

# Minutes of March 2010 meeting

## Summary of the 3rd IAP/IAC Joint Session Tuesday 23 March 2010 - KNAW - Amsterdam

Participants: IAP Executive Committee Members, IAC Board Members, Observers, Guests (in seating order, right - left): Mohamed Hassan, Howard Alper, Robbert Dijkgraaf, Yongxiang Lu, John Campbell, Joanna Lacey, Yves Quéré, José Franco, Tarek Hussein, Eduardo Krieger, Paulo de Goes Filho, Wieland Gevers, Mariana Weissman, Volker ter Meulen, Achiel Van Cauwenberghe, Ahmad Zaidee Laidin, Sangkot Marzuki, Tarik Celik, Stephen Cox, Lorna Casselton, Tracey Elliott, Ed Noort, Yonglong Lü, Giovanni Seminara, Juan Asenjo, Jeeon Frietman, Shuqin Fu, John Boright, Michael Clegg, Wang Zhenyu, Guy de Thé, M. Vijayam, N. Sathyamurthy, Hideaki Karaki, Noriko Nakamura.

### 1. Opening remarks

Robbert Dijkgraaf, President of KNAW, and IAC Co-Chair, warmly welcomed the participants to the 3rd IAP/IAC Joint Session, once again hosted by KNAW in Amsterdam. Yongxiang Lu, President of CAS, and IAC Co-Chair, underlined his hopes that the discussions would generate new ideas and increase interaction. He noted that IAP and IAC can play a joint role in promoting advances in a scientific society. He remarked that IAP has grown to be the largest association of science academies and plays a key science advisory role in society. IAC counts on the input of IAP know-how in the IAC study process.

H. Alper and M. Hassan, IAP Co-Chairs, in turn thanked KNAW for its impressive commitment, both in terms of human and financial resources, in handling the organization of the three main meetings. M. Hassan proceeded to outline the main achievements accomplished following the signing of a joint MOU in 2008.

- i) In matters arising, he noted that since the Joint Session in 2009, a series of climate change workshops had been successfully implemented following a partnership established in 2009 with the European Climate Foundation. The report on these workshops is available at [www.twas.org](http://www.twas.org).
- ii) "Beyond the Economic Crisis" – a draft statement proposed in 2009 at the joint session had followed the IAP statement process but unfortunately had not reached a majority of endorsements from the IAP Membership at the end of 2009. The IAP EC had therefore agreed in London in January 2010 that IAP members and the regional networks will receive the text in the form of a set of views for information and further circulation at a national level. The text is available from the IAP Secretariat.

### 2. Summary of Main Discussion

The delegates were provided with documentation for the meeting, as follows:

1. Summary of the discussions of the 2nd IAP/IAC Joint Session (March 2009)
2. Reports on the Joint IAC/IAP Regional Workshops implemented since the previous Session, and guidelines for the implementation of workshops.
3. IAP/IAC Memorandum of Understanding (2008)
4. Follow up proposal to the IAC Report on Energy "Lighting the Way"
5. Proposal for a new series of IAP/IAC Reports in policy decision-making
6. Request from the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and Rajendra Pachauri (Chairman, IPCC) to IAC to conduct an independent review of the IPCC process

## **Item 1: IAP/IAC Regional Workshops**

M. Hassan informed the participants that since the 2nd Joint Session, a further 4 regional workshops have been implemented by IAP Regional Networks. Detailed reports of the first three workshops were provided to the delegates. The 4th report is forthcoming.

1. IANAS Regional Workshop on “Women for Science”, April 2009, Mexico
2. NASIC Regional Workshop on “Gender Participation in the Development of Science”, November 2009, Bangladesh
3. NASAC/TWOWS Regional Workshop on “Women for Science in Africa”, December 2009, Kenya
4. NASAC Regional Workshop on “Jatropha Curcas-derived Biofuel Industry in Africa”, February 2010, Kenya

This brings the total of implemented workshops to 6. The IAP website contains the summary of each workshop, and links to the final reports and recommendations<sup>1</sup>. Two additional regional workshops have been postponed to 2010, namely:

1. IANAS Regional Workshop on “Inventing a Better Future” – a Strategy for Building Regional Capacities in Science and Technology”, Brazil, May 2010.
2. NASIC Regional Workshop on “Alternate Sources of Energy: Prospects and Options”, Pakistan, October 2010.

Reports on these will be presented at the next Joint Session.

### **1.1 Discussion on the Workshops on the IAC Study “Women for Science”**

Three Workshops have been held on this topic. M. Hassan briefly illustrated the main recommendations emerging. H. Alper proceeded to illustrate a number of similarities among the regional workshop recommendations, as well as some substantial differences.

Following discussion on the main issues emerging, H. Alper pointed out that many of the recommendations are very revealing as they show the challenges from a regional perspective, as well as from country to country. The overarching common problem is encouraging women into science and technology, and addressing the real challenge of self esteem – building pride and confidence it appears is vital.

Yonglong Lü reminded delegates of the forthcoming TWOWS General Assembly and International Conference on “Women Scientists in a Changing World”, 27-30 June 2010, Beijing. He suggested that the main recommendations could be shared with the TWOWS participants during a special session.

Participants then highlighted a number of initiatives underway for women in science: Y. Quéré mentioned that a number of organizations award prizes to women scientists, and outlined the L’Oréal-UNESCO Awards for Women in Science<sup>2</sup>. P de Goes added that the Brazilian Academy already cooperates with UNESCO and has signed an agreement for grants for Women in Science. Some of the Prize Winners have since become Fellows of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences. Tarik Celik added that many countries run similar schemes nationally or at a regional level. M. Weissmann also mentioned similar initiatives underway in Argentina and added that the national research council and the national atomic energy commission are both led by women. She added that in smaller countries it is not a problem of encouraging women into science careers, but encouraging science itself. L. Casselton noted the UK Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowships<sup>3</sup> – which provides flexibility for maternity leave – and the Rosalind Franklin Award<sup>4</sup> for women in their mid-careers. She also added that The Royal Society has recently recognized the achievements of Chancellor Angela Merkel (PhD in quantum chemistry) by awarding the King Charles II Medal for her extraordinary contributions to the promotion of science and science in society<sup>5</sup>.

H. Alper noted that IAP/IAC could create working groups to include corporate partners and stakeholders from universities with a specific mandate and objectives to look at the results of the workshops. R. Dijkgraaf added that IAP and IAC can help position some of the recommendations, but to do so requires involvement of leaders at university level and ministers, in addition to academies of science.

In summary, it was agreed as follows:

1. IAP will attempt to collect the information on various award schemes and support for women in scientists implemented by IAP Members;
2. IAP and IAC Co-Chairs set up a task force to consider follow up to the recommendations of the IAP/IAC Workshops.
3. IAP Co-Chairs portray the workshop recommendations at the TWOWS Meeting in June. The task force should also propose a set of actions to IAP/IAC.
4. IAP approach UNESCO to seek potential membership on the Committee for the L'Oreal-UNESCO Prizes.

T. Elliott agreed to serve on the TF. It was recommended to invite Manju Sharma and Johanna Levelt Sengers, and university presidents (H. Alper suggested Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, Principal at McGill University, Hon. Shirley Ann Jackson, President of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute). IAP and IAC Co-Chairs should also be on the committee.

M. Hassan concluded that the three main IAC Studies were now exhausted. He added that not much follow up had taken place on the recommendations of the IAC Study on Agriculture (Realizing the promise and potential of African Agriculture), particularly as it focused on a regional problem. He announced plans that NASAC will address the topic at its forthcoming EC meeting.

## **1.2 Discussion on the Workshops on the IAC Study “Lighting the Way”**

J. Boright mentioned - with regards to the follow up of the Workshop on Energy organized by IANAS and hosted by the Argentinian Academy in 2008 – that an ambitious set of action items had emerged and the reports of the workshops have been turned into standing programmes of IANAS with permanent committees. He added that the IAC reports served as a fundamental basis and had provided substance both for the workshop and the follow up discussions. H. Alper noted it would be useful to provide the IANAS workplan to other regional networks as an example. T. Hussein added that the workshops in itself should serve as a tool. Joint projects should also be encouraged (eg. ASRT in Egypt is interested in running a workshop on Solar Energy)\. M. Hassan noted that NASAC could take up the initiative at a regional level with ASRT and this could be presented at the forthcoming NASAC EC meeting. R. Dijkgraaf noted that the IAC study on energy was very comprehensive and could lead to future short studies, for instance on green technologies. He suggested the establishment of a task force to look at the Study and propose follow up topics to IAP/IAC, taking into account other studies by other organizations. K. Lambeck noted that numerous energy reports were already underway or published. He suggested one should concentrate on the interaction between areas of energy – for instance food/water. IAP/IAC could find a niche without getting into the discussion on specific technologies. H. Alper agreed that we need to focus on a particular component and consider forward looking issues, for instance gas hydrates. Yongxiang Lu added that China is looking into increasing its renewable and nuclear energy sector and that renewable energies is an important topic with the need to include the involvement of policy makers.

The participants agreed to establish an IAP/IAC task force to evaluate the recommendations of the Energy Workshops and draw up proposals for IAP/IAC. The Brazilian Academy of Sciences agreed to serve on the task force. Additional suggestions were welcomed from the participants. The Co-Chairs will finalize membership.

## **2. Future IAP-IAC Collaborative Projects/ Policy Studies**

R. Dijkgraaf introduced the idea to carry out joint IAP/IAC projects in the form of short policy studies. Participants were provided with a paper “Strengthening the Voice of Science in Policy Decision Making” drafted by the IAC. Policy studies could be produced annually, and the input for the studies could be provided from the results of thematic workshops organized by IAP member academies. Following the release of such a study, special briefings for policy makers and regional conferences should be held. IAC proposes to use reports issued by national academies as a basis for a study and bring these to the centre stage by building on some of the more global and relevant issues. This would add extra value to efforts made at a national level and would be of benefit to IAC and IAP.

It would also allow member academies to comment on one specific report and build on the results. He concluded that one of the strengths of the IAC Studies so far is the use of IAP expertise. E. Krieger added that financial support would be required to fund the development of such studies. J. Boright mentioned that already an IAP Statement (eg. Ocean acidification) takes its starting point from an academy report – in this case the Royal Society. He also mentioned a potential IAC-IAMP study on “Global Surveillance of Infectious Diseases”. This is based on the Institute of Medicine’s report on “Sustaining Global Surveillance and Response to Emerging Zoonotic Diseases” (2009) and could give a policy study a leading start. He added that funding had yet to be identified to start the study process.

M. Hassan noted that IAP’s new SPII had a section dedicated to “Science Communication” where it mentions the issuing of IAP Statements emanating from IAP Advisory Reports. IAP was in the process of identifying a niche for producing such reports and he quoted decisions 12- 14 in SPII. He added that IAP and IAC could work closely on producing joint policy reports.

The participants agreed to pursue the proposal of a joint policy report and the IAP Co-chairs informed that the IAP EC would consider IAP financial support for a first joint IAP/IAC policy report for 2011.

## **3. IAP/IAC Development Advisory Committee**

H. Alper introduced the agenda item already agreed on at the previous Joint Session, but which was proving difficult to get off the ground. He mentioned that many potential high level individuals identified so far were often too busy and the search was ongoing for committee members. He had managed to obtain the commitment from Francisco Ayala to co-chair the committee and added that the position of co –chair from a developing country was still vacant. R Dijkgraaf confirmed that it is a complex task to identify a suitable person who has status in the business community as well as a love for science. He suggested the IAP and IAC delegates build on contacts and put names forward to the IAP and IAC Co-Chairs as soon as possible.

## **4. UN request to IAC for IAC review of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**

R. Dijkgraaf informed participants of the recent request to IAC from the UN SG and the Chair of the IPCC to establish a “Independent Evaluation Group”. He pointed out that a number of errors had been identified in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, and following the UN Environment Council Meeting in Bali (February 2010) a review was required in order to ensure full confidence in the scientific process underpinning IPCC assessments.. He informed participants that the proposal had been discussed at length at the IAC Board and had met favourably with Board Members. He mentioned that IAC would now consult IAP members following the usual procedure

to identify experts to serve on the study panel. He added that UNEP and WMO, parent organizations of the IPCC, have agreed to provide administrative support and channel the funds. IAC had outlined a realistic budget of US\$ 950,000, approved by UNEP and WMO. In his concluding remarks, R. Dijkgraaf added that IAC will take great care in setting up the review panel, taking into account gender and geographical balance, expertise in climate science and knowledge of the IPCC process, experience in management of large scale organizations, as well as communication. He added that IAC is aware that the panel members cannot have assisted in the IPCC Report due to potential conflict of interest. He pointed out the tight timeframe - the UN expects the IAC report by 31 August 2010. He added that the Panel will have one Chair, and a Vice Chair, with a total of 11 members. Administrative staff will work full time, and 3 plenary meetings of the panel are planned. The letter to IAP members will include the detailed timeframe as well as the terms of reference. Those not selected for the Panel will be kept on record as potential reviewers during the drafting process.