33rd Meeting of the ICSU Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR)

ICSU Secretariat,
Paris, France, 10 -11 April 2017

REPORT

Attendees: CSPR Members: Jinghai Li (Chair), Tom Beer, Nina Buchmann, Valéria Csepe, Chad Gaffield, Maria Guzman, Fumiko Kasuga, Stewart Lockie, Muhammad Saidam, Oyewale Tomori, Martin Visbeck, David Black (ex officio), Heide Hackmann (ex officio), Daya Reddy (ex officio). Invited Guests: ISSC Representatives (Carolina E. Adler, ETH-Zurich, and Mathieu Denis, ISSC Executive Director; and Sarah Moore, ISSC Secretariat) and Chairs of Regional Commissions (Lourdes J. Cruz, and Juan A. Jaen). ICSU Secretariat: Lucilla Spini (Head of Science Programmes), Charles Ebikeme (Science Officer), Katsia Paulavets (Science Officer), Anne-Sophie Stevance (Science Officer), and Maureen Brennan (Administrative Officer).

Regrets received: from CSPR Members: Enrico Brugnoli, Mark Ferguson, Dinakar Salunke; from Invited Guests: Babatunde Samuel Agbola.

1. Opening of the Meeting and Welcoming Remarks
   Li Jinghai and Heide Hackmann

The meeting was opened by the CSPR Chair by welcoming the CSPR Members and the invited participants. He highlighted that this must be a happy meeting and very special one as it is the first time to invite the Regional Commissions Chairs. The ICSU Executive Director also welcomed the CSPR, and acknowledged the work of the Secretariat as well as that of the CSPR Chair, given his roles in the transition/merger processes including within the Transition Task Force. Given the participation of invited guests – as follow up to the decision at the last CSPR meeting - all participants were asked to introduce themselves.

2. Adoption of the Agenda
   Li Jinghai

The Committee adopted the agenda without any modifications.

   Decision:
   The CSPR adopted the agenda.

3. Decisions of the 32nd CSPR Meeting, and 117th Executive Board Meeting
   Li Jinghai

The report of the 32nd CSPR meeting has been approved and made publicly available on the ICSU website. The decisions of the 117th Executive Board meeting have also been approved. These documents are provided here for information. This was the opportunity also to recall the importance of the conflict of interest policy. The CSPR took note of the reports and of the importance of conflict of interest policy.

The ICSU Executive Director took this opportunity to highlight that the French Government has granted the continued use of the premises as well as a small financial contribution. Clarifications were also
sought on why the French contributions were cut, and it was highlighted that this was a result of “confusion” related to the disbursement of the funds to ICSU and to the French Academy.

**Decision:**
The CSPR took note of the reports and of the importance of the conflict of interest policy.

### 4. General Assembly
*Heide Hackmann and Charles Erkelens*

An update was provided on the planning and organization of the General Assembly by ICSU Executive Director and Operations Director by highlighting that the programme includes a Science Day which is organized by the host academy in line with the 1992 Resolution concerning ICSU/Taipei relationship, half-day for Members’ Fora, and one-and-half-day is devoted to ICSU GA, prior to the joint ICSU/ISSC meeting. This was the opportunity to confirm that CSPR members can attend the ICSU GA (with the exception of the EB Meeting) as observer at their own expenses; and that they can also attend the Science Day upon invitation by the host academy. In this context, it was suggested to switch the GA agenda around to ensure that the discussion about the merger comes before the reporting – as done for this meeting of the CSPR.

**Decision:**
CSPR took note of the Draft Agenda and Programme (also suggesting to switch the GA agenda around), and the opportunity for CSPR members to attend ICSU business meetings (with exception of EB Meeting) as observer at their own expenses, and to attend the Science Day upon invitation by host Academy, at their own expenses.

### 5. Update on the Transition Task Force (TTF)
*Li Jinghai and Charles Erkelens*

The ICSU Executive Director provided an introductory update on the merger process to date, by recalling the steps since the establishment of the Joint Working Group, the Extraordinary GA, the TTF and the SWG. Furthermore the ICSU Operations Director provided an overview of the structure and mandate of TTF, also by highlighting its focus on statutes, finances, and secretariat’s structure. It was emphasised that the draft Statutes are now being reviewed and discussed within TTF (hence the draft cannot be distributed yet), two HR consultants have been hired to work on the Secretariat’s structure, and French lawyers are assisting on the legal frameworks related to the merger of two French organizations. The CSPR was also informed that the TTF will have another meeting at the beginning of June, so as to have all the outputs ready before July in order to allow time for distributing the information to the membership.

Clarifications were sought on the content related to the merger processes, and to the expected final legal entity of the new organization with respect to implications related to the members’ fees/dues and voting rights. In this context, it was highlighted that according to French law there is no difference between creating a new organization (by dissolving both organizations) or absorbing one into the other: in both cases all the members will automatically become members of the ensuing structure. On the other hand, it was emphasised that for members, the joining of a new entity may cause concerns related to legal/administrative issues related to budgeting and disbursing fees.

The discussion highlighted (i) the importance of taking into account the literature on research around merger processes; (ii) the very tight time-frame given that the process needs to be completed; (ii) building the new organizations taking into account what we value, and the strengths of, both ICSU and ISSC; and (iii) the importance of clarifying the requirements for membership in the new organization and of creating a more agile structure for the new organization. Furthermore, clarifications were requested on the future of this Committee.
In this context, the Executive Director took the opportunity to inform that this process was accompanied by a study by the ISSC Secretariat on the structures and statutes of other related organizations, in order to set out all the options concerning operations and governance. But completion of this work is bound to the finalization of the strategy.

The Secretary General highlighted that it is important to focus on getting the 2/3 majority of votes by the members. In order not to fail in this process, it is considered prudent to keep the Statutes as simple as possible to avoid recurrent revisions. He further noted that the SWG has confirmed that there should be committees of the type of CSPR and CFRS, but final set-up will depend on the strategy. It was emphasised that the Terms of References (ToRs) for these committees are not part of the Statutes, but of Rules of Procedures which will be drafted and agreed later on in the process. The Executive Director clarified that if the vote is positive, there will be the need to define an Implementation Plan towards operationalizing the merger. It was highlighted that interim arrangement for this Committee (CSPR), i.e., extension of its current mandate, may also be required.

The discussion also suggested that the Secretariat should have a more active role in contacting and talking to members so as to have a more efficient conversation in October 2017. Here the CSPR was informed that there is a Communication Team working on this process, that there may be webinars on the subject, and that Regional Offices are also convening meetings to discuss with members at the Regional level. The Executive Director further emphasised that all processes are committed to full transparency.

Given the disjuncture between workload and urgency, it was also suggested that even if the CSPR has been placed in a holding-pattern, there could be still time to utilize the CSPR Members also for talking to ICSU Members (of course without overstepping the Secretariat and TTF/SWG). The ISSC Director welcomed CSPR advice on all the outputs. In concluding this agenda item, the importance of successfully realising the merger was underlined by the CSPR Chair. CSPR members expressed, that they have been and still stand ready to support the ICSU EB and SWG by providing comments and suggestions on drafts of the merger documents. In particular it was recommended that an additional document which is in a more tabular form comparing statutes, missions and goals could be helpful to show that the new council is not radically different from what exists already.


Marlene Kanga, President-Elect, WFEO

Marlene Kanga, President-Elect of WFEO, presented WFEO structure and activities (see ANNEX 1) and highlighted that during her presidency, she commits to work more with ICSU. The CSPR welcomed the presentation and took the opportunity to ask clarifications concerning activities, structure and governance of WFEO. The CSPR highlighted the importance of linking WFEO with ICSU, with a focus on SDGs, gender, and disaster risk reduction - also highlighting that ICSU bodies (e.g., UHW, Future Earth) and members have interests in engineering.

Decision:
CSPR welcomed the importance for further linkages between ICSU and WFEO, also within the context of the strategic-planning and merger processes.

7. Invited presentation - Nuclear Clean Up: proposal for a new initiative

Bernd Grambow (SUBATECH, Ecole des Mines, Nantes)

The proposal to establish a scoping committee to consider a new international initiative on nuclear clean-up science was presented to the CSPR, also to gather their views and recommendations, in view of upcoming presentation of the new initiative to the EB. Bernd Grambow acknowledged the opportunity to give the presentation to the CSPR. The focus of the committee would be on the current lack of coordination among
related research processes/components that appears to be preventing comprehensive nuclear clean-up science. The presentation is provided in ANNEX 2.

The CSPR expressed its appreciation of the importance of this topic. At the same time, members suggested that further attention in this initiative on the connections between and among the different research processes/components. Such connections are an example of activities in which ICSU should/can be involved; moreover, they are at the heart of the broader theme concerning nuclear energy - as each country (e.g., Jordan, Japan, Germany and France) has a different perspective and debate on the issue. The CSPR discussed the important role of the scientific community in addressing these issues and identified that there are coordination gaps also at different scales.

It was emphasised that the potential role of the scientific community in this initiative must include the full spectrum of perspectives including science/industry and science/society interfaces - and they should not be included just in the role of “rescue team”. It was noted that at the present time, the lack of coordination of the scientific community does not offer opportunities for interrelating multiple interpretations of relevant data (e.g. differences in ensuing mortality rates in affected populations; differences in life expectancy upon exposure) sometimes leading to confusion in decision/policy-making. In particular, the important role of the social sciences was highlighted. In addition to “communication/perception studies” at the findings stage, the social sciences should be integrated from the beginning by focusing on – inter alia – problem-framing, regulatory frameworks, behavioural and cultural dimensions, gender-lens issues, and the interpretation of measurements.

In the same way, the CSPR also recommended the importance of furthering engaging stakeholders – including the IAEA – at the beginning of this process and not at the end, also to avoid duplication of efforts. The idea of convening a workshop to identify current processes – including ongoing advisory mechanisms - was also suggested to further define the needs for this initiative and to clarify the ICSU role (e.g., also vis-à-vis IAEA).

This was also the opportunity for CSPR to be informed of relevant activities of the Science Council of Japan (SCJ) by CSPR Member Fumiko Kasuga who serves also as the Chairperson of the SCJ Health Management Committee established after the Fukushima accidents. Taking into account SCJ ongoing work on clean-up science (also in collaboration with scientists from other countries), she highlighted that among the lessons-learnt is the importance of taking one step at the time – i.e., ensuring collaboration among scientists first and then fostering collaboration/engagements with other stakeholders – given the difficulties posed by this type of research.

It was confirmed that this was a very important issue that will be discussed by the ICSU EB at its next meeting, also taking account the discussion/recommendations by the CSPR on this proposal. This was also the opportunity for the CSPR to recall that ICSU – or the new organization – cannot do everything, and that prioritization is required within the context of the discussion of the strategic plan; mechanisms for the initiation of new programmes should be developed, and then individual proposals should be reviewed.

Decision
CSPR welcomed the proposal for a joint scoping committee (ICSU, IAEA, etc.) and agreed to recommend further thought on stakeholder engagement also through consultation and review of current landscape.

8. Update on the ICSU- ISSC Strategy Working Group (SWG)
Li Jinghai and Heide Hackmann

The ICSU Executive Director presented an update on the process towards developing a new strategy informing the CSPR of the SWG Meeting and Workshop held in January 2017. It was highlighted that the workshop was facilitated by the consultant Andy Martin (FireTail) who has also conducted the previous consultations/survey and that the earlier consultation, also with CSPR, has been taken into account. Upon reporting on the actions ensuing from SWG Meeting and Workshop, the Executive Director illustrated the
rationale, context and main goals of the draft strategy “Advancing science as a global public good”, as well as the membership consultation process towards finalizing the high-level strategy for a new, merged organization. This was also the opportunity for her to report on possible developments concerning agenda-setting, regional presence and activity-framework (instruments and mechanism), also given ongoing work of TTF. It was also emphasised that the annex (as it stands) need to be furthered, by identifying the actual role of ICSU vis-à-vis co-sponsored programmes (this is also an issue related to the capacity of the Secretariat).

It was clarified that this document is a high level framework, and that an implementation plan will be developed subsequently. Concerning the timeline, it was noted that feedback from members will have to be submitted by 15 May 2017 so as to feed into the SWG Meeting to be held on 30-31 May 2017, and to the TTF Meeting on 1-2 June 2017, and the Joint Meeting of the ICSU and ISSC Boards.

9. Open discussion – draft strategy and next steps
Heide Hackmann

Following the update on the development of strategy document, the CSPR was invited to provide comments and provided the following comments/suggestions:

General comments on process and procedures:
1. CSPR respects the decisions in Oslo, but nevertheless some members felt excluded from the process and this should be conveyed to the EB, as the CSPR was not utilized as it could have done, and that the work by CSPR at its past meetings on strategic planning was ignored in the final text.
2. The importance of situating the document in the ongoing journey towards further collaboration/cooperation between ICSU and ISSC, and towards a successful outcome of the merger processes.

Specific comments on the text and structure:
3. The definition of science should be included in the main text (and not as a footnote) and it should further take into account a comprehensive definition (taking into account the perspective of different languages). In this context, “science” needs to be codified in the entire document.
4. Need to further streamline the document - in the same simple and structured way of the presentation by the ICSU Executive Director. At the moment, it is leading without conclusions.
5. The role of the Annex needs to be clarified.
6. The terms “transdisciplinary” needs to be defined further; also to be clarified with respect to the membership of the new organization – would the membership include non-academic stakeholders? or would the organization work on capacity-building for the academic community to conduct more transdisciplinary science? It needs to be clarified whether the membership is academic or transdisciplinary. Here it was noted that “transdisciplinary” was called for at the last Unions Meeting; while the ICSU review encouraged the use of “pluridisciplinary”.
7. The issue of partnership needs to be further addressed, as it is currently missing from the document: this is important for ongoing partnerships with IAP, UNESCO, and possibly WFEO, and especially if, for instance, we consider to engage private sector companies as partners. It was suggested that partnership could appear in section 2.
8. The core values’ point on “environmental sustainability” should encompass all the dimensions of sustainability – as done for the studies of “sustainability” of the science (e.g., in Germany and Switzerland).
9. There is no reference to “global environmental change” (only to systems); nor to digital media.
10. There should be reference also to the fact that science also encompasses the study of policy (science on policy / science on governance).
11. The section on benefits for members is thin and could be strengthened by mentioning aspects such as: facilitates reviews of integrated science programmes, provides access to UN science advice, and provides an international platform to discuss and advance issues of concern to members.

This was also the opportunity to provide clarifications on how priorities and initiatives are decided within ICSU (also with respect to processes of ISSC in which the GA identified priorities). It was acknowledged
that there is not a standard procedure for defining new priorities and/or new initiatives (IBs, Campaigns, and Networks), and reference was made to foresight exercises, to individuals’ proposals, proposals by Unions and/or members, as well as to the role of the Secretariat in facilitating opportunities/proposals. Here, the importance of furthering communications between Members, CSPR and IBs/Initiatives was called for, as well as the importance of identifying criteria for the establishment of new initiatives/priorities (without creating lengthy procedures).

**Decision:**
CSPR agreed in providing the inputs and recommendations on the strategy document (as above).

10. Agenda 2030/SDGs – updates & brainstorming
10.1. – ICSU current and future role in Agenda 2030 and other related international frameworks

*Lucilla Spini*

An excellent overview of 2016 achievements and current developments related to ICSU work within the framework of Agenda 2030 was provided by the Head of Science Programmes, also to highlight ICSU recognition in UN documents and reports, and to acknowledge the work done by CSPR Members within the framework of the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and the Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR). The ensuing discussion highlighted the importance of being proactive at HLPF, also to be engaged at the national level, and the fact that many individuals/organizations with UN fora refers to ICSU as a key stakeholder in these processes.

10.2. – ICSU Report on Interactions across the Sustainable Development Goals

*Anne-Sophie Stevance*

Science Officer, Anne-Sophie Stevance reported on ICSU work on the report on interactions across the Sustainable Development Goals as part of its on-going involvement in the UN-led process to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Building on the 2015 report assessing the SDG targets, this work seeks to make the case for the importance of identifying and understanding how the 17 goals and 169 targets interact with each other to support an effective implementation of the SDGs and achieve the desired outcomes across the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The report is aimed as a tool for policy-makers in identifying and managing synergies and trade-offs and promoting an integrated approach to the implementation of the SDGs that minimizes negative outcomes. The report presents a framework consisting of a seven-point scale that characterizes the range of positive and negative interactions that can occur between targets and goals, from one goal counteracting or even cancelling another to one creating the conditions or even being indispensable to the achievement of another. The scale is supplemented by a set of important dimensions that influence the nature and strength of the interactions (geography, governance, technology, time sensitivity). The framework was initially published in June 2016 as an ICSU working paper accompanied by a commentary in Nature by Nilsson et al. The report also presents a detailed analysis of key interactions of four goals (SDG2 on food, nutrition and sustainable development, SDG3 on health and well-being, SDG7 on energy, SDG14 on oceans) with all the other goals. For each of the four goals, key interactions at goal and target level are identified, characterized using the scale, a few regional and country examples are provided to illustrate how the interactions play out in particular contexts, policy options are identified to manage the potential synergies and trade-offs, and knowledge gaps are identified. The report brings together 22 scientists from 8 different research institutions: the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS), the Kiel based Future Ocean cluster, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development (IRD), the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Monash University, the New Zealand Centre for Sustainable Cities, and the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI).

The ensuing discussion highlighted the importance of the theme of SDG integration within the context of the merger; and that the report could be used as a contribution (to “give-back”) to our membership also to assist them towards the implementation of SDGs at the national/local levels. The CSPR was also informed that there will be a campaign towards the dissemination of this report, also via organization of a
series of events and opportunities at, *inter alia*, the STI Forum, the UN Ocean conference and the High Level Political Forum.

10.3. – Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR)  
*Muhammad Saidam*

Following the High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development in 2016, Members States have agreed to issue the report every four years. Member States also requested the creation of an independent group of scientists to draft the quadrennial Global Sustainable Development Report. The independent group of scientists comprises 15 experts, appointed by the Secretary-General in December 2016 (see [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/globalsdreport/2019](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/globalsdreport/2019)). A first meeting of the experts was held in February 2017. An update on progress – including opportunities towards linking the ICSU community to the GSDR 2019 edition – was provided by CSPR Member M. Saidam, a member of the 15 Independent Group of Scientists. He emphasised that the upcoming report will be written by the 15 Independent Group of Scientists and supported by a UN Staff Task Team and thus will have a different approach and language. He informed the CSPR that the preparation of the report will involve an initial phase of receiving inputs and analysis, followed by a synthesis and write-up, and a review process. In this context, a briefing document was tabled at the meeting, so as to highlight upcoming milestones in the process. It was also noted that in the First Meeting of the UN Independent Group of Scientists – 2019 GSDR, ICSU key role was mentioned by several participants. The second meeting for this process will be organized so as to enable interaction with the HLPF scheduled for July 2017. M. Saidam will keep the CSPR and Secretariat informed of further developments.

10.4. – IAP Project on SDGs  
*Li Jinghai and Muhammad Saidam*

An update was provided on recent meetings and developments on the IAP Project on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The CSPR Chair, who is also a Co-Chair for this project, highlighted that after two meetings (one in New York and one in Paris), the project agreed to focus on the national academies’ engagement in the SDGs at national level. The CSPR was also informed of a survey conducted in this context, highlighting that the awareness of SDGs in science academies is very low, and of a mapping of science advice in the UN. It was noted that at the last project meeting in Paris, the ICSU Executive Director was present and gave an excellent presentation. Here, ICSU President-Elect took the opportunity also to update on the sister-project conducted by IAP on African challenges as this has also linkages to the SDGs, in order to raise the issue on how to link this project to ICSU (e.g., via Regional Office for Africa, LIRA2030). It was concluded to identify further linkages between IAP and ICSU on Agenda 2030 and to keep the EB informed of the processes.

10.5. – STI Forum  
*Heide Hackmann*

Following the meeting of the 10-Member Group to support the Technology Facilitation Mechanism held at ICSU earlier this year, an update was provided on the programme of the second Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for the SDGs (STI Forum), to be held at UN Headquarters on 15-16 May 2017. The ICSU Executive Director, who is also a member of the 10-Member Group, highlighted that ICSU as well as other organizations, suggested names for speakers (and that some of them are invited), and that the 10-Member Group fostered the establishment of a “cross-cutting” issue (National STI for SDG roadmap).

It was also emphasised that this will be an important opportunity to showcase ICSU work (including INGSA) and to leverage our convening power via the organization of a forum of funders (see agenda item below). The CSPR was also be updated on relevant side events – not organized directly by ICSU – but held in partnership with CODATA, WFEO, IAP and the Association of Science and Technology Centers (ASTC). The ensuing discussion on ICSU work related to Agenda 2030 highlighted the importance to further assist the scientific community to navigate this space; maybe also via developing relevant tools as “science for SDG website”.
Decisions:
CSPR welcomed progress on ICSU engagement in the implementation of Agenda 2030, and agreed on the importance of disseminating the SDGs report and engage with relevant processes (as above).

Tuesday, 11th April

9. Open discussion – draft strategy and next steps (cont’d) – wrap up

Heide Hackmann

The discussion on the strategy document continued by highlighting the following comments and suggestions:

1. Importance to understand how the intended audience will interpret the wording in the strategy. If this strategy is about getting members to sign on and vote for the merger; then the interpretation of the wording by the members should be taken into account. On the other hand, given Agenda 2030, the importance of selling our position to a broader audience was also noted.

2. Term “good” means many things and thus it is important to frame “public good” within the context of SDGs; and also to refer to the terms “wellbeing” (or “welfare”) in the document in line with the ongoing debate on SDGs and in line with the fact that wellbeing is/should the main goal for science.

3. The term “public good” requires clarifications or rewording (more in line with “for the benefit of society”) as it has different connotations for different people, for different sectors (e.g., health sector), for different countries and regions, and under different situations. Reference was made to “public” vs. “private” and to “public good” vs “public benefits”. Other expressions called for were: “common good”, “societal good”, “population good” and “community good”. Also, the tag-line as it stands is not a statement of purpose, but a statement on what we want science to be. It was noted that the current ICSU tag-line should be changed only for a good reason and not just for the sake of changing.

4. Differences between “global” and “international”. The term “international” needs to be prominently featured as a main characteristics of our work - if it is in the name of the new organization than it does not have to be in the tag-line. If not, this should be addressed.

5. Differences between “unified” and “global” voice; and the absence of taking into account the “individual” level – i.e., diversity within a unified voice – was also emphasised as missing the alignment of SDG’s call of “leaving no one behind”.

6. Importance of clarifying how the scales (regional/national levels) are taken into account. Also to ensure that the new organization does not reflect ICSU’s “pan-European/North American” skew.

7. Importance of sharpening the language – especially to clarify the meaning of “impact”.

8. Importance of emphasising the intrinsic value of science per se.

9. Further clarity required on the engagement of the private sector (see also agenda item above).

10. Further clarity on the benefits for the members; at the moment, there are only requests for the members. The issue of “talent-sharing” and “mobility/networks” is to be taken into account here.

The discussion has also addressed the following more general issues:
1. Possible names for the new organization, also taking into account knowledge/awareness (or not) of the acronym “ICSU” and the importance of creating a new brand for the new organization.

2. The relationships between ICSU (and then the new organization) with its IBs/Programmes, also underlining the variety of frameworks and the complexity of some of the programmes. It was noted that the merger should not necessarily make them disbanded, but that there should be more clarity on their successes/failures/completion, and role for ICSU across their life-span.

**Decision:**
CSPR agreed in providing the inputs and recommendations on the strategy document (as above).

### 11. Update on ICSU IBs/Programmes

#### 11.1. IRDR: recent developments and future of programme

*Heide Hackmann*

ICSU Executive Director gave a report on IRDR developments on behalf of Science Officer, Anne-Sophie Stevance, also by recalling that IRDR went through an independent review presented to CSPR at the October 2016 meeting which pointed to a number of important strategic and governance issues. She highlighted recent developments including: (i) the resignation of the Executive Director of IRDR, Prof. Rajib Shaw, effective at the end of March 2017 (there is an agreement with the programme secretariat host that Prof. Shaw will remain involved as an advisor to the IPO for the following months until the management of the IPO is settled), (ii) the decision by Future Earth to establish a Knowledge Action Network (KAN) on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience, (iii) the decision by the Belmont Forum to start the scoping for a Collaborative Research Action (CRA) on Disaster Risk, Reduction, and Resilience led by two members of the Forum, namely the Italian National Research Council (CNR-DTA) and the China Taipei Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST). A first scoping meeting is planned for 05-07 June 2017 in Florence. After consultation with the co-sponsors and CSPR and EB, it was decided to reach out to the Future Earth leadership to explore options for closer collaboration around the development of the KAN as a focus for IRDR’s future development.

She also reported on the meeting which was organized at ICSU in Paris on 28-29 March and its conclusions including (i) recruit a new Executive Director through a targeted fast-track approach, with the strong involvement of RADI, (ii) pursue collaboration between IRDR and Future Earth around the development of the KAN, noting that other communities (and in particular WCRP needs to be engaged). The KAN should be a jointly branded forum for bringing together a more integrated approach to risks and disasters, for making use of the current structures (IRDR, Future Earth projects, etc.) to implement activities of common interest, and for coordinating outreach to funders, (iii) IRDR to continue managing its network and grow its profile of activities as an independent programme based on a 3-year strategy and implementation plan to be developed by the SC and ED to clarify a set of deliverables, and the role that the IRDR network (especially the International Centers of Excellence) can play. It was noted also that the Belmont Forum is very supportive and that there is no talk of merging Future Earth and IRDR.

In this context, clarifications were sought on overlap/complementarity between Future Earth’s KAN and Belmont Forum’s CRA; it was then noted that CRA is funding research, while KAN has broader objectives based on coordinating and facilitating networks. This was also the opportunity to highlight that ICSU is both a partner in Belmont Forum and a co-sponsor of IRDR. The discussion emphasized that it was a very good summary and the solutions presented were in line with the review; the ICSU Secretariat was congratulated for this.

#### 11.2. Urban Health & Wellbeing: nominations for SC members and midterm IPO review

*Pierre Ritchie, Chair, Sc, UHW (via Skype)*

The term of office of the Chair and two members ends on 31 May 2017. Eight nominations were received; the Chair and Director screened the applications and propose to CSPR in the order of priority, three
candidates to replace the three outgoing members. Earlier this year, the Urban Health and Wellbeing (UHW) Programme invited nominations for individuals to serve on the Science Committee (with the replacement of outgoing members, three members are being sought). The IPO has coordinated the call for applications inviting nominations. Candidates are expected to take up their positions on 1st June.

Pierre Ritchie, outgoing Chair of the SC, updated the CSPR on the proposed nominations for the SC as well as on the recently completed mid-term review for the IPO hosting and related issues.

The CSPR agreed to recommend the replacement of the following SC Members:

- **Ritchie, Pierre** 1 June 2016- 31 May 2017* Chair (former Member)
- **Hanaki, Keisuke** 1 June 2016- 31 May 2017* Member (renewed) Term ends
- **Salem, Gerard** 1 June 2016- 31 May 2017* Member (renewed) - term ends

with:

- **Howden-Chapman, Philippa** (New Zealand) 1 June 2016 - 31 May 2019 (current Member) New Chair
- **Fu, Bojie** (China) 1 June 2016 - 31 May 2019 Member
- **Corburn, Jason** (USA) 1 June 2016 - 31 May 2019 Member
- **Nguendo Yongsi, Blaise** (South Africa) 1 June 2016 - 31 May 2019 Member

This was also the opportunity to discuss procedures related to self-nominations – an issue which was clarified by highlighting that any of the four sources (ICSU, IAMP, UNU and SC) was able to submit nominations. However, the importance of clarity on self-nominations should be made by CSPR.

Concerning the mid-term IPO review, the UHW SC Chair highlighted and acknowledged the appropriate and generous support provided by Chinese hosting organizations and confirmed that this support will continue. However, it was also the opportunity to inform the CSPR that the IPO is facing difficulties related to new travel regulations at the national level. The IPO is currently working with the IUE Director to try to identify solutions and will seek assistance from the ICSU Secretariat so as to allow international bodies not to be subjected to these restrictions. Clarifications were sought on the documentation and on the mid-term review which was highlighted as a separate internal process with respect to the Programme’s review in 2018. Here acknowledgements were made concerning the support by Chinese hosts towards operations of the IPO, and concerning the work of the outgoing Chair who has been instrumental also in the Programme’s inception phase.

### 11.3. INGSA

*Heide Hackmann*

An update was provided by the ICSU Executive Director on recent developments concerning INGSA. In particular, she highlighted that the current membership includes over 1000 people (45 countries), and that INGSA conducts successful capacity-building activities. Furthermore the CSPR was informed that ICSU signed two agreements on behalf of INGSA: one with UNESCO and one with IDRC. The latter being a funding agreement for fostering activities to establish regional chapters and fellowships/grants schemes. More detailed on IDRC activities will follow in due course as they are actually being defined at the time of reporting. Acknowledging that Peter Gluckman always highlights the linkages between INGSA and ICSU in different fora, the importance of defining “parenthood” and “branding” of ICSU activities was discussed by the CSPR. This was also an opportunity to highlight that ISSC is not involved in INGSA, the engagement of ICSU Members is not clear, and that the new Council should maintain linkages with INGSA (especially within the context of SDGs). These issues were noted also as very important vis-à-vis government changes and succession in leadership in New Zealand. It was acknowledged that INGSA is developing very rapidly and effectively; and that at the next meeting of INGSA Executive (in September 2017) a strategic plan will be discussed towards guiding its further activities.
This was also an opportunity to highlight that there is currently no policy on logos for ICSU IBs and/or associated networks such as INGSA.

11.4. Future Earth: Update and Executive Director

Heide Hackmann and Charles Ebikeme

An update was provided by ICSU Executive Director and Science Officer Charles Ebikeme on current developments in Future Earth following the meeting of the Governing Council (GC) and discussion on SC/EC restructuring, KAN concepts and the GC restructuring, as well recruitment of a new Executive Director. In particular, it was highlighted that GC discussed that more clarity is required on the definition and establishment of KANs, and that governance requires restructuring (via establishing a single advisory committee).

Concerning the upcoming review process, it was reported that the GC members and funders are very interested in being involved, and tasked ICSU to produce a detailed map/outline for next meeting in 2018 (so that the review could take place in 2019). On the other hand, the CSPR was also informed that some GC members suggested that perhaps an independent review by PWC might be more appropriate. The ICSU Executive Director took the opportunity to acknowledge ICSU Head of HR for coordinating the recruitment process of the new Executive Director for Future Earth who will be appointed shortly.

Given the imminent appointment of a new Future Earth Executive Director (ED), the CSPR also suggested to have a quick interim review to serve as a guide for the new ED. It was noted that that the GC agreed to perform that function in the interim with this new strategic direction they are giving. The sensitivity was that any review at this early stage would bias the community and potential funders; the GC wants to make sure Future Earth has time to implement new strategic direction before review.

11.5. INASP: recent developments

Lucilla Spini

An update was provided on the current relationship between ICSU and INASP, following the first meeting of the working group on ICSU/INASP cooperation. In particular, it was highlighted that the INASP and ICSU have not been in recent contact due to several changes in the ICSU and INASP Secretariats. Current leadership on both side, as well as the interest vis-à-vis the merger process has led to re-engagement by INASP in ICSU activities. On the other hand, INASP has expressed interest in reviewing the current cooperation-agreement/framework and has requested not to be reviewed as per current IBs’ review schedule. In this context, it was recalled that INASP is a charity working primarily on capacity building (also collaborating with CODATA, and in dialogue with ICSU Secretariat on LIRA2030) and that INASP will invite ICSU to participate at its next Board Meeting in May. The current situation of INASP led to a discussion by CSPR on how to cultivate relationships with IBs when they reach independence, and how to foster different kinds of linkages (e.g., via membership, partnerships, joint activities). It was noted that the review was not appropriate in this context.

11.6. WDS: extension of Chair’s mandate

Lucilla Spini

WDS has requested to have the current Chair of the WDS Scientific Committee, Sandy Harrison reappointed. Her term will end June 2017, and the CSPR is asked to recommend an extension for 3 years (i.e. until June 2020) so as to allow continuity in ongoing activities. The CSPR recommended the extension of the WDS SC Chair’s mandate.

Decisions:
CSPR welcomed the developments in IRDR, and the collaboration with Future Earth.
CSPR welcomed the developments within Future Earth; and within INGSA.
CSPR recommends the proposed list of candidates to be invited to UHW SC, for EB approval.
CSPR recommends not to review INASP and to consider another type of arrangement for synergies with ICSU.
CSPR recommends the extension of mandate of current Chair of the WDS SC, for EB approval.

12. Update on review processes

Lucilla Spini

An overall update on the schedule of the review processes was provided also recalling recent electronic decisions taken by the CSPR (e.g., on WDS review). In reviewing the schedule of review processes, the CSPR discussed ICSU’s role in reviewing programmes, by highlighting that as a co-sponsor/sponsor of activities, it is a duty for ICSU to review the activities. On the other hand, ICSU should also respect the fact that some IBs do not want to be reviewed. In this context it was noted that SWG thinks that ICSU should be doing reviews with funders and other co-sponsors (also to share the burden of costs and responsibility and secretariat support).

The CSPR agreed to conduct the following review within the current schedule:

2017:
• WCRP
• GOOS

2018:
• WDS
• Urban Health and Wellbeing

2019:
• Future Earth
• Joint COSPAR, SCOSTEP and IUCAF (pending discussion re: timing / legacy)

Decision:
The CSPR agreed to conduct the reviews of WCRP and GOOS in 2017; WDS and UHW in 2018, and Future Earth in 2019; and a joint review of COSPAR, SCOSTEP and IUCAF to be conducted in 2019 (pending consultations on timing and legacy for these IBs)

12.1. GOOS Review

X. Yan (GOOS Secretariat) and Lucilla Spini

A brief presentation was provided on the draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the review panel of the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS). The draft ToRs were approved by the CSPR, also highlighting the importance of the self-study and that the review is not just for ICSU but it is an exercise for all the co-sponsors. Importance of taking account the merger time-table with respect to the review timeline was also emphasized. The successful experience of the GCOS Review was recalled. In agreement with the proposed members for the review panels, the CSPR agreed to appoint Martin Visbeck as CSPR ex officio member of the review panel for GOOS.

Decision:
The CSPR agreed on the proposed GOOS review ToRs and proposals for panel members; and agreed to have Martin Visbeck as the CSPR ex officio member of the review panel.

12.2. WCRP Review

Katsia Paulavets

Science Officer, Katsia Paulavets, updated on the WCRP review including the meeting held just prior the CSPR, also recalling that Fumiko Kasuga is the ex officio representative for CSPR in the review panel.
While it is not possible to provide information on evaluation of the programme given the very start of the process, it can be highlighted that WCRP scientifically is doing very well, however there are some concerns related to structure and funding issues. It was reported that the first meeting went very well, even if the atmosphere was very tense.

This was also the opportunity to flag out that ICSU contributions should not just be considered in financial terms, but also in its capacity of enabling opportunities. In this case, WCRP would not have had a trust fund without ICSU being present as co-sponsor. Also, the CSPR was reminded that programmes like WCRP can be considered as examples of co-designed programmes since the inception, given that they are an integration of UN agencies (e.g., WMO) and research communities (via ICSU). The funding situation – and funding cuts related to new geopolitical set-ups – were further discussed, also to encourage the community to help WCRP (e.g., via the res-institution of symbolic contributions such as the one by IUGG to the programme).

**Decision:**
CSPR noted progress on the WCRP review.

### 13. Update on preparations for the World Science Forum (WSF) 2017

*Lucilla Spini and Muhammad Saidam*

An update on the preparations concerning the WSF to be held in Jordan from 7-11 November 2017 was provided, also by highlighting the new website at [http://worldscienceforum.org](http://worldscienceforum.org), including an informative video as well as the programme for the plenary sessions. Acknowledgements were made to CSPR for having provided suggestions for speakers for plenary sessions as well as comments on thematic sessions. On the other hand the CSPR was informed that the final list of speakers has not been issued yet by the local organizers. The CSPR will be kept informed of developments, also given the upcoming meeting of the Steering Committee – now including also ISSC and IAP – to be held at ICSU HQ on 26 June 2017.

### 14. Update on LIRA 2030 incl. Meeting of Funders

*Katsia Paulavets*

Science Officer, Katsia Paulavets, provided an update on the developments concerning LIRA203 including the current call for pre-proposals that focuses on advancing the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 11 on cities in Africa. The deadline for pre-proposals is 17 April 2017. The importance of linking these activities with Future Earth and other ICSU IBs was re-emphasized, as well as the linkages with ISSC activities on TD training. The CSPR was also informed that one of key LIRA activities for 2017 is a Global Forum of research funding agencies, foundations and development agencies aimed at facilitating strategic exchange and synergistic collaboration across different funding communities around a common interest in supporting science for the effective implementation of Agenda 2030. ICSU will lead on this initiative in partnership with Future Earth, the Belmont Forum, Sida, the Volkswagen foundation and UNDESA. To plan this forum ICSU will convene a preparatory meeting with representatives of funding communities on 12 May 2017 in New York. The outcomes of this meeting will be presented at the STI forum, which will take place on 15-16 May 2017.

**Decisions:**
CSPR noted progress on the planning of the World Science Forum 2017.
CSPR noted progress on the LIRA 2030 Africa programme and Global Forum of funding agencies.

### 15. Update on Grants Programme

*Charles Ebikeme*

Science Officer, Charles Ebikeme, thanked all for participation in review and evaluation of the grants applications; and highlighted that the idea was for awarded grants to be much more collaborative and from the applications it does seem that there is much more diversity in the partnerships.
Given that the funds have just been disbursed, there is no progress report on the activities from the awarded project; however, in November the CSPR will receive progress reports/yearly activity from the three projects for CSPR to review. In this context, it was suggested to request clear milestones for the projects in the yearly report, and to explore World Science Forum 2017 as the platform to showcase the initial results.

The CSPR discussed the importance of conducting evaluation in committee face-to-face set-up so as to ensure consistency on the utilization of grades in the final decision; and also the importance of continuing the grants programme after the merger as an important “give-back” activity for the membership. The latter point raised the issues of the availability of funds for this programme, after the merger.

This was also an opportunity for the CSPR to discuss linkages between the funded activities and the developments related to strategic planning and merger processes, as the awarded projects will be implemented in the merger-process time-frame.

Decisions:
CSPR noted progress on the Grants Programme and recommended to include milestones in the yearly reporting.
CSPR recommended continuity of the Grants Programme also after the merger.

16. ICSU CODATA 2017 Conference and related initiatives
Simon Hodson, CODATA Executive Director

An update was provided on CODATA activities with a focus on those initiatives enabling ICSU-wide participation, namely the CODATA 2017 Conference “Global Challenges and Data-Driven Science” also endorsed by ICSU via ICSU EB, and an initiative to develop a CODATA Commission on Data Standards for Science. The presentation is provided as ANNEX 3. The discussion with CSPR highlighted the importance of continuing with the campaign related to the Science International’s Accord; and the key work to be done on data standards; as well as the opportunity for CODATA to shift role by leveraging its convening power towards coordinating the landscape of data science stakeholders.

Decision:
CSPR noted the presentation CODATA activities.

17. Chair’s Summary, evaluation of the meeting, and draft agenda for 34th CSPR Meeting
Li Jinghai

In evaluating the meeting, the CSPR highlighted the importance of streamlining (content and duration) the presentations on nominations, and to include only presentations that have a key message for the CSPR. This should be taken into account in organizing the next meeting. In addition the CSPR was asked to identify the topics/agenda-items for the next meeting to be held in September 2017. The following topics were identified:

1. Future of CSPR-like Committee if the merger happens or not (so as to present the CSPR view to the GA) by focusing on (i) the Terms of Reference and (ii) on the modus operandi of the Committee (also given the shift in the way CSPR work due to merger-processes).
2. Agenda item on emerging issues also to be updated and discuss developments from TTF (especially given the proposal that the EB will become GB with more responsibilities and decisions-making within the three years in between GAs).
3. Agenda item on developments related to SWG.
4. Progress review on WCRP review process.
5. Follow-up from High Level Political Forum.
6. CSPR role in the transition phase (also with respect to development of Implementation Plan) which may actually be over another 2-year period.
7. Reports from IBs and discussion on the future of IBs.
8. Update on the proposal on nuclear clean-up science.

The invited Chairs of the ROLAC and ROAP Commissions and the ISSC Representatives were thanked for their participation in the meeting. This was also the opportunity to highlight some regional activities such as CIELAC for ROLAC and SIMSEA for ROAP. The importance of allowing speaking slots for the invited guests was also raised within the context of future meetings.

The Chair of the CSPR concluded this agenda item by recalling the main point discussed during the meeting, namely:

- The merger and the future of science not just for the challenges related to SDG but also for science itself within the context of a new definition of “universalality” of science.
- The strategy/vision for the new Council by addressing also terminology/linguistic issue (“international” vs “global”; the definition of “science”) and the structure of documents (e.g., Annex, footnotes); and the importance of conveying these suggestions to the EB and further processes.
- The next steps related to IBs/Programme and their reviews, also to ensure to have appropriate logic and principles, with science as the core value.
- Outreach and engagement processes for the new council: how to become a global unified voice, and how this can be “identified” (e.g., via logo and beyond).
- The importance of finalizing the merger processes.

**Decision:**
CSPR agreed on the above agenda items for its next meeting.

18. Any Other Business

*All Members*

N/A

19. Date and Place of Meeting in 2017

34th CSPR Meeting will be held on 5th and 6th September at ICSU/Paris

*Li Jinghai*

The work of the Secretariat was appreciated in organizing the meeting and taking detailed notes of the discussion. It was agreed that the draft report will be prepared shortly after the meeting and circulated to the CSPR for review/approval so as to have the report ready for the EB meeting to be held on 24-25 April 2017. A PowerPoint presentation will also be prepared by the Secretariat so as to allow the Chair of the CSPR to present the recommendations to the EB. The CSPR will meet for its 34th Meeting in Paris on 5-6 September 2017.

End of meeting.

3 Annexes

1. PPT WFEO
2. PPT Nuclear Clean-Up
3. PPT CODATA