15th Meeting of the ICSU Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR)

27-29 April, 2008

Château de Neuville Bosc
60119 Neuville-Bosc
France

Decisions

Present: R. Balstad, C. Cesarsky, A.M. Cetto (ex officio), H. Gupta, M. Hoshi, C. Leaver, K. Mokhele (Chair), L. Mytelka, K. Raivio, R. Ramasamy, P. Ritchie, T. Rosswall (ex officio), H. Vessuri

Secretariat: P. Cutler, L. Goldfarb, J. Legg, M. Mokrane, H. Moore (for Item 10), P. Ocampo-Thomason, C. Smith

By Invitation: D. Carlson (For Item 15, on telephone), L. Fresco (For Item 13), R. Harris (For Item 11), G. McBean (For Item 9, on telephone), H. Mooney (For Item 10, on telephone), G. Oldham (For Item 6)

1. Opening of the Meeting

The Chair opened the meeting, noting the heavy agenda and the regrets sent by B. Abegaz, C. Bréchignac, M. Clegg, J. Schellnhuber, and A. Whyte.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The Committee was invited to adopt the agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To adopt the agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Decisions of the 14th CSPR Meeting and 96th Executive Board Meeting
   (not treated elsewhere)

Following the previous (14th) CSPR meeting, the draft decisions were circulated and a few comments incorporated. The agreed decisions were posted on the ICSU website.
The Executive Board met on 11-12 October 2007. Several of its decisions related to other items on the agenda for the 15th CSPR meeting.

The Executive Board followed the recommendation by CSPR and appointed J. Schellnhuber (EB96 Item 4.2) as the ICSU representative on the Global Energy Assessment initiated by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA).

The Executive Board also followed the CSPR recommendation that ICSU should no longer be a Co-chair of the Science and Technology Committee of GEO (EB96 Item 4.3). Since then there have been additional informal consultations to try to find alternative solutions to strengthening the input from the international science community to GEO.

Special note was taken of the discussion under EB96 Item 5 on the Unions meeting in April 2007. National and Union Members continue to express concern over the perceived lack of transparency regarding the appointment of Committees by the Executive Board as well as Review and Planning Groups by CSPR. Thus, it has been decided to post the CVs of all appointed candidates on the ICSU website. Under EB96 Item 4.4 there was special mention about the lack of consultations with Scientific Unions when CSPR launches reviews of Interdisciplinary Bodies. The CSPR took note of this and will consider possible changes in the procedure for the appointment of Review Panels at its next meeting.

The Executive Board appointed K-G. Mäler as a member of the Scientific Committee of the Earth System Science Partnership (EB96 Item 6.1). Under EB96 Item 6, it also decided not to devolve to CSPR decisions regarding composition of the governing bodies of Interdisciplinary Bodies appointed by ICSU.

With regard to EB96 Item 6.4, it was noted that the Secretariat continues to work closely with ISSC and UNU, in consultation with the Scientific Committee for IHDP, to find solutions to some of the challenges that remain as a consequence of the addition of UNU as a third sponsor and the move of the IHDP Secretariat to the UN complex in Bonn. Despite much effort, progress was slow—in part due to different organizational cultures. All three sponsors have now agreed on the way forward. The next steps are to meet with funders in Bonn and then, later in May, to meet with IHDP Officers. With good will from all sides, the situation can be resolved. But there is currently no fallback position. There is nothing CSPR can do at this point. It is an organizational issue for the Executive Board as necessary.

The Committee discussed three aspects of the relationship between CSPR and the Executive Board. First, in planning for ICSU’s second strategic planning process, it will be useful to clarify a priori the roles of the Executive Board and CSPR. Second, a desire was expressed for a greater interaction with the Board. Third, there will be many rotations on the Board and CSPR following the General Assembly because of term limits. In addition, T. Rosswall is retiring as Executive Director in January 2009. It is therefore a critical transition period and one in which care must be taken to transfer the corporate memory.

In general, it is not practical for the CSPR and Board to meet back to back because the Secretariat needs to prepare documents for the Board taking note of CSPR decisions. A more practical arrangement is for the Officers’ meeting to overlap on an annual basis with CSPR for perhaps 90 to 120 minutes, followed by a joint working dinner. The Committee decided to target its 17th meeting in February 2009 as the first opportunity for this arrangement (see Item 17 for tentative dates). In general, CSPR has not had a structured discussion of its interaction with the Board, but decided to also conduct this at its 17th meeting.
Decisions
To note that the decisions of the 14th meeting of CSPR have been posted on the ICSU website;
to note decisions of the Executive Board at its 96th meeting;
to consider possible changes in the procedure for the appointment of Review Panels at the 16th
meeting of CSPR;
to hold a structured discussion on the relationship between the CSPR and the Executive Board at
the 17th meeting of the CSPR; and
to tentatively plan for a joint session with the ICSU Officers at the 17th meeting of CSPR.

4. Implementation of the First ICSU Strategic Plan 2008-2011

T. Rosswall briefed CSPR on the continued implementation of the ICSU Strategic Plan.
Implementation continues as planned, but the implementation phase is especially intensive
during the first six months of 2008 in preparation for the mid-term assessment of achievements at
the ICSU General Assembly in October.

There is some delay in getting output from ISPRE and the future of that Panel should be
considered once the first output is received and the reaction from Members to the work is known
(see Item 12 for more discussion of ISPRE).

The Committee discussed interactions with the ICSU Regional Offices and their Regional
Committees, and options for more efficient and effective dialogue. A proposed first step is to
invite the Chairs and Directors of each Regional Office to meet with the CSPR at the CSPR’s
16th meeting in Maputo on 25 October. Further into the future, CSPR could also consider
occasionally meeting at Regional Offices.

Decisions
To note progress in implementation of the ICSU Strategic Plan 2006-2011; and
to invite Chairs and Directors of Regional Offices to participate in the 16th CSPR meeting on 25
October in Maputo, Mozambique.

5. Preparing for the Second ICSU Strategic Plan

5.1 Framework for the Planning for the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan

Planning for the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan began in 2002 with a foresight exercise and open
consultation with Members. A number of Priority Area Assessment (PAA) and strategic review
exercises were initiated between 2002 and 2005, under the aegis of the CSPR or the Executive
Board. The consolidated Strategic Plan was prepared by CSPR, approved by the Board, and
presented to the General Assembly in October 2005. As this was the first ever ICSU Strategic
Plan, the planning process had to be developed de novo. Whilst many things worked well, others
were less effective. In considering how to develop a new plan for 2012-2017, CSPR reflected on
the lessons learnt during the previous exercise.

Since 2006, there have been a number of significant changes in the structure and focus of ICSU,
most notably the implementation of Regional Offices, which have their own priorities and plans.
It will be important to accommodate these changes in the global strategic planning process for
2012 onwards. In addition, a number of new Members have been welcomed into ICSU since the
last planning process, and ensuring the engagement of all ICSU Members and Interdisciplinary
Bodies presents a major challenge.
The decision of the 28th General Assembly was “to request the Executive Board to present plans to the 29th General Assembly (2008) for the development of a Second Strategic Plan for ICSU, 2012-2017”. CSPR was asked to provide overall advice to the Secretariat. The Committee’s ideas touched on four themes: the basic starting parameters and assumptions, contextual changes regarding science and society that need to be considered, the main ICSU-specific challenges, and ideas on the planning process itself, including lessons learned from the previous process. The CSPR discussion will inform the discussion at the Executive Board in May and, after further refinement and prioritization, it will be the basis for a presentation by the Vice-President for Scientific Planning and Review at the General Assembly for consideration and debate by the Members.

5.2 Strengthened Involvement of Social Sciences in ICSU

The three background documents developed by CSPR as input to its in-depth discussion were sent to the ICSU Members for review and comments. Very few responses were received (two from National Members and two from Unions). Although this seems to indicate a lack of interest of Members on this issue, it should be noted that the annual meeting of European National Members (in Helsinki in April 2008) focussed a major part of the discussions on social sciences. Although there was no formal conclusion from that discussion, all participants that voiced an opinion were in favour of a much strengthened involvement of social sciences in ICSU, while at the same time collaborating closely with the International Social Science Council (ISSC). The President of ISSC was present in Helsinki and voiced the opinion that ICSU should continue to give its support to the further strengthening of its sister organization.

The International Sociological Association (ISA) has decided to apply for Union membership in ICSU. ICSU and ISSC, in collaboration with IHDP and the Director of the ICSU Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, are planning a major session at a global ISA meeting in September. ICSU is also working with ISSC to provide input to the World Social Science Forum (May 2009).

Based on formal and informal consultations, the Secretariat prepared a draft of a document to be presented to the Executive Board for submission to the General Assembly. The CSPR discussed ways of finalizing the draft.

**Decisions**

To note the strengthened involvement of social scientists in the planning of new initiatives as part of the implementation of the ICSU Strategic Plan 2006-2011 and to further enhance this as relevant;

to challenge National Members, especially those that include social sciences, to assist ICSU in identifying social scientists to serve on relevant ICSU planning and review committees to ensure that such initiatives have proper balance among relevant disciplines;

to work with the International Social Science Council (ISSC) as a key partner in strengthening international social science of relevance for implementing ICSU’s Strategic Plan and to engage ISSC in the dialogue concerning the development of the Second Strategic Plan 2012-2017;

to assist ISSC in strengthening its programme by identifying scientists as appropriate who could help inform the further development of ISSC;

to consider applications from social science Unions in order to strengthen the involvement of social sciences in the development of the ICSU agenda; and

to recommend to the Executive Board that the role of social sciences be included on the agenda for the National and Union Members Fora at the 29th General Assembly.
6. Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) Review

G. Oldham conducted the SCOPE Review supported by the ICSU Secretariat and advised by a Reference Group appointed by the CSPR. The intended meeting between the consultant, the SCOPE Executive Committee and the Reference Group did not take place due to time constraints and the view of some members of the SCOPE Executive and Reference Group that it was inappropriate for an environmental group to bring people from around the world to meet for only one or two days. Instead, it was agreed that the preliminary draft report would be sent to the two groups for comments and if necessary a conference call would be convened. The teleconference was not necessary and a revised version of the report was prepared in the light of comments received. This first revised version was sent to the ICSU family and the SCOPE members for comments. The version presented to CSPR was the second revised version, which includes the comments received from the ICSU family.

The answers to the questions posed in the Terms of Reference were based on an analysis of 123 responses to the web based questionnaire that was sent to 370 individuals who have been associated with the work of SCOPE over the past five years. The analysis also took into account interviews that the consultant held with approximately 50 key informants. Reports and accounts were also consulted and analysed.

The results of the review demonstrate that SCOPE has had an illustrious past and particularly in its early days made many contributions to knowledge and to policy. More recently, several new organizations have been established which work at the environmental science and policy interface. These provide competition for SCOPE’s scientific assessments. They also provide competition for available financial and human resources. The financial situation facing SCOPE is now acute with funding for the Secretariat and administrative costs exceeding the membership dues from its Members by more than $50,000 per annum. One of the main reasons for this situation is that the dues are paid in dollars and about 50% of the expenses are spent in euros. The loss in value of the dollar has not been matched by increases in membership dues.

The review identifies the strengths and weaknesses of SCOPE. Most of these had been identified in the 2003 ICSU Priority Area Assessment on Environment and its Relation to Sustainable Development, and are well known both to the SCOPE Executive Committee and to the SCOPE Secretariat. Some measures have been taken to overcome the weaknesses over the past five years, but the financial situation has meant there are still many problems that remain to be solved.

The review identifies four options for the future of the organization. These are the “more of the same” option; “the rejuvenation or re-invention” option; “the merger” option; and “the closure” option. The majority of the people interviewed favoured the rejuvenation or re-invention option, although about a fifth was in favour of the merger or closure options. Very few people thought that SCOPE could survive by doing more of the same.

G. Oldham presented the report to CSPR and answered questions in a wide-ranging discussion. The discussion focussed on the changing landscape for scientific assessment and the need to clearly target an appropriate policy audience. It was felt that the SCOPE model had outlived its usefulness even though the mandate is not irrelevant. In addition, it was noted that many organizations within and outside the ICSU family are conducting major science assessments in key areas of environmental policy concern and are now ahead of SCOPE in engaging with users through websites and other tools. The appropriateness of the membership model of SCOPE was questioned in relation to selection of topics for review and the policy relevance of the resulting reports. SCOPE has not been strategic in its selection of topics and has not engaged the
community up front in this discussion. The options for the future of SCOPE presented in the report were thoroughly examined and the pros and cons debated.

**Decisions**
To thank G. Oldham for his review of SCOPE and to extend thanks also to the Reference Group; to note that SCOPE has produced many very influential assessment reports during the past decades. Assessments of scientific knowledge on key environmental issues have become increasingly important as links between scientific research and policy development. Many organizations now carry out such assessments and SCOPE reports are of decreasing relevance; to note that the unique niche that SCOPE occupied after its initial establishment in 1969 is thus no longer apparent; and to recommend to the ICSU Executive Board that it proposes to the General Assembly to close down SCOPE as an ICSU Interdisciplinary Body after a suitable transition period, recognizing that SCOPE is a membership organization governed by an Executive Committee with separate legal status under French law.

---

**7. 2008 Grants Evaluation**

Ten proposals were considered in a two-step process by CSPR. First, each proposal was reviewed in depth by a subgroup of CSPR. Then the full CSPR assessed each proposal, guided by the comments from the relevant subgroup (see Annex 1). The CSPR noted that the application process and format could be improved, and that the purpose of several proposals was unclear and the value added by the activity was often not clearly spelled out.

**Decisions**
To fund at Euro 30,000 each the proposals submitted by DIVERSITAS, IMU, ISPRS, IUTAM, SCAR, WCRP, WDC; to decline proposals submitted by CODATA, IUPESM, SCOPE; and for the Secretariat to send a letter to each lead applicant expressing the decision and including any specific comments raised in CSPR’s evaluation of the proposal.

---

**8. Human Health**

At its previous meeting, CSPR agreed on the Terms of Reference and composition for a new Planning Group on “A Systems Analysis Approach to Health and Wellbeing in the Changing Urban Environment”. The membership of this Group was subsequently agreed by email. The Group met for the first time in conjunction with a workshop that was held at the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Vienna in January 2008. A summary report of this workshop and note of the Planning Group meeting were provided to CSPR.

One of the issues discussed by the Planning Group was its own membership, and several areas were identified for which additional expertise would be useful. These included clinical public health, political science, urban sociology, and urban planning. It was also noted that developing countries and women were under-represented. Members agreed to submit names of appropriate experts to fill these gaps and the ISSC was also consulted in this regard. K. Mokhele, P. Ritchie, and C. Smith considered all the submitted names (12 in all) and proposed three additional members to be invited to join the Planning Group as follows: T. Capon (Australia, Public Health), S. Parnell (S Africa, Urban Geography) and E. Reese (Argentina, Urban Planning).
C. Smith updated CSPR on developments. There was as yet no clarity of thought in the Planning Group as a whole about what is fully involved in adopting a systems analysis approach. In addition, it was recognized that there is more than one way of conducting systems analysis. The second meeting of the Planning Group on 17-19 June at IIASA would serve to flesh out the methodological approaches.

In the meantime, the key challenge was to identify a suitable individual to chair the Planning Group. The first meeting of the Planning Group was chaired by K. Mokhele as the Chair had not yet been identified. K. Mokhele has also agreed to chair the second meeting after which he would withdraw from the process. It was important that a permanent Chair be identified for the Group as soon as possible and that he/she also attend the June meeting. Several people had been approached and declined this role for various reasons. Of all the remaining names that had been submitted, one person stood out as having the necessary expertise and status to act as chairperson – D. Yach (South Africa, clinical epidemiology).

K. Mokhele had made an initial approach to Dr. Yach. There had also been discussion about the possibility of having a Co-chair or Vice Chair from IIASA, which would help to ensure the institutional commitment from this potentially critical partner. L. McKellar, who was already on the Planning Group, could capably serve this role. Some CSPR members expressed concern about D. Yach’s affiliation with PepsiCo but it was also noted that if ICSU has serious aspirations to involve the private sector in its activities, then the quality of the candidate made this an ideal test case. If D.Yach were to accept, it was agreed that ICSU should seek his signature on a statement for the file indicating that, if the discussions of the Planning Group involve PepsiCo or affiliated companies, he would excuse himself.

**Decisions**

- To appoint T. Capon, S. Parnell, and E. Reese to the Planning Group;
- to invite D. Yach as Chair of the Planning Group;
- in the event that D. Yach declines, to appoint Co-chairs comprised of L. McKeller (IIASA) plus one of the other existing members of the Planning Group;
- to devolve to K. Mokhele and P. Ritchie the decision on which Planning Group member would be Co-chair with L. McKellar.

9. **Hazards**

Following a decision of the 28th General Assembly, a Planning Group established by CSPR was charged with the planning of a major new ICSU initiative on Natural and Human-induced Environmental Hazards and Disasters. The Planning Group held four meetings: the last, in Paris on 30-31 October 2007, followed immediately on from a Consultation Forum to which all relevant international organizations were invited. Since then, a further revision of the Group’s Report was carried out, and that revision was once again sent to ICSU Members, Interdisciplinary Bodies, and partner organizations for comment and suggestion. The final version of the Report, submitted for consideration by the CSPR, was prepared taking into consideration those last comments, as well as those that the CSPR itself had made at its 14th Meeting.

The Chair of the Planning Group, G. McBean, made a presentation through a telephone link, describing the later revisions, and the value-added nature of the programme now proposed. Members of CSPR expressed their overall satisfaction with the revised report. Various questions on coverage of the proposed programme made reference to compound disasters, industrial accidents and epidemics caused by human, animal and plant pathogens as a consequence of disasters. The use of the term ‘forensic’ investigations gave rise to a short discussion.
Decisions
To recommend to the Executive Board that:
the report be published;
the Board, in turn, recommend to the 29th General Assembly that ICSU establish a major new interdisciplinary programme of ten years’ duration entitled *Integrated Research on Disaster Risk – the challenge of natural and human-induced environmental hazards* (acronym: IRDR), in possible collaboration with other international organizations; and
to thank the members of the Planning Group for their work.

10. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) Science Follow-Up Group

The Group met a last time in Paris in December 2007 and agreed to propose a new programme on linked ecological-social systems that should consist of a limited number of sites selected against specific criteria, where interdisciplinary teams of scientists would address the link between ecosystem service and human well-being using the conceptual framework of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA).

The scientific community has been very engaged in a parallel process among the MA partners to ensure implementation of its findings and prepare the ground for a second global assessment. The partners, including ICSU, have all agreed on a way forward and a Coordination Committee has been established co-chaired by UNEP and UNDP. The Executive Director represents ICSU on this committee.

The process initiated by the Government of France on an International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB) has also concluded its work. The two processes have concluded that in the future developments, the MA and the IMoSEB processes need to be combined. UNEP will be invited to an international intergovernmental meeting in September 2008 to consider the need for a second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services. It will also consider the possible development of an appropriate mechanism for more rapid reviews of key issues of importance for policy in this area.

Several informal consultations have taken place; the most recent being at the Resilience 2008 Conference cosponsored by ICSU.

The Chair of the MA Science Follow-up Group, H. Mooney, joined CSPR by telephone link to present the report. The discussion covered such topics as models for defining poverty, data for immediate decision making, aggregate indicators, and the very complex set of players and interactions. The discussion also covered ICSU’s role as “honest broker” in discussions of merger between MA follow-up and IMoSEB and ICSU’s potential role in further advancing the follow-up activities. H. Mooney noted the elapsed time between the scientific community perceiving climate change as a problem in 1979 and when political momentum led to action (more than 25 years) and expressed hope that this elapsed time can be shortened in the case of MA-related issues, perhaps by science leadership developing structures to facilitate societal buy-in and action more quickly. Lastly, the discussion covered the role of the private sector in the MA process and follow-up. This sector has been intimately involved throughout, and is now seeking science advice on its own sustainability initiatives.
Decisions
To recommend to the ICSU Executive Board that:
the report be published (with the addition of an Executive Summary); and
that the Board, in turn, recommend to the 29th General Assembly that ICSU establish a major new interdisciplinary programme of ten years’ duration on *Ecosystem Change and Human Well-being* in collaboration with UNESCO and UNU;
to note the continued process to establish the framework for a second global assessment on ecosystem services and human well-being; and
to note the results from the very successful Resilience 2008 Conference, which brought together science leaders in linked natural and social sciences to address resilience of natural and social systems.

11. Report of the Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID)

Following a decision of the 28th General Assembly, an *ad hoc* Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID) was established by CSPR in February 2007. It was charged with analysing and making recommendations on the future structure and directions of three Interdisciplinary Bodies (WDC, FAGS, and CODATA) and identifying any other actions that might be necessary to facilitate a coordinated global approach to scientific data and information. The Committee met three times and produced a draft final report, which was circulated to all ICSU Members for comment. CSPR considered this report in the light of the input from Members in order to make recommendations to the Executive Board, which will decide on final recommendations to the 29th General Assembly.

The Chair of SCID, R. Harris, briefed CSPR on the report and the Member comments. The discussion covered the role of CODATA including its current activities and how they relate to its Strategic Plan. The discussion also covered the relative roles of the proposed *ad hoc* Strategic Coordinating Committee for Information and Data and CODATA, and the potential inefficiencies created if the two groups disagree or overlap in their role. The purpose of the new *ad hoc* committee was to coordinate and oversee reform of the multiple data activities of ICSU for a finite period. It was noted that the WDC and FAGS met a week prior to the CSPR meeting and were concerned that there could be a leadership vacuum until summer 2009 when the new structure was likely to be put in place. To fill this vacuum, they had formed a Transition Committee. On the composition of the new *ad hoc* committee, it was noted that observers from the life sciences could bring valuable perspectives.

Decisions
To thank the members of the *ad hoc* Group for their work; and
to recommend to the ICSU Executive Board that:
the report be published;
ICSU assert a strategic leadership role in relation to scientific data and information;
a new ICSU-World Data System (WDS) be established as an Interdisciplinary Body to replace WDC and FAGS;
CODATA be strongly advised to focus on implementation of the three main initiatives in its strategic plan;
a new *ad hoc* Strategic Coordinating Committee for Information and Data be established for three years, renewable for one further period of three years;
ICSU Members be strongly encouraged to establish Committees or Commissions, where these do not already exist, focusing on data and information issues; and,
further to this, that a review of CODATA, including evaluation of how it has responded to the SCID report and is meeting ICSU’s strategic priorities, be carried out by CSPR early during the period of the next ICSU Strategic Plan, 2012-2017.

12. International Science Panel on Renewable Energies (ISPRE)

Energy was identified by many Members as a high priority for ICSU during the development of the Strategic Plan, 2006-2011. After much deliberation by both CSPR and the Executive Board it was agreed that scientific assessments of the status of research on renewable energies was a potentially important niche. The discussions and planning for ISPRE started in 2004 with support from the German Government. After approval of the plans, the Panel was established by the Executive Board in January 2007. It is co-sponsored by the Renewable Energy Policy Network (REN21), and the International Council of Academies of Engineering and Technological Sciences (CAETS).

ISPRE has now held three meetings and is in the process of finalising its first assessment report on biomass, wind, and photovoltaics. This report was supposed to be ready in time for the major Washington International Renewable Energy Conference (WIREC) that took place in March 2008. However it is still in draft form and the progress towards completion since the last ISPRE meeting in early February has been slow. Considerable concerns were expressed about the originality and usefulness of the report at this meeting and subsequent discussions between the ICSU Secretariat and REN21 have confirmed these concerns.

The current chair of ISPRE is J. Luther, formerly Director of the Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems in Freiburg. The Secretariat support for the Panel (~0.5 days per week) continues to be located at this Institute. The financial support comes from the German Government, which according to the chair is willing to continue this support, depending on the generation of useful products by the Panel. Professor Luther has recently announced that he will be leaving Europe to take up new position in Singapore. This will presumably weaken his commitment to ISPRE even further and also the Panel’s links to funding. Thus far, the ICSU Secretariat has been unable to discuss this situation with him. In addition, the current director of REN21, P. Suding, who has been supportive of ISPRE, is moving to a new post.

In the absence of a completed product from ISPRE, and the uncertainty regarding the Chair, the future of the Panel is uncertain. One further meeting is provisionally scheduled for December, 2008/January 2009 and new Task Groups to carry out additional assessments of solar-thermal and hydro energy research have been discussed. It is clear that if the Panel is to have a future, it will require negotiations and discussions with the co-sponsors and potential funders and substantial input from the ICSU Secretariat.

The CSPR discussed the continuing rationale for the Panel’s activities, the priority to attach to this, and possible ways forward. The consensus was that ICSU has struggled to find a niche in an arena that is already rich in activities, and that, given the progress of ISPRE to date, it was unlikely to have a significant impact in the area of renewable energies. It was suggested that ICSU focus its energy in this general area on the Global Energy Assessment, on which J. Schellnhuber represents ICSU.

Decisions
To recommend to the Executive Board that there will be no report from ISPRE at the 29th General Assembly; and
for CSPR to revisit the future of ISPRE once its first report has been received.
13. Global Environmental Change Programmes

13.1 Background

L. Goldfarb set the overall ICSU context in which the following items fit.

13.2 Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP) Review

The Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP) Review Panel began its work in April 2007 and finished its report in February 2008. The Panel’s approach was consultative and evidence-based. During the course of the Review, the Panel reviewed over 200 pages of background information, including self-assessments, responses to questionnaires, and standardized interviews. The report was also reviewed for accuracy by the ESSP in January 2008 and then sent to the ICSU family and the International Group of Funding Agencies for Global Change Research (IGFA) for comment in February.

The resulting report focuses on the value-added of the Partnership. Report sections address ESSP’s science, governance, engagement with the wider community, capacity building, and resources. In addition, the Panel considered several development scenarios and recommended an evolutionary path; ESSP’s development needs to be guided by a scientific strategy which should be developed by the Partnership in consultation with others. The development scenarios take a “big picture” approach, which includes consideration the evolution of the four Global Environmental Change (GEC) programmes, which currently sponsor the ESSP.

L. Fresco, Chair of the Review Panel, presented the report to the CSPR. The ensuing discussion covered such topics as mission overlap with that of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP), low levels of understanding of the ESSP role by those outside and even within the GEC community, interrelationships among the GEC programmes, the challenge of limited resources, the unclear role of the Global Change System for Analysis, Research, and Training (START) within ESSP, the lack of discussion of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) in the context of GEC programmes and ESSP, the fundamental added value of ESSP in bringing a broad multidisciplinary view, the scientific sense and political challenges of aiming at the “fusion” model proposed in the report, the pros and cons of ICSU formally sponsoring ESSP, and the ways forward in terms of accelerating the evolution of ESSP and the GEC programmes.

Decisions

To thank the Review Panel for its forward-looking and constructive proposal;

to recommend to the ICSU Executive Board that the report be published;

to recommend to the ICSU Executive Board that the General Assembly invites ESSP to become an Interdisciplinary Body subsequent to an indication from the ESSP that the Partnership is willing make necessary changes;

to request a written response, regarding the overall review and in particular the recommendation concerning the ESSP governance, by the Partnership before the ICSU General Assembly;

to check back in a year’s time to see if the recommendations have been taken on board by the ESSP; and

recognize that the time has come to examine how individual science programmes collaborate and respond to scientific and policy needs, in view of the need to address the challenges and opportunities facing Earth system science. Consequently, CSPR will consider organizing a high-level meeting to outline options for the needed framework for global environmental change research and its policy relevance, once the reviews of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme and World Climate Research Programme are finished.
13.3 Approval of Replacement Member of ESSP Scientific Committee

The CSPR approved four people to serve on the ESSP Scientific Committee (SC), but A. Cropper had to step down when she accepted the Deputy Executive Director position at UNEP.

**Decision**

To appoint J. Carabias to the ESSP SC to serve from 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2010 with the backup of Y. Kakabadse in the event that J. Carabias cannot serve.

13.4 International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) and World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) Review Updates

The reviews of the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) and International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) are being conducted in parallel. Both reviews are in collaboration with IGFA. In addition, the WCRP review is a collaboration with the Programme’s other sponsors—World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO.

The Chairs of the Panels met in December 2007 to plan their approach. In January 2008, each Panel met for the first time in full. The second meetings of both Panels are timed to closely follow the annual meetings of the respective scientific advisory bodies of the two Programmes (in April 2008 for WCRP and May for IGBP). In addition, both Panel chairs visited the relevant Programme Secretariats in April. Draft versions of the reports will be sent to the Programmes for fact checking in September, and then to ICSU members and other review sponsors in October. The final versions of each report should be sent to CSPR in January 2009.

Both Panels are currently in their information gathering phase. In addition to reviewing a wealth of documents, the Panels are distributing web-based questionnaires, sending representatives to participate in the scientific advisory committee meetings, and interviewing Programme and Secretariat leadership as well as other key individuals.

**Decisions**

To note progress on the reviews of IGBP and WCRP; and to emphasize to both Panel Chairs the value of consultation with people and organizations outside the programme structures.

14. 2009 Grants Programme

No further information has been received from UNESCO regarding the proposal that, as of 2009, the Grants Programme should focus on ICSU-UNESCO collaboration. The Executive Board did not agree to the earlier CSPR proposal that the programme should focus on the priorities of the Regional Offices.

**Decisions**

To recommend to the ISCU Executive Board that: the Grants Programme be maintained in its current form for 2009; and the Executive Board recommend that the 29th General Assembly decide on the future of the programme beyond 2009 and task the CSPR with considering how to take it forward.
15.  International Polar Year 2007-2008

IPY is widely hailed as a success. The discussions of the ICSU-WMO IPY Joint Committee (and elsewhere) have now turned toward ensuring the legacy of IPY. The dialogue covers the potential roles for various organizations, including ICSU, in the post-IPY phase (post March 2009).

Given these discussions, ICSU may need to consider developing a position on its role, if any, in the post-IPY phase. The success of IPY raises the broader strategic question for ICSU of its role when a programme, particularly a short one such as IPY, is very successful but has a sunset clause.

IPY has exposed issues related to ICSU’s interests in data availability. Despite good intentions and positive statements from all parties at the outset of IPY, the availability of IPY data (even a complete set of metadata) is by no means guaranteed. This has become a major point of concern for the Joint Committee, and the co-chairs wrote to ICSU and WMO seeking help to solve the problem.

D. Carlson, Director of the IPY International Programme Office, briefed the CSPR by telephone link. He noted that the IPY has generated at least $400 Million of new research money in addition to $800 Million of existing polar research funds that have been relabelled as IPY funds. He also noted that the IPO will close by September 2009, and raised questions of how to sustain valuable networks and other activities, including those currently coordinated by the IPO. He emphasized that continued international coordination is needed beyond the end of IPY in March 2009, and noted that presumably the longer-term research funds will still be available beyond the life of IPY. It was also noted that two members of the ICSU family, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) and the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) are key participants in the IPY and will need to show strong leadership in the post-IPY phase.

The discussion focused on ICSU’s potential role in the post-IPY phase. D. Carlson indicated that ICSU started the process and should help in the closeout. He noted that the future of the coordination activities lies in the international setting rather than in a national institution, and that the list of potential bodies is short. He sees a potential enabling role for ICSU in calling for a continued international coordination function. By as soon as July 2008 (when the IPY Joint Committee next meets), there could be a call for Expressions of Interest to support an international science coordination and outreach function. The advisory body for this function would not be the current IPY Joint Committee, whose term expires at the end of 2009. Questions were posed about the role of SCAR and IASC in this context, and for how long would such an activity be needed. 2012 was raised in this context, as this is when the final IPY follow-up conference is planned.

The discussion covered additional aspects of a potential ICSU role in the IPY legacy. An attainment summary that addresses the impact of IPY and what worked (e.g., what educational tools were useful) would be very important. Such an evaluation of impacts by ICSU and WMO would be a logical part of the next Strategic Plan after 2012. In addition, the IPY has developed a strong education and outreach component that would benefit from continuity in the post-IPY phase. Though ICSU has not traditionally been strong in this area, it was noted that action on the capacity building and education theme of the current Strategic Plan 2006-2011, which was put off until the second three-year phase of implementation, could be focused to help address this challenge.
Decision
To recommend to the Executive Board that ICSU develop a position on its role in IPY legacy activities in the post-IPY period (post-March 2009).

16. Future Meetings

CSPR members have been invited to the 2008 General Assembly (21-24 October 2008) in Mozambique. At its previous meeting, CSPR decided to meet in the afternoon of Saturday 25 October 2008. At this meeting, CSPR members will observe how the General Assembly responds to the first three years of implementing the Strategic Plan 2006-2011, how it discusses the final three years, and how it reacts to ideas for developing the Strategic Plan 2012-2017. CSPR Members will then begin to shape how the planning process should move forward.

Tentative dates of 5-7 February 2009 were set for the 17th meeting of the CSPR, which, it is hoped, will run back to back with the Officers meeting. These dates will be finalized following the Executive Board meeting on 25 May.

K. Mokhele reminded the Committee of the reason for the interface with the Officers. This will be a new set of Officers, with possibly four out of five being new. The current CSPR will exist until the Chair delivers his report to the Executive Board in April 2009. The new CSPR Chair will be appointed at the General Assembly, and will attend the October 2008 and February 2009 CSPR meetings. The current Chair will chair those meetings. The process of selecting a new CSPR will begin immediately after the General Assembly and the slate will be approved by the Executive Board in April 2009. Four of the current CSPR members have term limits, but all of the other members in the room indicated they would be willing to be considered for a second term if asked.

Decisions
To note that the 16th meeting of CSPR will take place in Maputo on 25 October; and to set 5-7 February 2009 as the tentative dates for the 17th meeting.

17. Any other business

17.1 Global Climate Observing System (GCOS)

The GCOS Scientific Committee will meet in October 2008 and there are several committee vacancies. The proposal to ICSU was to strengthen expertise in the areas of: terrestrial observations, space observations, oceanography and the cryosphere. GCOS was reminded that the standard procedure is to submit nominations by 1 September for appointments starting the following calendar year, and ICSU is in discussions with the GCOS Secretariat to see how to best address this scheduling issue.

Decisions
To recommend that the Executive Board renew I. Wainer’s term for the period 1 January 2009 - 31 December 2010, as well as A. Afouda, Ed. Hill, and D. Kumar’s terms for the period 1 January 2008 - 31 December 2010; to recommend that the Executive Board appoint A. Belward, B. Goodison, M. Kadi, and T. Karl to the GCOS SC for the period 1 January 2008 - 31 December 2009; and to note that consultations with WMO, UNEP, and IOC-UNESCO are necessary.
## Annex 1: Grant Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal #</th>
<th>Lead Applicant / Supporting Applicant(s) (only eligible ones included)</th>
<th>Regional Offices</th>
<th>Title of Proposal</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CODATA; Canada, USA, ICSTI, WDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>To bring key policy &amp; decision makers together: The need for a coordinated global approach towards a more open access environment to scientific data &amp; information.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DIVERSITAS</td>
<td>ROLAC</td>
<td>Identifying biodiversity research, conservation, and management priorities in Latin America and the Caribbean in the light of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment’s findings</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>ROLAC</td>
<td>Mapping Scientific Disciplinary Networks in LA and the Caribbean</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ISPRS; IGU, INQUA, IUGG, IUGS, IUSS</td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>Mapping GeoUnions to the ICSU Framework for Sustainable Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IUPESM; Mozambique, Tanzania</td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>Evaluation of appropriate technology for health and well-being in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IUTAM; IUGG, UK</td>
<td>ROAP</td>
<td>Summer School on Fluid Mechanics and Geophysics of Environmental Hazards</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SCAR, WCRP, IASC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer school on Ice sheet models for the 21st century</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SCOPE; IGBP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WCRP</td>
<td>ROAP</td>
<td>Cities at Risk: Integrating Science and Policy for Managing Climate Risks in Asia’s Coastal Megacities</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WDC; South Africa, CODATA</td>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>World Data Center in Africa for Biodiversity and Human Health</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>