

---

## 18th IHDP SC meeting

Nanjing, China  
20-22 October 2011  
*Report*

### **Participants:**

#### **Scientific Committee members**

Partha Dasgupta (Chair), Ilan Chabay, Balgis Osman-Elasha, Elena Nikitina, Germán Palacio, Xuemei Bai

#### **Representatives of projects and partner programmes**

Ruben Zondervan, Corrie Griffith, Tobias Langanke, Sander van der Leeuw, Qian Ye, Claudia Pahl-Wostl, Anne-Helene Prieur-Richard, Mark Rosenberg

#### **Guests**

*Thomas Krafft, Junpei Kubota, Daniel Niles*

#### **Secretariat**

*Anantha Duraiappah, Barbara Solich, Anne Kathrin Raab, Carmen Scherkenbach, Louise Smith*

#### **Not present**

*Susanne Moser, John Dryzek, Carlo Carraro, Frank Biermann, Anette Reenberg, Alice Newton, Peijun Shi, Carlo Jäger, Karen Seto, Roberto Sanchez-Rodriguez, Antonio Bursalacchi, Anne Larigauderie, Sybil Seitzinger, Konrad Osterwalder, Rik Leemans*

#### **Prepared by:**

IHDP Secretariat  
UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10  
D-53113 Bonn, Germany  
Tel. +49-228-8150600  
Fax: +49-228-8150620

---

## Opening Session

In the beginning of the meeting, Anantha Duraiappah announced that important decisions were presently being made regarding the future of research on global environmental change (GEC). He stressed the immanent need to define the most important questions that GEC research should address over the next ten years and talked about the role the IHDP Scientific Committee (SC) should play in this process.

## Unpacking the Social Sciences for Global Sustainability Research

### 1. World Views, Beliefs, Values & Ethics

Firstly, it was acknowledged that when discussing worldviews, beliefs, values and ethics, it was important not to adhere to one homogenous model. The challenge that scientists face was thus to create accounts of human behaviour that accommodate anecdotes while at the same time ensuring the representation of variability. Essentially, the aim of such an exercise was to discuss what it meant for a definition of worldviews, beliefs, values and ethics to be “complete” despite the common reluctance of the scientific community to change the current frameworks.

It was pointed out that this ambitious exercise might bring with it some difficulties. However, the value of identifying and phrasing questions in order to increase the influence of the social sciences in processes outside of IHDP was strongly underlined. In the course of discussion, participants explored in how far the areas and questions proposed in Discussion Paper 1 were adequate representations of the complexity of the “worldviews, beliefs, values and ethics” research area. The matters raised included, among others, the different temporal and spatial scales of the questions as well as their ability to contribute to long-term goals of understanding. In this context, it was mentioned that while it was clear that the questions were interrelated, the mutual relationships between them needed to be better defined (i.e. between worldviews, behaviour and institution – questions 1, 2 & 3). Eventually, the agreement emerged that in order to achieve clarity the existing questions under each topic should be reconsidered, and that a comparison to the ICSU Grand Challenges and the Belmont Challenges would be a good starting point for this.

Generally, participants stressed that it was important to integrate and engage with both social and natural sciences. It was regarded crucial to define the links between these two without conflating them into a single unit. Equally crucial importance was attached to the greater integration of social sciences into the GEC discourse and re-framing of the current research questions to ensure they reflect the important role of societies for identifying solutions to current problems.

### 2. Social & Institutional Structures

Participants discussed questions surrounding the need for and the feasibility of sustainable social and institutional structures. Most importantly, the discussion exposed the reasons for failed institutions

---

and, in doing so it entailed an indication of how they could be improved, highlighting interconnections to other areas of concern.

Overall, the session was dominated by statements that highlighted the complexity of human-nature interactions as well as the structural consequences of this. It was argued that the ways in which societies and especially smaller groups of individuals within these societies organise were not fixed by defined structures but rather characterised by dynamic processes, including a considerable degree of uncertainty. Institutions, however, were often organised along paradigms of linearity that did not reflect those non-linear interactions of contemporary socio-ecological systems. Accordingly, the complexity of human decision-making and its consequences were neglected and nature left out as a factor within processes of institutional structuring.

Participants therefore deliberated about possible ways of better conceptualising this apparent complexity. While it was acknowledged that the Earth System Governance Project (ESG) already touched upon such relevant issues as planetary boundaries and stewardship, it was remarked that the governance perspective should be complemented by alternative approaches.

The group examined scale as an appropriate parameter for framing the issue of institutions for sustainability. There was an understanding that the causes and effects of environmental change occurred at various scales, both over space and time, and that it was important to gain a better understanding of the social and institutional structures that operate at these scales as well as their effectiveness in responding to changes in scale. Furthermore, it was mentioned that the Institutional Dimensions of Global Environmental Change Project (IDGEC) had already provided a framework that incorporates scale and the interplay between scales and that this framework might be helpful for further analysis of the “Social and Institutional Structures” section.

### **3. Choices, Decisions, Behaviours**

At the beginning of the session, the concern was voiced that the issue area of ‘Choices, Decisions and Behaviours’ seemed particularly imprecise and asked participants to discuss possible ways of bringing clarity to this area. Firstly, the importance of routine in making choices and decisions was indicated and a typology reflecting actions that were not based on conscious choices was suggested. Upon the exchange between participants, it was highlighted that the current discussion seemed to focus predominantly on different forms of rules that guided decisions, and therefore it would fall more into the section on institutions and structure. In the following, the participants stressed the fact of institutions and structures being governed by norms. While participants argued that these elements needed to be distinguished, it was agreed that the relationship between them was crucial. It was regarded as essential to think about norms outside of an institutional setting to see how they might interact in different societies. It was pointed out that a margin-of-action existed for whether or not a change or innovation could actually happen with respect to a particular norm, and to which extent both current economic development and the pressure for consumption could be regarded as norms. It was recognised that the topic of change/innovation provided a great foundation for interdisciplinary research.

---

On a different note, it was said that caution needed to be exercised about the language that was being used to describe the problems at hand. This was important in order not to privilege one social theory on behaviours and norms, just as sharing knowledge from different scientific communities was crucial for inter-disciplinary research; a positive and engaging language needed to be found. Subsequently, possible contributions of various social theories (for example social constructivism) to this section were discussed. It was agreed that this discussion highlighted the importance of having an assessment of research on global environmental change in order to bring together different perspectives and to find a framework that served policy-makers.

#### **4. Plausible Futures**

This session started with a summary by Xuemei Bai of a presentation that she had prepared on “plausible futures”. She highlighted the three most important areas: Firstly, she clarified the goals that should be achieved in the future; secondly, she placed emphasis on understanding dynamics, trends and key responses; and thirdly, she inquired about the processes that could accelerate the achievement of desirable changes including the role of knowledge.

The importance of narratives was emphasised because of their role in communicating possible futures to the public by linking them to local identities. In addition, Xuemei Bai mentioned the importance of the learning process underlying the use of knowledge.

It was added that planetary boundaries, understood as a model looking at natural cycles and defining thresholds for the planet as well as the interrelations between these thresholds, might be a good way of thinking about plausible futures but that it was unclear what IHDP could contribute to this. However, the agreement on the feasibility of this approach for the discussed scientific paper was not unanimous. Subsequently, the discussion focused on the question of how to interpret ‘resilience’ as used in this section. It was mentioned that resilience might not be the best concept to describe the qualities of a society that allow it to manage as a social system without completely losing its character and coherence.

Furthermore, the difference between sustainability as a goal and as a future was discussed. Participants questioned whether sustainability in itself was a suitable indicator of a desirable future because it neglected the nuances of equity and well-being.

It was recognised that further factors should be incorporated into the discussion: among others, demographic development, urban development, rural innovation as well as the trade-offs between different spatial and temporal scales were mentioned. Finally, it was concluded that the underlying issue was to find an open-ended way of thinking about futures of a system as complex as society without neglecting the dynamics of that system.

---

## 5. Methodologies

The following discussion was based on the premise that reinforcement of inter- and trans-disciplinary research was a necessary condition to understanding coupled socio-ecological interactions. It would require bringing together a range of disciplines within the social sciences, natural sciences and humanities. However, it was acknowledged that each discipline had its own frameworks, methodologies and tools. The challenge was to provide a common platform including a common terminology and dataset that helped to bring these disciplines together.

Within this context, a paper by Max-Neef was presented and the four areas of trans-disciplinarity as presented in the paper were outlined: Values, Ethics and Philosophy; Politics and Law; Architecture, Engineering, Agriculture and Industry; as well as Physical Sciences, Mathematics, Chemistry, Geology and Ecology. According to the paper, trans-disciplinarity was a kind of vertical alignment between these areas.

The subsequent discussion focussed on methodological approaches that might be useful to analyse socio-ecological systems. Some participants argued that being responsive to coupling, changes and non-linearities should become an explicit part of what was considered to be appropriate research methodologies. The importance of special structures and scale was raised.

Some participants advocated a change in research design in order to improve inter- and trans-disciplinary exchange, and stressed that IHDP might indeed have to improve the organisation of its scientific network. It was identified by some of the participants that the problem at hand might be of an epistemological nature rooted in a division between nature and society, or culture and ecosystems. In this context, IHDP's role might be to restructure knowledge without these biases and design projects that incorporate more experimental methodologies. Many participants agreed that collaborations between different scientific communities were essential to addressing real-world problems. In this context, IHDP's potential leading role for large-scale interdisciplinary initiatives was emphasised and it was pointed out that it was well positioned to help overcome the current funding problems for collaborative research.

The session on "Unpacking the Social Sciences for Global Sustainability Research" was concluded by setting out the way to proceed: information had to be synthesised into major categories and the ways of framing these categories needed to be explored anew. This work should be conducted in small groups working on separate sections of the report.

## **IHDP Addressing the Sustainability Challenge: Implementation. Secretariat Level: Present and Future**

### **Dalberg positioning consultations**

Anantha Duraiappah presented the outcomes of the Dalberg positioning consultations during which a SWOT analysis had been conducted. The aim of this exercise was to advise IHDP on how it could position itself for the next ten years of operation. He reported that while the analysis had identified

numerous strengths of IHDP, it also showed the need for IHDP to play a more proactive role within the global environmental change research arena. The consultants had pointed to IHDP's unclear mandate and had criticised the programme's outreach for being too broad and its network for its exclusiveness.

In response the Secretariat was currently working on defining the key focus areas for IHDP's future. Moreover, a new IHDP Communications Strategy had been developed after the consultations.

### **Global Assessment on Drivers and Responses to Environmental Change**

Anantha Duraiappah subsequently presented the planned Global Assessment on Drivers and Responses to Environmental Change (GADREC, working title). He mentioned the importance of users exerting influence on the Assessment's shape and of having a multi-stakeholder board including representatives of the civil society. He furthermore explained the necessity of a tight timeline: the final document was expected to be ready for the evaluation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), planned for 2015.

It was decided that the IHDP Secretariat should go ahead with the activity and report back at the 19<sup>th</sup> SC meeting.

### **Inclusive Wealth Report**

Anantha Duraiappah's presentation of the current development of the Inclusive Wealth Report (IWR) generally gained positive feedback. He explained that the geographic distribution of the analysed countries, in particular the small representation of Africa, was due to a lack of available data for many parts of the developing world. It was acknowledged that the Report would be a good way for IHDP to attract the attention of policy-makers.

### **IHDP engagement in IPBES**

As the last point of the session, Anantha Duraiappah presented IHDP's engagement in the Intergovernmental Panel for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). He talked about the current suggestion of creating an independent science panel and an independent review panel to support IPBES. Recently, IHDP had been commissioned with conducting a survey on how the IPBES should be structured.

He stated that at present, 112 countries were involved in the process, and that the International Council for Science (ICSU) and the United Nations University (UNU) were represented jointly by DIVERSITAS and IHDP.

### **IHDP Project Level: Present and Future**

The current status and future orientation of IHDP projects was elaborated in group discussions. For that purpose, five topics had been selected and were discussed simultaneously in five separate groups. The selected topics were:

- Ten key human dimensions questions and the Visioning process, Belmont Challenge and Transition

- 
- Project funding
  - IHDP Secretariat, Scientific Committee and projects
  - Project interconnections and joint activities
  - Involvement of the developing world in project activities

Each group discussion was hosted by one chairperson and guided by two questions assigned to the respective topic, discussed in separate rounds. After a break, allowing the chairs to conclude the results of the discussions, each topic was presented in plenary followed by a debate between all participants.

### **Ten key human dimensions questions and the Visioning process, Belmont Challenge and transition**

Presenting the outcomes of the group discussion to all participants, Germán Palacio proposed that the Scientific Committee should provide more advice to the projects on scientific framing. It was decided to form a sub-committee within the SC to support the projects' activities and enhance communication between the SC and Projects.

Acknowledging the uncertainty related to the projects' future framing in the face of the transition process, it was suggested that the projects, particularly the joint ones, should proactively consider those issues from IHDP and ESSI frameworks that could be addressed by the new initiative and could be imbedded in its science plan. Some participants, however, remarked that their work effort related to the positioning within the ESSI, and that eagerness to work collaboratively with the new initiative had not been noticed by the ESSI yet. They welcomed the fact that core projects would play an important role in the merged structure. Yet, they expressed their wish to receive more information about the process and the structures of the transition. Finally, the importance of stressing the core role of the projects, collectively forming IHDP and the new initiative, in the transition process was emphasised.

### **Project Funding**

Elena Nikitina presented the results of the group discussion on funding and addressed the concern that the uncertainty related to the transition could have a negative effect on the willingness of funders to subscribe capital. Some participants feared that funding agencies could be negatively responding to the transition process and disrupt project activities, especially the IPOs' operation. It was, however, pointed out that the funding situation could improve after the transition. On the other hand, it was suggested that the problem could lie in the long-term funding needed to run projects and IPO's and that the funding agencies generally have problems in considering those research projects as cutting-edge science. In this context, strategies should be developed to attract funding over longer periods and to induce higher recognition of the value added by the networking efforts.

### **IHDP Secretariat, Scientific Committee and Projects**

Ilan Chabay summarised the main outcomes of the discussion on the relationship between the projects, the Secretariat and the Scientific Committee, and addressed the core question by asking for an indication on how the needs of the projects would be met and how communication, reporting and transparency of the Secretariat's activities and resources would be ensured in the future. In the following discussion, the importance of retaining IHDP Secretariat professionals in the long term was stressed. It was said that while IHDP had recently been facing funding constraints, the support of the

---

Scientific Committee and its outreach to donors could help IHDP to overcome those difficulties. Although, due to the global economic crisis, governments were cutting back on core funding, there was still a good opportunity for receiving project-based grants. A successful Assessment exercise of the Secretariat could attract the resources needed to reduce pressure and raise the number of Secretariat staff.

Some participants, on the other hand, emphasised the need for increased added value for the projects coming from the Secretariat and suggested the enhancement of routine procedures. In response to that, Anantha Duraiappah specified the way forward for the projects to identify their priorities. He mentioned that the Secretariat had instituted the “Executive Director’s Update” in order to make its activities transparent to the SC and projects, as well as quarterly teleconferences as an opportunity for communication. He stated that science-policy interaction was the main potential area of the Secretariat’s project support.

### **Project interconnections and joint activities**

Under the lead of Xuemei Bai, the group discussed three main issues related to the topic. Firstly, the focus was on interconnections among already existing projects. It was indicated that individual projects were already collaborating in terms of joint meetings and exchange of people, especially among projects with common interest. The experiences were mainly positive and often resulted in increased impact. The joint conclusion pointed to the necessity of enhanced efforts of both the Scientific Committee and the Secretariat regarding communication and linking the core projects as well as between the projects and IHDP, especially in regard to successful science-policy-interaction. However, there were voices stating unnecessary interconnection might lead to an increase of the, already relatively high, complexity of the projects. Therefore, collaboration needed to be driven by joint interest. In terms of implementation, the group identified the IPOs as possible hosts to exchange activities.

The second main point was the elaboration of a suitable format of presenting IHDP at the Planet under Pressure conference to be held in London in March 2012, directly following the 19<sup>th</sup> Scientific Committee meeting. The unanimous conclusion was to conduct an interactive panel discussion around interesting issues and key questions instead of presenting the projects’ progress. It was discussed that, since IHDP was scheduled for two sessions at the conference, there should be one scientific session and one with a focus on policy, outreach and other practical implications of conducting integrated research. As success factors for the sessions, the group recommended a diverse team of panellists, including Scientific Committee members, project representatives and experts from outside the IHDP community as well as broad questions that go beyond the interest of the panellists.

Concluding the discussion, the group addressed collaboration beyond IHDP. The project representatives indicated an interest in advanced leadership on the part of IHDP instead of an allocation on the project level. Furthermore, the group identified the need to improve the corporate identity of IHDP projects, which could include a project webpage with a consistent design. Due to the already complicated GEC landscape, cautions were raised to avoid bringing in further structural layers, as numerous duplications were said to already exist. Therefore, it was agreed that collaboration on common interest should be encouraged but not mandated.

---

Subsequent to Xuemei Bai's presentation on the core outcomes regarding the discussion on project interconnection, it was discussed how to expand the IHDP community beyond the projects and the Scientific Committee. Liaising with professional associations, such as the European Union Association of Environment and Resource Economy, was recommended.

### **Involvement of the developing world in project activities**

The group chaired by Balgis Osman-Elasha examined the discussion topic along three questions. Firstly, the group identified advantages of a deeper involvement of developing country scholars. The main points specified in this regard included the introduction of diverse perspectives and values, and addressing issues relevant to developing countries. Secondly, the creation of a mutual learning process was mentioned. It was also indicated that a greater involvement of developing country scholars would contribute to the redefinition of the capacity building concept and the mechanisms towards deeper cooperation among developing countries and between developing and developed countries. The group specified that such involvement would shift the Northern thinking of developing countries being receivers of knowledge and information towards an understanding that developing countries are sources of knowledge and information themselves.

Finally, the group focused on the obstacles of greater developing world involvement. As main barriers a lack of networks and databases, weak communication among developing countries and between developing and developed countries as well as a lack of recourses were indicated. Additionally, it was regarded as critical that developing country scholars often disconnected from their home countries when relocating their operations to developed countries. Considering English being the language for international recognition and publications, the language barrier was regarded as a further obstacle.

In the subsequent discussion, it was suggested to connect with reputable English-speaking African centres of excellence, which already existed in Africa. The strategy was suggested be to link IHDP to these centres, as collaboration would facilitate obtaining manpower from developing countries for projects in need of it.

Germán Palacio informed the participants about a recent proposal of the Colombian Science and Technology Innovation Agency, which was involved in the topic of global change. He recommended scheduling a meeting between a Scientific Committee member and the agency's president in order to open up the discussion on this matter.

Ilan Chabay pointed at a meeting of the International Sociological Association in Argentina, which would cover the topic of global change. He signalled the possibility of introducing IHDP's framework to the forum by attending the meeting with a person from the Secretariat as well as from the Scientific Community.

### **“Unpacking the Social Sciences for Global Sustainability”: decisions on further steps**

It was emphasised that the outcomes of the discussions, consolidated in a report, should be publicised and sent to the Alliance stakeholders in order to provide input to the transition process and development of the new overarching initiative. Furthermore, an academic article would be

---

submitted to the policy forum section of “Science”, which, as the first contribution from the social sciences on the topic, was anticipated to be welcomed – especially when written by the IHDP Scientific Committee.

The report will be structured around the DAY 1 discussion topics, with sections no longer than 1000 words. In order to have a first draft ready for submission to the transition team before their meeting in San Francisco, on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2011, a relatively tight timeline was determined:

- 15<sup>th</sup> November 2011: Deadline for the sections
- 20<sup>th</sup> November 2011: Deadline for first order draft sent to Scientific Committee
- 25<sup>th</sup> November 2011: Deadline for comments on the first draft
- 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011: Deadline for second order draft sent to Scientific Committee
- 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2011: Deadline for comments on the second draft
- 5<sup>th</sup> December 2011: Deadline for final document

It was also decided to issue a report-based policy brief in January.

The sections and respective authors were composed as follows:

- Worldviews, Beliefs, Values and ethics: Germán Palacio
- Choices, Decisions and Behaviours (including political challenges/conflicts): Heinz Gutscher, Thomas Krafft
- Social and Institutional Structures: Elena Nikitina, Frank Biermann
- Plausible Futures and Transitions: Xuemei Bai, Sander van de Leeuw
- Methodologies: Ilan Chabay, Tobias Langanke, Xuemei Bai

The participants were encouraged to elaborate further and were given the choice to change the name of the section. It was announced that subsequent to the contributions, Anantha Duraiappah and Partha Dasgupta would jointly create the report.

## **IHDP Outreach/Presentation**

Anne Kathrin Raab, IHDP Communications Manager, reported on the IHDP communications strategy for 2011-2013. She said that the current communications strategy had been drawn on the outcomes of the 2011 IHDP SWOT analysis, based on the Dalberg consultations as well as on input from the projects.

The first future objective identified in the strategy had been ‘Awareness’. Accordingly, the communications activities would be utilised to strengthen the social sciences within the global environmental change research field and to increase visibility of IHDP. Secondly, ‘Exchange’ had been perceived as further objective. This included an increased exchange and dialogue among the entities within IHDP as well as leveraging societal adaptation toward global sustainability.

Anne Kathrin Raab further mentioned that it had been identified that in order to achieve these objectives, IHDP needed to set its agenda to become the key organisation addressing the human dimensions of GEC. Further, it should be made another priority to attend already existing events and to organise own events.

---

The importance of understanding these efforts as a group activity, and thus the necessity of contributions from the Scientific Committee and the projects was emphasised.

### **Strategic Positioning**

IHDP's increased visibility should be achieved by positioning IHDP as the expert on human dimensions and by addressing the key audiences, i.e. scientists and policy-makers, as well as by reaching out to new communities. It was stated that for enhanced science-policy interaction, the IHDP Secretariat was going beyond a translation process and would create a platform to enable the exchange between science and policy, while public and press would play of minor role. The relevance of the latter was said to be ascribed to its ability to apply pressure on policy, inducing it to work on specific topics.

### **Beijing Dialogues**

Anne Kathrin Raab presented the concept for a new IHDP event: the "Beijing Dialogues" (working title), targeted at science-policy interaction and created in a new format to attract people from around the world, including high-level scientists. She said the event was planned to be held biannually, taking place in Beijing once a year, plus in an annually rotating location, and was to focus on locally important themes. The main objective would be to foster science-policy dialogue and interaction between participants through the introduction of an unusual format. This could provide a prominent stage for IHDP projects as well as the Scientific Committee to display their sciences and network. Anne Kathrin Raab informed the participants that some very strong partners had already been approached to support the event.

### **IHDP participation in the Planet under Pressure conference**

Anne Kathrin Raab introduced the idea of a conference newspaper in order to maximise IHDP's impact during the Planet under Pressure conference (PLAN). The objective of such paper would be to embed the broad spectrum of human dimensions topics presented at the PLAN sessions and to present inter- and trans-disciplinary projects. An additional digital version would enable IHDP to deliver it to the 5000 recipients of IHDP's "Networker" newsletter and other IHDP-endorsed networks. She further explained that the communications office was currently seeking for funding for this endeavour, with support from the PLAN communications budget, and that with regard to manpower, the communications office would conclude a large portion of the work in advance. However, support on sight was also agreed on, including partners such as the Imperial College in London.

It was further announced that IHDP would be present at the conference with an exhibition booth.

### **Rio +20**

It was announced that IHDP had applied for a side event together with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for policy and press, which would be a valuable opportunity to launch the Inclusive Wealth Report and to address its main target groups.

### **Working Paper Series**

A further idea of the communications office was introduced: a writing tool for young scientists, especially from developing countries. They would be provided with an opportunity to publish their papers on the IHDP website, cover them with a blog entry and receive valuable advice and comments

---

from the IHDP community. Additionally, the members of IHDP's projects and the SC could contribute with mentoring and copy-editing of the content.

### **Bonn Dialogues**

The Bonn Dialogues series was discussed – a discussion panel organised in cooperation with UNU in Bonn and a German NGO for catastrophe prevention. It was stated that IHDP was not in favour of the rather conservative event format, as it did not attract large audiences. The manpower and funds invested by IHDP were said to be disproportionately high in contrast to the benefits, especially since the Bonn Dialogues had a strong UNU – rather than IHDP – branding. Due to these disadvantages, it was announced that the IHDP Secretariat was considering a withdrawal from the involvement.

### **IHDP Services**

Anne Kathrin Raab used the opportunity to encourage the projects and the Scientific Committee members to make use of the Secretariat's outreach opportunities, which especially referred to the possibility of sharing information with the community. She emphasised that the communications team would appreciate the utilisation of their offer, as they could only communicate if they got the respective input.

## **IHDP Outreach / Discussion**

### **Beijing Dialogues**

Regarding the Beijing Dialogues, participants suggested to collaborate with the National Committees in order to ensure for greater participation of the Global South and local event coordination. The topics could be chosen depending on the local “burning issues” and the entire event broadcasted on-line to increase IHDP's visibility.

It was suggested to explore innovative event formats like, for example, a so-called “science café”, where people gather at informal venues, which would limit the costs and engage local communities. The format would, however, depend on the target audience: general public and/or policy-makers. It was suggested that IHDP should learn from the success of the prestigious Shanghai Forum and invite government officials to participate.

Furthermore, an appropriate name for the event was discussed. It was acknowledged that the name “Beijing Dialogues” contradicted the idea of the event's changing location in different parts of the world. Options suggested included: Beijing Human Dimensions Initiative, Science-Policy Dialogue or Beijing Initiative.

### **Bonn Dialogues**

It was noted that the IHDP communication strategy had a rather international reach, targeting scientists and policy-makers and not the general public. As some activities were more important than others in pushing the IHDP agenda, and as the constraints of resources did not allow implementing all measures sufficiently, it was suggested to withdraw IHDP's participation from the Bonn Dialogues series and to identify other key activities for IHDP instead. It was said that this event series would not influence IHDP's funding from German sources.

---

## Working Paper Series

Participants expressed concern that the Secretariat and most of the IHDP network members would not be able to manage the manuscript review and editing. Due to this constraint, it was suggested to re-consider cautiously whether to run the series or not.

## IHDP participation in the Planet under Pressure conference

The idea of having a social-scientific newspaper at the conference received positive feedback and participants encouraged the Secretariat to go ahead. Furthermore, they agreed that all IHDP SC and project members should carry the IHDP flag at the sessions they organise/participate in.

It was also agreed that the two additional IHDP sessions should be interlinked and jointly branded.

Additional ideas for advancing IHDP's visibility included setting up an interview booth or a booth with web communication, allowing people to ask questions and connect with an expert from IHDP. The website could be maintained by IHDP after the conference. Due to the lack of resources, it was decided that this could only be done with the support of the other conference stakeholders.

## Senior Fellows

It was pointed out that the idea of establishing the Senior Fellows affiliation to IHDP arose from the fact that there was a great interest among researchers in getting involved with IHDP's Scientific Committee. For those not selected and for former members of the IHDP Scientific Committee, joining as Senior Fellows would be a good alternative opportunity. Fellows could act as ambassadors for IHDP by getting involved in project and organisation meetings. The Senior Fellows would be nominated with the approval of the Scientific Committee. The selection criteria would remain the same as for the Scientific Committee, with the exception that the constraints of regional and gender balance would not apply.

The SC meeting participants received the idea favourably. However, it was mentioned that Senior Fellows would need a benefit it return to attract their interest. It was suggested to invite a few of the Senior Fellows to each Scientific Committee meeting for enhanced interaction.

## Closure of the Open Session

Due to the fact that many of the Scientific Committee members would attend the Planet Under Pressure conference in March 2012, it was decided to schedule the Scientific Committee meeting back-to-back with the conference. Furthermore, one day of the meeting would be conducted jointly with the Scientific Committee of DIVERSITAS in order to discuss collaborative projects and research.

Possible dates were identified as follows:

- 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2012: IHDP meeting
- 24<sup>th</sup> March 2012: Joint Day
- 25<sup>th</sup> March 2012: Free or half-day meeting
- 26<sup>th</sup> March 2012: Start of the Planet Under Pressure conference