

15th IHDP SC meeting

School of International Studies, JNU, Delhi, India

14-17th October 2008

Draft Report

Participants:

Oran Young, Sander van der Leeuw, Geoffrey Dabelko, Hebe Vessuri, Roberto Guimarães, Ernst Weizsäcker, Ilan Chabay, Gernot Klepper, Balgis Osman-Elasha, Rik Leemans, Andreas Rechkemmer, Heide Hackmann, Karen O'Brien, Frans Berkhout, Jozef Pacyna, Anette Reenberg, Thomas Rosswall, Linda Sygna, Juergen Weichselgartner, Anna Wiczorek, Carlo Jaeger, Martin Rice, Bernd Siebenhuener, Frank Biermann, Janos Bogardi, Shobhakar Dhakal, Anand Patwardhan, Mark Rosenberg, Sybil Seitzinger

Outline:

1	Programme reports: chair, executive director, treasurer	2
2	Project updates	4
3	Reports from partner Programmes and ESSP	6
4	New IHDP research initiatives	8
5	Reflections on synthesis processes and IHDP's cross-cutting themes.....	11
6	Capacity development and science-policy interaction	12
7	Open Meeting.....	14
8	Strategic planning and administrative issues.....	15
9	Miscellaneous	17

Prepared by

Falk Schmidt, Academic Officer

Schmidt@ihdp.unu.edu

Dr. Louise v. Falkenhayn, Academic Officer

falkenhayn@ihdp.unu.edu

IHDP Secretariat

UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10

D-53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel. +49-228-8150600

Fax: +49-228-8150620

The 15th IHDP SC meeting was officially opened by a welcome address of Professor Bharat Desai from the School of International Studies (SIS) at JNU. After lunch Professor Pusshpesh Pant, Dean of SIS, welcomed the meeting participants and highlighted that it was an honour for SIS to host this distinguished group of international scientists at his school. Oran Young on behalf of the SC expressed IHDP's gratitude to SIS for the opportunity to hold the 15th IHDP SC meeting at JNU and for all the support provided.

1 Programme reports: chair, executive director, treasurer

After a tour de table **Oran Young** (IHDP chair) gave a brief presentation on major developments in the period since the 14th SC meeting. He highlighted the fact that many members of the SC were appointed just after the 14th SC meeting (or just before the last SC meeting). He stressed the role of the Strategic Plan 2007-2015 to guide the work of IHDP and the necessity to prioritize in times of growing opportunities and demand. (*presentation available online*)

Andreas Rechkemmer (Executive Director of IHDP) introduced the months since the 14th SC meeting as a phase of transition, renewal and growth. The new institutional set-up with UNU as a 3rd sponsor of IHDP was mentioned as well as the importance of the Strategic Plan 2007-2015, which is especially relevant for the work of the Secretariat, and changing parameters of IHDP's funding base. Furthermore, Andreas Rechkemmer mentioned many other improvements such as a new IHDP image and public appearance, e.g. its new website. At its core, IHDP has a healthy portfolio of science projects, each at different stages of their life-cycles and, as a result of the Strategic Plan 2007-2015, capacity development and science-policy interaction have gained more importance. Finally, major improvements in IHDP's communication and outreach activities were presented, including plans to upgrade the IHDP UPDATE into a peer-reviewed journal. (*presentation available online*)

Sander van der Leeuw (Treasurer of IHDP) presented the financial report. He highlighted that IHDP was able to broaden its funding base. As a result, IHDP is less dependent on the German contribution although, their budget cut is one of the major challenges for the programme. He also introduced the business plan 2008-2010 that serves as a good starting point for a more strategic allocation of IHDP's finite resources. Nevertheless, it remains a major challenge for IHDP to secure its funding every year and a new approach is needed, as a result of new requirement stemming from the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2007-2015, if the existing funding gap is to be closed. (*presentation available online*)

One point of **discussion** was the right mixture of funding coming from IGFA members and additional sources. IGFA money is currently covering the bulk of IHDP's income but it is likely that it will not be able to close the funding gap with these sources alone. Hence, IHDP should continue to work closely with the IGFA members, to secure large parts of its funding basis. In addition, new resources can be found, for example, via project-based funding and funding from new sources such as development aid agencies.

Related to this question, a short discussion emerged about the nature of the Secretariat, whether it is an implementing body or a "pure" facilitator. During the discussion it was clarified that "implementation" in the IHDP context refers to pro-actively implementing decisions of the SC, using the Strategic Plan 2007-2015 as the major reference document, , but not an "implementation body" in the classic UN understanding.

A third item of discussion was the importance of the business plan. Even though the current business plan is a major step in the right direction, improvements are still possible and necessary. It was particularly mentioned that the current plan is still weak on expenditure issues. If the plan is to serve as a useful document to guide action, identify funding gaps and to allocate resources, it has to be upgraded and has to provide more detailed information. The Secretariat clarified that the Business Plan presented to the SC is mostly used as a tool for fundraising, and successfully served to provide (potential) donors with an understanding of the IHDP activity portfolio. The document is in fact a summary of the much more detailed internal workplan and budget, which includes first estimates of the numbers suggested by the SC. The Secretariat will submit the full version to the SC, and invites feedback to be used for the development of the next budget in 2009.

A brief discussion emerged on the possibility of tracking all resources that are coordinated by global Programmes such as IHDP (an argument often raised in the IGFA context as well). However, even if it is currently pursued to include core and joint project budgets in IHDP's documentation, previous attempts showed that this is hardly possible and of limited informative value to include everything that is influenced by the Programmes.

One point that came up throughout the SC meeting was the role of the SC itself and the different groups within the SC (executive, appointed members, project chairs, ex officio). The renewed IHDP constitution provides some guidance here; however, more internal discussions seem to be needed. A clear and good relationship between the Secretariat and the SC is crucial. The Secretariat needs clear guidance from the SC. This includes input from the SC for the development of the budget as well as identifying trends and prioritization, e.g. to support activities in developing countries.

Finally, the relationship between the different types of projects in the ESSP context was addressed. On the one hand, a general consensus existed, that it is desirable to treat core and joint projects as de facto equal entities within IHDP. On the other hand, the issue of complementarity of works being undertaken within ESSP and IHDP emerged throughout the meeting. For example, clear procedures are in place for an IGBP-IHDP co-sponsorship of the IHOPE project. What needs to be in place to transform it also into an ESSP activity?

The SC endorsed the Programme reports. Related recommendations are listed on a separate page.

2 Project updates

Anette Reenberg (Chair of GLP) presented the update of GLP. She reminded the SC that GLP is just about to finish its start-up phase. She highlighted GLP's session at the IGBP Congress 2008, the supportive function of GLP's nodal offices and funding opportunities in the EU context. She also informed the SC that funding for the IPO for the years after 2009 is currently under review at Copenhagen University. Major discussion items included the improvement of the visibility of the research findings of the projects (applicable to all projects) and the effective collection and use of data generated by projects. (*presentation available online*)

Jozef Pacyna (Chair of LOICZ) presented the 5 themes of LOICZ and its 3 current priority topics. He put emphasis on the mid-term synthesis of the project planned for 2010 which is an innovative approach to harvest research findings during the project's life-cycle and to prepare for another round of priority topics to implement the ambitious science plan. He also highlighted the support provided by the LOICZ regional nodes and he introduced briefly the incoming chair Alice Newton and 4 candidates for SSC membership. The IHDP SC expressed his gratitude to Jozef for his leadership over the past years that have represented the transformation of LOICZ from an IGBP core project into a joint project with IHDP. (*presentation available online*)

The SC approved the candidates for the LOICZ SSC as well as the new chair Alice Newton as suggested by LOICZ. (This will be effective once the IGBP officers have approved them as well.) However, the SC asked LOICZ to give priority to candidates with a social science background for the (five) replacements taking place next year.

Frans Berkhout (Chair of IT) presented the project that was implemented in two phases: a) a community building phase that also developed a scientific framework and b) an implementation phase that applies the scientific framework, which was developed in the OECD context, also to the developing world, particularly Asia. He introduced IT's planning for its synthesis phase, with a book project that is currently being developed, a strong presence at the IHDP Open Meeting 2009 (including its next SSC), and a Synthesis Conference in 2010. However, so far no concrete candidate for a follow-on project has been identified. A major point of discussion was the synthesis process for IT, this was also picked up later again. (*presentation available online*)

Linda Sygna (Executive Officer of GECHS) presented an update on their project with a focus on its synthesis phase from June 2008 to June 2010. In this phase, GECHS concentrates on "shifting the discourse" in climate change discussions, using the human security paradigm. A possible special report of IPCC on a broader understanding of disaster risk reduction is currently being prepared and supported by Norway with input from GECHS. Another component of the synthesis phase is the dissemination of its research findings, with three books in preparation and more to come after the synthesis conference in June 2009. GECHS will be present both at the Copenhagen Conference and the IHDP Open Meeting 2009. It was discussed that GECHS and the crosscutting theme on VAR are closely related. It was stressed, something which is also valid for IT, that the synthesis process should make sure that new people and ideas are being incorporated into follow-

on activities. It was also stated that it is challenging to prepare the synthesis conference while the project is still under such high demand. (*presentation available online*)

Michail Fragkias (Executive Officer of UGEC) joined the committee by phone. He highlighted the IHDP Open Meeting 2009 as an opportunity to showcase first results of the project. (UGEC also plans its next SSC for Bonn back to back with the OM.) A flagship activity is its work on urban responses to climate change with a regional focus on Western Africa and the Americas. An IPCC-like report for urban areas is currently under consideration and UGEC is also involved in this. In addition, collaborations with other projects were mentioned, such as GLP, KLSC, GCP, or LOICZ, and also first contacts with IGAC from IGBP. The upcoming (mid-term) synthesis conferences of these projects are also important platforms for UGEC.

Anand Patwardhan (Co-Chair of GCP) presented highlights of GCP. While GCP's work on carbon trends and budgets are highly successful, and are an important source of information for various purposes, the project also integrates human dimensions research for instance through its work on vulnerabilities or carbon management i.e. through its urban carbon management initiative. GCP was also presented and discussed as a success case for the science-policy interface, given the media coverage for GCP or the high visibility of its products in international forums. The project has just entered its synthesis phase and hence it will be very interesting to follow its developments over the coming years.

John Ingram (Executive Officer of GECAFS) reported on the successfully held international conference on food security, organised by GECAFS in Oxford, April 2008. At this conference GECAFS explored the various linkages between the food systems, globalisation and different stressors. It was concluded that clear signals exist to indicate that environmental changes have reached the food systems. A major contribution of GECAFS in this context is the wider focus on food security instead of food productivity, still the dominant focus in international assessments. One major concern of the project is its three regional initiatives and GECAFS has been working hard to implement them. Currently, GECAFS is preparing a proposal for the years 2009-2011 that will also be its years of synthesis. It was also introduced that GECAFS on behalf of ESSP contributed a lot to the development of the upcoming CGIAR-ESSP challenge programme on climate change (CCCP).

Mark Rosenberg (Co-Chair of GECHH) introduced the project that became an IHDP co-sponsored project after the 14th SC meeting. He briefly touched upon the broad research agenda of GECHH and briefed the SC on recent attempts to establish the IPO in Canada. A brief discussion occurred on the scope of the project and whether or not it will include issues of mental health or stress-related illnesses. Other points of discussion were the importance of economic parameters in the health care systems, a systems perspective as such, and the right scale of analysis for a project on health (implemented by global programmes). It was also presented that the 1st SSC meeting will take place in December 2008, in Mexico, and it will be a major task for the committee to identify first concrete research topics to get the implementation of GECHH started.

Martin Rice (Coordinator of ESSP) presented recent developments of GWSP. On the one hand, the project is doing fine. It has just reached its mid-term implementation phase with three major initiatives at its core. GWSP has several collaborations with IHDP projects such as LOICZ, IDGEC and ESG. It plans to have an open science conference in 2012 to present the global system perspective on water. However, it was also discussed that local perspectives have to also be included (which is the ongoing challenge for GWSP with its focus on the global system). On the other hand it had to be reported that due to insecure funding, all IPO staff members have left the project and in a best case scenario, it will be re-staffed by the beginning of 2009 at a reduced level of funding. This situation is certainly not fortunate and has to be observed carefully since, as LOICZ pointed out, cooperations with other projects, amongst other things, are affected.

3 Reports from partner Programmes and ESSP

Sybil Seitzinger (Executive Director of IGBP) joined the IHDP SC meeting for the first time, since she has just started her new position at IGBP at the beginning of September. She stressed the good collaboration between IGBP and IHDP, manifested, for example, in the co-sponsoring of GLP and LOICZ. She briefly introduced IGBP's work on and contribution to assessments such as the IPCC and presented highlights of the IGBP Congress, Cape Town 2008. She proposed IGAC, ICED (follow on to IMBER and GLOBEC) as well as IHOPE as candidates for further collaboration (with IHOPE being the one that is most advanced in this respect since it is already a joint activity of the two programmes). She invited IHDP to comment on the ICSU review of IGBP and she brought to attention the fact that IGBP will have a mid-term synthesis of its current project cycle in 2009. This will also lead to the 2012 Open Science Conference (NB: not planned as "closed" IGBP congress again).

Martin Rice completed the presentations of partner programmes by adding a few points on latest developments within WCRP and DIVERSITAS. He introduced the new chair and executive director of WCRP and their interest to increase collaboration with IHDP, using the upcoming Open Meeting, for example, for joint sessions. DIVERSITAS is planning its second Open Science Conference, Cape Town, 13-16 October 2009. It was also mentioned that DIVERSITAS is well connected to intergovernmental and assessment processes such as UNCBD, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment or IMoSEB.

Rik Leemans (Chair of ESSP) underlined in his presentation the partnership role of ESSP for the four global change programmes as well as the integrative nature of the joint projects. With the 2008 ESSP workshop on biofuels (with GCP in the lead) and the successful creation of the Climate Change Challenge Programme (CCCP), which is focusing on adaptation challenges for agricultural systems (with GECAFS as the focal point for ESSP and Thomas Rosswall as the Chair of the new initiative), two prominent examples of ESSP's activities of the past months were presented. In the case of the biofuels workshop, participants of the SC meeting agreed that a "rapid response" to pressing issues such as this workshop could often be the appropriate approach (instead of creating

new joint projects as the default option). The IHDP SC was invited to put forward names for the SSC of CCCP and it was mentioned that the Director's position will be announced soon. Another major area of ESSP's work is related to climate change. ESSP was presented both at the 2007 and 2008 SBSTA meetings of UNFCCC in Bonn and is taking a lead in organising a meeting jointly with IPCC on "Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability", Amsterdam, 21-23 January 2009 (also supported by IHDP with Frans Berkhout in the lead). Furthermore, ESSP will be presented at the Copenhagen Conference on climate change next March and at the ISSC World Social Science Forum in May 2009 in Bergen, Norway. In Copenhagen, ESSP will convene its 3rd SC meeting, hosted by Anette Reenberg at her department. This ESSP SC meeting will also focus on the strategic planning for ESSP, a crucial step for the "new" ESSP. To define its role for integrative science, the following central building blocks for ESSP's strategic agenda are envisaged:

- its relationship to the four programmes;
- its involvement in (global) assessments and modeling activities;
- areas for rapid responses to emerging needs for quality science;
- its relationship with and role for national committees of the four programmes; potential publications (e.g. an ESSP journal);
- ESSP's take on capacity building activities;
- a major ESSP forum for and with stakeholders (e.g. Davos-like); and
- major science challenges for the next decade such as land use conflicts, further work on climate change or global trade issues (that may also be jointly identified and developed with stakeholders).

Concerning the ESSP journal: Anand Patwardhan will be editor-in-chief for social sciences and a first issue is planned for autumn 2009. The journal will consist of review papers, around 10 for each issue, and will be by invitation only. It will also provide a platform for the four programmes to publish. Rik Leemans once more underlined the importance of an existing momentum for the human dimensions that should be reflected in the journal.

A major discussion item was the relationship between ESSP and IHDP. Even though the 2nd ESSP SC, June 2008, Oxford, addressed this issue (that is equally relevant for all programmes), more clarity is still needed, e.g. whether ESSP will continue to be a partnership or if it will emerge as a strong coordinating programme. The ESSP strategic plan should provide guidance in this respect and should define ESSP's niche. This may go beyond current activities jointly implemented, such as, ESSP's role in bringing together the information for a joint and coherent annual report for the IGFA members. Thomas Rosswall informed the SC about a high-level meeting in the first half of 2009. The meeting will take the findings of the ICSU reviews, including the one on IHDP, as a basis to discuss the current "GEC research landscape" and may propose some recommendations for the coming years. Finally, it was stated that a strengthened ESSP has to be able to attract additional funding instead of tapping into the same resources allocated so far for all the four programmes. CCCP could be a promising good example for attracting new resources, e.g. from funders investing in development research/assistance.

4 New IHDP research initiatives

Frank Biermann (Chair of the Scientific Planning Committee and proposed Chair of the ESG SSC) presented the ESG project, based on the Science Plan submitted prior to the SC meeting for approval of the SC. He presented the planning process that has taken place since the 14th SC meeting, including the official review of the Science Plan by an IHDP appointed panel as well as a broad, additional review process, by several dozens researchers who are interested in the research agenda of ESG. He also introduced ideas on the governance structure of the project that consists of different layers of involvement and he presented a first set of SSC members. The project will be completed by a series of (regional) conferences, a vital part of ESG's implementation.

The SC approved ESG as a new IHDP core project with acclamation and the proposed SSC members were approved as well, including Frank Biermann as chair of ESG. However, it was requested that for the remaining 2 to 4 seats at the SSC, priority has to be given to candidates from the "global South", especially from Africa, Latin America and Middle East/Central Asia. A new list of candidates should be presented at the 16th SC meeting. One point of discussion were the "flagship activities" of ESG and it was reassured that the current ones (on food, water, carbon and economic system(s)) are not a finite set of activities and others may join as appropriate. Another discussion point was the difference between "governance" and "management", some this that also related to the scope of ESG and that will be addressed throughout the project's implementation. Another point was that governance is often perceived as a "soft factor" while "hard politics" may not be captured well by the governance approach. Others, in return, emphasized the "democratic notion" of the governance concept that is worthwhile to explore further in this project (even though this topic was much stronger at the beginning of the planning process compared to the agenda laid out in the final Science Plan).

Carlo Jaeger (Co-Chair of the Scientific Planning Committee) presented IRG. Even though the process is somewhat less advanced than ESG, IRG was able to submit a "pilot science plan" for approval to the SC. Carlo Jaeger used the Chinese ice storm experience in 2008 as an empirical example to demonstrate the importance of IRG's research agenda and the usefulness of its scientific framework to analyse such cases. So far, a (growing) gap still exists between the occurrence of major risks and our ability to understand as well as to respond effectively. The coupled systems paradigm will be a guiding theoretical basis for IRG, which will also move beyond simple "rationalistic approaches" in risk management. The SPC has decided to focus on transitions in and out of such risks, something which will give great prominence to learning theories in the IRG, and to address one of the most important components of risk analysis and to avoid an insurmountable research agenda. Finally, Carlo Jaeger highlighted the fact that IRG is a fully international initiative, with full ownership by the Chinese colleagues, who initiated this project and presented it at the 14th SC meeting in 2007 (Peijun Shi is Co-Chair of the SPC).

During the discussion, it was stated that part 1 and part 2 of the current Science Plan still lacks full integration, something to be changed for the final version. The issue was raised that in its current form, IRG is a bit too managerial or applied in its character instead of applying a purely social science research design. Apart from these more "structural" views on IRG, some stressed the

necessity of including typical social science research themes such as cultural factors and (individual) perceptions of risk, something, however, that seems to highlight the need for an improved and clearer final version of the Science Plan rather than addressing a real lack of such questions within IRG. In addition, several links to other projects exist, for example LOICZ expressed its interest to collaborate as well as KLSC and links to ESG are obvious. It was also mentioned that some phrases such as “unacceptable risks” or “exceeding current coping capacity” should be clarified. One major challenge for IRG is to reconcile the need for a clear, stringent research set-up as, for instance, applied in risk insurance research. While on the other hand, the project has to look into the “unknown” as well as into much less rational behavior than applied, for example, in most economic theories.

IRG has been in contact with the ICSU initiative on integrated research on disaster risk and Gordon McBean, who is heading the ICSU initiative, is also member of the IRG Scientific Planning Committee. At a recent meeting in Davos, Switzerland, several options were discussed for future collaboration. In the end, IRG could even be an IHDP core project co-sponsored by the ICSU initiative (that is currently being transformed into a programme of its own).

Unfortunately, the planning process of IRG has been influenced negatively by visa problems for Chinese members, both at Santa Barbara, California, in June 2008 and at the SC meeting in Delhi. IHDP appreciates the ability of those affected to cope with this situation and will continue to assist in similar occasions as much as possible.

Based on the discussion, the SC adopted IRG as a Pilot Science Project of IHDP. It will also appear as pilot science project in all IHDP media such as the website or the IHDP UPDATE. This decision provides IRG with the opportunity to go ahead and finalise the initiative using the momentum IRG has already generated. At the same time, in order to become a full IHDP core project, which is the final aim of IRG, the completed Science Plan, which will also take into account the feedback from the SC, has to be submitted to the IHDP appointed review panel as instructed by the standard procedure of IHDP. Once the IRG scientific planning committee has incorporated the comments of the review panel, the Science Plan can be approved by the SC and IRG and adopted as core project. If things unfold quickly, this can be envisaged already for the next SC meeting.

Ilan Chabay and Bernd Siebenhuener presented KLSC. They highlighted the cross-cutting character of the initiative and the fact that many projects are already partially dealing with issues of knowledge and learning. This initiative, however, will focus on changes and the role knowledge and learning could and should have to enable desired change towards sustainability. Hence, the relationships between the different variables expressed in its title are a major focus of the project instead of dealing with them (too much) in isolation. The initiative is already based on several meetings and interactions that have been taking place since early 2007. A Scientific Planning Committee was proposed and accepted by the SC, though regional balance remains an issue, and a first draft science plan should be presented at the next SC meeting. First concrete collaborations of KLSC are being planned together with ESG and IRG. Finally, as a result of the envisaged research agenda of KLSC, it will contribute substantially to the overall debate about IHDP's priority area of science-policy/practice interactions.

During the discussion, it was stressed that the quite general framework of KLSC should be clearly linked to GEC research in order to focus the work right from the beginning. A close collaboration with the established projects may also be helpful for that purpose. At the same time, KLSC should be implemented as a cross-cutting project and therefore it might be slightly broader in scope and a little less specific than traditional science projects in order to be flexible enough for broad cooperation. KLSC will demonstrate how this may work best and if a slightly different logic of implementing IHDP's research agenda can be established. The central factor for success (or failure) could be whether or not the initiative is able to provide a scientific framework that goes beyond the scope of specific study areas while remaining scientifically sound and sharp. It also has to demonstrate that it has "a life of its own" instead of being a knowledge and learning "clearinghouse" for the established projects.

Several points were additionally discussed: The initiative has to identify its value added since several studies, e.g. on system innovations or transition research, are dealing with these questions as well. Related to that: the project has to be very clear about the terms used, such as knowledge and learning, and it has to be explicit if it uses them differently than in related studies. KLSC clearly implements one of the major overarching goals of the Strategic Plans 2007-2015 since it is broadening the scientific agenda and involves new communities, for instance, cognitive and behavioural sciences as well as research on the role of values for change processes. However, the relationship between behavioural change and societal change, as stated in its title, needs clear explanation and it has to be clarified how it is related to issues such as learning barriers, ability to "un-learn" or the crucial role of uncertainties, particularly in GEC related issues. A major challenge the project could deal with is moving from ex post explanations of changes (or non-changes) to projections of what might happen, based on the KLSC framework. It was also discussed that IHDP's projects and its findings could be an interesting area of study itself in this context (which has been already discussed in the planning process). In general, the comments were very supportive and encouraging for this new initiative. The initiative was very well received and many examples were provided that could be of interest for this topic and for future concrete collaboration (beyond ESG and IRG that are already pursued).

Sander van der Leeuw presented the latest developments of IHOPE. The SC decided already at its 14th meeting in 2007 to adopt IHOPE as an IHDP activity (until then it was sponsored by IGBP alone) and to launch a joint planning process. In the meantime, the committee has drafted a Science Plan that will be put forward in the next weeks for review and approval. It is envisaged that the process can be finalised and the project approved at the 16th SC meeting.

There was great support for the IHOPE attempt to collect data systematically and to become a rich source for others who would like to work with the data, e.g. for modeling. In its current shape, IHOPE will focus on climate, settlements, environment, demography and agricultural data. It was briefly discussed that it is difficult to incorporate economic data (beyond some information on wealth) and scale related issues (both spatial and temporal) and this may create challenges for easy utilisation of the data. However, the SC welcomed the report with enthusiasm and is looking forward to receiving the Science Plan.

Sander van der Leeuw also presented the state of affairs for the cross-cutting theme on Vulnerability, Resilience and Adaptation (VAR). Even though the process has slowed down a bit in the past two years, an interesting panel discussion was held at the Stockholm Resilience Conference, April 2008, and a follow up event is planned for the IHDP Open Meeting 2009. Sander suggested involving Finona Miller (Australia, background in integrated vulnerability assessments) in the planning of the next steps as she was crucial for making the Stockholm panel a success.

In the discussion it was reiterated that the main attraction of VAR is in bringing the different discourses together instead of dealing with them in parallel. It was mentioned that the meeting of the GEC community with IPCC, January 2009, Amsterdam, will be interesting since work on impacts, adaptation and vulnerability will be a central building block during this meeting. The SC also welcomed the report on VAR with enthusiasm, using the IHDP Open Meeting 2009 as an important milestone in the process and bearing linkages with GECHS and a potential follow-on initiative in mind.

5 Reflections on synthesis processes and IHDP's cross-cutting themes

As more IHDP projects enter their **synthesis** phase and since experience exists from Lucc and IDGEC, the SC discussed how to best plan and implement the final phase in a project's life-cycle and how to initiate follow-on initiatives. Frank Biermann was asked to give a short presentation on the transition from IDGEC to ESG which, is widely perceived as a successful example of transition management. It was highlighted that projects should start early and should integrate discussions about follow-on activities in their planning of synthesis activities. It should be an open process that invites new people and ideas to participate; however, it should also achieve a balance of continuity and renewal. In the case of ESG, an open science conference was held in May 2007, about half a year after the IDGEC synthesis conference, to present to and discuss the research agenda for the new project with a wide audience. Support from the IHDP Secretariat, both in terms of funding of SPC meetings and support from staff members for the planning process, was an important element in the transition period. Finally, leadership is crucial for the whole process.

Oran Young started the discussion of the **cross-cutting themes** with a short introduction on their history within IHDP. These themes emerged from the SC as a promising tool to provide greater scientific coherence to IHDP, since they are representing major social science research streams and they provide a specific scientific role for the SC within IHDP, i.e. to define, implement and readjust them. With the current work on governance and the work on knowledge, learning and societal change, these themes are being implemented and their relatively general character to date will be transformed during this process. In doing so, it will also be clarified what their role vis-à-vis in a core and joint projects is. This question arises as soon as these themes are not fully mainstreamed within IHDP's research agenda and fully absorbed by the individual project (which is not the case, as the emergence of the new initiatives demonstrates).

Some were rather cautious about these themes, since they may not be the right "tool" to coordinate research effectively. Hence, it could be that these themes will serve only as an advisory

capacity, e.g. on governance research, or providing input to science-policy dialogues and the like rather than inspiring novel research. Once a theme has reached sufficient momentum, it should be transformed into a core project of its own. Others, however, highlighted the fact that the intellectual scope of the cross-cutting themes may not be captured by one core-project alone.

Furthermore, these themes may go a step beyond “classic” collaboration with well-established (and sometimes compartmentalized) projects by pursuing a cross-cutting agenda that directly builds, at least partly, on research done in projects. For such an understanding of the cross-cutting themes, there are at least two main challenges: first, to define the right mixture of components that provide a “core” research agenda and those elements that link with and integrate the agendas of the other projects and employ their existing expertise.

One conclusion is also that the Secretariat seems to have a major role in implementing the cross-cutting themes, since it is best positioned to oversee developments in all projects and since it is the body that implements decisions of the SC, e.g. decisions on the cross-cutting themes. The Secretariat perceives the cross-cutting themes as very helpful to introduce programme wide concerns to the mostly autonomous activities, to inspire new perspectives on existing research topics; and serve as an important frame during the pro-active development of new initiatives and projects. Second, to provide a scientific framework, something like the usual science plans and yet slightly different in nature, that is strong enough to direct research being done under this theme and flexible enough to provide many entry points for others (potentially also discourses taking place outside IHDP or along its margins) is important.

Finally, it was stated that the existing theme on thresholds and transitions should not be left aside and it was suggested to incorporate “sustainable development” (or a related title, as many raised concerns that “sustainable development” could be a poor title for an IHDP cross-cutting theme) in the list of cross-cutting themes. To go forward with this idea, Balgis Osman-Elashaand and Roberto Guimaraes agreed to draft a short concept note by the next SC meeting. To sum up, this part of the discussion was very lively and has provided initial and substantial ideas for how to go forward. It became obvious, however, that implementing cross-cutting themes will take different pathways and it was also mentioned that new themes such as sustainable development have to fit well with the overall priorities as laid out in the Strategic Plan 2007-2015 and should not exceed an “optimal size” of IHDP’s work portfolio – something that needs further discussion.

6 Capacity development and science-policy interaction

Andreas Rechkemmer presented the different pillars of the **capacity development** work of IHDP. Its flagship activity was the IHDW and the 6th IHDW successfully took place following the SC meeting. During a joint meeting with participants of the IHDW in the morning of October 16th, SC members were provided with the opportunity to interact with the participants and to “evaluate” the format and its effectiveness. Experiences gathered during this IHDW will be used to further improve this “brand” of IHDP.

In addition, the IHDP scholar programme that was presented at the 14th SC meeting has been implemented and IHDP was able to attract many scholars, both resident and international,

mostly at an early career stage to join the Secretariat for a specific period of time. As this programme becomes more and more attractive, a standardized recruitment process should be implemented. As a next step, a more systematic integration of the scholar's work with the research activities of the projects should be envisioned.

Another component is IHDP's national committees that play an important role for capacity development efforts, though their role for IHDP certainly goes beyond these efforts. Unfortunately, the ISSC seed grant programme is not able to provide IHDP with its little but useful money (at the moment) that typically previously helped support the foundation of new national committees in developing countries. Consequently, some proposals from countries are on hold for the time being.

Finally, at its premissis, IHDP has organized short meetings (up to half a day) for student groups on GEC-related issue areas and uses this as an opportunity to introduce the programme to a wider audience and also to experiment with different formats of training courses. However, the Strategic Plan 2007-2015 provides an even broader mandate, such as building up capacities for scholars interested in science-policy interactions or interactions with the media.

Due to the major reorganization resulting from the move of the Secretariat to the UNU as well as a clear focus on facilitating the development of new research initiatives in the months since the 14th SC meeting, the Secretariat was not yet able to start implementing the full range of possibilities of IHDP capacity development agenda. Heide Hackmann invited IHDP to join the current ISSC discussions about capacity building and to share the great amount of experience IHDP has collected so far. It was also mentioned that UNU is very active in capacity building and opportunities for collaboration could be explored.

Regarding **science-policy interaction**: IHDP is involved in areas such as IPCC and work related to UNFCCC, including SBSTA. Together with other Bonn-based agencies including UNU-EHS, IHDP is organizing the Bonn Dialogues on Global Environmental Change, taking place twice a year. The Bonn Dialogues target the public and they have a focus on raising awareness on GEC issues. In 2006, IHDP started its science-policy dialogue series and its 2nd Dialogue was held in June 2008, hosted by Ernst von Weizsaecker in Santa Barbara, California, on "Energy, Sustainability and Societal Change". While the workshop generated interesting ideas (now published as an IHDP UPDATE Extra), provided the space for real dialogue beyond a typical academic debate, and brought together many people working in the interface of science and policy, it was not possible to attract policy makers to attend. Hence, for a 3rd Dialogue, the concept may have to be adjusted and guidance on this aspect is most welcome.

In the discussion two different functions and roles for science-policy activities were stressed, as also presented in the Strategic Plan 2007-2015: first, internal capacity building for those interested in science policy interactions and second, working in the interface as an information provider, a match-maker between science and policy, a "boundary organization". It was also stated that using IPCC as an example of science-policy interaction is only partly correct, since IPCC is very much driven by the GEC programmes. It was further suggested to make use of major events and to convene meetings back-to-back for participants who are interested in science-policy questions. At such meetings, these people are often present and selected "trainings" or briefings on specific issues can have a big impact. Instead of targeting decision-makers alone, who are very hard

to reach anyway, such “boundary persons” are most important in this respect. Challenges such as climate change but also the current financial crisis provide many opportunities and even call for IHDP to present its contributions toward such issues in a useful manner.

7 IHDP Open Meeting 2009

Falk Schmidt (Academic Officer of IHDP and new Task Force Manager for the IHDP Open Meeting 2009) presented the IHDP Open Meeting 2009 and the state of its preparation. The Secretariat worked very hard to find a new date and location for the Open Meeting after the Delhi plans had to be cancelled. It was possible to present the new venue – World Conference Centre Bonn – very soon after the postponement and relocation was announced. Only very few withdrawals occurred and a limited second call for papers attracted more than 200 new papers that are currently being assessed incorporated into the stream of sessions. The new set-up also has attracted interesting partners for the conference, ranging from governmental agencies, the UN, and the private sector to research institutes that would like to run sessions back-to-back with the IHDP Open Meeting 2009. It is planned to finalize a large proportion of the sessions, additional events and list of partners before the end of the year. The new website, updated on a regular basis, is a major part of a comprehensive communication strategy for the Open Meeting. Based on a rather conservative estimate of the number of participants, the direct conference costs can be covered by registration fees. However, fundraising is a major priority for the next months to offset other associated costs such as costs for additional staff that were hired for the Open Meeting. Finally, a major challenge is to raise funds for participant support, something that will need a lot of energy in the next months.

During the discussion, many good ideas were generated for how to support participants (in the form of stipends). It was suggested to prepare country specific lists to approach research councils individually. Great support was given for this idea, namely from Roberto, Sander, Anand, Hebe, Gernot and it was mentioned that the IHDP national committees should support this effort, too. Finally, it should also be ensured that money can be transferred and paid out easily for this purpose. As criteria for allocating these stipends, results of the grading as well as regional and gender balance will be applied.

Louise von Falkenhayn (Academic Officer of IHDP) briefly presented the proposals for the 8th Open Meeting, scheduled for 2011 or 2012. So far interest exists to hold it in Hong Kong, Singapore and Brisbane. Singapore handed in a “commercial” proposal that is also backed by government agencies. Scientifically, the Australian proposal is the strongest so far and it is also likely that governmental agencies will support it, something to be confirmed until the IHDP Open Meeting 2009. Later in the discussion Merylyn Wasson joined by phone. She also expressed her confidence that a firm commitment from the government should be available by March 2009, i.e. prior to the 7th Open Meeting. Such a commitment would include a large amount of money for travel support; especially for participants from developing countries (it may even include carbon offsetting). Finally, it was recommended that the final proposal for hosting the 8th Open Meeting

should stress the regional dimension of the offer, i.e. it is also representative for Oceania, it should include the local host institution (so far Brisbane) and should clearly stress how it is rooted in the Australian community. While major enthusiasm for the Australian proposal was generated, it was also mentioned that the SC should think about having all or every other Open Meetings in Bonn to reduce costs, to benefit from its supportive environment and the fact that it would be at the "IHDP Headquarters".

8 Strategic planning and administrative issues

Prior to the agenda item devoted to the institutional sponsors it was announced that this session will be a "closed session". Only the representatives of the three sponsors, the appointed SC members, the project chairs and in addition the ESSP chair attended this session. The session convened from 11:30 to 14:30. It was announced that a report provided by the sponsors will be circulated in due course. Since this session was about issues of high relevance to the Secretariat, Andreas Rechkemmer protested the procedure. He stated that it is inappropriate and does not contribute to the positive development of IHDP, if the head of the Secretariat, IHDP's Executive Director, is excluded from central discussions.

To kick-start a discussion about the future set-up and funding base for the IHDP, Sander van der Leeuw gave a short presentation that also provided background information on the "Packard Initiative", a bid to the Organizational Effectiveness Program of the Packard Foundation.

A major challenge of the current set-up of IHDP is that it is rooted in the 1980s, somehow copied the "model" that was in place for IGBP and has not been really transformed since then. The Strategic Plan 2007-2015 and adding UNU as a third institutional sponsor were first steps in a different direction, something that is yet to be fully implemented and at the same time "just a start". Interestingly, the need for continuous transformation does not come from a crisis IHDP is facing right now. IHDP is rather "challenged" by the increasing demand for its science and other services; the success of Human Dimensions research is in fact currently exceeding its capacity. On an operational level, the scope of the new mandate means that many demands cannot be answered fully or with satisfactory effectiveness.

To address these questions, they have to be put in the wider context of the rapidly changing environment in which IHDP is operating. One major issue regards the broadening the funding base beyond traditional government funding. It appears obvious that the existing funding gap cannot be closed with "traditional sources alone". IHDP and in the end the SC have to consider carefully, if and how IHDP should become active in more project-based fundraising (as signals from IGFA recommends as well). How should private foundations be approached? What can be done in partnership with the private sector? How to link with major NGOs? And what about a membership model for IHDP's funding base? Different forms of funding will necessarily imply programmatic changes, in particular project-oriented funding.

In addition, it is also necessary to re-think the different bodies of IHDP and their roles. The Secretariat is structurally overloaded in its current set-up; would it be possible or desirable to redistribute some functions or rather adjust the structure? Given the historical development, the programmatic decisions of the SC, and the changing set of stakeholders in the programme, the role of the institutional sponsors may also be an issue for adjustment. In these scenarios, “sponsorship” by purely scientific actors alone might no longer suffice and rather change towards “IHDP is accredited by...”. One concrete example illustrating the debate is whether IHDP will seriously implement the mandate for stronger science-policy interactions and capacity development and thus answer the request to increase its role in the current world-wide political debate.

The relationships with other organisations both inside and outside the GEC community should be assessed and defined to better position the Programme. IHDP’s various stakeholders equip the programme with a mixture of different resources and provide different levels and aspects of “legitimacy”. NGOs are gaining more and more influence in fields of high relevance for IHDP; should the programme respond to it? Finding answers to these questions and challenges is not an issue of preferring one stakeholder over the other, it will rather define our ability of positioning IHDP vis-à-vis its stakeholders in a way that best contributes to the development of the programme.

As a consequence of such an analysis, IHDP contacted the Packard Foundation’s Organizational Effectiveness Program. They agreed to provide funding for a professional consultant who will help facilitate internal discussions and will formulate recommendations based on this process to be picked up by the SC for further decisions. Thus, the SC is asked to approve this so-called “Packard Initiative” as a first, promising start for an open discussion about IHDP’s future as a GEC programme. Such a discussion should start as early as possible to prepare IHDP for the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2007-2015 but also, maybe even more importantly, for the time beyond 2015. In such a longer-term perspective, the vision and mission as well as the composition and weight of the pillars of IHDP’s work will have to be discussed as well. Hence, this would start a new round of strategic planning that would build on the recent experiences but would also start to really think outside the box.

During the discussion it was decided to start with the process immediately, to draft ToR for the consultant and to further discuss the initiative at the next SC meeting. In early 2009, the consultant should start to work, though the full collective stock-taking may easily last until the SC meeting in 2010. With this initiative IHDP would be a forerunner within the GEC community and IGBP, ESSP and ICSU specifically expressed their interest to participate and to learn. LOICZ reported on its own experiences with a consultant to improve internal effectiveness in the IPO with overall positive outcomes; something to learn from, even though it’s much more focused compared to the potential scope of the “Packard Initiative”.

However, during the discussion a number of crucial questions occurred. It was pointed out that the quality of the questions put forward by IHDP and ToR of the consultant will also determine the quality of the results. In the discussion, no consensus was achieved on how broad this initiative should be and how the rather short-term questions of effectiveness and the long-term vision and set-up of IHDP can be integrated and combined best. However, the question of

legitimacy and stakeholder structure was confirmed highly relevant. It was also discussed that the consultant, rather an outsider than someone from the network, should be familiar with the kind of work IHDP is doing in order to achieve a good outcome. The open outcome of the discussion support a rather extended time horizon until 2010. It is nevertheless important to focus now on the next step, i.e. drafting the ToR for the consultant. The draft will be circulated within the SC and should be approved before the end of the year. The draft paper on the Packard Initiative that was circulated prior to the SC meeting and could be used to start a (online) discussion until the next SC meeting.

9 Miscellaneous

SC membership: Leena Srivastava missed two consecutive SC meetings. According to the ICSU rules for SC membership, she has to rotate off. In the past, the SC has asked ICSU to defer such a decision due to health or severe personal reasons of these SC members and clear signals from their side to continue their membership functions as soon as circumstances allow. In the given case, the SC decided to replace Leena Srivastava and suggestions should be circulated in the next weeks, taking into account candidates that were suggested for the last round of replacements, in order to present a candidate to ICSU in February 2009. The membership term could then be backdated to 1 January 2009, preferably for a new member from India. It was also decided that the next SC meeting should discuss the existing procedure for SC member replacements as an agenda item.

Roberto Guimaraes presented some **ideas on how to improve the work of the next SC meeting**, following the IHDP Open Meeting 2009 in Bonn (most likely directly after the OM). He asked the Secretariat to provide the information two months prior to the meeting, including a draft agenda. This would also provide sufficient time to sort out some (procedural or administrative) questions prior to the meeting. The agenda could be structured along items for information, discussion, and decisions. Given this short timeline until the next SC meeting, some discussion should start right now and some documents should be provided before the end of the year such as the ToR for the consultant of the "Packard Initiative". For this purpose, the weblink that was used for the 15th SC meeting could be maintained.

Oran Young summarized at the end the major points of the 15th SC meeting: the IHDP science agenda proved its progress and the scientific portfolio presented itself as balanced and attractive; discussions about administrative requirements ranging from an improved business plan to a better definition of the roles of different actors within IHDP, the challenge to prepare IHDP for the 21st century, to transform its "logic" that goes back to the 1980s, its relationship to other actors in the field such as ESSP and some ideas on how to meet increasing demand for capacity development and science-policy interaction activities. The meeting closed at lunch-time, October, 17th. It was followed by an informal discussion on IHDP-IPCC relationship. The Amsterdam workshop, January 2009, was the major point of discussion and how to ensure that the human dimensions will be high on the agenda at this important meeting.

