20th Meeting of the ICSU Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR)

27-28 September, 2010

5 rue Auguste Vacquerie
75116 Paris, France

MEETING REPORT

Present: I. Alcantara-Ayala, J. Asenjo, R. Balstad, L. Brito, C. Cesarsky, D. Chen (ex officio), H. Gupta, C. Leaver, Y.T. Lee (ex officio), Y. Lü, K. Raivio (Chair), C. de la Rey, B. Salem, M. Tchuente (ex officio), H. Vessuri, A. Whyte


By Invitation: D. Carlson (Science Cabaret), M.L. Chanin (Item 16), M. Keenan (Item 14), R. Kuroda, L. MacKellar (Item 9), J. Marks (Item 14)

Apologies: N. Nakicenovic, J. Rockström, C. Cesarsky (second day)

1. Opening of the Meeting

The meeting was opened by Stand-in Chair, Anne Whyte. The Chair, Kari Raivio, joined the meeting during the first break. The overarching theme of the meeting was to frame the development of ICSU second Strategic Plan, 2012-2017, and most agenda items fed into this discussion.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

**Decision**

To adopt the agenda, with the modification to add discussion on Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) Scientific Committee nomination to Item 7.4.

3. Decisions of the 19th CSPR Meeting and 102nd Executive Board Meeting
   (not treated elsewhere)

The draft decisions of the 19th CSPR meeting (CSPR19) had been circulated and a few amendments incorporated. The agreed decisions had been posted on the ICSU website, as had those of the 102nd Executive Board (EB102), which met in April 2010.

CSPR was reminded that a statement on the IPCC controversy had been posted on the ICSU website. The Committee also discussed follow-up to the Unions Meeting 7-8 April 2010 (EB102 Item 10) and the ongoing need to improve understanding and knowledge of ICSU among the Unions.
3.1 ICSU World Data System (ICSU WDS)

(CSPR19 Item 11 and EB102 Item 5.1) The ICSU WDS Scientific Committee had met for the second time in March 2010. The Committee finalized the Draft constitution of the ICSU World Data System and adopted a Draft Data Policy Statement. The members also continued working on the Preliminary WDS System Architecture and Criteria for WDS membership. The 3rd meeting of the WDS Scientific Committee was to be held in conjunction with the CODATA International Conference (Cape Town 23-24 October 2010). The committee was providing a substantial contribution to this conference by organizing one of the scientific sessions.

The Executive Board had accepted the recommendation from CSPR to establish an ICSU WDS International Programme Office and requested the Secretariat to call for proposals from ICSU Members to host the Office. The call was sent on 6 August 2010 to all ICSU National Members, Unions, Interdisciplinary Bodies, Associates and Partners. It was also sent to a list of (90+) organisations interested in ICSU WDS. The deadline for receiving the proposals was set to 30 September.

3.2 Ad hoc Strategic Coordination Committee for Information and Data (SCCID)

(CSPR19 Item 11) Since the last CSPR, the SCCID committee had held its second (24-26 March 2010) and third (15-17 September) meetings in Paris. The second meeting was used to examine the remaining Terms of Reference and update the work plan. A first set of draft recommendations addressing some of Terms of Reference were compiled and consolidated into Draft Routes to Recommendations.

During the third meeting, the committee was hoping to complete the summary of draft recommendations addressing all the terms of reference and to produce an Interim Report.

Decision
To note that the decisions of the 19th meeting of CSPR have been posted on the ICSU website; to note decisions of the Executive Board at its 102nd meeting; to note progress with the WDS and SCCID.

4. Review of implementation of the first ICSU Strategic Plan, 2006-2011

The Executive Director briefed CSPR on the continued implementation of the ICSU Strategic Plan, 2006-2011 (http://www.icsu.org/2_resourcecentre/Resource.php4?rub=6&id=149).

CSPR discussed the progress that had been made with involving social sciences in ICSU activities. It was noted that there are several ongoing activities within specific programmes, but the need to engage social sciences in increasing measures was recognized. ICSU should clarify its strategy with regards to social sciences. It was decided to add discussion on strengthening social sciences in ICSU in the next CSPR Meeting.

The discussion also covered ICSU’s role in relation to the private sector, and it was suggested that this might be an area to look at in more detail in the next Strategic Plan.

It was noted that the DIVERSITAS review was postponed because the Visioning process was fast-tracked.
Decision
To note report on progress in implementation of the ICSU Strategic Plan 2006-2011; to add discussion on social sciences to the agenda of the 21st CSPR Meeting.

5. Strategic Plan, 2012-2017 (Part I of discussion)

The Strategic Plan, 2012-2017 should be ready by April 2011 for approval by the Executive Board and the General Assembly in September 2011. Consequently, a complete draft of the Plan would have to be approved at the 21st meeting of CSPR in March 2011. In preparation, an initial draft for the Strategic Plan was presented for CSPR’s consideration, prior to circulation to the ICSU membership and partners for comment. The proposed document structure was based on the Executive Summary of the current Strategic Plan, 2006-2011.

The discussion of the working draft document for the new plan was split into two sessions: a brief introduction and preliminary consideration on the morning of Day 1 and two sessions of a longer discussion on Day 2 (all summarized here under Item 5). Several of the substantive activities and themes that needed to be consolidated in the strategic plan were discussed under specific items during the meeting and are summarized under those items.

CSPR’s discussion on the draft Strategic Plan was wide-ranging, covering a number of key areas:

Structure of the report: the aim should still be to produce a relatively brief (~25 page) report that emphasised both continuities and change. The draft document structure was okay, however the text included a number of duplications and ‘prose’ that should be avoided.

New Frontiers: it was noted that an ICSU specific definition of New Frontiers needed to be articulated, focussing on developments in interdisciplinary and international science to which ICSU might make a useful contribution. In this context the proposal to develop ontology and standards for nanoscience was interesting: the topic itself was no longer new but the potential ICSU contribution was important and unique.

Regional activities and integration: CSPR discussed how to improve the impact of the regional offices in strengthening regional science, which should be a focus area of the new Strategic Plan. The establishment of a Regional Office in the Arab Region was an important target.

Developing countries: It was noted that the old division between developed and developing countries was no longer useful. Following the UN practise, in the new Strategic Plan, 3 categories should be used: Less developed countries, emerging economy countries, and the developed countries. It was noted that the emergence of certain countries had led to even greater inequities between the less developed and developed countries.

Young scientists: greater emphasis should be put on attracting the next generation of scientists into ICSU programmes and activities.

Energy and Human Health: it was agreed that these should both remain as themes in the draft plan for consultation (see items 9 and 10 for details)

Science and Policy: the potential role of ICSU and its programmes in enhancing the capacity of decision-makers to use science was an area for future development
ICSU Structure: ICSU is a complex matrix of Members, IBs, Associates and policy committees and need to think how the structure can be simplified and communicated more clearly and succinctly.

ICSU external review: this was timely and important and should consider the overall composition and of the Unions Membership.

Role of Unions: there was a need to develop a dialogue with the Unions about how they can contribute to ICSU activities.

Hazards: present the IRDR programme as separate to sustainability/Earth system research.

Sustainability/Earth system research: mention joint programmes and activities that address specific areas such as food, water and agriculture.

Intellectual Property: do not maintain this as a stand-alone priority for the future but deal with under other areas/activities eg CFRS and CODATA.

Decision
To request the Secretariat to develop a revised complete draft, taking on board the CSPR comments and the planned discussion with regional Directors and Chairs and the Executive Board; to agree that there be an email consultation with CSPR on this 2nd draft prior to it being send out to the ICSU Membership for comment; and, to consider the comments from Members a 3rd draft of the Plan at the 21st CSPR meeting.

6. General Assembly Agenda

A draft agenda and plan for associated activities for the upcoming GA in 2011 had been sent to the ICSU family for comments in July. The feedbacks received so far was positive, with a number of suggestions for the two planned invited scientific lectures in the GA agenda.

CSPR discussed criteria for the three invited scientific lectures. It was important to include both developing world and developed world perspectives in these lectures. The focus should be in real challenges that connect to ICSU’s mission and strategy, not just on topics of general scientific interest. Mario Molina was suggested as a possible candidate to give a lecture.

Decision
To note the planned GA agenda and activities.

7. Environmental Programmes

7.1 Earth System Visioning Process Update

The goal of this process, which was launched at the ICSU General Assembly in 2008, was to engage the scientific community to explore options and propose steps to implement a holistic strategy for Earth system research. There was a need for a transition from research dominated by the natural sciences to research involving the full range of sciences and humanities. A need also existed for transiting from a preponderance of disciplinary research to a more balanced mix of
disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research and for research approaches that actively involve stakeholders and decision-makers.

CSPR has approved a three-step process. Briefly,

- **Step 1** focused on the research priorities and determined the most important research question in Earth system research that needs answering in the next decade.
- **Step 2** examined the institutional framework needed to support the identified grand challenges at the Sponsors Meeting on Visioning Institutional Frameworks for Global Sustainability.
- **Step 3** to explore transitioning from existing structures to new ones at a meeting in spring of 2011.

Based on a wide consultation and in depth discussion at a 2-day meeting in September 2009, a document entitled “Grand Challenges in Global Sustainability Research: A Systems Approach to Research Priorities for the Decade” had been developed by the Visioning Task Team.

On 22 June, 2010, ICSU and ISSC hosted in Paris an Open Forum to explore institutional frameworks that could effectively and successfully support the research and delivery of the Grand Challenges in global sustainability research. This Open Forum provided a platform to facilitate exchange of information and perspectives.

Following the Open Forum, there was a meeting between the co-sponsors of the four major global environmental change programmes (IOC, ISSC, IUBS, SCOPE, UNESCO, UNU, WMO), the four global environmental change programmes (DIVERSITAS, IGBP, IHDP, WCRP) and other ICSU programmes, ESSP, UNEP, funding bodies, and individual scientists. The task team was working now on the implementation of the conclusions from the June meeting and on planning of the last step of the visioning process.

In order to shape an approach that will best engage the Earth system research community on the identified Grand Challenges, the final step of the Visioning process was to examine how to make the transition from the current approach to the needed approach. A summary report of the various recent meetings and a concept note for a new initiative were provided for consideration by CSPR.

CSPR discussed that real action was necessary for implementation of Grand Challenges. The institutional transition was likely to be the most difficult part of Visioning programme and required establishing a new relationship between the many stakeholders. CSPR members were asked to feedback electronically on the Draft Concept Paper for Global Sustainability Research Initiative.

### Decision

To endorse the Grand Challenges in Global Sustainability Research document;

to note progress in the Earth system visioning process, including the initial concept for establishing a major new integrated initiative;

---

**7.2 ICSU Belmont Challenge Study**

In late 2009 the Belmont Forum, a group of major funders of international global change research led by US NSF and UK NERC, invited ICSU to conduct an analysis of the international research capability required to respond to the challenge of delivering knowledge to support human action and adaptation to regional environmental change. This challenge was named the Belmont Challenge and required regional and decadal prediction, advanced observing systems and the integration of the social sciences.

To address this task, ICSU set up a panel consisting of 15 international experts with Guy Brasseur as the chair, in December 2009, when the first meeting of the panel was held. Directly after the
first draft report was ready in April, the Panel had its second meeting. While the panel members served in their personal capacity, the report was able to benefit from, and build upon, the collective wisdom of a large community with which they interact. The analysis drew on the existing synthesis and assessment products of the broader scientific community, the experiences and strategic plans of the global change programmes and other related international and national activities, and many peer-reviewed papers.

The report has undergone extensive peer review. Inputs were sought from relevant ICSU bodies and other organizations. The Panel had a telephone conference in July 2010 to discuss all the review comments and to finalise its report. This version was endorsed electronically by the Executive Board.

It is interesting to note that the visioning outcomes cover elements set out in the Belmont Challenge. Although the Belmont analysis and the visioning process were two independently designed processes, the overlap in the priorities identified only served to underline their importance. As such, the discussions and suggestions of the Belmont analysis provided useful inputs to the ongoing visioning process.

CSPR discussion focused on models for funding international research and activities. The process developing the Belmont Challenge was interesting in this regard.

**Decision**

To note the publication of the Belmont report.

### 7.3 IGBP 2012 Open Science Conference

In the previous CSPR meeting, it was decided “to request that the Visioning Task Team enters into discussion with IGBP regarding the upcoming 2012 Open Science Conference: Planet Under Pressure: new knowledge, new solutions”. This issue was discussed during the ESSP SC meeting in April 2010 and during the second visioning meeting in June 2010. A consensus had been reached and made clear during the visioning meeting, where all the global environmental change programmes and ESSP Chairs were present, that this event would be a joint effort of the whole global environmental change community and it provided an excellent opportunity to integrate scientific inputs to feed into the Rio+20 conference and to officially launch the new initiative that may come out of the visioning exercise. On 9 September 2010, the Executive Director was invited to join the Scientific Organizing Committee as an *ex officio* member to represent ICSU. The conference is considered as a major global-change science conference of the four ICSU programmes and its partnership.

CSPR discussion emphasized how this conference provided a great opportunity for ICSU (and UNESCO) to prepare for Rio+20. All four global environmental change programmes should work together in this.

**Decision**

To welcome the joint efforts of the programmes in making links between this Open Science Conference and the visioning process plus the Rio+20 conference.

### 7.4 Nominations for Environmental Programme Committees

ICSU requests that organizations for which the Council appoints members (i.e., DIVERSITAS, Earth System Science Partnership[ESSP], Global Climate Observing System [GCOS], Global Ocean Observing System [GOOS], Global Terrestrial Observing System [GTOS], International
Geosphere-Biosphere Programme [IGBP], International Human Dimensions Programme [IHDP], and World Climate Research Programme [WCRP]) submit nominations by 1 September. This year, ICSU received nominations from DIVERSITAS, GOOS, IGBP, IHDP and WCRP.

Each organization is asked to submit more nominations than slots available so that ICSU’s role goes beyond rubberstamping. In addition to considering the submitted nominations, CSPR can recommend the consideration of additional individuals. Applications are vetted by CSPR and then sent to the Executive Board for approval. For the organizations that have co-sponsors (DIVERSITAS, GCOS, GOOS, GTOS, IHDP, and WCRP), the relevant co-sponsoring institutions are also involved in the final decision of appointments.

**7.4.1 DIVERSITAS**

DIVERSITAS is seeking renewal for 3 members and appointment of 2 new members to replace 1 member rotating off and 1 slot left open in 2009 in its Scientific Committee.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of S. Diaz, P. le Prestre, and H. Mooney for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to recommend that the Executive Board appoint B. Reyers and E.A. Rosa to the DIVERSITAS SC for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to note that consultations with UNESCO, IUBS, and SCOPE are necessary.

**7.4.2 GCOS**

GCOS is seeking renewal for 12 members and appointment of 3 new members to replace 3 members rotating off its Scientific Committee.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of A. Afouda, A. Belward, A. Cazenave, B. Goodison, M. Kadi, L. Kajfez-Bogotaj, T. Karl, D. Kumar, K. Onogi, S. Roesner, L. Song, and A. Zaitsev for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2012;

to recommend that the Executive Board appoint Ed Harrison, J. Hermes, and R. Pulwarty to the GCOS SC for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2012;

to note that consultations with UNESCO, IOC, UNEP, and WMO are necessary.

**7.4.3 GOOS**

GOOS is seeking renewal for 5 members and appointment of 1 new member to replace 1 member rotating off its Scientific Committee.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of M. Feeley, C. Grant, J. Gunn, D.Y. Lee, and D. Stammer for the period 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2011;

to recommend that the Executive Board appoint S. de Mora to the GOOS SC for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to note that consultations with IOC, UNEP, and WMO are necessary.
7.4.4 **IGBP**

IGBP is seeking renewal for 2 members and appointment of 4 new members to replace 4 members rotating off its Scientific Committee.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of A. Chen and P. Dube for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to recommend that the Executive Board appoint E. Brondizio, P.A. Matrai, L.K. Satheesh, M. Uematsu to the IGBP GB for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013.

7.4.5 **IHDP**

IHDP is seeking renewal for 4 members in its Scientific Committee.

EB101 in October 2009 approved the appointments of five IHDP SC members: X. Bai, C. Carraro, J. Dryzek, H. Gutschcher and S. Moser for the period 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2012. The letters of appointments were not signed by one of the co-sponsors (UNU) until recently. Given the lapse of time (circa 8 months), it is now proposed that the term of appointment begins on 1 January 2011 – 31 December 2013.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of I. Chabay, E. Nikitina, B. Osman-Elasha, and G. Palacio for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to recommend that the Executive Board approve the term of the 5 members approved last October for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to note that consultations with UNU and ISSC are necessary.

7.4.6 **WCRP**

WCRP is seeking renewal for 7 members and appointment of 5 new members to replace 5 members rotating off its Scientific Committee.

**Decision**

To recommend that the Executive Board renew the term of A. Busalacchi, G. Flato, D. Griggs, H. le Treut, J. Marotzke, J. Slingo and C. Vera for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2012;

to recommend that the Executive Board appoint G. Ragga, P. Yanda, T. Kari, H. Liao and D. Karoly to the WCRP JSC for the period 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2013;

to note that consultations with IOC and WMO are necessary.

7.4.7 **IRDR (Integrated Research on Disaster Risk)**

The CSPR was informed of an imminent electronic consultation that would be needed on nominations for the replacement of two members of the IRDR Scientific Committee. The mandate of the Chair of the Committee, Prof. Gordon McBean, was due to end at the close of the fifth meeting of IRDR-SC in 2011 and consultations were taking place regarding his replacement. The advantage of having Prof. McBean reporting on the IRDR at the upcoming General Assembly was raised, along with the possibility of his mandate being exceptionally extended for the purpose by one session of the Committee.
**Decision**
To recommend to the Executive Board that the mandate of the present Chair of the IRDR Scientific Committee, Prof. Gordon McBean, be extended until November 2011, it being understood that his replacement would, by that time, be named.


CSPR discussed this agenda item at both its 18th and 19th meetings. The decisions taken by CSPR19 on this agenda item read: “To explore options for developing a series of policy papers on key aspects of science for sustainable development during the preparatory phase of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, 2012 (Rio+20); and to advise the Executive Board that additional resources will need to be identified if ICSU is to attach high priority to Rio+20.”

As regards the recommendation to explore options for developing policy papers on key aspects of science for sustainable development, the Secretariat was unable up to now to make progress with this task. Efforts to prepare a first policy paper on energy and sustainable development, with the involvement of some CSPR members, need to be pursued further.

As regards the advice on Rio+20 given by CSPR19 to the Executive Board, the Board at its 102nd meeting in April 2010 decided “To note the views and advice from CSPR; and to agree that ICSU should attach high priority to its participation in Rio+20 and take action to secure additional resources to this end.”

Consequently, the ICSU Secretariat, after consultations with the directors of the Regional Offices, prepared a funding proposal, amounting to US$ 630 000. The President-Elect, Prof. Yuan Tseh Lee, and the Vice-President for External Relations, Prof. Reiko Kuroda, agreed to approach possible funding sources in Asia, on the basis of this proposal. On 8 September 2010, the Executive Director was informed that the full amount budgeted in the funding proposal has been secured from a number of sources including the National Science Council Taiwan (NSC).

During the last six months, the ICSU Secretariat has used all opportunities available to start discussions with the research programmes involved in the Visioning Process on how best to organise joint efforts of feeding scientific input into the Rio+20 preparatory process. All programmes have responded positively and agree to follow a coordinated approach, led by the ICSU Secretariat.

In early August this year, the UN Secretary-General announced the convening of a High-Level Panel on Global Sustainability. The outcome of the 18-month work of the Panel would be a final report, with the “Brundtland Report” serving as a model. The Panel would feed its work both into the ongoing negotiations of a post-Kyoto Protocol agreement under UNFCCC and the Rio+20 preparatory process. ICSU has been in contact with the Panel Secretariat regarding possible scientific input by ICSU and its international research programmes into the work of the Panel.

CSPR20 discussions emphasized the importance of ICSU’s role in feeding into the work of the High-Level Panel on Global Sustainability. It was noted that ICSU should be pro-active in providing scientific support to the work of the panel, and to this end keep in close contact with the Panel Secretariat. On the planned ICSU activities, as outlined in the funding proposal, in support of the Rio+20 process, CSPR members suggested that specific efforts should be made to engage young scientists in the process.

CSPR20 also emphasized the need for ICSU involving key partners in its planned Rio+20 activities, notably in the planned regional workshops, to be organized by ICSU’s Regional Offices. Co-organizing these workshops with UNESCO, as already discussed between the two organizations was very welcome.
**Decision**
To welcome the additional funding and endorse the planned activities feeding into the Rio+20 process.

9. **ICSU’s potential role in energy**

Energy is a priority for ICSU in the current strategic plan but following the disbandment of the International Science Panel on Renewable Energy (ISPRE) in 2009 it was not an area in which there was currently any concentrated activity. Discussions at the previous CSPR meeting, which included a summary of the ongoing Global Energy Assessment and consideration of the Regional Office activities, concluded that any future global energy activity should be incorporated within the framework of the Grand Challenges for Global Sustainability Research. There was considered to be potential for engaging global networks to focus on regional actions and in this context the Unions might have an important role to play.

Following the decisions of 19th CSPR meeting, the Secretariat sent a memo to ICSU’s Scientific Unions on their activity and interests in the area of energy, and their opinions on ICSU’s potential role in energy. 6 unions responded, including IUFRO, IUGG, IUGS, IUHPS, IUMRS and IUPAC. (It was noted that several Unions, such as IUPAP, that have a strong interest in energy research did not respond to the consultation). Different types of activities, focused on broad areas relevant to energy, had taken place in the past 5 years, and have been directly held or co-organized by these Scientific Unions. The Unions were also planning more activities and research in the future, and had views on potential roles for ICSU. The full responses from the Unions, and a summary, were provided for consideration.

In the light of the activities in the Regional Offices and the Unions, CSPR discussed ICSU’s potential future role in Energy. It was suggested that ICSU should build on the work that has been done at the Regional Offices. However, it was also noted that if ICSU shouldn’t replicate what is already being done in other organizations, but identify a unique niche. One suggestion was that this niche could be to perform a global analysis of how sustainable energy future might look in different parts of the world. Currently an analysis of the whole energy landscape seems to be missing, although the ongoing Global energy analysis could help to fill this gap.

**Decision**
to include sustainable energy in the next strategic plan with a focus on the needs of less developed countries, working via the Regional Offices and Unions on capacity building.

10. **Urban Health and Wellbeing**

Human Health was a priority area in the current Strategic plan and a topic in which several of the Unions had a particular interest. CSPR commissioned a scoping study that reported in 2007 and proposed a systems analysis approach to health and wellbeing in the changing urban environment as a topic for a potential new ICSU programme. A Planning Group was established in 2008 to take this forward and this Group met on 5 occasions to develop its final report which was presented now for consideration by CSPR. The co-chair of the Planning Group, Landis MacKellar, attended the meeting in person and Pierre Ritchie, a former CSPR member and CSPR-liaison to the Planning Group, joined by teleconference. Dr MacKellar was from the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, which had been a partner in the planning exercise and could potentially have an important role to play in implementing an eventual programme.

During the planning, CSPR had had the opportunity to comment on two interim versions of the science plan most recently at CSPR18. The draft science plan had not yet been sent out to the ICSU Membership for consultation, although it had been sent to a number of individuals, who had
responded positively. Similarly, whilst efforts were made during the planning exercise to get input from local urban policy-makers, the policy community had not been formally consulted.

CSPR had a lengthy discussion on the proposed plan that covered a range issues: the choice of urban versus rural; the challenges in identifying the relevant urban decision-makers; the importance of integrating economics into the systems models and the role of the unions.

Some concerns were expressed as to whether ICSU should be venturing into the health research area but members were reminded that the General Assembly had approved human health as a strategic priority. It was recognised that this science plan addressed the main issues raised previously by CSPR and had a lot of potential. It was decided that further consultations on the draft report should be conducted before making the final decision. WHO should be approached to see if they would be interested in this type of a programme.

**Decision**

To support the science plan, in principle, and circulate to the ICSU Membership and interdisciplinary bodies for comment;

to invite IIASA to co-sponsor the potential programme;

to request the Secretariat to explore the interest of other potential co-sponsors and/or supporting organisations, including WHO;

subject to these consultations, to make a final recommendation on launching a new programme at the next CSPR meeting

---

**11. Grants Programme**

The 2011 Grants Programme was announced in May 2010 following the decision of the 19th CSPR meeting to give applicants more time to prepare proposals. The deadline of 2011 Grants Programme is 1 December, giving the applicants 3 more months than past years. In the 2011 announcement, the “meaningful engagement of Regional Offices in proposal development from the outset” has been emphasized in the programme statement. The priorities for 2011 programme were the same as in 2010 and 2009.

The five reports from 2009 awardees were presented to CSPR in order to assess the quality of the work conducted under the auspices of the programme and calibrate its judgements of proposal quality. CSPR members who were involved in the original proposal assessments took the lead in presenting the final reports.

Overall, the goals listed in the proposals had been reached or even exceeded during 2009. The leverage of these relatively small amounts of money to make productive connections between scientific unions or IBs and regional offices was impressive.

**Decision**

To note the information of the 2011 application material;

to approve the final reports from the 2009 programme.
12. Science Education

The ad-hoc Review Panel on Science Education (RPSE) had held a second meeting in Paris on 9-10 September 2010, during which it had examined responses to a questionnaire that had been sent to all ICSU members on 3 March, as well as draft sections of the Panel’s report that had been assigned to certain panel members. On the basis of this, and through a series of break-out sessions, the Panel was able to draft a consolidated text, which – once finalized by the Chair – would be sent to ICSU family members for comment ahead of its final revision. RPSE was planning to meet for a third and final time in February 2011 to approve its Report, which would be submitted to the 21st Meeting of CSPR in March 2011.

**Decision**

To note the progress made by the ad-hoc Review Panel on Science Education in carrying out a strategic review of ICSU’s role in relation to science education.

13. International Polar Year (IPY)

The International Polar Year (IPY) 2007-2008 was co-sponsored by ICSU and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). As the largest international scientific collaboration in 50 years (since the International Geophysical Year of 1957-58), it involved more than 50,000 scientists, educators, and data experts from more than 60 countries in over 230 internationally coordinated projects. The projects attracted at least $0.5 Billion in “new” funds for polar science over the two-year period.

The early scientific successes of IPY were reported by more than 2300 participants at a major conference in Oslo in June 2010. In addition to stimulating new science, IPY energized ICSU-affiliated polar organizations including the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC), the Climate and Cryosphere Project of the World Climate Research Programme, and several others. It also stimulated major efforts in education and outreach (the lessons from which are being compiled in a project funded by the ICSU Grants Programme, and a teaching resource that has been produced with partial support from ICSU [http://www.ipy.org/hidden/item/2297-promotional-material-for-the-polar-resource-book]), early career development (through the formation, growth, and engagement of the Association of Polar Early Career Scientists), and data stewardship (including a grants-programme-funded project called the Polar Information Commons, led by CODATA).

ICSU’s role in IPY is captured in brief in a summary paper and in the report from the Workshop on the legacy of the IPY by the IPY Joint Committee (JC). The report described the fourteen recommended follow-up action areas within six overarching themes identified during the workshop.

IPY was centred on a two-year period from 1 March 2007 to 1 March 2009, but has involved many more years of effort and its legacy was expected to continue. ICSU’s role in the legacy was closely tied to the Visioning process and how ICSU’s programmes align around the Grand Challenges for Global Sustainability Research. There has been a conscious effort, both in public statements by ICSU during the major IPY conference hosted in Oslo, and during the Sponsors’ meeting for the Visioning Process, to converge on this idea.

Many aspects of the lessons of IPY were covered in the JC’s Summary Report, and these should influence planning of future ICSU activities. Members of IPY leadership groups were already involved in ICSU’s ongoing activities in education and data, and continued attention to the lessons, gaps, and momentum from IPY was crucial. Lessons were also learned in setting up and operating the International Programme Office (IPO) that was hosted by the Natural Environment Research Council at its British Antarctic Survey.
The IPO Director, D. Carlson, was present and provided his analysis of the successes and (relative) failures of IPY including an assessment of future challenges. [He also gave a multi-media presentation in the evening that highlighted the range and impact of IPY research, education and outreach activities].

**Decision**

To thank Dave Carlson for his outstanding contribution as director of the IPY programme Office

### 14. ICSU Foresight Analysis

CSPR decided at its 17th meeting to initiate a foresight analysis in conjunction with development of the Strategic Plan, 2012-2017. The purpose of the ICSU foresight analysis was to explore the potential development of international science in a changing economic, social, political, and environmental context in order to test the role and mission of ICSU and guide long-term strategic choices.

At its 18th meeting, CSPR decided to form a Task Team to advise the Secretariat on the design and implementation of the ICSU foresight analysis. In October 2009, the Task Team initiated the information gathering phase of the project. This phase continued until April 2010, and resulted in a list of key drivers of international science over the next 20 years (presented at the 19th CSPR meeting). In April 2010, the Task Team met in Paris to shape the next phase of its work—translating the inputs on key drivers into initial exploratory scenarios of the future of international science and how it benefits science and society. At this meeting, the Task Team consulted with experts on scenario development who subsequently have been advising the Task Team on drafts of the resulting 4 exploratory scenarios.

CSPR was asked to consider the draft scenarios for the development of society and international science over the next 20 years and identify initial insights from the foresight process that inform development of the Strategic Plan, 2012-2017. The Chair of the Foresight Task Team, John Marks, and a member of the Task Team, foresight expert Michael Keenan, presented the draft report, and the subsequent plans for constructing a ‘success scenario’, to CSPR.

The Committee had an interactive discussion on the scenarios. It was noted that they were well developed and provided a good basis for further considerations of ICSU’s future role in international science. It was suggested that to attract further interest in the scenarios, ICSU should eventually widen the scope of consultation beyond the Unions (social scientists, politicians etc.).

Several topics were identified that might merit more emphasis in one or several of the scenarios. These topics included the future role of anti-globalization, anti-science and religious movements, citizen science, small and medium sized companies, regionalization, disciplinary vs. interdisciplinary research, access to data worldwide and attractiveness of scientific careers. CSPR also discussed how research might be funded 20 years from now and how to make the scenarios more balanced in the terms of negative and positive aspects. It was noted that the current vs. future landscape of science still be had to be more fully mapped into the scenarios.

**Decision**

To approve the draft report and scenarios for circulation to Members for input, after further refinement in the light of the of CSPR’s comments;

to agree that a workshop should be organised in conjunction with the next CSPR meeting to develop a ‘success scenario’.
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15. **Strategic Plan, 2012-2017 (Part II of discussion)**

As discussed in Agenda Item 5, CSPR was invited to reflect on the discussions at this meeting and advise the Secretariat on adjustments to the draft of the next strategic plan. (See Item 5 for the discussion and decisions relating to the Strategic Plan, 2012-2017)

16. **Regional Offices**

16.1 Asia and the Pacific

The Terms of Reference approved by CSPR19 were subsequently approved by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MOSTI) through the host institution Malaysian Academy of Sciences (ASM). The Ministry also agreed on the names submitted by CSPR for Panel membership and submitted their own names. In the event several of the people originally proposed declined and final slate of the Review Panel had to be agreed electronically with the CSPR Chair.

The Review Panel had discussions over two meetings, an initial meeting in June (25-26) held in Paris, followed later by a site visit in August (9-11) to Kuala Lumpur organized with the assistance of the Malaysian Academy of Sciences. In the first meeting the Panel reviewed its Terms of Reference (ToR), considered and analysed information gathered from the online consultations and reviewed the reports submitted by the Director of the Regional Office and the Chair of the Regional Committee together with other key documents submitted by the ICSU Secretariat and the Regional Office. At that meeting, the Panel received oral briefings from the Director of the Regional Office and the Regional Committee Chair (via video conference).

At the site visit in Kuala Lumpur the Panel received further inputs from the Director of the Regional Office and the Chair of the Regional Committee, and met with representatives of the Academy of Sciences Malaysia (ASM) and visited the Regional Office. The Panel also held a series of meetings and telephone conference interviews with representatives of the Malaysian Government, the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MOSTI), some of the Office’s regional partners and one of the members of the Regional Committee. The Panel’s draft report and recommendations were completed in Kuala Lumpur; Panel members further refined the draft report through electronic communication.

ROAP Review Panel Chair, Marie-Lise Chanin, gave a briefing on the report of the Review Panel. Afterwards CSPR discussed the implications. Particular emphasis was placed in the review on how to more fully include the less developed countries in the region, which was dominated by the newly emerging economies. There was considerable potential for sharing scientific resources within the Region and for working more closely with the Scientific Unions. It was noted that ROAP, as all the Regional Offices, had selected sustainable energy as a priority area, which was relevant to the earlier discussions (see item 9)

Overall the Office had started well and appeared to have a promising future, although resources were clearly a limitation.

**Decision**

To thank the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) Review Panel for its work; to endorse the recommendations put forward by the ROAP Review Panel; and, to recommend to the Executive Board to publish the final report of the ROAP Review.
16.2 Latin America and the Caribbean

The ROLAC Review Panel held its initial meeting in Paris (19–20 March 2010). At that meeting, the Panel reviewed the ToR, the key documents submitted by the Regional Office and the Secretariat (inc. Director’s and Chair’s report) and the information gathered using the online consultation. The Panel also received oral input from the Regional Director and the Regional Committee Chair (via video conference).

In May (17-19) the Panel visited the Regional Office in Rio de Janeiro, met the Director and staff, and the members of the Regional Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean (RCLAC). During the visit the Panel also met the President and other representatives of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences (ABC), the Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos (FINEP) and other regional organizations. The Panel received input from the Mexican Academy of Sciences (AMC) (via teleconference) and from the national Council for Science and Technology of Mexico (CONACyT). The draft report and recommendations were prepared in Rio de Janeiro immediately following the site visit and finalised by electronic consultation.

ROLAC Review Panel Chair, Michael Clegg, gave a briefing on the report of the Review Panel. Afterwards CSPR discussed the implications. The Office had done well in Rio and the main issue was the imminent relocation to Mexico, which would also entail a change in leadership. It was emphasized that the transition of the Office (to Mexico) should be carefully managed so as to preserve the momentum of the work of ROLAC. It was noted positively that Mexico had promised considerably increased resources for the Office, which should permit it to consolidate and expand its activities and improve visibility.

**Decision**

To thank the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) Review Panel for its work;

to endorse the recommendations put forward by the ROLAC Review Panel;

to recommend to the Executive Board to publish the final report of the ROLAC Review.

16.3 Establishment of CSPR sub-group to consider all RO reviews

At the CSPR18 a proposed Review of Science and Technology in Developing Countries was discussed. CSPR noted that it had directions from the General Assembly and agreed on the main issues that need to be addressed in a forward-looking strategic review of the ICSU’s role in promoting science and technology in developing countries. CSPR also noted the importance of completing the reviews of all three Regional Offices to feed into this strategic review. It had become clear that the Regional Office reviews were more complex and required more resources than originally envisaged. The Regional Office reviews also included a significant strategic, forward looking element, and it was always understood that there would be some overlap with the broader strategic review. Based on these considerations, CSPR had decided to first analyse the Regional Office reviews before deciding on the need for a broader strategic review.

Now that the three reviews of the individual Offices had been completed, CSPR was asked to reconsider this area. A number of generic issues were identified that were relevant for all the Offices and would be most effectively addressed with a common approach and/or policies. These ranged from major strategic issues to more specific operational issues, including:

- Clarifying the remit and realistic expectations from the Offices
- Processes for implementing the regional science plans and integrating them with global activities
- How to more fully engage the Unions?
- Governance, eg composition and role(s) of the Regional Committees
- Communication with ICSU-Paris and between Regional Offices
- Clarification of responsibilities and rules and revision of MoUs

It was proposed that a sub-group of CSPR (4-6 members) should be established to assist the Secretariat in considering these generic issues. This group would meet for a day prior to the next CSPR meeting and might interact via email and/or teleconference before-hand. The issue of whether there should be a broader strategic review of S&T in Developing (or Less Developed) countries would then be decided upon separately by CSPR after it had considered the report of the sub-group.

**Decision**
To request the Secretariat to draft the ToR for a CSPR sub-group to consider the generic outcomes from the Regional Office reviews;

to agree that this sub-group should meet prior to the next CSPR meeting and report to the full committee.

**17. Strategic Plan, 2012-2017 (Part II of discussion)**

As discussed in Agenda Item 5, CSPR was invited to reflect on the discussions at this meeting and advise the Secretariat on adjustments to the draft of the next strategic plan.
(See Item 5 for the discussion and decisions relating to the Strategic Plan, 2012-2017)

**18. Meeting Evaluation**

There had been some organizations/technical problems with the tele-conferencing during the meeting. This was disruptive but it was agreed that the appropriate use of tele-conferencing was an efficient way to include input from guests who could usefully contribute but were not essential to items under discussion. Where essential input and discussion was required the preference was to have guests attend in person.

**19. Date of Next Meeting**

In a General Assembly (GA) year, CSPR meets in March/April rather than February to allow more time for preparation of materials for the GA (e.g., a strategic plan). The next meeting of CSPR had already provisionally planned for 30-31 March 2011. It was agreed to extend this to include a Foresight workshop (item 14) and to consider holding the meeting in an appropriate residential seminar location near Paris.

The 30th ICSU General Assembly was to be held in Rome on 26-30 September 2011. CSPR was expected to attend the GA and meets on the day after.

**Decision**
To confirm 30, 31 March and 1 April for the next CSPR Meeting, with one day being put aside for a Foresight workshop;

to reserve 29 April for a CSPR sub-group meeting to consider the Regional Office reviews (identified CSPR members only);
to note that CSPR members attend the 30th General Assembly in Rome and meet on 1 October 2011.

20. **Any Other Business**

A presentation on 'Why National Members Join ICSU' by Jacinta Legg.

Kari Raivio  
Chair

Deliang Chen  
Executive Director
Annex 1: List of Acronyms

ABC  Brazilian Academy of Science
AMC  Mexican Academy of Sciences
ASCEND21 Agenda of Science for Environment and Development into the 21st century (ICSU)
ASM  Academy of Sciences of Malaysia
CFRS  Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science
CODATA Committee on Data (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body)
CONATyC National Council for Science and Technology of Mexico
CSD  Commission on Sustainable Development (UN)
CSPR  Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (ICSU Policy Committee)
DIVERSITAS An international programme of diversity science (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body, cosponsored with IUBS, SCOPE, UNESCO)
EB  Executive Board of ICSU
EB101/102 101st/102nd meeting of the Executive Board
ESSP  Earth System Science Partnership (a partnership of DIVERSITAS, IHDP, IGBP, WCRP)
FINEP  Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos
GA  General Assembly (of ICSU unless stated otherwise)
GCOS  Global Climate Observing System (Joint Initiative of ICSU, cosponsored by WMO, UNEP, UNESCO-IOC)
GEC  Global Environmental Change
GEO  Group on Earth Observations
GEOSS  Global Earth Observing System of Systems
GOOS  Global Ocean Observing System (ICSU Joint Initiative with UNESCO-IOC, WMO, UNEP)
GTOS  Global Terrestrial Observing System (ICSU Joint Initiative with WMO, UNEP, UNESCO, FAO)
IAP/IAC  Inter Academy Panel / Inter Academy Council
IB  Interdisciplinary Body (of ICSU)
IASC  International Arctic Science Committee
ICPC  Interagency Coordination and Planning Committee for Earth Observations
ICSU  International Council for Science
IGBP  International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (Interdisciplinary Body of ICSU)
IGFA  International Group of Funding Agencies for Global Change Research
IGU  International Geographical Union
IHDP  International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (Interdisciplinary Body of ICSU, cosponsored with ISSC, UNU)
IIASA  International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
IOC  Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (of UNESCO)
IPCC  Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN)
IPO  International Programme Office
IPY  International Polar Year 2007-08 (Joint Initiative cosponsored by ICSU and WMO)
IRDR  Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body)
IRENA  International Renewable Energy Agency
ISPRE  International Science Panel on Renewable Energies
ISSC  International Social Science Council
IUBS  International Union of Biological Sciences (ICSU Member)
IUFRO  International Union of Forest Research Organizations (ICSU Member)
IUHPS  International Union of History and Philosophy of Science (ICSU Member)
IUGG  International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (ICSU Member)
IUGS  International Union of Geological Sciences (ICSU Member)
IUMRS  International Union of Materials Research Societies (ICSU Member)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC</td>
<td>International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (ICSU Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPAP</td>
<td>International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (ICSU Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSTI</td>
<td>Ministry of Science Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERC</td>
<td>Natural Environment Research Council (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Science Council Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio+20</td>
<td>UN Conference on Sustainable Development, to be held in Rio de Janeiro 20 years after the initial such conference in Rio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>Regional Office for Africa (ICSU Regional Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAP</td>
<td>Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ICSU Regional Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLAC</td>
<td>Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ICSU Regional Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSE</td>
<td>Review Panel on Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scientific Committee or Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAR</td>
<td>Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCID</td>
<td>Ad hoc Strategic Committee on Information and Data (ended in 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCID</td>
<td>Strategic Coordinating Committee on Information and Data (ad hoc ICSU committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td>Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body until 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNU</td>
<td>United Nations University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCRP</td>
<td>World Climate Research Programme (Interdisciplinary Body of ICSU, cosponsored with WMO and IOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS</td>
<td>ICSU World Data System (ICSU Interdisciplinary Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS-SC</td>
<td>World Data System Scientific Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>World Meteorological Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>