Report of 9th CSPR Meeting

Paris, 29 November – 1 December 2004

Present: David Parry (Chairman), Michael Clegg, François Gros, John Marks, Khotso Mokhele, Graeme Pearman, Ranjan Ramasamy, Dai Rees, Pierre Ritchie, Thomas Rosswall (ex officio)

Apologies: Anne Buttimer, Ana-Maria Cetto (ex officio), Kiyoshi Kurokawa, Goverdhan Mehta, Eric Odada

By invitation: for Agenda Item 6, Jorge Allende (by telephone)

Secretariat: Carthage Smith, Laurie Geller

1. Welcome and Opening of the Meeting

Apologies for absence were received from Anne Buttimer, Ana-Maria Cetto (ex officio), Kiyoshi Kurokawa, Goverdhan Mehta, and Eric Odada.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Decision: Agenda was adopted.

3. Report of the 8th CSPR Meeting and Matters Arising

The discussion of follow-up issues focused on two topics:

CSPR Grants Programme

CSPR discussed concerns raised by A. Buttimer about the selection of 2005 grant recipients. CSPR agreed that there was some variability in how grant applications were evaluated and graded by different members, and that further discussion of such matters would be beneficial. It was further suggested that in advance of the meetings in which grant recipients are selected, the Secretariat should circulate a list of all the ‘A-level’ applications, and should invite all members to read those applications that may require focused discussion.

Thomas Rosswall explained the current state of uncertainty in future Grants Programme funding, due to unexpected cuts in UNESCO support. He reported that the
EB had decided to go ahead with requesting proposals for 2006, noting that funding is yet to be secured.

**IHDP Evaluation**

ICSU (through CSPR) and the ISSC have agreed to organize an external assessment of IHDP. The panel members are Leen Hordijk (Chair), Tessa Marcus, Graeme Pearman, Jai B. P. Sinha, Barbara Torrey, and Rüdiger Wolfrum. This assessment panel, the work of which is financially supported by DFG and IHDP, will have its first meeting on 15 December. CSPR suggested that it is not realistic to expect the panel to complete a final report by the CSPR meeting in June 2005; however they should send a *draft* report to CSPR by the time of its next meeting.

![Decision:]

- To note report from the 8th CSPR meeting.
- To request the Secretariat to distribute a list of A-graded proposals to CSPR members prior to the meeting.
- To request the IHDP evaluation panel to submit a draft report by the end of May 2005.

4. **Report of the 89th Executive Board Meeting**

![Decision:]

To note report.

5.1 **Consortium Packard Grant Proposal**

Funds were requested and received from the Packard Foundation for the development of activities to further define two of the research areas identified in the Consortium Advisory Group report, and to organize a Scientist/Practitioner Dialogue Meeting in 2006. Due to concerns about the fact that this proposal was drafted and submitted without the express consent of ICSU, the EB recommended that ICSU withdraw from participation in this activity.

![Decision:]

To note that funding has been received for proposed activities, but that the primary responsibility for these activities rests with the Initiative on Science and Technology for Sustainability (ISTS), and that ICSU will withdraw from formal participation.
5.2 **Consortium Advisory Group**

The *Ad hoc* Advisory Group to the Consortium on S&T for Sustainable Development held their final meeting on 18-20 October and are currently working on completing their report. An ‘interim’ final draft was presented to CSPR for information and consideration of how the recommended activities relate to ICSU’s larger strategic planning efforts.

In discussing the report, CSPR noted the Advisory Group’s efforts in addressing their difficult task, but expressed concerns about the tone and/or content of various aspects of the draft report. It was suggested that if these concerns cannot be addressed in the final revisions, the report should be released with some sort of official ‘ICSU response’ that highlights these concerns.

**Decision:**
To note the draft report and its implications for ICSU’s strategic planning processes.

5.3 **Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Follow-up**

ICSU is one of the institutional sponsors of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, which is being completed for launch at the UN in March 2005. It is not yet clear if there will be a recommendation to carry out a follow-up full assessment in the near future. Through the assessment process, a number of gaps in scientific knowledge had been identified. In addition, the MA efforts included a number of ‘sub-global’ assessments, which brought together various groups of scientists and decision-makers. ICSU co-sponsored a workshop in March 2004 to address the important scaling issues that need to be addressed in synthesizing knowledge from the various sub-global assessments. The MA invited some key partners (UNESCO, UNEP, UNDP, World Bank, WRI, ICSU) to a consultation in October 2004, at which time it was decided to look for funds to carry a new phase of activities over the next 3-5 years. Thomas Rosswall informed the CSPR of the status of this proposal, which includes a possible Secretariat function for ICSU.

**Decision:**
To note the EB decision to continue consultations on a possible ICSU Secretariat function, as a follow-up mechanism to identify research gaps, provide coordination for MA sub-global assessment activities, and continue the development of scaling methodology development.

5.4 **Preparations for WSSD+5**

The Government of South Africa has initiated planning for a series of events to ensure that science is high on the agenda for WSSD+5 in 2007. They have explored the interest of ICSU to provide scientific guidance in this process. An OECD meeting, as a follow-up to the Ministerial Declaration on Science for Sustainable Development (January 2004), is scheduled for 2005 and a high-level meeting, possibly under the auspice of the UN Committee on Science and Technology for Development, will be held in 2006. Thomas Rosswall presented the latest developments, including the possible roles for ICSU.
**Decision:**
To note the EB decision to participate, if so requested, in the planning activities to strengthen scientific input in the WSSD+5 process, including the follow-up to the OECD Ministerial statement on science for sustainable development.

---

6. **PAA Capacity Building**

The draft PAA report was presented by Panel Chair Jorge Allende. CSPR discussed the report’s 49 recommendations, especially the proposal to establish a new Committee on Science Education. CSPR identified the recommendations that either caused concern or that should be included at this stage in the draft strategic plan.

---

**Decision:**
To request Ranjan Ramasamy to transmit the conclusions of the discussion to the Panel; and to note the following items of particular importance for the strategic development:

3.4.2., 3.4.3, 3.5, 6.5.2. (Rec. #10, 15, 18, 19, 43) ICSU should establish a Committee on Science Education (CSE) to focus on the promotion of primary, secondary, and tertiary education with special attention given to science education at the secondary level, where Unions could make substantial contributions. Inquiry-based methodologies of science education should be promoted, where appropriate. The tertiary-level science-education initiative of the Committee on Science Education should interact with the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research, and Knowledge. The PCDC should advise the Executive Board on major issues of capacity building in science not covered by the Committee on Science Education.

1.4. and 6.3 (Rec. #16 and 45) The ICSU family should consider the approach of the global change research community to address capacity building needs, through START, by linkage to ongoing international research programmes. The participation of young scientists in the international scientific endeavor is one of the most important contributions that ICSU can make towards capacity building in science.

2.2, 3.2. (Rec. #8 and 13) Based on documentation of scientific supply and demand of scientific human capital that may be provided by UNESCO and OECD, the ICSU family should pay special attention to the problems resulting from the mobility of human capital between least-developed countries and developing countries, the “brain drain”. The ICSU family should diffuse information about different strategies that have been successfully applied to utilize the diasporas in capacity building of their countries of origin and other measures to reduce brain drain.

3.3. (Rec. #12) The ICSU family should work with its partners, including the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, UNESCO, and other UN bodies (e.g., the Gender Advisory Board), to improve the participation of women in science, including efforts to make science education more accessible and to harmonize careers in science with work life and family life.
4.1 and 4.2 (Rec. #22 and 23) ICSU should develop a strategy for improving its public outreach in order to communicate the importance of science to society, and should promote initiatives among its membership aimed at encouraging the public understanding of scientific issues, thereby helping to build a scientifically literate global society.

6.9.2 and 6.9.4 (Rec. #29 and 31) Unions should assist and coordinate, with National Members and the ICSU Regional Offices, region-specific capacity-building programmes.

7. Science and Society

Carthage Smith briefly presented the report Science and Society: Rights and Responsibilities. This report was produced directly under the aegis of the EB, and thus was presented for information only, in the context of the overall strategic plan.

**Decision:**
To note the report.

8. Basic Sciences

Carthage Smith briefly presented the position statement The Value of Basic Sciences and Basic Research, which was produced directly under the aegis of the EB, and thus was presented to CSPR only for information. This statement, which is relevant to ICSU’s strategic planning efforts, will be formally released at the ICSU General Assembly in October 2005.

**Decision:**
To note the statement.

9. Strategy Document

The first draft of the ICSU strategy document was presented to the CSPR. All sections of the report, in particular the proposed actions, were discussed in detail. CSPR approved of the current report structure, but suggested revisions to various sections of the report. These revisions will be incorporated into the next draft.

A particular concern was raised by members as to the roles of IAP and IAC relative to ICSU. It was suggested that these organizations might be viewed as potential competitors as well as collaborators, and that the relationship needed clarification in the strategic plan.

The presentations of finances in the strategic plan were also discussed in depth. It was agreed that the details of future resource requirements should be presented in a separate document, but further consideration should be given to including summary financial information in the strategic plan itself.
The proposed timetable for completing the report is as follows:

- 20 Dec. 2004  revised report distributed to CSPR
- 6 Jan. 2005  comments due from CSPR
- 15 Jan. 2005  report circulated to ICSU Members
- 15 March 2005  comments due from ICSU Members
- 23 March 2005  CSPR conference call to discuss report
- 18-20 April 2005  draft presented to the EB for final adjustments and approval
- May 2005  final version circulated to Members
- October 2005  approval by General Assembly

**Decision:**
To incorporate the changes suggested at the meeting; and to agree on the time table as listed above.

10. Dates of Future Meetings

**Decision:**
The next meeting is scheduled for 7-8 June 2005.