Report

Present: Malegapuru William Makgoba (Chair), Juan A. Asenjo, Tom Beer, Boshra Bakr Salem, Valéria Csepe, Cheryl de la Rey, Christopher Field, Fumiko Kasuga, Lü Yonglong, Nebojsa Nakicenovic, Hubert Savenije, Martin Visbeck, David Black (ex officio), Gordon McBean (ex officio), Steven Wilson (ex officio)

Secretariat: Peter Bates (Item 12, 13), Gisbert Glaser (Item 12), Howard Moore (Item 4), Katsia Paulavets (item 6, 7), Carthage Smith, Anne-Sophie Stevance (Item 5)

Apologies: Lidia Brito, Vijay Prasad Dimri

1. Opening of the meeting and introductions

The meeting was opened by the Chair, Malegapuru William Makgoba. ICSU welcomed the new CSPR member, Stewart Lockie, to the Committee. The chair invited CSPR members to consider and declare issues of personal bias and conflicts of interest as the meeting progressed.

Decisions

To develop clear guidance on conflicts of interest for ICSU committees;

to include the ToR for CSPR as a standard paper at all future meetings.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Committee adopted the agenda.

3. Decisions of the 24th CSPR Meeting and 108th Executive Board Meeting

The report of the previous CSPR meeting had been approved by members and made publicly available on the ICSU website. Likewise the report of the most recent Executive Board meeting had been finalised. It was noted that CSPR meetings are timed to take place prior to the Executive Board and many of the items go forward to the latter.

3.1 Update on External Review

The CSPR was informed that the Selection Committee had identified possible members and would be shortly contacting them to see if they were interested in becoming members of the External Review Committee.

3.2 Unions Meeting Update

The CSPR was reminded that representatives of ICSU’s Unions meet with members of the Executive Board and Secretariat at the mid-point between General Assemblies. The next such Unions’ meeting was due to take place 29-30 April 2013. After consultation with unions ICSU had produced a draft agenda, which aimed to give Unions ample time for discussion on how they could contribute to key ICSU projects. ICSU had asked Unions to submit information about their activities and future priorities, which were to be compiled and distributed prior to the meeting as background information.
One of the proposed topics on the agenda for the Unions’ meeting was ‘New Research Horizons’. The proposal from CSPR 24 that a call be made to Unions for ideas for annual ICSU New Horizon meetings was discussed in this context.

The CSPR highlighted:

- The importance of new horizons research, noting that this is an opportunity to involve young scientists in scoping exercises. They also noted that the ongoing nanotechnology project involves several unions.
- The importance of open access and open data as a topic for the Unions meeting. It was noted that open access is often not appropriate for the social sciences due to ethical issues in sharing sensitive social science data. The need to hear the ideas, opinions and experiences of Unions with open access was agreed upon. It was also noted that different National Members have experiences with open access, and could also be involved in future work on this topic.

**Decisions**

- To note the reports from the 24th CSPR and 108th Executive Board;
- To note progress with the external review;
- To emphasise the importance of new horizons research and open access as topics for the Unions meeting.

4. Update on implementation of the Strategic Plan 2012-2017

A brief update on strategic priorities and actions not covered elsewhere in the meeting agenda was presented under this item.

4.1 CODATA Review update

The Review Panel on CODATA had held its second meeting within the framework of the 23rd International CODATA Conference and the 28th CODATA General Assembly, on 28-31 October 2012 and 1-2 November 2012 respectively on the campus of the Academy of Sciences located in Taipei. This had allowed Panel Members not only to experience the major biennial scientific event organized by CODATA first hand, but also to be present at the meeting of its main governing and decision-making body. They had also been able to interview the current Officers and Executive Committee of CODATA, three of its past-Presidents, officers of the WDS and leading personalities from the data and information community.

Preparation of the Panel’s Report was well under way, and it was predicted to be submitted to CSPR, as scheduled, for examination at its 26th Meeting in September 2013. There was not thought to be need for a third meeting of the Panel.

It was noted that the relationship between CODATA and the World Data System was being considered by the review panel and would be a topic for discussion at the next CSPR meeting.

4.2 Urban Health and Wellbeing

The first meeting of the Scientific Committee for the new Urban Health and Wellbeing programme had taken place in Paris in December 2012. The next meeting was scheduled to take place in Kuala Lumpur in May and would include a session with the scientists involved in developing projects with the support of the Regional Officer for Asia and Pacific. The plans for an international Conference on Urban Dynamics in Paris in September 2012 were proceeding well and partnerships with other key organisations were being developed. An open call for offers to host the International Programme Office (IPO) had gone out to all ICSU Members in January and offers were to be considered by the Executive Board at its meeting in April.
The CSPR noted that:

- This is a predominantly health-science based activity, which is something of a first for ICSU.
- It would be necessary to partner with other large networks/initiatives also working on cities.
- It would be important to link to health organisations. WHO and the Gates Foundation are both very important as partners in health. It was noted that there was a WHO representative on the committee, but that WHO would probably not initially be a formal sponsor. The International Society of Urban Health and the Inter-Academy Medical Panel should also be involved.
- The programme would not only focus on health, but also address other urban development issues using a systems approach. It would be important to ensure that the planned International Conference on Urban Dynamics is more than a standard urban health conference.
- There would need to be strong links with Future Earth due to the importance of urbanisation for global environmental change.
- IRDR will also be an important partner due to the impacts of disasters in urban areas.
- Several countries potentially interested in hosting the IPO are in the Asia and the Pacific region.

It was agreed that this was a challenging but important programme for ICSU to initiate and that CSPR should monitor its progress closely. There should be a full briefing by the Urban Health Scientific Committee Chair at the next meeting.

4.3 Observing Systems

A proposal for a review of ICSU’s role in the Earth Observing Systems had been endorsed at the 30th General Assembly, when WMO also invited ICSU to participate in its review of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS). In subsequent discussion at the CSPR 22 meeting, it had been agreed that ICSU should participate in the GCOS review and it was noted that the proposed broader ICSU review could have important implications for Future Earth. In practice, the GCOS review had been considerably delayed although a review panel had been established at the time of CSPR 25, which included ICSU nominations from CSPR (MV) and WDS. It had been agreed at the CSPR 23 meeting (March 2012) to await the outcome of this review before initiating the proposed ICSU strategic review.

The annual Plenary Meeting of the Group on Earth Observations (GEO) coordinating efforts to build a Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) had been held at Iguacu Falls, Brazil, in November 2012. ICSU was continuing to contribute to GEO/GEOSS as a co-sponsor of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS), the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) and the Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS), as well as through its other specialized interdisciplinary bodies, in particular CODATA and DIVERSITAS. ICSU had been represented, in its capacity as a GEO Participating Organization, at the GEO Plenary Meeting. Among the decisions taken by the GEO Plenary had been the recognition of the World Data System (WDS) as a GEO Participating Organization in its own right.

The CSPR 25 noted that:

- The distinction between GEO, GEOSS, GCOS, CEOS etc needs to be clearer as it is not very clear at present. A document mapping these entities is needed before CSPR can really have a meaningful discussion.
- One aim of the review at the strategic level is to figure these distinctions out and identify where science collaboration is most needed, including the relationship with future Earth.
- ICSU needs to examine how it is involved in the observing systems and what it is trying to achieve. There is a need to look at how health and disaster data etc could feed into observing systems.
- Despite some concerns as to next steps, the observing systems were making important contributions, for example GOOS has made great progress in ocean observations.
4.4 **Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) programme update**

Working Groups addressing four main projects of the IRDR programme had been established and were active. Of these, the one arguably attracting the most interest from the hazards and disasters community was FORIN – Forensic Investigations of Disasters. This sought to develop a standard protocol for the careful analysis of past disaster events, their causes and their immediate aftermath, so as to be able to draw lessons for the future. Others projects were: RIA – Risk Interpretation and Action; DATA – an initiative related to the standardization, storage and dissemination of disaster loss data; and AIRDR – a global assessment of integrated research on disaster risk reduction worldwide. Efforts were being made to articulate these and other activities of the global IRDR programme with the activities on disasters being planned and carried out by the ICSU Regional Offices. The IRDR-SC was to hold its ninth meeting in Geneva on 18-20 May 2013, in connection with the UN Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (19-23 May 2013). IRDR was to host a special event at the Platform.

CSPR recognized that reviews were needed of:

(a) the arrangement through which the International Programme Office for IRDR was hosted in Beijing; and

(b) the development of the IRDR International Centre of Excellence hosted by the Academy of Sciences located in Taipei, and its contribution to the objectives of the global IRDR programme.

In both cases CSPR instructed the Secretariat to pass on its concerns to the relevant parties over shortcomings in integration and communication that had been reported to it. It endorsed the specific proposals made in a written memo by the Chair IRDR-SC for greater involvement of IRDR and its IPO in the planning and implementation of activities of the ICoE, such that the Centre might make a more effective contribution to the programme, and one which was less dependent upon START as the sole operational partner. These proposals included:

1. The strengthening of IRDR on the ICoE Advisory Board, by adding a 2nd IRDR SC member and having the IRDR Executive Director be made an ex officio member of the Advisory Board;

2. Increased, more active participation of the ICoE at IRDR –SC meetings. The ICoE representative at these meetings should play an active liaison role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To note progress with the Review of CODATA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To invite the chair of the Urban Health Programme to report to the next CSPR meeting;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To request a background paper on the observing systems for the next CSPR meeting and draft ToR for a strategic review;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express concern as to the potential conflict of interest for individuals involved in several different IRDR related committees and to endorse the specific recommendations made by the chair of the Scientific Committee for IRDR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Future Earth**

In September 2011, the 30th ICSU General Assembly approved the establishment of a new 10-year interdisciplinary initiative on Earth system research for sustainability, as an interdisciplinary body, in cooperation with the partners of the “Science and Technology Alliance for Global Sustainability”, which included ICSU, the International Social Science Council (ISSC), the Belmont Forum of funding agencies, UNESCO, UNEP, UNU; and WMO as an observer.

Future Earth is a 10-year international research programme which will provide the knowledge required for societies to face the challenges posed by global environmental change and to identify opportunities for a transition to global sustainability. It will support science of the highest quality, integrate the natural and social sciences, as well as engineering, the humanities and law. It will be co-designed and co-
produced by academics, governments, business and civil society, encompass bottom-up ideas from the wide scientific community, be solution-oriented, and inclusive of existing international Global Environmental Change (GEC) programmes, projects and related national activities.

Future Earth was being designed in close cooperation with the existing Global Environmental Change Programmes sponsored by ICSU. DIVERSITAS, IGBP and IHDP had expressed their will to be merged under Future Earth, and WCRP was ready to strategically cooperate with Future Earth, by mobilizing its climate research community.

From the outset, an important criterion for the design of Future Earth was the full involvement of all regions, and a stronger focus on developing countries. With the assistance of the ICSU Regional Offices and support from SIDA, Regional consultations had been conducted for Africa (31 October – 02 November 2012, Cape Town), Asia Pacific (21-23 November 2012, Kuala Lumpur), and Latin America and the Caribbean (03-04 December). Regional groups were being formed to build on the momentum generated in these meetings. Future Consultations on Future Earth were scheduled in Europe (13-14 May, Paris), Middle East and North America (6-7 June, Cyprus) and North America (26-27 June, Washington).

Future Earth had entered an interim operating phase in January 2013 and was expected to be fully operational by end-2014. Important milestones included:

Finalisation of the Transition Team report on the initial design of the programme
The report presented the recommendations of the Transition Team to the Science and Technology Alliance for global sustainability and was expected to be finalised by the end of March 2013.

The report described the vision, rationale and overall goals of the programme; proposed a research framework that was deliberately open to guide the transition of current programmes and projects into Future Earth and the definition of new activities; proposed a flexible governance structure to embed the key functions of Future Earth (including co-design of the research with stakeholders) without overly constraining the implementation; provided key recommendations for the future development of a capacity building and communications strategy and a funding strategy.

At the 24th CSPR meeting it had been agreed that the draft design report would be seen by CSPR before it was finalised.

Consolidation of interim arrangements and transition of current GEC programmes and projects
The Future Earth Science Committee was planned to comprise 16 members and 2 co-chairs and was expected to represent the full spectrum of global environmental change science from natural to social sciences, economics, humanities and engineering and to include scientists from non-academic sectors. Scientific excellence as well as sound understanding and commitment to inter- and trans-disciplinary approaches were to be essential attributes of the Future Earth Science Committee. Nominating bodies included: ICSU National Members, Scientific Unions, Scientific Associates and Interdisciplinary Bodies, ISSC members, the Belmont Forum, GEC programmes (DIVERSITAS, IGBP, IHDP, WCRP), APN, IAI and CAETS (International Council of Academies of engineering and technological sciences). A selection committee (including a few members of CSPR) had been put together to review the nominations and make recommendations to the ICSU EB and ISSC EC (the Alliance was also to be consulted for endorsement) for decisions at their next meetings (22-24 April for ICSU EB).

A transition management Board had been established by the Alliance and was working with the GEC programmes to establish an interim secretariat and ensure the migration of existing GEC projects and activities into Future Earth over the next 18 months. A meeting had been held in November 2012 to present Future Earth to the GEC projects operating under or across the 4 GEC programmes and discuss challenges and requirements for their smooth transitioning into Future Earth. A second meeting of the projects was planned for the first half of 2013. The engagement of the GEC projects was critical in order to populate Future Earth and provide a solid base for further development of the programme.
The Alliance had decided on the early appointment of an Interim Director to lead the transition until a permanent Secretariat was established (through a tendering process). This position had been advertised and the appointment was expected to be made in April/May.

The CSPR made the following comments and recommendations:

- The scope of Future Earth is all-encompassing but for the successful implementation of the programme, its scope and boundaries should be made clearer and the research agenda needs to ensure that it addresses regional and national challenges.
- ICSU’s members have a role in spreading the word on Future Earth and helping raise visibility of the programme at the national level. Given the scope of Future Earth, such a networked approach is needed to give momentum to the programme.
- Germany has chosen to form a German committee for Future Earth. However, there is no formal guidance on how to form or run such committees, so it is up to each country to decide what suits them.
- There may be more funding for sustainability research coming through the Belmont Forum and other sources. The Belmont Forum is recognised as a critical partner.
- The design process so far has been mainly top down with a strong focus on bringing the global change programmes on board. It is now essential that the programme opens up to more bottom up input, including from outside of the traditional GEC community known to ICSU. This involves reaching out to the wider scientific community working on GEC related issues, across natural, social sciences, and engineering, but also the policy and development community, and the private sector. Young scientists are also an important group to involve in Future Earth.
- The private sector should be involved. While CSPR members point out that businesses and industries have different agendas, efforts should be made to engage them in Future Earth. The World Business Council for Sustainable Development can be an important player in this respect.
- There is a need for a strategic discussion on the relationships and synergies between Future Earth and other programmes such as IRDR, Urban Health, International Polar Initiative (potentially) as they have a number of similarities and potential overlaps in terms of the scientific community they mobilise, the funding they apply for, etc.
- The questions of policy relevance vs policy prescriptive are not framed in the same way in the social sciences. New language is needed that reframes the debate in a more constructive way. Future Earth could explore ways that science policy dialogues could be made more efficient.
- Achievable goals should be defined for the next 18 months.

Decision

To approve the Transition Team report for publication, noting that additional editing is ongoing;
To note the process for appointing the interim Scientific Committee and interim Director;
To identify strategic issues to be raised at the next Executive Board meeting, as above;
To stress the need for Future Earth to now open itself up to more ‘bottom-up’ input from researchers and projects beyond the GEC community;
To call for a strategic discussion on the relationships and synergies between Future Earth and other programmes such as IRDR, Urban Health programme, International Polar Initiative;
To note that Future Earth should endeavour to engage in a more creative discussion on science for policy than has been possible so far, with meaningful involvement of the social sciences;
To highlight the need for achievable goals to be defined for the next 18 months.
6. **Energy**

ICSU’s role in the area of energy had been considered briefly at the previous CSPR 24 meeting, when it had been reported that funding was available from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) for a regional-global integration workshop that would focus on developing a common strategic framework for taking forward ICSU’s activities in this area. In this context, it had been noted that there was no global ICSU programme and 3 distinct regional science plans on Energy. At the same time, a major aim of the Future Earth initiative was to inform transformations to more sustainable lifestyles, for which energy (production and consumption) is a critical factor.

The integration workshop was to take place in Mexico on 8-9 April and, starting with the existing regional science plans, would focus on identifying a unique niche(s) for ICSU with regard to energy transformations. The agenda for this meeting was provided for consideration by CSPR. Immediately following this workshop there was to be a regional implementation meeting in Mexico and a similar meeting was to take place in Kenya on 6-7 May. The outcomes of these meetings would inform how energy-related activities might be included in the planned future grant proposal to SIDA (item 7).

The CSPR noted that:

- Defining a niche for ICSU in the field of sustainable energy might be challenging, given the vast number of on-going initiatives. A self-organising bottom-up approach in each region might be a preferred option with ICSU playing a facilitating/catalyzing role.
- Focus should be on supporting the implementation of regional energy activities under existing ICSU programmes such as Future Earth, IRDR and Urban Health.
- The option of providing science support for existing international and regional initiatives, such as Sustainable Energy for All, should be explored.
- Potential areas where ICSU could contribute include:
  - Providing regional scientific input to the development of an Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) on energy
  - Carrying out a comparative analysis of environmental impacts of renewable energy technologies
  - Exploring linkages between energy consumption and materials use
  - Looking at energy in urban systems (through the Urban Health Programme)
  - Looking at energy and disasters (through IRDR)
  - Promoting increased energy access
  - Encouraging a systemic approach, promoting the transformation of energy systems
  - Supporting adaptation of appropriate energy technologies for different regions
  - Engaging Unions and National Members in ICSU work on energy
  - Carrying out, jointly with ISSC, a scoping exercise on social issues related to the energy field
- The narrative for the energy workshop should be revised.

**Decisions**

To advise on the workshop agenda, as above.

To note that defining a niche for ICSU in the field of sustainable energy might be challenging, given the vast number of on-going initiatives. A self-organising bottom-up approach in each region might be a preferred option with ICSU playing a facilitating/catalyzing role.

To note that there are many areas where ICSU could potentially contribute, as described above.
7. SIDA Grant

In June 2012 substantial funding (~€770k) was secured from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) for an 18 month pilot programme that focused on *Strengthening the Involvement of Developing Countries in Setting and Implementing the Research Agenda for Global Sustainability*. This included funding for regional consultations on Future Earth, as well as integration and implementation workshops for disaster risk and sustainable energy. The full proposal had been considered previously by CSPR and an interim report on the activities to date had been prepared for SIDA and was presented to CSPR.

The discussions had begun with the Regional Directors and SIDA representatives on a potential 10 year follow up grant (2x5yrs), which was likely to be on the scale of €1-1.5m Euros per year. A draft concept note outlining the priorities and modalities for this funding had been prepared and was presented now for consideration by CSPR. From the ICSU perspective it was important that any donor funding was used to address ICSU’s own strategic priorities, promoted integration of regional and global activities and aligned with the established remit and role(s) of the Regional Offices. It was also be noted that the reporting requirements on this funding could be considerable and depend on the type of activity that is supported.

The CSPR noted that:

- An enabling and multiplying approach should be considered when designing activities for the 10-year project proposal.
- The 10-year project should focus on supporting the implementation of regional projects through seed-funding with the aim of leveraging additional funds.
- More preparatory efforts could be put into informing participants about the objectives of the future workshops, so that they come fully prepared and contribute in a meaningful manner.
- Convening a meeting (or a series of meetings) that would focus on aligning priorities of the development aid community could be an activity under the 10-year project proposal.
- Regional Offices should have an implementation role for ICSU’s programmes.
- Regional Offices should not be distributing research funds. Distributing small SIDA grants, similar to the process for ICSU grants, was suggested as one of the options of how Regional Offices can support regional projects to obtain funds.
- The next project proposal should focus on global sustainability. Future Earth, energy and IRDR should therefore be part of it.
- The role of ICSU Regional Offices in Future Earth, in the interim and longer-term, is still to be defined by the Transition Team.
- Science for Policy and Rio+20 follow up activities should be an integral part of the next proposal.

**Decision**

To note the progress report;

To advise on the future proposal as above, particularly that the Sida grant should strategically enhance activities that ICSU already has in its strategic plan, and provide seed funding to enable regional offices to leverage additional funds.

To advise that ICSU must ensure that Sida does not overly influence the remit of the Offices and agenda of activities.
8. Scheduling and Modalities of Future Reviews

8.1 Regional Offices
The 3 ICSU Regional Offices had been reviewed for the first time under the aegis of CSPR in 2009-2010. The timing of the next reviews was determined by the MoUs for the Offices, and (in the case of Africa) the potential need to solicit proposals for a new host. A schedule for the timing of these reviews was presented for consideration by CSPR 25, with ROA being the next office due for review.

The CSPR noted that:
- South Africa have indicated that they would like there to be an open call for the next host of ROA, partly so it does not appear as though South Africa is dominating the region.
- It would be a shame to move ROA as it is stable and has good institutional support from NRF.
- The process used in previous reviews was effective, and it would be good to examine lessons learnt.
- It would be important to consider ROA’s response to the previous reviews as part of the next review.
- There needs to be agreement on what to review and how. Work on this should be done prior to the next CSPR meeting when the ToR should be approved.

8.2 Interdisciplinary Bodies
In line with ICSU’s statutes, all Interdisciplinary Bodies were supposed to be reviewed every 5 years. In practice, this timing had not been tightly adhered to although a series of priority area assessments (PAA) had been carried out in 2003-2004 that did strategically review the majority of ICSU’s bodies. A number of more detailed performance reviews of specific bodies had been carried out since then, the most recent of these being the ongoing CODATA review. There remained a number of ICSU bodies that had not been reviewed in any detail for a decade or more. A table summarising the review status of all IBs was provided for consideration by CSPR.

It was noted that ICSU bodies were of varying size and nature and that detailed reviews could be resource intensive. Where reviews were necessary the review process should be appropriate to the task required. Options such as grouping bodies together for review, eg for the Observing Systems, or ‘light review’ by CSPR itself could in some cases be adequate to ensure the quality and strategic importance of ICSU’s portfolio of IBs.

The CSPR noted:
- The possibility of doing a ‘light review’ every 5 years, and a ‘heavy review’ every 10 years.
- The need for a roadmap/ schedule of what needs reviewing and when for the next CSPR.
- That roughly 4 IBs a year would need reviewing, so the process will have to be simple and streamlined, with established criteria.
- The possibility of grouping IBs for review by broad themes eg environment
- The need to know if there are sunset clauses on the IBs – reviews should look at whether they should continue.
- For the next CSPR the following information is needed: criteria for reviews, a roadmap, more information on individual IBs (eg size, set up etc), particularly for the ones to be reviewed next year.
- That a one page input from each IB’s chair is needed, including when they want to be reviewed so that the review process can be of most benefit to the IB.
Decision
To advise on the processes for reviewing, as necessary, Interdisciplinary Bodies and regional Offices, as above.
To request the Secretariat to do more preparatory work on the Regional Office reviews, with the aim of defining what need reviewing and how to go about this, so that a full plan is ready for CSPR 26.
to prepare a roadmap/ schedule of which IBs need reviewing and when, ready for the next CSPR. This should include criteria for reviews, roadmap, more information on IBs (eg size, set up etc), and a response from each IB’s chair on how and when they wish to be reviewed.

9. Grants Programme

CSPR was charged with managing the award of grants to ICSU Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies. The total funding available for the Grants Programme in 2013 was €300,000 and a ceiling of €30,000 was imposed on all applications. A total of 16 applications had been received (led by 8 Unions, 3 GEC Programmes and 5 Interdisciplinary bodies).

Each proposal had been reviewed in depth by subgroups of CSPR. Consequently, lengthy discussions of the majority of proposals were not necessary. The detailed discussion at the meeting focused on those proposals that were potentially fundable and where consensus was difficult to reach.

The statement and schedule for the 2013 grants programme was provided for consideration by CSPR, and they were asked to advise on any adjustments that might be made in 2014.

The CSPR approved funding for 9 projects. They also noted:
- The need to work more on encouraging collaboration between Unions.
- The need for more coordination in sharing previous reports of relevance to current reviews (from the same applicants, etc).
- The need to receive reviews from workshop participants to properly assess the success of this kind of activity.

Decisions
To award grants to nine projects (see annex for list);
to announce the 2014 Grants programme.
To have a strategic discussion on the grants programme at the next CSPR meeting.

10. International Polar Initiative

The Strategic Plan 2012-2017 committed ICSU to carry out a review of the future international coordination of polar research and ICSU’s role, including legacy issues arising from the International Polar Year (IPY). This had been considered by CSPR 23 (March 2012), when it was noted that two ICSU-affiliated bodies - the Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research (SCAR) and the International Arctic Science Council (IASC) were planning an assessment of polar research needs post-IPY. It was agreed at that stage to await the outcome of this assessment before deciding on the need for another ICSU review. The importance of securing and building on the IPY data legacy was also noted.

David Hik, the IASC President, joined the CSPR 25 meeting by video-conference to present the progress that had been made on this assessment and proposal for a long term International Polar Initiative (IPI), which had been supported by WMO. Polar research had a potentially important role to play in the Future Earth programme and David had also been invited to comment on how IPI and Future Earth could be integrated.
The CSPR noted:
- That the CSPR is not well placed to advise on how the IPI fits with Future Earth.
- There is a worrying lack of social science in the IPI proposal.
- There is a need to engage unions doing polar research.
- IASC is an associate to ICSU, so ICSU does not have a remit to review IASC.
- That a review of SCAR should look at SCAR’s relationship with IASC and other polar initiatives.
  A review should also consider what Future Earth requires in terms of polar work.

**Decision**
To agree that SCAR (including its relationship with IASC) should be reviewed as part of the normal cycle of IB performance reviews (item 8); To note that more collaboration with and input from the social sciences is needed in the IPI proposal if it is to contribute to Future Earth.

11. Appointment of Scientific Committees

The Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society (PECS) is a 10-year initiative that was established by ICSU in 2008 to foster coordinated research to understand the dynamics of social-ecological systems and generate policy-relevant knowledge to enable sustainable stewardship of these systems. PECS was co-sponsored with UNESCO and hosted by the Stockholm Resilience Centre.

The scientific committee of PECS had been initially appointed for 3 years in June 2009 and at the time of CSPR 25 was in its second term until June 2015. In order to ensure continuity, the issue of partially renewing its membership had been discussed with the Science Committee. There were currently two vacancies and, in the first instance, it was proposed that these be filled and then the terms of other members be staggered. CSPR was asked to advise the Executive Board on the nominations for the two vacant positions.

It was noted that PECS had indicated its willingness to become part of Future Earth and initiate a transition in this direction, including exploring synergies with existing projects currently under the GEC programmes (such as Biosustainability and iHope). The renewal of the Science Committee was noted as an opportunity to strengthen these relationships.

The CSPR noted that they had little option to choose as there were only 2 candidates for 2 vacancies. They asked for more information and a background narrative from the Scientific Committee so that they could make an informed decision. They also noted the need for a rotational schedule for the next 3 years.

**Decision**
To request more information and more candidates.
To request a rotational schedule for the next 3 years so that the appointment process for the PECS science committee follows a standard procedure.

12. Science for policy

12.1 Evaluation of Rio+20 activities

In order to fully assess ICSU’s work for Rio+20, a consultancy firm (*Firetail*, based in the UK) was commissioned to conduct surveys and interviews with key Rio+20 stakeholders, to determine their perceptions of ICSU’s impact. International policy work is a complex arena with many actors and few direct cause-and-effect links, which makes it difficult to determine the successes and limitations of a programme of work, especially one as broad and far reaching as ICSU’s activities for Rio+20. The study
had helped to tease out strengths and weaknesses in the work programme, and offered ICSU concrete recommendations on which to build for its future work in science for policy. At the time of CSPR 25, ICSU was working towards many of the recommendations in the report, including a greater focus on policy work at the national level, making direct contact with policy-makers and strengthening communications activities.

The CSPR noted the report and provided their views on the process. While some were very enthusiastic about the report, others were concerned with the cost of hiring the consultants to do a review. It was pointed out that this was a small fraction of the cost of ICSU’s Rio+20 activities, and analysing that investment was important.

12.2 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) update

At the Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in June 2012, the world’s governments agreed to develop a set of sustainable development goals (SDGs). The goals should address and incorporate the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and their interlinkages in a balanced way. The SDGs were intended to be global in nature and applicable to all countries, developed and developing alike, while taking into account different national realities and capacities. This would make them different from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were targeted at eradicating extreme poverty and related social ills in developing nations by 2015. An intergovernmental UN Open Working Group (OWG) had been set up on 22 January 2013 by the UN General Assembly. It was tasked with developing a set of proposed SDGs during 2013 and 2014, to be submitted to the UN General Assembly for approval in 2015.

At the time of CSPR 25, ICSU was working with the UN to make sure that scientific advice and expertise was available to the OWG. To this end, the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, ICSU and ISSC had agreed to organize an Expert Group Meeting on “Science and Sustainable Development Goals” at the UN in New York on 20 and 21 March 2013. The meeting (with about 30 scientists invited) was meant as an occasion both for the scientific community to discuss among itself how science can best inform the SDG process, and for the scientific community to initiate a dialogue with policy makers, including members of the OWG, who were engaged in intergovernmental deliberations on the SDGs.

Similarly, ICSU had supported the preparation of a paper providing a scientific underpinning to the SDGs process. This paper was written by a small group of scientists and science-policy experts who had been on the Organizing Committee of the Planet Under Pressure Conference (London, March 2012) and/or were involved with Future Earth. The paper integrated the goals of keeping the Earth system in a Holocene-like state (planetary boundaries) as a prerequisite for global sustainability, with universal human well-being goals and post-2015 MDGs. The paper had been submitted to Nature.

In addition, ICSU was to contribute to the work of the OWG through its role as co-organizing partner, together with ISSC and WFEO, of the Scientific and Technological Community UN Major Group.

The CSPR noted that:

- This is a complicated and fluid process for which clear science advice mechanisms were not currently mapped out.
- ICSU had an important responsibility to follow the process on behalf of the scientific community so that science can provide input when opportunities arise.

12.3 Scientific Advisers Network

ICSU was working with Sir Peter Gluckman, the Chief Scientific Adviser from New Zealand, to create a forum for discussing opportunities, challenges and best practices in national science-policy processes. This was planned to bring together chief scientific advisers (CSAs) and provide a neutral venue for them to convene and discuss science-policy links. The forum was to include formally recognised CSAs and,
for countries where chief scientific advisers are not in place, scientists with equivalent or leading positions on science for policy. Beyond its initial discussions, this proposal could generate a global network for exchange and dialogue. The aim was to convene a first meeting of CSAs around the time of ICSU’s General Assembly in New Zealand in 2014.

The CSPR proposed that:

- The ‘Chief Scientific Advisers Network’ should be renamed to reflect the fact that most of the participants will not in fact be CSAs, but ‘equivalents’ (i.e., people well positioned to discuss and advise on national science-policy links without a formal CSA title). This change was also recommended to dispel the impression that the activity was an effort to promote CSAs as an ideal science-policy interface to countries that did not have them. It was highlighted that CSAs will not be appropriate for all countries, and advocating this should not be an intended outcome of this activity. Instead, the aim is to identify key high-level people who are best placed to advise on and discuss national science-policy processes.
- ICSU’s National Members should be involved in this activity, particularly in the process of identifying ‘equivalents’.
- This activity should be framed as one of ICSU’s activities in its portfolio of activities for science-policy.

### Decisions

To note the Firetail evaluation;
To advise that ICSU needs to think carefully about value for time, effort and money when engaging in large projects, particularly those tied to UN processes with uncertain outcomes;
To highlight that the SDGs process is important, but also fluid and uncertain, and that ICSU’s efforts to follow the SDG process on behalf of the scientific community and define access points for science are therefore highly valuable;
To advise that the title and concept of the CSAs project should be modified to remove some of the focus on CSAs. The project should be seen as an effort to explore national science policy processes;
To recommend the involvement of national members in the CSAs project.
To advise that all these activities need to be presented as part of a coherent ICSU strategy on science for policy.

### 13. Climate Policy Options Project

ICSU had been approached by Dr. Laurie Geller, Senior Program Officer at the National Academies (and who previously worked at ICSU), to develop a project to create an international dialogue on the role of the scientific community in advising national climate change response efforts. ICSU had begun working with her on this, but the project was very much at the early planning and scoping phase. The CSPR were invited to discuss this draft proposal and provide advice on how best to move forward.

The CSPR noted that:

- This activity should be framed in a broader context to explore the climate science advice landscape.
- That social scientists who study the climate science-policy interface should be included in the activity.
- That a scoping meeting should be held to bring together those working on providing national-level climate advice and social scientists.
- That a number of countries, including the Philippines and China are also doing interesting work on climate change assessments and policy.
Decision
To note that his activity should be framed in a broader context to explore the climate science advice landscape, and should include social scientists who study science-policy climate processes.
To recommend the organisation of a scoping meeting involving those working on providing national-level climate advice and social scientists studying these processes.
To advise that this activity should also be presented as part of a broader ICSU strategy for science for policy, alongside the activities discussed in the previous item.

14. Chair’s Summary and Discussion

CSPR members were invited to highlight points of importance from the meeting that should be carried forward in the Chairman’s report to the Executive Board at its next meeting.

The CSPR raised the following points:
- The importance of science communication and science for society.
- The importance of Future Earth, including the coordination between other programmes and Future Earth.
- The important role of science for policy in ICSU’s portfolio, and the need for a strong strategy, particularly for the SDGs, and not forgetting the role of the media and public in influencing policy makers.
- The need to use the grants programme more strategically and to get regular feedback on grants.
- The importance of National Members and the need to work more closely with them.
- ICSU’s role at the international level, relative to other organisations, should be analysed.
- The need to broaden capacity building to create institutes in regions where they are lacking, including for example a centre for excellence on disasters in Africa, which could be a virtual network or a physical office.
- The importance of forging stronger links with the social sciences.
- The importance of the Unions in ICSU and need to review some IBs and their interactions with unions.
- The need to make the review process to clearer and more systematic.

15. Evaluation of the Meeting

The CSPR were asked to evaluate the meeting, and raised the following points:
- The more systematic recognition of conflicts of interest in this meeting was important.
- The need to provide more information on some items in order for the CSPR to make informed decisions.
- The need for a 20 minute agenda item for free discussion on issues relevant to the CSPR in future meetings

16. Dates of Next Meeting

The 26th meeting was planned for the 26th and 27th September 2013 at the ICSU Secretariat in Paris.