Report of discussions and decisions
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On specific items: Frans Berkhout, Indira Nath, Kari Raivio, Steven Wilson, Maureen Brennan, Gisbert Glaser, Anne Larigauderie, Howard Moore, Katsia Paulavets, Clare Thirlway

Apologies: Hubert Savenije

Thursday 26th September

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chair. The Chair remarked that CSPR as a committee has played an important role in the activities and governance of ICSU, and this needs to be captured in a more elaborate description of the committee than the current ICSU Rules of Procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a document describing the role and responsibilities of CSPR for the next meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Committee adopted the proposed agenda without changes.

3. Decisions of the 25th CSPR Meeting, and 109th Executive Board Meeting

3.1 Reports of the 25th CSPR and 109th Executive Board meeting

The report of the 25th CSPR meeting had been approved and made publicly available on the ICSU website. Likewise the decisions of the 109th Executive Board meeting had been finalised. A number of cross-cutting issues were raised in these two meetings. They included:

3.2 Conflicts of interest

A conflict of interest may arise when a member of a committee has the opportunity to influence decisions made by the committee in ways that could lead to personal gain or advantage of any kind for him/her, a member of his/her family or a company/organisation in which he/she is employed or has a stake. In these cases the member will have a conflict of interest. CSPR pointed out that the definition of a conflict of interest proposed in the Draft ICSU Conflicts of Interest guidance document needed to be made more precise, possibly through non-exclusive examples. It is the responsibility of each member of the committee to declare any conflict or potential conflict of interest before or when the relevant matter is being discussed.
so that a decision can be made regarding his/her participation to the discussion. Declarations of conflicts of interest are systematically recorded in the report of the meeting, and will be made publicly available on ICSU’s website.

3.3 External review of ICSU
The Terms of Reference and panel membership list for the external review of ICSU were provided for information. It had taken more time than anticipated to finalize the membership of the External Review Panel and responses were still awaited from two persons. It was now planned to hold the first meeting of the Panel in late October of this year with a second meeting in January 2014. The timeframe for completing the review of ICSU had also evolved: an interim report would be presented at the 2014 General Assembly, allowing for comments from members to be considered for the final version.

3.4 Open access
At the 23rd CSPR meeting in March 2012 it was recommended that “ICSU develops a project which will enable it to arrive at a common position on the broad issues of Open Access”. The Executive Board established an ad-hoc subgroup to take it forward. It was agreed that the project should include access to both information (science publications) and data, as well as related bibliometric indices and incentives. A letter was sent to all ICSU Members requesting initial input on these issues and a meeting of the Board subgroup and invited experts took place at ICSU the day before this CSPR meeting. The CSPR chair provided a summary of the discussions of the ad-hoc group.

The Committee recognised the need for ICSU to develop principles on open access, in line with its mission to promote the universality of science, and not develop or take a stance on particular business models. The Committee also advised ICSU to reach out to other groups working on the issue of Open Access (ex: the Royal Society recently convened ministers from the G8 countries on this issue), including from less developed countries, to achieve higher impacts.

Decisions
3.1 To note the reports of the 25th CSPR and 109th Executive Board meetings
3.2 To revise the Draft ICSU Conflicts of Interest guidance document; To agree the publication of the declaration of interests on ICSU’s website; To note progress on the external review.
3.3 To note the altered timeframe for the external review of ICSU
3.4 Note progress on the Open Access policy project.

4. Update on implementation of the Strategic Plan 2012-2017
Progress reports on strategic priorities and actions, for which CSPR has a responsibility but that were not covered elsewhere on the meeting agenda, were presented under this item.

4.1 Urban Health and Wellbeing
The new ICSU programme Health and Wellbeing in the Changing Urban Environment: a Systems Analysis Approach was approved at the General Assembly in 2011. The Scientific Committee (SC) for the programme met for the 3rd time in September 2013 prior to the CSPR meeting in association with an International Conference on Urban Dynamics, co-sponsored by the programme. A call for proposals to host the International Programme Office was launched in January and resulted in several applications from China. Establishing the IPO as soon as possible is a top priority.

In response to the request from CSPR at its previous meeting, the Chair of the Scientific Committee for the Urban Health Programme, Indira Nath (India), joined the CSPR meeting by video-conference and provided an update on the latest developments. While there is a lot of expertise on modelling urban dynamics and on health, there are capacity gaps in developing and applying a systems approach to research on these issues. A number of activities have been held to raise awareness about the programme and identify potential high-
level contributions that the programme could make, including on the definition of the post-2015 Development Agenda and follow-up to the Millennium Development Goals. Partnerships with the World Health Organisation, the Global Health Forum, the International Society for Urban Health and Inter-Academy Medical Panel (IAMP) were being explored. Several pilot projects were being developed with support from the ICSU Office for Asia and the Pacific and opportunities for funding were being pursued from a number of sources.

CSPR commended the progress made towards the implementation of the programme. Recognising that the programme is in its early implementation phase, CSPR stressed that a balanced and integrated approach of the 3 main components of the programme (health, urban dynamics and well-being) needed to be maintained, and also between different regions of the world where the challenges of rapid urbanisation and its consequences on health and well-being are acute (i.e. Africa). There is also a need to bring out the scientific and societal challenges that the programme seeks to address to facilitate the outreach to key stakeholders (including funders and policy-makers).

4.2 Future Earth

Future Earth – research for global sustainability is a 10-year interdisciplinary initiative on Earth system research for sustainability, established by ICSU and co-sponsored with the partners of the “Science and Technology Alliance for Global Sustainability” comprising also the International Social Science Council (ISSC), the Belmont Forum of funding agencies, UNESCO, UNEP, UNU; and WMO as an observer.

There has been considerable progress in the implementation of Future Earth since the previous CSPR meeting. The Transition Team report on the initial design of the programme has been finalised and is in production. The Science Committee for Future Earth was appointed in June 2013. It comprises 18 members and encompasses the diversity of disciplines and expertise needed to address global environmental change in all its dimensions, including natural and social sciences, humanities and engineering. Mark Stafford Smith, Science Director of CSIRO’s Climate Adaptation Flagship in Canberra, Australia is the inaugural Chair, Melissa Leach, Director of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) STEPS (Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability) Centre in the UK and Belinda Reyers, a Chief Scientist at the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in South Africa, will serve as Vice Chairs.

The interim Secretariat has been established and is hosted by ICSU. Frans Berkhout has been appointed as Director of the interim Secretariat, supported by two science officers (Diana Greenslade and Anne-Sophie Stevanace). Further recruitments of a dedicated communications officer and administrative officer are underway. Frans Berkhout identified 5 important priorities for the coming 18 months:

1. establishing the permanent governance structure of Future Earth (including the Engagement Committee and the globally distributed secretariat),
2. integrate the existing global environmental change projects;
3. engage new communities, including outside academia;
4. develop the Future Earth identity and develop a communications strategy; and
5. develop the funding base of Future Earth.

Regional and national meetings are also taking place in Europe, the Middle East, North America and Asia, involving ICSU members and ICSU regional offices. A number of general communication activities have been undertaken including the successful launch of a blog.

Frans Berkhout raised 3 issues for CSPR to advise on:

1. The relationship between ICSU and Future Earth
2. The connections between Future Earth and other ICSU programmes and activities (such as the Urban Health and Well Being programme, or CODATA and WDS)
3. Advice on how to engage new communities, including within the Future Earth Engagement Committee
4.3 Observing systems, including GCOS
The proposal for a review of ICSU’s role in the Earth Observing Systems was endorsed at the 30th General Assembly, when WMO invited ICSU to participate in its review of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS). It was agreed at the CSPR meeting in March 2012 to await the outcome of this latter review before initiating the ICSU’s broader strategic review. Martin Visbeck represents ICSU on the GCOS review panel and reported that this review was likely to be completed in Jan/Feb, 2014.

Decisions
4.1. To request a written report against the Terms of Reference of the programme Science Committee for Urban Health;
To advise that future developments for the programme should ensure a balanced approach to urban dynamics, health and well-being, and a strengthened presence in regions outside of Asia
4.3. To await the outcomes of the GCOS review to define a holistic approach to reviewing the Earth Observing Systems

5. Report of the Unions Meeting

Integrating disciplinary perspectives (including Unions) into interdisciplinary initiatives is one of the three major cross-cutting priorities in the Strategic Plan, 2011-2017. However, defining effective and energising ways to engage the Unions in ICSU’s activities has been a long-standing challenge.

Representatives of the Scientific Unions of ICSU met in Paris in April 2013. ICSU’s interdisciplinary activities, in particular Future Earth, Urban Health and IRDR were presented and discussed, and discussions on New Horizons were initiated. Whilst the Unions expressed strong support for these programmes, it was not clear to them as ICSU Members how they could contribute to or benefit from the programmes. Suggestions were made in this regard, including a proposal for specific meetings/workshops to explore in more depth how the Unions might contribute. Some Unions have taken steps towards getting involved or leading interdisciplinary initiatives, such as the International Year of Global Understanding being proposed by the International Geographical Union.

CSPR emphasised that the Unions have been a fundamental part of ICSU since its creation. One question that has become more and more important for science in general, and for ICSU in delivering its broad mission through interdisciplinary activities, is the boundaries of disciplines and of knowledge that are shifting, as society changes. Combining disciplinary depth and boundary crossing has led to major scientific breakthroughs and Unions working together within the framework of ICSU have an important role to play in this respect. This will require stronger dialogue and joint work to help science communities embrace this new context. A sign of this changing context and the subsequent need to evolve the governance of ICSU, is the increasing financial difficulty that some of the Unions face, and the difficulty to attract early-career scientists.

CSPR recommended that ICSU further help the Unions to work on boundary and interface issues and work on clarifying what the ICSU brand stands for (for ICSU’s funders, stakeholders, partners, programmes, members, etc.). To foster integration across disciplines, it was suggested that a survey be carried out to ask Unions for pragmatic solutions around the important issues that they raise on a regular basis (involvement of young scientists, ICSU’s brand, science education), and ask each Union to identify 5 Unions that they would like to work with. Already Unions clusters of ‘sister’ disciplines have been formed but further cooperation could be explored. In addition, ICSU should consider increasing its membership base, inherited from the first half of the 20th century, possibly opening up more to other types of organisation (noting that the Associate membership category could be further exploited).
To conduct a survey to the Unions to co-define an action plan to address long-standing issues (lack of collaboration between ICSU and Unions, ICSU brand, science education) as a follow up to the April 2013 meeting;
To work on clarifying the ICSU brand and explore options to diversify the membership base of ICSU.

6. ICSU’s portfolio and the Science & Technology Alliance for Global Sustainability

ICSU has been instrumental in establishing Future Earth. In 2009-2010, ICSU in collaboration with ISSC conducted a Visioning exercise to explore future directions for Earth system research that could stimulate scientific innovation and address policy needs in the context of global environmental change. This called for a new initiative that addresses the intersection of global environmental change and sustainable development and builds upon the ICSU-sponsored global change programmes, and led to the development of Future Earth. ICSU brought together ISSC and the Belmont Forum around the need for a common strategy to develop trans-disciplinary research for global sustainability and to mobilise international resources to implement it. This provided the foundation of the Science & Technology Alliance for global sustainability. ICSU has provided essential support in the initial design phase of the new Future Earth programme and is currently hosting the interim secretariat led by Frans Berkhout.

At this important juncture in setting up the programme it is timely to have an open discussion on the strategic directions for ICSU’s involvement in Future Earth. The proposed discussion points include:

- The links that ICSU has traditionally maintained with its programmes and how the scale and the governance set-up of Future Earth may require the current approach to evolve.
- ICSU’s ability to remain and continue as a strategic partner of Future Earth.
- The ambition ICSU has for the Alliance and the role it can play in it.
- The need for ICSU to clarify the relationships between some of its programmes related to global environmental change that are partly overlapping (IRDR, Urban Health and Wellbeing and WDS).
- New areas within and outside of Future Earth where ICSU can initiate new activities

The interface between ICSU and individual ICSU programmes should be discussed on a case-by-case basis to identify the most appropriate way to ensure mutual benefits (MoU, joint activities, etc.). A review of the ICSU’s portfolio on environment-related activities could be considered at a later stage.

The Governing Council of Future Earth was being envisaged as a multi-stakeholder decision-making body will provide strategic guidance and overall leadership. The composition and terms of reference of this council needed to be crafted carefully and role and responsibilities of individual Alliance members need to be clarified. ICSU had provided strong leadership in the creation of Future Earth, starting with the Visioning Process; and had also mobilised funding and resources to support the design and early implementation of Future Earth at the global and regional level. This leading role, as representative of the global science community, needed to be fully recognised in the Future Earth Governance structure and processes.
7. Sustainable Energy

- Update

Sustainable energy is a strategic priority for ICSU. However, ICSU does not have a global programme on Sustainable Energy, although each of the three ICSU Regional Offices has developed its own Science Plan focusing on different priorities for action.

The Global-Regional Integration Workshop on Sustainable Energy (8-9 April 2013, Mexico) sought to identify the ICSU niche in the field of sustainable energy, building on regional research priorities.

Given the multitude of initiatives on sustainable energy at regional and global levels, the workshop concluded that ICSU should not establish a new stand-alone programme on sustainable energy but rather focus its efforts on promoting integrated trans-disciplinary research and capacity building activities on sustainable energy under the framework of Future Earth. In these efforts, ICSU should synergize with relevant global and regional programmes and initiatives, such as the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative (SE4ALL). To ensure integration of sustainable energy within Future Earth, it was suggested that sustainable energy experts should be represented in the Future Earth governing structure. It was also proposed that ICSU should mobilize scientific input to the development of a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) on energy.

Building on the outcomes of the Integration Workshop on Sustainable Energy, the African Regional Implementation Workshop on Sustainable Energy was held on 6-7 May 2013 in Kenya. The workshop explored how ICSU ROA can contribute in the field of sustainable energy, identified key partners with whom opportunities for collaboration should be explored, and provided suggestions how existing research project proposals should be revised to ensure their alignment with Future Earth.

Given a strong regional interest in sustainable energy, recommendations from CSPR members were sought on how Sustainable Energy should be integrated across ICSU work, including Future Earth and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Decisions

To recommend that the Regional Offices focus their energy activities on developing projects that fit within the framework of existing ICSU programmes, in particular Future Earth and Urban Health;
To agree that ICSU should be involved in key science for policy processes in relation to energy;
To prepare a position paper for the UN Open Working Group meeting, Nov, 2013, on energy.

8. Regional Offices

The three ICSU Regional Offices were reviewed for the first time in 2009-2010 and a preliminary schedule for the next reviews was considered at CSPR25.

8.1 Review of the African Office

At its previous meeting CSPR expressed a preference for continuing the current hosting arrangements in South Africa, whilst recognising that this would need to be negotiated with the relevant parties. The
Executive Board confirmed this view and in June, 2013, the ICSU President and Deputy Executive Director visited Pretoria to discuss with the National Research Foundation (NRF) and Department of Science and Technology (DST). The CSPR chairman participated also in these discussions. The outcome was a commitment from the South African partners to continue to host the Office for a maximum of 5 more years (from April 2015). This was dependent on the outcome of the review of the Office, which, in addition to its standard remit, should consider how to maximise the synergies between ICSU’s strategic aims and the relevant interests of the S. African partners and also advise on the process for identifying a suitable new host over the next 5 years.

In the light of the discussions in Pretoria, draft terms of reference for the review of the African Office were provided for consideration by CSPR. Both the ToR and the review process are based on those used for the previous review. The most critical part of the process is identifying committed and high calibre members of the review panel. All ICSU Members have been solicited for nominations (32 nominations were submitted) and CSPR members were also invited to make suggestions. In addition to the standard criteria, CSPR was also asked to consider the need for continuity with the previous African Office review and across the reviews of all 3 Offices.

8.2 SIDA grant proposal
In June 2012 funding (~€770k) was secured from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) for a 20 month pilot project 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.

One of the key outcomes of the pilot project will be submission of a 10-year (2X5 years) project proposal to SIDA in Dec 2013, which is likely to be on the scale of €1-1.5m Euros per year. A draft concept note outlining the priorities and modalities for this project has been previously shared with CSPR members. The concept note is being continuously revised based on discussions with Regional Offices, Regional Committees, and SIDA. The follow up grant will aim to support integrated trans-disciplinary research and capacity building activities on global sustainability, with particular interests in disaster risk, sustainable energy, urban health and wellbeing, and global environmental change. The grant is expected to foster implementation of regional research priorities within these four areas. From the ICSU perspective it is important that any donor funding is used to address ICSU’s own strategic priorities, promotes integration of regional and global activities and aligns with the established remit and role(s) of the Regional Offices.

Decisions
To approve the ToR and process for the review of the African Regional Office;
To agree that the ICSU Secretary General should serve on the review panels for all of the Regional Offices;
To invite Lucie Lapointe, Canada; Chika Trevor Sehoole, South Africa; and Christopher Leaver, the UK to serve on the ROA review panel;
To affirm that the panel chair – to be agreed with NRF- should be from outside the African region;
To note progress with the grant proposal to SIDA.

8.b. Open discussion
The chair opened the floor for a free-flowing discussion on strategic issues that committee members had identified.

ICSU membership
The constitution and governance structure of ICSU developed in 1919 has enabled ICSU to grow as an organisation with the legitimacy and mandate to represent the international scientific community, including to the UN. However, the boundaries of knowledge are shifting and the long standing disconnect between ICSU’s activities and ICSU’s membership needs to be addressed. New development avenues for ICSU
need to be considered, including additional forms of membership (other than national members and Unions), identity and added value of ICSU (compared to other organisations such as IAP or IAC), new ways to listen and exchange with members (for example, allowing members to raise issues between general assemblies).

The ICSU brand
The ICSU brand and the lack of visibility of ICSU were also raised as important issues going forward. The need for ICSU to be visible was debated as ICSU is an umbrella organisation, a network of networks, and as such, some members felt that ICSU should not necessarily aim to develop a frontline profile (the analogy with re-assurance companies was taken). Other members argued that the connections between ICSU and the scientific activities and programmes are not known and that ICSU has taken little credit over the activities it has generated (1957 International Geophysical Year was recalled at the latest compelling example when ICSU was widely visible via an initiative it had created). There was a consensus among the committee that ICSU should primarily aim to improve its visibility within its own Membership, focusing on recognition for existing programmes and activities. New activities designed mainly to make ICSU visible were not considered to be a priority.

Decisions
To recommend to the Executive Board that consideration should be given to ICSU’s long-term membership structure;
To advise that the ICSU brand should be developed and strongly promoted with the ICSU Membership
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9. Future Reviews of Interdisciplinary Bodies

There is a statutory obligation to review all ICSU Interdisciplinary Bodies at regular (normally 5yr) intervals and the devolved responsibility for this lies with CSPR. These reviews are an opportunity for ICSU to engage with its activities, and participate in their strategic development.

A table listing all IBs and their essential characteristics, including dates of last reviews, was discussed by the committee. It was decided to review SCOR and SCAR together as they operate in a similar way (common ToR). The review of SCAR would need to include the relationship with IASC. INASP’s review should include its involvement in open access debates and would not necessarily require a dedicated review panel. The review of Future Earth was also discussed. As a joint programme of the Alliance members, the date and modalities of the review will have to be discussed with the Alliance; however, it was recommended that a review be conducted within 3 years in order to allow for any redirection if needed.

The committee also discussed the overall criteria for the reviews. The criteria should not only aim to check if the IBs fit with ICSU’s mission and strategy, but also consider their on-going relationship with ICSU and the added value of this. The review criteria should also encourage consideration of the body in relation to other ICSU bodies as well as relevant organisations operating outside ICSU, to identify potential synergies (ex: observing systems need to be considered together) or overlaps. Points related to process should not be included in the criteria.

Decisions
To agree the work-plan the next reviews as follows:
2014: Observing systems
2014-2015: SCOR – SCAR;
2015: WCRP; INASP’
2015-2016 COSPAR – SCOSTEP – IUCAF; PECS (if has not joined Future Earth); IRDR
10. CODATA Review

In accordance with the ICSU Second Strategic Plan 2012-2017, CSPR appointed an ad-hoc Panel to carry out a review of the Committee on Data for Science and Technology (CODATA). During the course of its work, the Panel held two meetings, the first at the ICSU Secretariat in Paris in July 2012, the second during the 23rd International CODATA Conference and 28th General Assembly in Taipei in October-November 2012. The Report of the Review Panel, including 13 recommendations, was presented to CSPR, via teleconference, by the Chair of the ad-hoc Review Panel, Kari Raivio.

Kari Raivio highlighted that data is a fast-moving area in science. New categories of scientists working on data (“digital natives”) are emerging and outputs of this growing body of research take multiple forms (and primarily not publications). Financial support to maintain databases is lagging behind this expansion in a number of fields. There is overall a need to improve scientific and technical management and use of data. The review highlighted a number of issues that were supported by CSPR: the variety of member categories in CODATA, the need to identify and clarify CODATA’s niche in a crowded field as well as its interface with WDS, the need to review the data science journal which is not serving a large audience of scientists and does not contribute significantly to CODATA’s recognition. CSPR recommended that CODATA considers the most efficient way to refocus their limited resources and focus on facilitating the practical use of data for scientific work. CSPR endorsed the overarching recommendation from the review panel to streamline in the long-term ICSU’s structures dealing with data & information (looking at CODATA, WDS and beyond). Recommendation 13 on including ex-officio representation in ICSU programmes SC was considered too prescriptive. Likewise, the need to consolidate structures might not necessarily lead to a single Interdisciplinary Body.

Decisions
To endorse the recommendations of the review panel, with the exception of recommendation 13, which is too prescriptive as currently worded;
To publish the report of the CODATA review together with the final recommendations from the Executive Board;
To thank the review panel for its clear and insightful report

11. Science for policy

11.1 SDGs Update
Agreement among the world’s governments to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was one of the main outcomes of the Rio+20 summit. A UN Open Working Group (OWG) has started its work in March 2013 to define a set of proposed goals for submission to and approval by the UN General Assembly. Currently, the OWG focuses on a comprehensive information gathering exercise, as well as on initial discussions around the concept and scope of SDGs. As invited by the UN, ICSU and ISSC have provided scientific input to the four meetings of the OWG over the March to June 2013 period. This input was mainly based on materials received from Interdisciplinary Bodies and the Future Earth community. In March 2013, the UN, ICSU and ISSC organized an Expert Group Meeting in New York on Science and Sustainable Development Goals. The main messages resulting from this meeting were discussed with Government representatives, members of the OWG. For the June meeting of the OWG dealing with health and sustainable development, the Scientific Committee of the ICSU Health and Human Wellbeing Programme prepared an ICSU expert brief on health and SDGs.
Though circular mails sent by the ICSU Executive Director in May and early June, National and Union Members, Regional Offices, Interdisciplinary Bodies, and the Future Earth community have been invited to provide published or written materials for submission to the secretariat of the OWG in the UN in New York. Contributions are especially required related to thematic areas such as biodiversity, oceans, sustainable cities, sustainable consumption and production, and disaster risk reduction. These and other themes will be the subject of OWG meetings later in 2013 and in early 2014.

Moreover, ICSU has supported the preparation of a paper published in Nature in March 2013 providing a scientific underpinning to the SDGs process. This paper has been written by a small group of scientists and science-policy experts who were on the Organizing Committee of the Planet Under Pressure Conference (London, March 2012) and/or are now involved with Future Earth. The paper integrates 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 same group of co-authors is now working on another paper focusing on the science for operationalizing targets and indicators across scale for the proposed six SDGs.

Science for sustainable development was also on the agenda of the ministerial segment of the 2013 regular session of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), held in Geneva, 1 - 4 July. Upon invitation by the UN, the ICSU representative made an oral statement calling for a better harnessing of science and innovation for societies to bring about transformative change towards sustainable development and poverty alleviation.

CSFR stressed the importance of ICSU’s involvement in the SDGs process. Opportunities to strengthen the relationship with UNESCO should be considered.

11.2 Senior Science Advisors meeting

The Chief Science Advisor to the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Sir Peter Gluckman, is working with ICSU to convene as part of ICSU’s 2014 General Assembly, a meeting of Senior Science Advisors with the aim to explore interests for establishing a permanent network of science advisors. This proposal emerged in the context of ICSU’s post Rio+20 discussions on how to strengthen science-policy engagement around the world.

The main aims of this high level event would be to determine the national science-policy processes and structures that are in place around the world, exchange on a few selected priority topics, and determine if there is value in creating a permanent network of senior science advisers, with regular meetings.

Steps taken so far include:
- Drafting of a draft project proposal further outlining objectives, methodology, timeline and background;
- Assembling a Steering Group and convening a teleconference of this Group to discuss the agenda for this event.
- Sharing the draft project proposal with National Members and Unions to seek their input on the agenda and their suggestions for participants from their respective constituencies.

CSFR recommended the Secretariat to explore various models of science-policy advice (and institutional arrangements).

11.3 IPBES Update

IPBES, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, was established in April 2012 by representatives from 90 governments, following 7 years of negotiations. IPBES is an assessment mechanism, with similarities to IPCC, which will provide policy relevant scientific advice on biodiversity and ecosystem services, in response to requests from governments and other stakeholders. IPBES held its First Plenary (IPBES-1) in January 2013, in Bonn, the host city of the future IPBES headquarters, and will
hold its second Plenary (IPBES-2) in December 2013 (Antalya, Turkey). IPBES is placed under the auspices of UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP.

ICSU has been leading the input of the scientific community during the negotiation phase, and will continue to do so now that IPBES is established. ICSU’s input has consisted in providing views (plenary statements, written contributions) on all aspects of IPBES including rules of procedure, the conceptual framework, the future programme of work. ICSU has also been providing names of scientists for several experts workshops (e.g. on knowledge systems, on the conceptual framework), and has also convened scientific workshops, such as on the knowledge generation function of IPBES. For IPBES-2 (December 2013) ICSU has been asked to produce an IPBES stakeholder engagement strategy, and to co-chair the multi-stakeholder forum (together with IUCN).

ICSU has had a delegation at all Plenaries and has established itself as the representative of the scientific community in IPBES. ICSU’s input has been coordinated by DIVERSITAS (Anne Larigauderie), but will now be coordinated directly from the ICSU’s secretariat, with Anne’s new position as Head of Science in Society at ICSU. In the future, it is envisaged that ICSU’s role in IPBES would be twofold:

1) Continue representing the scientific community at IPBES, to provide advice on the IPBES process itself (rules of procedure, future requests, nomination of experts, of reviewers, etc.).

2) Liaise with relevant ICSU activities, and in particular with Future Earth, to ensure that the scientific gaps highlighted by IPBES in its future assessments are addressed by the scientific community, since IPBES itself will not carry out new research.

Given the intergovernmental nature of IPBES, ICSU could also potentially play a role through its national members.

Decisions
To note the update on ICSU’s input to the Open Working Group on SDGs;
To note progress in organising the Senior Science Advisors meeting;
To support ICSU’s continued involvement in IPBES, emphasising ICSU’s role in helping its scientific programmes to engage with IPBES and be major knowledge providers

12. Grants Programme

12.1. Grant proposal from IUTOX and IUPHAR
CSPR was asked to review related proposals from IUTOX and IUPHAR, which had not been considered at the previous meeting, although they apparently were sent before the submission deadline. After careful review, it was agreed that the proposals should not be supported as they bore close similarities with each other and with a previously funded proposal from IUTOX in 2011 (“funding over several years for the same or similar projects usually will not be granted”).

Decisions
To decline the related proposals from IUTOX and IUPHAR.

12.2. Reports from 2012 Grant Awards
Reports from the 2012 Grants were due at the end of June 2013. Six of the eight awardees of the 2012 Grants provided reports. WDS and SCOSTEP provided interim reports as their projects were delayed.

The following comments were made on the reports:
• IMU: the involvement of ROLAC is not clear beyond the grant application; project successful
• IRDR: the report focuses on the first step to develop a funding proposal but do not specify whether the grant application was successful. Participation of funding agencies and regional diversity were lacking but the level of participation of young scientists was good. The objectives should be more focused in order to assess outcomes.

• IUPAP: achievements are not clear

• SCOSTEP: activity seems to be on tracked although not completed yet

• CORDEX: successful level of participation in the 2 events organised

• WDS: activity delayed

• IUPHAR: the use of teleconferencing is positive and should be encouraged; involvement of regional offices in the project to be clarified; involvement of the University of Ethiopia to be clarified.

In general, objectives and achievements need to be made clearer and reports need to be shorter. Reports should be provided once the activity is completed. The standard length of an activity is one year; a 1-year extension can be granted, if justified. Applications from projects that have not completed the activities for which they were awarded a grant should not be accepted. The regional offices have provided letters of support to a number of applicants but do not seem to be involved in delivering the activity.

**Decision**

To request the secretariat to convey the comments to the grant awardees and the regional offices.

12.3. Strategic discussion on the Grants Programme

The ICSU grants programme was reviewed by an ad-hoc review panel in 2007. This review was conducted against a background of the withdrawal of funding for the programme from the US State Department and UNESCO. The review recognised that since its introduction in 2002 the programme had represented good value for money and concluded that:

“There is a strong case for ICSU to support a revised and more focussed grants programme in the future. This should focus on promoting new and genuine collaborations between ICSU’s Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies in the areas of i) Capacity Building in a broad sense, and ii) New Scientific Frontiers, i.e. cutting edge scientific developments at the interface between different disciplines. Such a programme can be an important mechanism for implementing ICSU’s vision and addressing these two strategic priority areas. It also provides a practical and measurable link to the activities of the Scientific Unions, in particular.”

At that juncture there was optimism that joint sponsorship of the programme with UNESCO could be revived. In the event, severe funding cuts at UNESCO meant that this was not feasible and so the programme was re-launched in 2008 at a smaller scale with the budget (€300k) coming entirely from ICSU core funds.

In addition to an extension of the priorities proposed by the review panel, a particular emphasis on working with ICSU Regional Offices has been included in the criteria for the grants programme since it was re-launched. The review of the Regional Offices in 2009-2010, emphasised the importance of this programme as a mechanism to establish links with the activities of the Unions, many of whom share a common interest in capacity building.

The grants programme originally developed out of a more ad-hoc subvention mechanism that was in place up until 2001, by which the ICSU Finance Committee distributed funds to the Unions on request, mainly to support their routine activities. Not surprisingly, the introduction of a competitive system was disliked by many of the Unions and the subsequent reduction by more than 50% in the total available funding increased this dissatisfaction. It should be noted that the continuing value of the grants programme to the
Unions was emphasised throughout the Unions’ meeting in April this year and there were several specific suggestions for action that would have implications for future grants (see item 5).

Despite the focus on the concerns of the Unions, the 2007 review of the grants programme demonstrated that the most consistently successful lead applicants for grants have been Interdisciplinary Bodies (at that time SCOPE, CODATA, IGBP). These bodies were more successful than Unions in adapting to the change from subventions to competitive funding.

In the light of this history, CSPR is now invited to consider several key questions relating to the future of the grants programme:

1. What should be the future priorities (2015 onwards)? Should these be closely linked to ICSU’s major programmes – Future Earth, IRDR, and Urban Health? Should they focus on more generic priorities such as capacity building, science education etc.?
2. How can the programme be used to further strengthen links with the Regional Offices?
3. How can the programme be used to promote New Horizons activities?
4. Should both Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies continue to be eligible to apply as lead applicants?
5. Can the review process for proposals and final reports be improved, without creating unnecessary additional work for the secretariat and CSPR members?

All these issues should be considered in the context of a programme that currently supports a maximum of 10 grants at €30k each per annum. Previous CSPR and EB discussions on attracting additional funding for the programme have concluded that this would be difficult. It should also be noted that the schedule for the 2014 grants programme has already been announced. This means that, although some modifications may be feasible for 2014, any major changes could only be introduced in 2015.

CSPR recommended encouraging applicants to request funds for activities other than travel money for workshops in different countries. Recognising the limited amount of funding provided, the grants programme could be dedicated to improving interdisciplinary collaboration on New Horizons. Capacity building would be an important component of this. Linking the programme existing ICSU initiatives and programmes was considered to be inherently conservative.

Decision
To establish a CSPR sub-group (Stewart Lockie, Tom Beer, Boshra Salem) to work with the Secretariat to draft a new call for proposals focusing on inter-disciplinary collaboration on New Horizons

13. IRDR-SC

The International Programme Office was established in Beijing in 2010, and the first Executive Director of IRDR took up her responsibilities on 1 June of that year. While she showed a number of positive attributes during her term of office, it became increasingly clear to the co-sponsors that there were serious problems in terms of staff management, plus a failure to take the programme beyond its planning stage and to attract the funding necessary. It was decided that in order to take IRDR to a new operational level it needed a new Executive Director. Recruitment of that new Executive Director is under way.

The terms of office of two members of the IRDR Science Committee (IRDR-SC) come to an end on 15 November 2013; under the terms of reference of the IRDR-SC their appointments may be renewed or the individuals replaced

In addition, a third member has taken up major new responsibilities within her company and was obliged to step down from the IRDR-SC:
IRDR has consulted widely on possible additional membership of the Committee and was proposing 5 nominations for consideration. Decisions made by the ICSU Executive Board on the recommendation of CSPR will require the agreement of the two IRDR co-sponsors, ISSC and UNISDR.

**Decisions**
- To propose to the Executive Board that D. Benouar be appointed for another 3 year term on the IRDR SC, and that S.H.M Fakhruddin and V Jimenez Diaz be invited to serve a first term;
- To thank C Siwar and A Wirtz for their service on the SC

### 14. PECS

The Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society (PECS) is a 10-year initiative 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 is co-sponsored with UNESCO and hosted by the Stockholm Resilience Centre.

The scientific committee of PECS was initially appointed for 3 years in June 2009 and is now in its second term until June 2015. In order to ensure continuity, the issue of partially renewing its membership has been discussed with the Science Committee, also taking into account that PECS officially began its activities in 2011 with the creation of the PECS International Programme Office at the Stockholm Resilience Centre. There are currently three vacancies and, in the first instance, it is proposed that these be filled and then the terms of other members be staggered. CSPR is asked now to advise the Executive Board on the nominations for the three vacant positions based on the list of candidates put forward by the PECS SC. It should be noted that PECS has 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. The renewal of the Science Committee is an opportunity to strengthen these relationships.

PECS submitted an overall plan for the renewal of their science committee between 2013 and 2017. A list of eight candidates was provided to fill the existing three gaps. From 2014 and onwards, the PECS Scientific Committee proposed that two members of the PECS Scientific Committee are replaced annually; and the chair (Steve Carpenter) and Co-chairs (Patty Balvanera and Marja Spierenburg) replaced in 2017.

**Decisions**
- To recommend the appointment of Harini Nagendra, Berta Martin Lopez and Chinwe Ifejika Speranza based on consideration of balance.
- To thank Bina Agarwal, Wolfgang Cramer and Carl Folke for their service on the committee.

### 15. General Assembly

**15.1 GA Draft Agenda and Members Fora**

The 31st ICSU General Assembly will take place in Auckland, New Zealand from 28 August to 3 September 2014. T Unions and National Members forums will take place prior to the Assembly.

CSPR held half-day meetings in association with the past 2 General Assemblies and ICSU covered the costs of all CSPR members to attend the Assemblies. However, these CSPR meetings were not very productive given the length and intensity of the GA and associated events. Besides, there was some dissatisfaction from CSPR members at the last Assembly that opportunities for CSPR members that are not also part of a national delegation, are not clear. The situation is similar for the members of ICSU’s other key policy Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the conduct of Science (CFRS). Given the location of the 2014 General Assembly in New Zealand, and the high associated travel costs and demands on people to fly long distances and stay for extended periods, the Executive Board has agreed that there will be no meetings of ICSU policy committees in association with the 31st GA. The CSPR Chairman will
formally represent CSPR in the Assembly, as on previous occasions, and individual CSPR members who wish to attend are encouraged to participate in Member delegations.

Some members expressed their strong dissatisfaction as not being invited to attend the GA in New Zealand in their capacity as CSPR member. Although it was recognised that there was no formal role for CSPR, the opportunity to interact with ICSU Members was considered important.

**15.2 Discussion on CSPR report to the General Assembly**

The CSPR chairman will report on the following items at the GA:

- An overview of the implementation of the Strategic Plan, 2012-2017
- A report from CSPR: Reviews; Observations; Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR); PECS etc.

A synthesis of the work of CSPR during the past three years will be presented at the GA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ask the Executive Board to reconsider the decision to not invite all CSPR members to the General Assembly;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To agree that the Chair should work with the Secretariat to prepare a draft 4-page report ahead of the next CSPR meeting for presentation at the General Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16. Chair’s summary and discussion**

- **Presentation of outcome of meeting to the ICSU EB**

The chair briefly summarised the main issues of discussion and outcomes for each agenda item.

**17. Evaluation of the meeting**

The next CSPR could have a stronger focus on reviewing progress in delivering the strategic plan. Beyond the regular business (reviews, updates on programmes, etc.) that CSPR needs to deal with at each meeting, it may be good to try and crystallise one science vision and lessons learnt by the committee; this would require more time for genuine discussions.

**18. Dates of Next Meetings**

- **April & October 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To confirm that the date for the 27th CSPR Meeting is <strong>3-4 April 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>