanked The Dominican Republic Representative for the invitation to this important meeting since these are the kind of forums the IAI should be engage in as an institution.

## **10. Presentation of the Report of the External Review Committee**

In the afternoon session of Day 1, EC members went to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) headquarters to receive the presentation of the final report of the IAI External Review Committee.

After the welcome from the AAAS officials, the *IAI Director* made a presentation on the IAI. He said the IAI has two important characteristics: it is a regional and an intergovernmental institution. Hence, it focuses on the *regional* implications and adaptation to global change and can link the region to global fora such as the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change of the Earth Systems Partnership.

Some Global change science institutions are:

IGBP - physical, chemical and biological processes of earth system dynamics

IHDP - human dimensions of global environmental change.

Diversitas - biodiversity science for conservation and sustainable use

WCRP - climate variability and change

START - capacity building

The IAI takes into account all the issues dealt by these institutions but for the Americas only.

Then the IAI Director talked about regional research needs (derived from a RIOCC country survey in 17 countries). Countries declared that they lacked information on impacts about urban issues and energy. Regarding adaptation, they had low knowledge on urban issues, energy, soils,

biodiversity, forestry, and fisheries. As to regional concerns and regional responses, he gave some examples of IAI projects, showing the articulation of risk, exposure and vulnerability and their implications.

The milestones of the IAI -scientific excellence, inter-disciplinary research, networking and training & capacity building- generate an environment in which policy relevance for informed action is developed. Two publications of the IAI refer to this issue: “Communicating global change science to society” (SCOPE 68 volume, edited by Holm Tiessen et al.) and “How to improve the dialogue between science and the society” (UNESCO-SCOPE Policy brief).

Finally, he said that the IAI tries to address the entire cascade of initiatives: from research to data generation, building models, making information, synthesizing the information into knowledge, hopefully providing judgment and decisions that lead to actions and then monitoring the actions which return as feedback to research.

*Jerry Melillo, Chair of the External Review Committee, gave a presentation on the external review process and its conclusions. The external review process was requested by the IAI and was funded by the NSF. The terms of reference are: Review the IAI and its activities with a focus on its institutional and programmatic development. The review of the IAI should be done in terms of the Objectives of the IAI. It should also be forward looking, providing advice and recommendations that will help to define the path or “compass” for the IAI in the next decade...*

*Composition of the Committee:*

Dr. Jerry Mellilo (Chair)- *Co-Director, The Ecosystems Center at the Marine Biological Center*, Mr. Anthony Rock (Co-chair) - *Special Advisor, Strategic Initiatives, Arizona State University*, Dr. Robert J. Swap (AAAS Staff Officer), Dr. Hassan Virji - *Deputy Director, START*, Dr. Gordon McBean - *Professor and Chair, University of Western Ontario*, Dr. Ed Miles (until Feb 2007) - *Professor & Senior Fellow, University of Washington*, Dr. Mahabir Gupta - *Facultad de Farmacia, Universidad de Panamá*, Dr. Gilberto Gallopin - *Regional Adviser on Environmental Policies UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean*, Dr. Alice Abreu - *Director, ICSU office Brazil*, Mr. James Buizer - *Office of Sustainability Initiatives, Arizona State University*

Timeline

July 2006: External Review Committee (ERC) formed; Review begins with first meeting of the ERC

August 2006: Project Director visits IAI Headquarters, EC Chair

September 2006 – March 2007: Over 100 email, telephone, in-person interviews; Review of IAI documents; EC meets to draft report

May 2007: ERC meets to review advanced draft of report; Report completed

The three major Conclusions of the Committee were:

The IAI has had *notable achievements* in the past 13 years:

- Promising strides in overcoming operational difficulties
- Research program produces high quality science
- Greatest regional contribution: building scientific capacity throughout the Americas

The IAI still has a number of *unrealized opportunities*.

- Science and scientific capacity building has been insufficiently translated into policy-relevant discourse and action
- Coupling of natural and social sciences and dialogue with decision makers needs to be improved

The IAI will need the *full commitment of the CoP member states* to realize the Institute's goals.

- Countries must work to meet their contribution commitments
- CoP should take the lead in formulating a strategy for establishing an IAI endowment
- CoP, in cooperation with the IAI Director, should guide the development of a comprehensive communications strategy
  - Raise awareness of the Institute
  - Encourage dialogue between science and decision-making communities
  - Promote data sharing and collaboration among participants
- Establish appropriate metrics to evaluate IAI's effectiveness

*Findings and Recommendations:*

**a) Science and Research program**

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research is recognized as high quality, especially in the natural sciences</li> <li>• Science is becoming more regionally relevant</li> <li>• Latin American scientists are leading more of the research projects</li> <li>• The Data and Information System (DIS) is important, but not well executed</li> <li>• Too few projects include links between human activities and environmental change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain IAI's standard of scientific excellence</li> <li>• Strengthen regional relevance of research by focusing on risk, vulnerability, and adaptation</li> <li>• Initiate "across-project" synthesis activities involving both scientists and stakeholders</li> <li>• Develop and execute a plan to upgrade the IAI DIS</li> <li>• Encourage new projects that study the feedbacks between humans and global and regional environmental changes</li> </ul>

**b) Capacity building**

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IAI capacity-building activities are its most valuable regional contribution</li> <li>• No mechanisms is in place to track capacity building outcomes over the long term</li> <li>• Recent progress has been made in developing scientific program management capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand range of capacity building activities (eg. apprenticeships with government agencies, NGOs, and industry)</li> <li>• Develop a tracking mechanism of capacity-building efforts</li> <li>• Continue building capacity in science program management</li> </ul>

**c) Funding**

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all member countries have made their agreed upon contributions on a regular</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an equitable mechanism to help members meet their commitments and</li> </ul>

basis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, the IAI funding base for research and capacity-building depends upon only a few donors</li> <li>• The endowment called for in the Institute's charter has not been developed</li> </ul>	encourage additional participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore expanding the funding base for the IAI program with multi-lateral and private sector sources</li> <li>• Plan for the establishment of an endowment</li> </ul>
---	---

#### **d) Operations and Governance**

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IAI's goals are still valid, but lack evaluation metrics</li> <li>• Poor attendance at CoP meetings diminishes its effectiveness</li> <li>• The SAC is being underutilized</li> <li>• The Directorate needs more prompt advice on operational matters</li> <li>• IAI lacks a long-range strategic plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CoP should lead an effort to define metrics to evaluate the IAI's progress</li> <li>• Participation in CoP meetings by all member states is essential to the future success of IAI</li> <li>• The SAC should be doing more for IAI as outlined in the IAI charter</li> <li>• The EC should provide the Directorate with rapid advice on operational matters as requested</li> <li>• EC should appoint a small working group to initiate a strategic planning process</li> </ul>

#### **e) Communications and dialogue**

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a surprising lack of awareness of the IAI in science and policy communities throughout region</li> <li>• Policy makers have had difficulty translating IAI science into informed action</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CoP should see to it that the IAI develops a communications and marketing strategy to effectively disseminate the Institute's work to governmental, NGO, and scientific bodies</li> <li>• The Directorate, in consultation with CoP members, should develop dialogue events with regionally relevant policy and decision makers to inform the science agenda and enhance communications of IAI science to the policy community</li> </ul>

Finally, *Carlos Gay García*, (Universidad Autónoma de México, former representative from Mexico) gave some words on the initial times of the IAI and its evolution.

### **11. Terms of Reference for the IAI Strategic Plan**

The EC Chair recalled the participants that as per action 2, day 2 of the EC XXIV, a committee was established to draft the Terms of reference for the strategic planning process. The members of the



committee are Argentina, México, Panama, three SAC members and three members of the Directorate.

The IAI Director gave a background on the work of the committee. He considered that the IAI strategic plan was a very important task and represented a good opportunity to see how to fulfill the Institute's mandate better and add new components to it after almost 15 years of its conception. The committee had the purpose of defining the terms of reference for the strategic planning process. The draft document submitted to the EC (9\_ECXXV/English/November 22, 2007) is the result of e-mail exchanges between committee members on the issues. He explained that the first points after the heading "the TORs might consider the following" were the first circulated among the committee but the SAC Chair realized that some of them were already items of the Strategic plan rather than TORs for it. Therefore they developed the following first 5 points of the document:

*"the process of developing TORs should:*

- 1. engage the IAI science community and consumers of science information such as policy makers and development agencies.*
- 2. develop a funding plan to support the strategic activities.*
- 3. develop a communications plan that will service IAIs multiple audiences & prioritize communication efforts within IAI*
- 4. review IAI functions to ensure its governance is consistent with the mandate*
- 5. (possibly) review and amend as necessary the 4 science areas and develop key scientific questions that are of relevance to member countries and regional governing bodies."*

The document also presents a brief review of what the present IAI's mandate prescribes, as defined in the IAI Agreement and the declaration of Montevideo. There it says "The IAI should improve the balance amongst integrated research, development of research networks & informed actions". Integrated research and networks are an undisputed strength of the IAI. The Institute has worked in the last years in the area of informed action, but more efforts are needed there. The IAI is a unique institution in that, as an intergovernmental treaty organization, it has the political structure for promoting mitigation and adaptation to global change and, at the same time, provides the scientific foundations for that. The articulation between those two areas deserves attention in the strategic discussion.

The relation of the IAI with its member countries and its network community is a central issue that should be object of strategic analysis. The declaration gives more emphasis to affiliated and associated institutions than current practice reflects. The IAI has very few associated institutions and no affiliated institutions. For many years, there have been very few activities with the associate ones. He reported with satisfaction that CATHALAC has emerged as an active partner in our discussions about regional climate and policy implications. The TOR item might be to define goals and means for "strategic alliances".

The declaration indicates that UN Conventions be informed of the IAI's foundation. While IAI - UN relationships have developed, this is not based on a strategy. The IAI should spend some time in the strategic planning to define how the IAI as a regional intergovernmental organization should interact with these largely politically defined institutions of global reach. The IAI Director mentioned the examples of the IAI as observer to the UNFCCC and its participation in the SBSTA. The IAI can become a vehicle of formulating regional concerns within those global networks and act as a conduit of information between the global conventions and the regional scientific experience and political will.

Since the foundation of the IAI and the establishment of its mandate, scientists have witnessed a tremendous amount of developments in global change science and also in the realization of what global change is about by society at large. The Director can report from IGFA meeting that they are thinking of issues concerning the linking those institutions that deal with global change research with those that deal with development. As the Americas cover the spread of scientific and economic capacity, he thinks the issues of development and global change are crucial. The issue of adaptation and development is very critical and goes hand in hand with the reorientation of some of our mandates towards the millennium goals. Therefore, it may also be important to highlight the mitigative and adaptive capacities of the region in the context of sustainable development while considering economic development, poverty alleviation, equity, etc.

Engineering is an area missing from the science agenda, but perhaps left out for good reason. Again in the context of adaptation and mitigation, the TOR should define limits or the flexibility of limits in the IAI agenda. Maybe the IAI should find the way to participate in efforts towards the improvement of technology or the development of new technologies related to global environmental change. Medical sciences should also be taken into account.

Capacity building has received little attention in the mission statements. It is a simple issue as long as scientists or students are the target, but institutional, administrative, communication capacities are more complex issues that should be addressed in the TORs.

The Agreement establishing the IAI widely refers to the objective of promoting "regional cooperation for interdisciplinary research". This spirit of academic/scientific cooperation should be preserved. The TORs may need to address issues of science governance in member countries and international cooperation that aid science for decision making, mitigation, adaptation and development. Issues of science governance include quality control of science, scientists and science applications such as certification for consumer protection or environmental protection. Intellectual property rights have already been an issue in IAI agreements and need to be addressed as a governance issue.

#### *Comments:*

*SAC Chair:* When the SAC began the discussions about the Strategic Plan, it agreed that the mission statements were still valid and should not be opened up during the discussions. Then they concentrated in reviewing the 4 themes of the Science Agenda, which are roughly disciplinary based, and served very well during the last ten years. However, since the world has changed, perhaps those themes would not be so useful for the next decade. The SAC thinks this is an appropriate time for the IAI to review what needs to be done. It is important to have clear terms of reference since the process will be as important as the outcome.

*IAI Director:* Development agencies are looking for help and IAI has a strategic position to address some of those questions. He thinks it is crucial addition to the agenda

*EC Chair:* In the strategic planning there are some things to be avoided, for example, a long list of things to be done which may not be done because they are simply in a long list. It is necessary to know what should be done, how to do it, and a road map for it. There is also a problem of scale. The IAI Directorate has 13 people, the SAC 10 members, the EC 9 members and there are 19 Member Countries. With that reduced number of people, the IAI has to do outreach throughout the Americas. The problem is to upscale to policy makers in our countries. The evolving science agenda is a very good thing, but including huge areas such as engineering, health and

development might be risky. We should exercise the formulation of questions that may engage those issues.

*USA (Margarita Gregg):* A key point in strategic planning is how to measure success.

*Venezuela:* In Venezuela we have incorporated to the strategic planning the causes and origins of GEC. We do not disregard the search of technological solutions for environmental problems but we also consider the causes of global environmental change. A paragraph about the causes of GEC should be included. Although all of us are responsible for the improvement of our planet, responsibilities are different from the point of view of who cause global change. For the Ministry of Science and Technology, all technological knowledge related to global change is very important, but we also take into account how to transfer them to the social and political aspects they might have effects in the solutions of some of the potential problems.

*2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair:* The points regarding metrics for the evaluation of success and certainly discussion of analysis of causes are something very important because they are at the central components of good science. In the interest of good science, we certainly do not want to shy away from analysis that is done that may indicate particular causes. This Institute has always put forward the concept of high caliber science, regardless of any interests from in the political side, as showing in which direction analysis might point. One of the recent discussions in NSF was about the criteria to apply for broader impact and, within the context of IAI, that can be seen as the policy relevance portions or conditions that NSF puts upon the funding IAI provides. It is important to discuss what policy relevance is for the IAI.

*IAI Director:* I agree it is necessary to consider the causes of global change and discuss some of the activities of the IAI. For example the urban program of the IAI is relatively underdeveloped. Urban footprints in terms of global change indicators are huge, urbanization is progressing at a tremendous pace and IAI has only on urban project. I am a little worried about the question “who is responsible for global change?” because IAI could drift apart from the science. We can quantify, we can describe, we can attribute, but the set of moral dimension of the responsibility issue questions something where we would be moving to the advocacy or political action realm as an independent and hopefully neutral organization trusted by all parties.

*USA (Norman Barth):* Responsibility is a very big word. In some sense we already know the answer: greenhouse gases. We need extreme precision as to what is the context in which the world responsibility is being used. Otherwise, this could go in any number of directions. Some of them could be beneficial for IAI as an organization but others might not be.

*Mexico:* We should define the strategic planning process in the first place and, secondly, deal with its substance; what has to be done, what as been done, etc. Professionals can be hired for this job. The *EC Chair* agreed that external help was needed.

*IAI Director:* In the current budget there is no money for that process, it is 99 % committed. In other words, if the IAI is to embark on a process with external help, fund raising would be necessary.

*Canada:* In the discussion of strategic planning I would urge this Committee to think of cross cutting issues. One such example is data. All research requires data, all science requires data. We all know the explosion of data that we are experiencing now. It is a question of access to data but also using the data. IAI can create initiatives to help researchers and decision makers to access and use the data in a friendly format. In Canada there is an impact and adaptation group and convert models from around the world in a common format that people can download easily. Other

related initiative is the development of internet tools like Google Earth that is free and has many applications. All researchers need data and all data needs download. We are at a point where an old paradigm is giving way to a new one. These kinds of tools will facilitate integration.

*SAC Chair:* We have already taken a large number of steps. We are not starting from nothing The AAAS review provides some of the insights we need. I think it is appropriate not to underestimate the size of the challenge, but a lot has been done. It has not to be a discrete, separate activity. In February there will be a meeting of the PIs of CRN-II and SGP-HD programs in Panama. Could we reserve some time to get their input on some of the important questions that should be addressed? That is a starting point. These questions are very important to change the way in which the IAI operates. And regarding the main question “*relevant for whom?*”, the Members States are the first place to start. Why can we not profit from the CRN clusters meetings and ask them about the relevant questions? Setting the relevant questions from the outset is critical. It is a big task but it is manageable.

*USA (Lou Brown):* the objective of this document is not clear to me. I think we need to define what we want to achieve and then to find a way. The document has a lot of valuable information, but the EC should only concentrate in the first couple of paragraphs: do we want a strategic plan, do we want a work plan, a mission statement, a road map, and then define the process. I suggest stopping the discussion temporarily so that people can talk about this issue amongst themselves later in the afternoon and resume the discussion tomorrow.

The IAI Director clarified that the document was not very structured because it was the result of e-mail exchanges only. It is not by any means an authoritative document. It has served its purpose already in that stimulated discussion. Maybe we are already in a position to ask these questions:

Why do we want a regional organization to look at global change science?

What makes us special as a regional organization?

Why do we want to develop a science policy interface? What is the purpose of it?

Informed action is one of the key words, but what does it mean in practice and how do we put in into practice?

Maybe these small steps are issues that can be discussed in the small group suggested by USA and then have a more structured discussion afterwards.

The EC decided to continue with the discussion on the Terms of Reference for the Strategic Plan on the following day. A group composed of the EC Chair, Argentina, Mexico, Panama, the SAC Chair, and the IAI Director would meet at the end of the session to plan the discussion. (*Action 3, Day 1*)

On the morning session of Day 2, the EC reassumed its deliberations about the TORs.

The EC Chair explained that the group decided to consider the following material for the discussion:

- The five bullets of the draft TORs document;
- The recommendations of the External Review Committee (pages 2-4 of the report);
- Some brochures from NSF strategic plan.

The method followed was to compare the five bullets of the draft TOR document with the recommendations of the Review Committee to check if all recommendations were covered in the bullets. Bullet 6 on capacity building was added to the list. Then they read the recommendations for each of the areas defined in the AAAS report (science & research programs, capacity building,

funding, operations & governance and communications & dialogue) in order to discuss about them and define what kind of outcome was expected for it (e.g. brief document, paragraph)

### 1) Science and Research program

After a brief discussion, the EC members agreed that bullet 5 in the draft EC document (corresponding to science and research program) should read: *Develop themes and key questions concerning science and societal need on GEC, basically considering connectivity between areas and maintaining the standard of scientific excellence* (the words missing were to be completed by the strategic planning committee). The product would be a document of about 2 pages.

### 2) Capacity building

The outcome should be a document describing scope, goals, and ways of implementation of the IAI's capacity building program.

### 3) Communications and dialogue

The IAI Director explained that this includes three critical points:

1) Define which is the role of the Member Countries in the process of dissemination and communication. How do we engage Member Countries (not regarding money, but regarding mechanisms by which the IAI can diffuse knowledge more effectively)?

2) Synthesis of the IAI science – In CRN I it was on a postmortem basis, in CRN II, it is part of the research process. However, there is not a strategic direction on how far the IAI is engaged and how it will engage in that kind of synthesis activity. That has nothing to do with member countries. It is a scientific process. In a way, that scientific process sets the IAI apart any other funding agency that funds projects, receives the results and funds more projects. The IAI is engaged in structuring the assemblage of these projects and try a synthetic step that goes beyond it. That is written down nowhere.

3) The feedback, from the science evaluation and synthesis to the renewal of the science agenda and to the engagement of the member countries. How do we influence science governance through the synthesis process?

*Argentina:* I agree that the process of synthesis is essential for communications in the political level and in decision making. However, it is not the only process of communication with decision making. In this point I would include something about the relation between science and policy as a fundamental communication towards which the IAI has to orient its action.

*EC Chair:* I suggest having the opinion of extended audiences. They have to be consulted.

*IAI Director:* My suggestion is to make a core strategic plan. One part of this document has to be "How do we make this a living document?". If we want to do it very broad it will be very complex. I prefer a core document although imperfect.

*USA (Margarita Gregg):* I suggest forming a core team to prepare a draft. That draft is sent out to the EC, the CoP, and everybody else you decide in order to engage them in the document. They will provide comments that will be evaluated by the core team --to put them into a plan that is coherent and that is still within the vision of the IAI and has some kind of boundaries. Once the process is in place, you can make updates every 3 or 5 years.

*EC Chair:* We need to make the effort of sending questionnaires to an extended audience. We have to ask the community what they think about the activities of the IAI.

*IAI Director:* The suggestion of USA is very good, a draft that is circulated and then enriched with the comments of the EC and CoP members. As to the questionnaires, we have made science priorities questionnaires before. We have also been approached by IDRC and DFID to participate in their polling process (including industries, NGOs, scientists, etc.) across the continent.

*Canada:* I would like to share an outreach experience we are starting in Canada. One way to reach general public is through the media. I talked to a science journalist from the Toronto Star who recommended including a regular column in the website, written by researchers with the help of professional science writers. It is not something very expensive. The biggest challenge is to identify scientists willing to work with professional writers. We are going to implement a pilot plan of 6-8 articles with the Toronto Star on their website. Communication is vital to all of us. We have to communicate what we do to the public. Politicians react to the public not to us. It is in our duty to do so.

*EC Chair:* Then the output would be a document including analysis of surveys and also a road map so that communications can lead to other levels.

#### 4) Operations and governance

*EC Chair:* The main points under this title are the development of metrics, the strategic alliances with other organizations, a balance of scientific peer review and potentially other considerations for the development of projects and programs and finally the assessment of all this work.

#### 5) Funding:

*USA (Margarita Gregg):* It is during the implementation plan that you do start looking at things like funding. I think what you really have to do is to define what the strategy would be in order to approach a funding issue without going into the specifics of funding right now.

*EC Chair:* Therefore the output would be a document with guidelines of strategies for funding.

*USA (Vanessa Richardson):* The TORs document should basically include a purpose, the membership, some milestones and a timeline in order to have a draft for the next EC.

*Panama:* The committee in charge of the editing of the draft strategic plan should meet as soon as possible in order to have a draft for the next meeting.

*USA (Lou Brown):* I would like to second recommendation and I suggest that the group meet briefly here before leaving Washington in order to select a chair.

*EC Chair* suggested a timeline: progress report for EC/CoP Buenos Aires (June 2008) and final document for CoP 16 (a year and a half from now)

*IAI Director:* It is feasible to prepare a document for the next cop in 6 months from now so that we can re assume this discussion with more foundation. The Chair of the TOR committee was selected by acclamation by e-mail and it fell on me. If we decide to meet personally we will have to find additional funding.

## 12. EC-SAC Joint Session on IAI Strategic Planning

Before starting the discussion about strategic planning, the representative of Canada, Charles A. Lin, gave a brief presentation on data integration. He emphasized the importance of data as a crosscutting theme for science and gave several examples of data integration using Internet (presentation available at IAI webpage, meetings section).

The EC Chair made a brief summary of the discussions of the EC on strategic planning (see item 10).

Then the SAC Chair reported on the discussions of the SAC. He highlighted the following points:

When the SAC met in June 2006 made a short document called “Initiating a process to charge IAI future science agenda” and it had been distributed in the past to EC and CoP. At that time, the SAC came up with a number of recurrent themes that seemed to need attention (he mentioned this document because it could help to frame the questions):

- IAI’s primary product is credible science
- Improving our understanding of adaptation by socio-ecological systems to global environmental change
- Enhancing synergism amongst projects as part of a transition towards and integrated program of research for IAI
- Communications
- Establishing stronger links and partnerships with member states.

The concluding statement in that document sets the stage for why it is necessary to engage into this process in a couple of senses:

- Environmental degradation is a current issue in many parts of the Americas
- IAI is making significant contributions in understanding degradation processes
- Credibility of science places the institution in a position of strength

This was previous to the AAAS report. But the last two sentences are: “There has been an increase in environmental degradation since the IAI inception in 1992. Our expectations that IAI science gains policy relevance are also expected to increase. There is an urgent need to revise IAI’s science contributions, and, most importantly, there is an urgent need to start a complete planning process that would guide IAI in the next decades.”

The SAC Chair emphasized that science is the premier asset of this institution and we need to fit IAI science in a re-shaped world.

Finally, he made some comments regarding the EC deliberations on the Strategic plan:

- Strategic planning is a joint process between all IAI organs
- The SAC has looked at the mission statement for the IAI which includes 3 areas (integrated impacts, collaboration and informed action). The SAC recommended not opening it up for discussion in the strategic plan for now.
- Strategic plan needs to be inspired by the old science agenda but expanded to include several cross cutting themes. The SAC is very keen to promote this idea of cross cutting themes that bring to bear the various themes that are already in the IAI science Agenda

From his presentation of the day before, he suggested a number of themes that should be present in the discussion for the Strategic Planning:

- A better balance across the 3 IAI areas
- Consistent with resources vs new resources
- Enhancing collaborations with other GEC programs (for example take into account ESSP strategy)
- Proactive communications plan
- Shared process across all the IAI organs

He also pointed out that among the five points that the EC deliberated on (science & research, capacity building, communications & dialogue, operations & governance and funding) there was no reference to societal relevance of science. One of the things that came up clear from the AAAS review was how we make science more socially relevant (not only the science-policy interface)

He also said the SAC expected to produce a brief document with statements for the IAI Strategic plan during their meeting in Washington DC.

*Comments:*

*EC Chair:* Societal relevance is included in “communications and dialogue” because it includes the feedback from society, a synthesis for policy-makers, etc. The first step in this area would be an analysis of polls and surveys carried out by different institutions in collaboration with the IAI.

*SAC Chair:* expressed concern about confining society relevance into communications. We are talking of how to integrate a wider group of agencies into GEC science. It is not only about how we communicate science. It is a different type of partnership.

*IAI Director:* Under Communications and Dialogue strategy there should also be an engagement of stakeholders which to some degree takes care of joint planning. In practical terms, if we look at the NSF strategic plan, we can highlight societal reference in a separate section. We should also have in mind the idea of changing the way of doing business. These points are not in conflict and we can handle them.

*EC Chair:* The SAC is going to find the cross cutting themes, then we would need a document with a set of the cross cutting themes.

*SAC Chair:* The SAC is not proposing a document with the crosscutting themes right now. After six months, perhaps we will have a draft discussion document with them. They will have to be discussed at the SAC and EC and CoP meetings to receive some feedback. The SAC will be delighted to prepare it always bearing in mind it is a joint activity.

*IAI Director:* We need to find out in what portion we have permanent rules or principles that govern the IAI, and in what format are we presenting currently important themes and modes of procedure

*EC Chair:* The strategic plan is something that evolves. It can be revised as necessary. Therefore, two documents will be required, one on mechanisms and the other on cross cutting themes.

The EC Chair then asked the SAC for its opinion about broadening the scope of capacity building to high and elementary school (the IAI Agreement refers mainly to professionals).



The SAC members agreed that improving the capacity of high school teachers was a very important factor since they are multipliers and mentioned several examples of tools on the web (modules, slides, etc. in UCAR, NOAA, NASA, etc.)

Argentina said that perhaps the IAI could translate some of the materials that are not available in Spanish and Portuguese.

After that, the EC and the SAC members discussed about the drafting of the strategic plan and the timeline

*SAC Chair:* The EC has identified five areas and the SAC is going to have something similar. It is very important that the TORs committee receive this input and work on it. It has to be a joint partnership between the SAC, the EC and the Directorate. I suggest that the Committee have the TORs in a month so that the draft the strategic plan can be ready within 6 months.

Argentina suggested distributing the TORs before the end of the year inviting volunteers for the strategic plan drafting group.

El EC decided that the Committee in charge of writing the TORs for the Strategic Planning (composed of Argentina, Mexico, Panama, the SAC Chair and the IAI Director) will take into account the input from EC and SAC and finish the TORs by December 20. The document will be circulated to EC, SAC and CoP members (*Action 1, Day 2*).

The EC and SAC members decided to establish the group responsible for writing the strategic plan at that moment. The SAC Chair offered to participate in the group with other two members of the SAC. He would have the confirmation for middle January. Paul Filmer and Margarita Gregg will be the representatives of the US. Argentina, Mexico and Panama accepted to continue in the group.

The EC Chair suggested that the IAI Director not be the Chair of the Group in order to spread responsibility.

The EC established a group to write the IAI Strategic Planning. This group is composed of: Argentina, Mexico, Panama, USA (Margarita Gregg and Paul Filmer), the SAC chair plus 2 SAC members, and the IAI Director. (*Action 2, Day 2*)

The EC seconded the proposal of Panama that the Group in charge of writing the IAI Strategic Planning meet as soon as possible. (*Action 3, Day 2*)

*Dominican Republic:* We are in debt with the IAI. We would like to host the meeting of the writing group. We have bilingual experts on strategic planning that will be delighted to cooperate with this process.

The EC Chair thanked Dominican Republic for its offer.

Dominican Republic offered to host the meeting of the Group in charge of writing the IAI Strategic Planning. The meeting will be tentatively on 17-19 February 2008.(*Action 4, Day 2*)

### **13. Approval of Items to be forwarded to the CoP**

The EC will inform the CoP of the Terms of Reference for the IAI Strategic Planning and of the FAC charter and membership. (*Action 6, Day 2*)

#### **14. Future sites and meetings**

Argentina confirmed its offer to host the next EC and CoP meetings in Buenos Aires, on June, 2008. (*Action 7, Day 2*)

#### **15. Adjournment**

The EC Chair and the delegates thanked USA for hosting the meeting. She also thanked the IAI Directorate, the IAI Secretariat, and the interpreters for their work. The meeting was adjourned.

**25th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council  
November 28-29, 2007, Arlington, VA, USA**

**Action List**

**Day 1: November 28**

1. The EC approved the Agenda of its Twenty Fifth Meeting with the following modifications: 1) there would be a welcome speech from Dr Harlan Watson (US Department of State) and Dr Arden Bement (Director, NSF); 2) the report of the SAC Chair would be presented before lunch, immediately after the IAI Directorate report and; 3) the FAC report would be presented by William Smith instead of Louis Grittani.
2. The EC approved the Report of its Twenty Fourth Meeting with some minor modifications already communicated to the IAI Secretariat.
3. The EC decided to continue with the discussion on the Terms of Reference for the Strategic Plan on the following day. A group composed of the EC Chair, Argentina, Mexico, Panama, the SAC Chair, and the IAI Director would meet at the end of the session to plan the discussion.
4. The EC approved the FAC charter for two additional years (until January 2010). Brazil, Canada and USA will continue as member of the FAC.
5. The EC decided that the ad hoc Committee established to solve the problem of quorum for the Conference of the Parties will send a report with possible solutions in time for distribution to Member Countries to permit a decision at the next EC/CoP meeting.

**25th Meeting of the IAI Executive Council  
November 28-29, 2007, Arlington, VA, USA**

**Action List**

**Day 2: November 29**

1. The EC decided that the Committee in charge of writing the TORs for the Strategic Planning (composed of Argentina, Mexico, Panama, the SAC Chair and the IAI Director) will take into account the input from EC and SAC and finish the TORs by December 20. The document will be circulated to EC, SAC and CoP members.
2. The EC established a group to write the IAI Strategic Planning. This group is composed of: Argentina, Mexico, Panama, USA (Margarita Gregg and Paul Filmer), the SAC chair plus 2 SAC members, and the IAI Director.
3. The EC seconded the proposal of Panama that the Group in charge of writing the IAI Strategic Planning meet as soon as possible.
4. Dominican Republic offered to host the meeting of the Group in charge of writing the IAI Strategic Planning. The meeting will be tentatively on 17-19 February 2008.
5. The EC received the Financial Statements as of June 30, 2007
6. The EC will inform the CoP of the Terms of Reference for the IAI Strategic Planning and of the FAC charter and membership.
7. Argentina confirmed its offer to host the next EC and CoP meetings in Buenos Aires, on June, 2008.

**ACRONYMS**

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
AIACC	Assessments of Impacts and Adaptations to Climate Change in Multiple Regions and Sectors
ANAM	Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente (Panama)
APN	The Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research
CATHALAC	Centro del Agua del Trópico Húmedo para América Latina y el Caribe
CCSP	Climate Change Science Program (US)
CODATA	Committee on Data for Science and Technology
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CPTEC/INPE	Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos / Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais
CRN	Collaborative Research Network Program
CYTED	Programa iberoamericano de Ciencia y Tecnología para el Desarrollo
DAAD	German Academic Exchange Service
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DIS	Data and Information System
EC	Executive Council
ESSP	Earth System Science Partnership
EU	European Union
FAC	Financial and Administrative Committee (of the EC)
FAO	Financial and Administrative Officer
GBIF	Global Biodiversity Information Facility
GEC	Global Environmental Change
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GEOSS	Global Earth Observation System of Systems
ICSU	International Council for Science
IDRC	International Development Research Center
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme
IGFA	International Group of Funding Agencies
IHDP	International Human Dimensions Programme
IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura

INE	Instituto Nacional de Ecología (Mexico)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LBA	Large Scale Biosphere- Atmosphere Experiment in the Amazonia
LPB	La Plata Basin
NCAR	National Center for Atmospheric Research (USA)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NOAA/OGP	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Organization/Office for Global Programs (USA)
NSF	National Science Foundation
OAS	Organization of American States
OTCA	Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PI	Principal Investigator
RIOCC	Red Iberoamericana de Oficinas de Cambio Climático (Spain)
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
SCRP	Standing Committee for Rules and Procedures (of the CoP)
SENAMHI	Servicio Nacional de Meteorología e Hidrología (Perú)
SGP - HD	Small Grants Program – Human Dimensions
SO	Scientific Officer
START	System for Analysis, Research and Training
TI	Training Institute
TISG	Training Institute Seed Grant
TO	Training Officer
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
UN-ISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
WCRP	World Climate Research Program
WMO	World Meteorological Organization