

## **Division committee I meeting - Busan 2015**

Present:

Roberto Marquardt (President)

Kaoru Yamanouchi (Past president)

Angela Wilson (Vice president)

Assaf Friedler (Secretary)

Kristin Bartik (TM)

Jürgen Stohner (TM)

Frank Van Veggel (TM)

Taufiq Yap Yun-Hin (TM)

Kankan Bhattacharyya (AM)

Apologized:

Andrea Russell (TM)

### **1. Welcome, apologies for absence (RM)**

RM introduced the TMs and guests. Then RM spoke in memory of Tony Goodwin and a minute of silence was observed.

### **2. Approval of Agenda (RM)**

The agenda was approved. Several items were added to the misc session:

-divisional representatives to other IUPAC bodies and to bodies outside IUPAC

-division website

-strategic review

### **3. Recall and approval of Minutes of the off –year Division Meeting held in Switzerland 2014**

The minutes of the 2014 off year meeting were discussed. FvV asked for the minutes to be distributed earlier next time. KB asked to add a remark that we had a scientific meeting before. The minutes were approved with the above modifications.

RM asked that the website be updated with minutes of the last meetings that currently are still missing.

### **4. A brief recall to the Divisional work, its aims and objectives (RM)**

RM presented a brief recall of the divisional work. The issue of whether nomenclature should be one of the division aims was discussed. JS said it is the topic of Division VIII. KY said that it should be discussed before removing since there are historical reasons for that being included. A team of KY, FvV and JS will discuss whether it should be deleted from the division aims and a vote will take place in the next meeting.

AF will formulate a new text for the division aims incorporating dissemination and contribution to the world community. This will be discussed in the off year meeting.

Jan Apotheker from CCE joined as guest. He presented an idea for a future project to be discussed in the interdivisional meeting. He said that the difference between molarity and concentration is an example of something that is not defined and makes problems with chemical education. JS answered not to use the gold book as a reference because it is outdated. Use the green book instead.

### **5. presentation of the young observers:**

-Sara Sobeck, College of Wooster, Ohio

-Shelly Claridge, Purdue University

-Maricris Mayes, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth

-Savio Moniz, U. College London

-Hiroko Tokoro, U. Tsukuba, Japan

-Fouzia Perveen Malik, National University of Sciences & Technology, Pakistan

-Johan Scheers, Chalmers U. of Techn.

-Elisabeth Mansfield, NIST, Colorado, U.S.

Young observers gave individual short presentations of their scientific and teaching activities.

## **6. Discussion of sharing of Committee Tasks/Responsibilities**

RM showed the document with the division of tasks in the DC. The role of division liaisons was discussed. RM suggested that the division liaison should introduce himself to the secretary of the other DC and ask for the name of their liaisons to our DC, who will be the contact points. It was suggested that when anything comes up regarding a joint activity with another DC, the president will forward it to the liaison. The distribution of the work between the president and DC members was discussed. It was also suggested that the president will not do all the work on his own but will involve the DC members more. The topic was discussed. RM raised the issue of the advisory board and suggested that one DC member will go over the list of members and make sure they cover all topics and that the geographical distribution is OK.

The issue of reviewing manuscripts and book chapters was discussed. RM suggested that the secretary will receive manuscripts for review from the task group leader, and the secretary will dispatch them. The TM who gets the chapters for review has to look for experts in the advisory board and send it out for review. It was discussed what the format of the review should be. It was said by KY, KB, AF and AKW that we do not need to do a scientific review but just to check that it fits IUPAC style, rules and guidelines since it undergoes peer review anyway. RM said that so far peer reviewing was not granted by the publisher and that the Division had its duties in checking that science is adequate. KB said we should receive for review the versions after peer review. It was asked that we will get guidelines. It was stated that a general IUPAC policy of how to deal with books and what is our role is required.

At this point the President of IUPAC, Dr Mark C. Cesa, joined the meeting. Mark thanked the DC for raising the issue and asked if it is a general issue with other DCs as well. RM will raise the issue in the division presidents meeting. We need to know if this is a general problem and then decide what to do.

RM suggested that a TM will be appointed to keep the project table. It was said that it will remain the role of the secretary.

Action item: to establish a new project form with the procedure for a book publishing and a new contract in which the publisher will do the scientific review. The task group leader will get the money only if he accepts the conditions.

Action item: KB and AF will prepare for the next meeting a list of past members.

Action item: FvV should find out which information is missing in the division website and complete it

It was decided that no newsletter is required

## **7. A brief report from the 96th Bureau meeting**

RM reported about the bureau meeting. Then the written report to the council was presented. The next report should be adapted to the new division aims that will be written.

It was mentioned that Commission 1.1 needs to meet face to face for discussions but has no own money allocated. It was suggested to allocate money – 5000\$ - for participating in funding the meetings of Commission 1.1. IUPAC should be asked to match this sum and give 5000\$ more. It was decided to discuss it tomorrow in the finances part (see minutes point 10 below).

### **8. Feedback on the elections' results for the next biennium (KY)**

It was reported that Timothy Wellington, Pierangelo Metrangolo, Bert Weckhuysen and Attila G. Császár were elected as TMs. The division is now in process of electing AMs and NRs. There is a problem of a contradiction regarding the definition of the electorate. According to the bylaws:

"The electorate is defined by IUPAC Bylaws to be comprised of: Titular Members, Associate Members and National Representatives of the current Division Committee, the Task Group Chairs of projects active during the current biennium, and the current and immediately-preceding Nominating Committee Members. For this election, each Subcommittee and Commission Member has also been included in the electorate and is eligible to vote."

On the other hand KY received by email ""There have been questions regarding the electorate and I would like to clarify this for everyone benefit: A Division electorate includes all TMs, AMs, NRs, Chair of Commission and Subcommittees, and Task group chairs of current projects in good standing. Commissions members, Subcommittees members, nomination committees, and task group members are not included in the electorate."

Action items: we should write to the secretariat saying the rules regarding the electorate should be clarified before the next elections.

### **9. Progress Reports on Current Projects (AF, RM)**

RM described the role of the project monitor.

In the following the summary of the discussion on project reports is reproduced:

2001-028-1-100 Stoynov – terminated. 50% of the initial budget goes back to central.

2006-050-3-100 McQuillan – the report by Jim McQuillan says:

"(a) Tian Zhong Qun who with his colleague Ben Rin are handling the surface-enhanced Raman (SERS) part, and (b) Derek Peak who is working with me on the attenuated total reflection infrared (ATRIRS) experiments. These members of the Task Group remain committed to completion of the project. Thomas Wandlowski,

who was dealing with the surface-enhanced infrared (SEIRAS) part, unfortunately suffered a cerebral haemorrhage about a year ago and remains in hospital. Considering this factor and the number of difficulties encountered in assembling the SEIRAS experiments we have decided to cancel this part of the project. This decision removes the major obstacle to completion of the project and I am now confident this will be achieved in the coming months through finalising the text of the experiments and experimental testing."

Based on the report, the restructuring of the task group project shows that is very likely to finish in the near future. A no cost extension will be granted until the next off-year meeting.

2007-032-1-100 – Marquardt – a ready to print manuscript is finished. The project will finish this year. A no cost extension granted until the end of 2015.

2007-055-2-100 Yamanouchi – three members of the task group will meet in December. A no cost extension is granted until the off-year meeting. The project should be completed by then.

2008-037-2-300 Griesbeck – No reply from the task group leader. Div III is the lead but they did not get any response as well. The presidents of Div I and Div III will write him together and ask for a written report.

Update: a report was sent on the 5<sup>th</sup> of September, 2015. The project is active but proceeds slower than expected and the new expected date for dissemination is the end of 2016.

2010-009-1-100 Thommes – the project is successfully completed. AF will write to Prof. Thommes that the project is complete and the remaining 1572\$ will go back to IUPAC

2010-048-3-100 Cooke – We are still waiting for a written report. No cost extension granted until the off year meeting.

2011-022-2-100 Tennyson – The project is successfully completed and resulted in a highly cited paper.

2011-037-2-100 Chirico – No response from the task group leader. The project money is temporarily frozen. If no good explanation is sent until the end of the year the project will be terminated. AW sent a reminder to Chirico. AF wrote to Fabienne asking that the money will be frozen.

2012-38-1-100 Letcher – the project is completed but the book was published without the corrections suggested by IUPAC reviewers. This is an example for the discussion about books and will be brought up in the division presidents meeting. We request that a paragraph will be added regarding the review of book chapters stating also that it will take time.

2012-040-1-100 Perkins – project is successfully completed

2012-041-1-100 Letcher – the project is completed, too; as discussed for the other project, in future we need to make sure that the review will be done in time and the book will not be published before the review is completed.

2012-044-1-100 Metrangolo – the project is proceeding well as planned

2012-051-1-100 Fernandez – project was taken over from Dr Goodwin by Josefa Fernandez. The project was delayed due to the untimely death of the task group leader. The task group was restructured and the project goes on. A no cost extension for one year will be granted and KB will ask the new project leader what is left to be done in terms of deliverables and timelines.

2013-003-3-100 Wakeham – the book is at the proof stage and has not been published yet.

2013-035-1-100 Wallington – The project is progressing well. Taufiq will be the monitor. There is SMILES on the website – we should ask Dr Wallington why it is required.

2013-035-1-100 Stohner – the project is ongoing and will be discussed tomorrow

2014-010-1-100 Wakeham – The project slowed down due to the untimely death of Dr. Goodwin. Prof. Michael Banish agreed to lead the project. A two years extension was granted

2013-035-1-100 Stohner – project is progressing well. 75% of the budget is still available and will be used for a second meeting to start preparing the 4<sup>th</sup> edition.

2014-021-2-200 Ohrström – we will ask him tomorrow when we meet him. Div II is leading.

2014-028-2-100 Turanyi – The TG just started work. The proposal for the creation of the task group was approved on 6 March, 2015. The project leader (Tamás Turányi, ELTE, Budapest) asked the members of the group to confirm their participation in the task group. All researchers who were listed in the original proposal confirmed their willingness. The discussions about the organization of the work started via group e-mails. Also, the first personal meeting was organized during the European Combustion Meeting 2015 (ECM2015) conference. The members agreed in the following: Each member of the group selected about 30 elementary reactions and started to work on the corresponding data sheet; the results to be published will be jointly authored by the group members.

2015-002-2-100 Valiullin – new project on the diffusion in nanoporous materials - will be assigned to one of the new TMs

## **10. Finances (RM)**

RM reported on the budget and explained the expenses of the current biennium. The total budget is 59,200\$. Operations budget (30%) was essentially fully used for the off-year meeting. Projects budget is 70%. We have spent 93% of the total budget.

A discussion in reference to Commission I.1 took place, which resulted in the following action plan. At the beginning of the next biennium the president will ask the chairman of Commission 1.1 what are the plans for the biennium and then money (5000\$) will be allocated based on that before the entire division budget is spent. This way Commission 1.1 will have operational money not from the 30% operations budget. Money allocation will be approved in the off-year meeting based on a formal request from Commission 1.1.

Commission 1.1 is changing – some members reach the end of their term. It was suggested to bring back as TMs old members – people did not like the idea. AW proposed that it can be solved by a project proposal. Div. II do it as a project for Commission. 2.1. KY said we should try to hire new young persons to Commission . 1.1 in addition to the experts already there, for continuity. RM suggested that one of the newly elected TM will be the chair of Commission 1.1. AF suggested asking for a special permission to keep one or two TMs for 2 years due to the special situation where all the TMs are changing at the same time.

Decision: the chair of 1.1 will write a short project each biennium and money will be allocated.

Decision: we need to ask for two members (Jürgen, Robert or Yutaka) of 1.1 to stay for two more years and two will be replaced.

Note added by RM after the Council: it turned out that all current TM of Commission I.1 were eligible to stay at least one more biennium; the current composition of the Commission with Juris Meija as a new TM was accepted by the Council; Jürgen remains Chair of Commission I.1 and becomes ex-officio TM of Division I, as now the Division has reached its full number of titular members for the next biennium.

## **11. Future Strategy and New Project Proposals (RM)**

The minutes of the previous meetings were recalled to monitor the progress and future strategy.

The issue of biophysics was discussed. The point of collaborating with other societies in physics and biology was raised. AF suggested that a new division committee on chemical biology should be established.

The problem is to find the people who participate in these projects. The need to disseminate and advertise in order to encourage researchers to participate was highlighted. The website, conferences etc will be the right venues.

## **12. Students' cartoon competition**

This year there were three entries. There was a problem of advertising, which should be done through the NAOs next time. A one page explanation should be prepared. Competition and advertising should be done in collaboration with CCE.

After judgement of the received entries, it was decided that the winner is MinSik CHO from Korea. AF will ask Andrea to send response letters to all participants and inform Fabienne and write a summary for the website.

We will do the competition again – it is a good and useful outreach activity. It has to be advertised better. We will prepare the material and start now. The deadline will be January 2017. AF and AW will be in charge.

## **13. Misc.**

-Divisional representatives:

CCE – Assaf

COCI – Pierangelo or Frank

CPEP – Roberto

ICTNS – Roberto

PAC – Angela

Subcommittee on materials chemistry – Frank, Taufiq

Subcommittee on biomolecular chemistry – Assaf

Interdivisional working party on harmonization of quality assurance – Bert

Subcommittee on biophysico-chemical processes in environmental systems – Kristin

Subcommittee on nomenclature for properties and units (div VII) – Atilla

Subcommittee on medicinal chemistry and drug development – Assaf

Roberto will candidate to be the representative to CCU at BIPM, and to IUPAP

-Advisory board: the list should be updated. We will all look at the list and raise ideas. An updated list will be proposed and discussed at the next off year meeting



-Next off year meeting – AW will check and let us know in 1-2 months.

#### **14. 49th GA and 46th Congress in Brazil, 2017 (RM)**

We should be part of the organizing committee of the biophysics symposium. RM will speak with the organizers.

#### **15. Joint meetings:**

With Division III: A new joint project about NMR terminology was proposed. Div. I agreed enthusiastically to participate. RM and KB will participate in the writing of the project whose lead will be Division III

Lynn Soby: a report on the new IUPAC website. We need to make an icon for the division.

Briefing on the mole project: With Div. II, V, ICTNS and CCE. Based on the literature and the responses from the NAOs, the task group seems to support the new definition of the SI