

# International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry

## 146<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 15-16 October 2011

### MINUTES

<b>1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND FINALIZATION OF AGENDA.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. MINUTES OF 143<sup>RD</sup>, 144<sup>TH</sup> AND 145<sup>TH</sup> MEETINGS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4. INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF CHEMISTRY 2011 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
4.1 IYC STATUS UPDATE.....	2
4.2 CONTINUATION OF IYC INTO 2012 AND BEYOND.....	2
4.2.1 <i>Improve and Expand IUPAC's Worldwide Visibility</i> .....	2
4.2.2 <i>Continue Local Efforts with NAOs to Capitalize on IYC 2011</i> .....	2
4.2.3 <i>Impact of Global Water Experiment</i> .....	3
4.2.4 <i>IUPAC Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Initiative</i> .....	3
4.3 IYC INTERIM FINANCIAL REPORT .....	3
4.4 IYC WEBSITE – CURRENT AND FUTURE STATUS.....	3
<b>5. UPDATE ON INCHI TRUST ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. MEMBER RELATIONS COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. PROJECTS: SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS: COMMITMENTS, EXPENDITURES, AND UNDER REVIEW .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>8. FINANCE AND BUDGETS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
8.1 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR 2010.....	4
8.2 REVIEW OF BUDGET FOR 2012-2013.....	5
8.3 PERFORMANCE OF INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO.....	5
8.4 NAOs IN ARREARS .....	5
<b>9. FELLOWS AND AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>10. STATUS REPORT ON IUPAC SECRETARIAT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>11. PUBLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
11.1 STATUS REPORT <i>CHEMISTRY INTERNATIONAL</i> .....	6
11.2 STATUS REPORT <i>PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY</i> .....	6
11.3 BOOK PUBLICATION AND BOOK SALES .....	7
<b>12. IUPAC WEBSITE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>13. RATIFICATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF SYMPOSIA.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>14. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013 .....</b>	<b>7</b>
14.1 RATIFICATION OF DIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013.....	7
14.2 NOTIFICATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013 .....	7
<b>15. ASSIGNMENT OF BUREAU MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>16. PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND WORLD CHEMISTRY CONGRESS MEETING AND EVENT SCHEDULES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>17. IMPACT OF TWO-YEAR TERMS FOR DIVISION MEMBERS ON DIVISIONAL COMMITTEE PLANNING SCHEDULES .....</b>	<b>8</b>

146<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

**18. IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN IUPAC..... 8**

18.1 MORE RELIABLE CONTACTS WITH NAOS ..... 8

18.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES ..... 8

18.3 EXPANSION OF AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAM (AMP) ..... 9

**19. INCREASING IUPAC’S VISIBILITY AND FINANCIAL STRENGTH THROUGH TRADEMARK AND  
COPYRIGHT PROTECTION ..... 9**

**20. PROPOSAL FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN COCI AND U.S. CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND  
DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION (CRDF) FOR GLOBAL SAFETY TRAINING PROGRAM ..... 9**

**21. IMPROVEMENT OF PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS ..... 10**

**22. RECEIPT OF LETTERS OF INTENT TO HOST GENERAL ASSEMBLY ..... 10**

**23. DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT BUREAU MEETING ..... 10**

**24. DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING ..... 10**

**25. ANY OTHER BUSINESS ..... 10**

# International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry

## 146<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 15-16 October 2011

### MINUTES

Attendees: Prof. N. J. Moreau, Chair, Prof. D. StC. Black, Prof. J. Corish, Prof. J-I. Jin, Dr. A. Kallner, Prof. E. Reichmanis, Prof. N. P. Tarasova, Prof. K. Tatsumi

Absentees: Prof. S. Penczek

Guests: Dr. M. C. Cesa, Prof. R. Deplanque, Dr. F. Meyers, Prof. Q-F. Zhou

Secretary: Dr. T. A. Renner, Executive Director

#### 1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND FINALIZATION OF AGENDA

Prof. Moreau welcomed the Committee to Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. She noted that Prof. Penczek was unable to join the Committee because of a conflicting business commitment. She also expressed regrets that the location of the meeting had to be changed at the last moment. Prof. Reichmanis suggested that the location for future EC meetings be a subject of discussion for the entire Committee before a final selection is made.

There were no changes to the Agenda and the Agenda was approved as written.

#### 2. MINUTES OF 143<sup>RD</sup>, 144<sup>TH</sup> AND 145<sup>TH</sup> MEETINGS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

No new matters arising from the minutes of the three previous Executive Committee meetings (Taipei, Warsaw, and San Juan) were introduced.

#### 3. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Prof. Tatsumi stated that IUPAC must carry the momentum forward from IYC 2011. He recommended creating a Task Group to address related issues:

- current structure and possible restructuring of IUPAC,
- fund raising, and
- involvement in social needs; he asked for ideas from the EC as to how IUPAC could be more meaningfully involved with matters of sustainable development in cooperation with UNESCO.

Prof. Tarasova supported the recommendation of Prof. Tatsumi and stated that IUPAC has missed opportunities in the past. New ideas and plans should be generated now. Dr. Kallner stated that perhaps it would be necessary to modify the Statutes and Bylaws to permit IUPAC to make significant strategic changes. Prof. Black commented that any new Task Group should be led by the EC and not by the general membership of IUPAC. Prof. Tatsumi noted that he expected incoming Vice President and President Elect Dr. Cesa, along with others members of IUPAC's executive leadership, to work closely with him to define and achieve these strategic changes. Dr. Cesa acknowledged the challenge while recognizing that there would be some constraints and that better outward communication would be vital to future success.

**4. INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF CHEMISTRY 2011**

## 4.1 IYC STATUS UPDATE

Prof. Moreau summarized both the completed and the upcoming activities of the IYC. These included the Opening Ceremony in Paris, the Women's Global Breakfast, the Global Water Experiment, the General Assembly and World Chemistry Congress in San Juan, and the Closing Ceremony in Brussels. She commented that, in general, these events were successful but that IUPAC had not achieved sufficient recognition from the efforts made. Prof. Tarasova remarked that in Russia there was excellent response to IYC and that IUPAC was regularly featured in the activities that took place there. Prof. Zhou noted that China had sponsored activities that honored IUPAC and featured students as key participants. Prof. Tatsumi stated that in Japan the Marie Sklodowska Curie poster exhibition and experimental demonstrations were very well received. Prof. Moreau closed discussion on this Agenda Item by remarking that opportunities would exist to carry forward the successes of the IYC beyond 2011 and that IUPAC would have to be at the forefront of this effort.

## 4.2 CONTINUATION OF IYC INTO 2012 AND BEYOND

## 4.2.1 Improve and Expand IUPAC's Worldwide Visibility

In order to improve and broaden IUPAC's worldwide visibility, Prof. Moreau suggested that the Union should institute an IUPAC Day or Week of Chemistry. Prof. Black added that a single date should be celebrated together everywhere as a symbolic day. Prof. Corish noted that many countries have a science week and therefore might not wish to participate twice in their own and IUPAC's activities. Prof. Jin suggested that the new Task Group proposed by Prof. Tatsumi should handle this matter, along with other visibility issues. Prof. Tarasova added that the NAOs should be polled to see if they would support such an activity. Prof. Deplanque offered that any IUPAC Day or Week of Chemistry must be relevant to all regions of the world where such an event would be celebrated. Dr. Cesa stated that IUPAC should develop a unifying theme to carry this proposal through toward a tangible goal. Dr. Meyers suggested that the World Metrology Day (celebrated every year on 20 May) could be reviewed for potential use as a model for any new IUPAC activity. Prof. Tarasova closed the discussion with the statement that IUPAC should determine with certainty exactly what can or cannot be done regarding the use of the term "international" with respect to any future action plans on this issue. In general, the EC discussion on this Agenda Item was positive.

## 4.2.2 Continue Local Efforts with NAOs to Capitalize on IYC 2011

The EC acknowledged that success in sustaining the positive gains of the IYC would be dependent on maintaining the support of local efforts by the NAOs. The recurring theme of communications resonated again.

## Minutes

## 4.2.3 Impact of Global Water Experiment

The scientific, educational and public awareness aspects of the Global Water Experiment (GWE) were discussed by the EC. The EC also discussed the scientific merits of the GWE. In the end all agreed that the GWE had at least raised the awareness of many people around the world about the critical nature of establishing and maintaining adequate supplies of potable water. The greatest impact was thought to be on the young students who actively participated in the actual experiment in all parts of the world. Dr. Cesa noted that the GWE committee within IUPAC was examining the possibility of extending the term of the experiment into the first quarter of 2012, due to continued interest in participation. He also suggested that another experiment could be planned to coincide with the UN meeting on sustainable development (Rio+20), scheduled to occur in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June of 2012.

## 4.2.4 IUPAC Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Initiative

After the World Chemistry Leadership Meeting (WCLM) in Puerto Rico, IUPAC began a collaborative effort with ICSU to develop a strategy to introduce ways in which chemistry could best play a lead role in global sustainable development. The objective would be to influence directly the scientific content of the Agenda for the Rio+20 meeting in 2012 (see Agenda Item 4.2.3 above). The EC discussed what the nature of the collaboration with ICSU should be. IUPAC must be certain that the science that channels through ICSU to Rio+20 is correct. Prof. Moreau stated that the IUPAC Divisions should be asked for input on this matter where relevant and that this request for information should begin with the Presidents. As an expert in the area of sustainable development, the EC asked Prof. Tarasova to represent IUPAC formally to ICSU for Rio+20 activities. Finally, Prof. Jin recommended that IUPAC should resubmit an application for NGO status to the UN, since the results of a previous effort to do this were uncertain. Such status could be important for participation in Rio+20 and other initiatives of the UN involving chemical sciences.

## 4.3 IYC INTERIM FINANCIAL REPORT

Prof. Corish discussed expenditures related to activities of the IYC 2011. He also reviewed the status of revenue obtained from outside sponsorships. The current spending situation was reported to be largely unchanged from his earlier report made during the Council meeting in Puerto Rico in August 2011. His report was accepted without additional discussion.

## 4.4 IYC WEBSITE – CURRENT AND FUTURE STATUS

Dr. Meyers stated that traffic on the IYC 2011 website has been very high throughout the year. She summarized statistical usage information. Posted global activities had exceeded 1,700 and were anticipated to continue upward. She suggested that at the close of IYC the website should be deactivated with

# 146<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## Minutes

regard to new postings but should be maintained as an archive. The EC thanked Dr. Meyers for a job well done.

### **5. UPDATE ON INCHI TRUST ACTIVITIES**

Prof. Deplanque described the structure of the InChI organization and the technical work accomplished to date. InChI software comprises non-proprietary, open-source code that is freely accessible to all who wish to use it. Minutes of the last InChI Trust Board Meeting and of the last Annual General Meeting were included in the Agenda Book.

### **6. MEMBER RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

Prof. Jin noted that he had asked Singapore and Venezuela to become NAOs of IUPAC. Dr. Renner reported that he had detailed discussions at the General Assembly in Puerto Rico with representatives of Mexico, Colombia and Peru about becoming NAOs.

### **7. PROJECTS: SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS: COMMITMENTS, EXPENDITURES, AND UNDER REVIEW**

Dr. Renner noted that the three reports routinely provided to Division Presidents, Standing Committee Chairs, Task Group Chairs, and the IUPAC officers were included in the Agenda Book for the information of the Executive Committee. There were currently no unusual or notable items to mention with respect to the project reporting system.

An additional special topic was also discussed by the EC. A new project had been proposed entitled "Third International Workshop on the Impact of Scientific Developments on the Chemical Weapons Convention." The objective of this project was to provide advice to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) on scientific developments that may have an impact on the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and on the Review Conference for the CWC to be held by the States Parties in October 2013.

Prof. Tarasova stated that better geographical representation of countries should be included, especially where work in chemical weapons development occurs today. Prof. Corish asked for what purpose the requested funding of USD 5,000 would be used. He said that clarification of this matter would be required before final approval. Dr. Cesa asked how the international advisory board would be selected. His statement echoed that made previously by Prof. Tarasova regarding representation. In principle, the EC supported this effort but indicated that answers to the above-mentioned questions would be required before final approval would be given.

### **8. FINANCE AND BUDGETS**

#### **8.1 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR 2010**

Prof. Corish noted that the Agenda Book contains the audited financial statement for 2010. There was no discussion of this item.

## Minutes

## 8.2 REVIEW OF BUDGET FOR 2012-2013

Prof. Corish stated that the budget for 2012-2013 approved at the Council Meeting in Puerto Rico was a no-growth budget. Budgets for Divisions and Standing Committees have been fixed at 2010-2011 levels due to projected decreased income. Recent declines in income from the investment portfolios and from subscriptions to PAC are areas of concern for the new biennium. The Officers of the EC have been discussing ways to increase revenue to counteract these anticipated losses.

## 8.3 PERFORMANCE OF INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO

Prof. Corish and Dr. Renner reported that, despite the current very difficult worldwide financial climate, IUPAC has maintained its full range of activities. This was despite a diminution in the overall value of its portfolio, the income of which consisted of both dividends and interest and gains and losses on the values of the investments. The urgent need for IUPAC to diversify and increase its income streams to provide for its future activities was clearly stated.

The table below summarized the recent value of the portfolio.

## Portfolio Value Summary

Date	USD	EUR (in USD)	Total
31-Dec-06	3,991,233	1,559,961	5,551,193
31-Dec-07	4,192,852	1,668,575	5,861,427
31-Dec-08	2,969,792	1,531,446	4,501,238
31-Dec-09	3,603,516	1,307,702	4,911,218
31-Dec-10	3,465,432	1,248,346	4,713,778
31-Aug-11	3,186,924	1,186,459	4,373,383

The year-to-date change in value of the portfolio is -7.22%, which has largely tracked overall market fluctuations. Proceeds of two bonds that matured during the past year were used to pay normal operating expenses and other expenses related to IYC 2011.

## 8.4 NAOs IN ARREARS

Two NAOs were noted to be in arrears with regard to payment of the annual National Subscription. Cuba has encountered hardship in meeting its financial obligation to IUPAC. Dr. Renner reported that the Secretariat has been working with the Cuban NAO to try to find a resolution to their situation. It was suggested that IUPAC contact the International Division of the ACS to determine if they could help. Saudi Arabia has been arrears since they were formally admitted as an NAO at the Council Meeting in Glasgow, UK. Several attempts to resolve the matter with the Saudi Chemical Society have resulted in no action on their part. The EC voted unanimously that Saudi Arabia be removed as an NAO of IUPAC.

## Minutes

**9. FELLOWS AND AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS**

Dr. Renner reported that the Agenda Book contained an updated financial summary for the Affiliate Membership Program (AMP) and for *Chemistry International*.

There were no significant changes in the operation of the Fellows program. The current number of Fellows in our database was 1522. Each new fellow received a letter signed by the President informing him/her of his/her new status.

The (AMP) has remained relatively steady with regard to membership numbers over the past year. There were currently 2371 paid Affiliates, 671 from other chemical societies and 1700 from the ACS. In addition, there were 32 individual paid Affiliates, 82 individual sponsored Affiliates, and 220 sponsored Affiliates through chemical societies. The grand total was 2740 at the time of this EC meeting.

**10. STATUS REPORT ON IUPAC SECRETARIAT**

Dr. Renner reported that the Secretariat continued to operate with a staff of five persons in North Carolina and one person in Massachusetts. He added that the work load due to IYC had been at times overwhelming and that he was actively assessing the possibility of adding staff commensurate with the expected level of work in the new biennium. The EC acknowledged concern about the adequacy of current staff levels to support future needs. Prof. Black urged the EC to take financial risk to hire a new senior-level staff person as soon as possible. He recommended that Treasurer Prof. Corish should be charged with coordinating this activity. Prof. Black formally moved that action be taken to hire a new Secretariat staff member and that Prof. Corish coordinate this effort. Prof. Jin seconded the motion, which was then passed unanimously by the EC.

**11. PUBLICATIONS****11.1 STATUS REPORT *CHEMISTRY INTERNATIONAL***

There was no written report presented for *Chemistry International (CI)*. Financial and production information were included in the Agenda Book under Agenda Item 9. The EC recommended that IUPAC be more prominently highlighted on the cover of *CI* in the new year 2012 in the form of a full-color logo. Dr. Meyers was charged with executing this change.

Prof. Black raised the possibility of accepting advertising in *CI*. He recommended that advertising could be considered on a case-by-case basis and could be restricted to non-industrial only.

**11.2 STATUS REPORT *PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY***

Dr. Renner reported that the Agenda Book contained an updated financial summary for *Pure and Applied Chemistry (PAC)*. *PAC* continues to be a significant source of income for IUPAC despite the continued decrease of institutional subscribers. He mentioned that this issue was discussed by the Committee on Printed and Electronic Publications (CPEP) in Puerto Rico and that he had suggested to the committee that IUPAC should begin to evaluate the possibility of transitioning to electronic-only publication of *PAC* in an effort to

# 146<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## Minutes

reduce increasing production costs.

### 11.3 BOOK PUBLICATION AND BOOK SALES

Dr. Renner reported that sales of books had not constituted a significant source of income for IUPAC during the past year.

## 12. IUPAC WEBSITE

Prof. Deplanque noted that the effort to revitalize the IUPAC web site had made great progress since the last EC meeting a year ago. One of the greatest challenges was to export data from several existing older servers to the new server located at FIZ-Chemie in Berlin, as well as data located in the ACT database located at the Secretariat. A "beta" version of the web site had been released to Division Presidents, Standing Committee Chairs, and EC Members for evaluation. Pending feedback, it was anticipated that the new web site could go live to the general public before the end of 2011.

## 13. RATIFICATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF SYMPOSIA

Dr. Renner asked the Executive Committee to ratify the conference sponsorships approved since the meeting of the Bureau in Warsaw, as listed in the Agenda Book. A motion to ratify the sponsorships as requested was made by Prof. Black and seconded by Prof. Reichmanis. The motion was approved unanimously.

## 14. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013

### 14.1 RATIFICATION OF DIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013

Division Committee Membership rosters for 2012-2013 were included in the Agenda Book. The EC unanimously approved the appointments as written.

### 14.2 NOTIFICATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS 2012-2013

Standing Committee Membership rosters for 2012-2013 were included in the Agenda Book. The appointments to these committees were formally approved by IUPAC President Prof. Moreau.

## 15. ASSIGNMENT OF BUREAU MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Dr. Renner reported that the membership rosters for the Bureau Committees would be circulated to the members of the EC for review, input and additional nominations. Upon final approval of the President, new committee members would be notified.

## 16. PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND WORLD CHEMISTRY CONGRESS MEETING AND EVENT SCHEDULES

Members have complained that scheduling conflicts between General Assembly (GA) functions and those of the World Chemistry Congress (WCC) often prevent full participation. Changes to the meeting schedule for future GAs should be evaluated for possible implementation at the next GA/WCC in Istanbul in 2013 in order to make both events more compatible with each other.

Minutes

Prof. Black recommended that Divisional and Standing Committee meetings be reduced from two days to one. This change would simplify the GA schedule, make it more efficient, and help to reduce the overall cost of the GA. Members could participate more fully in WCC activities. Prof. Black, Prof. Deplanque and Dr. Renner were asked to develop a proposed schedule to test this new concept for the GA to be held in Istanbul in 2013. The EC supported this recommendation.

**17. IMPACT OF TWO-YEAR TERMS FOR DIVISION MEMBERS ON DIVISIONAL COMMITTEE PLANNING SCHEDULES**

The Executive Committee agreed in April 2010 that Titular members of Divisions be elected for two-year terms, with the possibility of re-election for an additional two years. NAOs have been notified of this decision by the document that is included in the Agenda Book. Feedback from Divisional I indicated that there could be some negative impacts on planning schedules if the new two-year term rule is rigidly enforced.

Prof. Black moved that the schedule for nomination and election of Divisional Committee Members should be changed back to the way it was previously done, but that two-year terms of office should be maintained. This procedure would become effective in October of 2012 and results would be approved by the EC and not by the Bureau as is currently done. Prof. Moreau seconded the motion and the EC approved unanimously.

**18. IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN IUPAC**

**18.1 MORE RELIABLE CONTACTS WITH NAOs**

Prof. Moreau commented that IUPAC should improve communications about its activities by informing more than just the NAO membership on a regular basis. She suggested that a primary NAO contact list should be updated and maintained. This primary list should be supplemented with contacts through other chemical societies and organizations within each country represented by a formal NAO. The existing NAOs would be informed first and those contacts on the supplemental list would be informed perhaps one week later.

Prof. Tarasova noted that current NAOs should be asked to propose other contact names. The Secretariat was asked to issue a letter to all NAOs with this request for new contacts. In the event of limited or no response from the NAOs, IUPAC would decide who should be the supplemental contacts. A response period of one month was suggested.

**18.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES**

Dr. Kallner proposed that National Representatives (NR) should be included on the memberships of Standing Committees (SC) and/or Project Task Groups (PTG). NAOs should be asked to take the responsibility for participation in at least two meetings of these SCs and PTGs, one for each year of the biennium.

Prof. Reichmanis stated that emerging countries might be harmed by such a plan because of the financial demands of sending delegates to meetings. Prof. Black noted that the NAOs do not have the right to appoint NRs to Standing Committees and that NR appointments must be approved by the Committees.

Minutes

Prof. Jin and Prof. Moreau both commented that the EC could only recommend this action but not mandate that it should be carried out.

**18.3 EXPANSION OF AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAM (AMP)**

Expansion of the AMP could permit participation by more chemists in the activities of IUPAC, especially those who are in the earlier stages of their careers. The Secretariat was asked to follow up on this possibility.

**19. INCREASING IUPAC'S VISIBILITY AND FINANCIAL STRENGTH THROUGH TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT PROTECTION**

Dr. Renner summarized his interactions with consultant Dr. Jesús Soriano during the General Assembly in Puerto Rico. Dr. Soriano has had significant experience working with non-profit organizations to protect intellectual property and to increase revenue streams. He suggested that IUPAC could benchmark itself against similar organizations (e.g., the Chemical Heritage Foundation) to search out and adopt best practices. General discussion among EC members indicated that IUPAC should have a development strategy in place first before trying to implement any major policy changes.

**20. PROPOSAL FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN COCI AND U.S. CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION (CRDF) FOR GLOBAL SAFETY TRAINING PROGRAM**

IUPAC has previously cooperated (through a formal contract) with the Civilian Research and Development Fund (CRDF, affiliated with the US Department of State) to disburse funds used for various international training programs. Since that contract has expired, CRDF has contacted IUPAC to discuss our possible involvement in a more substantive way to define and execute these training programs with a focus on chemical safety. Prof. Corish commented that IUPAC should be cautious in undertaking such a partnership due to the existence of possible conflicts of interest. Dr. Cesa briefly discussed the current chemical safety training program coordinated by COCI and suggested that the program could be expanded through the proposed cooperation with CRDF. Prof. Black stated that he saw this opportunity as at once positive and neutral. Similar situations already have existed with IUPAC's support of OPCW and Rio+20. He did not see any real danger or problems with the proposal in principle. Prof. Black moved that IUPAC should negotiate with CRDF to produce a formal written agreement to be reviewed by the EC. Prof. Jin seconded the motion. The EC unanimously approved the negotiation with CRDF. It was also recommended that the Chair of COCI should be included in the negotiations.

Prof. Tarasova commented that IUPAC should not focus only on chemical safety but should also be cognizant of issues involving chemical weapons and fissionable materials. Prof. Tatsumi noted that IUPAC could publicize companies who would participate in the Chemical Safety Training Program.

Minutes

**21. IMPROVEMENT OF PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS**

The project evaluation process was recently reassessed by Evaluation Committee Chair Dr. Kallner. He first looked for historical information from the Evaluation Committee, but this information was not well documented. He reviewed the “project review process” itself to determine its effectiveness. Division Presidents balked at his proposed revised reporting process. Prof. Kallner stated that there has never been a thorough review of the project system. IUPAC should assess the impact and ultimate value of the project system as it currently exists.

Prof. Black requested that Dr. Kallner write a brief synopsis of the successes and problems of the current Evaluation Committee situation. This exercise would assist the new incoming Chair of the Evaluation Committee to improve the project process. Prof. Moreau added that new project reporting system including new evaluation forms should be transmitted to all Division Presidents, Standing Committee Chairs, and Task Group Chairs.

Dr. Meyers noted that there was a system to document definitely the conclusion of a project. A project should only be designated complete when documentation has actually been submitted.

**22. RECEIPT OF LETTERS OF INTENT TO HOST GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Pursuant to action required by Agenda Item 21 of the recent Council Meeting in Puerto Rico, the Secretariat has issued a call for Expression of Intent to Host a General Assembly and World Chemistry Congress. Formal proposals from NAOs will be due before the next Bureau meeting in April 2012. Final decisions to accept proposals for 2017 and 2019 will be taken at the 47th General Assembly and 44th Congress (Istanbul, 2013). To date one formal letter of intent from Brazil has been received to host the General Assembly in 2017.

**23. DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT BUREAU MEETING**

The Executive Director reported that the dates and location of the next Bureau Meeting in 2012 had not yet been finalized. Dr. Renner indicated that he was still negotiating with several NAOs to host the meeting. Preferred dates would be 13-15 April 2012. It was suggested that if an NAO host could not be found, the Bureau Meeting could be hosted by the Secretariat at Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

**24. DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

The dates and place for the next Executive Committee Meeting have not yet been determined. As usual, preferred target dates would be in October of 2012.

**25. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Prof. Tatsumi reemphasized his desire to create a Task Group to examine IUPAC’s future activities and growth. Key issues to be addressed by such a group would be funding, visibility, and working structure of the Union.

Prof. Moreau thanked the EC members for their support and efforts, especially those who would be retiring at the end of 2011. The meeting was adjourned.

## **Addendum to the Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting – 15-16 October 2011**

Please refer to Agenda Item 21: Improvement of Project Evaluation Process

To the Executive Committee  
IUPAC

With the citations below (Terms of reference, composition and Terms of Office [Bye-laws] and IUPAC Objectives [statutes]) I set the scene for the work of the IUPAC Evaluation Committee.

In 2002 a comprehensive document 'Information for Task Group Chairmen' was published on the IUPAC homepage. Although it does not say so, I assume that it was endorsed by at least the Bureau, perhaps by EC or Council. The document describes the routines for reporting achievements to the Evaluation Committee and thus the Union. This document is available on the [www.iupac.org](http://www.iupac.org) and is attached as a pdf-file.

The present report has not been discussed with the members of the Evaluation Committee. The Annual report to Council was presented in San Juan.

### **Evaluation Committee 2009-2011**

Anders Kallner, Chair

Terry Renner, Secretary, *ex officio*

Members: Michael J Dröscher (COCI), Ales Fajgelj (Div V), Werner Klein (Bureau), Stanislaw Penczek, (Bureau). Prof Klein did not participate in the committee work.

### **Eval C Terms of Reference**

- (i) To determine the appropriate criteria for retrospective evaluation of each project.
- (ii) To evaluate all projects for conformance to plan.
- (iii) To evaluate the impact of projects on the relevant chemical community.
- (iv) To report to the Bureau, in writing, annually on the results of the evaluations done.
- (v) To inform, after discussion in the Bureau, the National Adhering Organizations of the completed evaluations.

### **Composition and Terms of Office**

- (i) There shall be an Evaluation Committee composed of five Members of the Bureau.
- (ii) The President, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall appoint the members and designate one of them as chairman.
- (iii) The period of service of the members shall be two years.
- (iv) The Executive Director shall act as Secretary for the Committee.

## **IUPAC Objectives**

The objectives of the Union are as follows:

- S2.1 to promote continuing cooperation among the chemists of the member countries;
- S2.2 to study topics of international importance to pure and applied chemistry which need standardization or codification;
- S2.3 to cooperate with other international organizations that deal with topics of a chemical nature;
- S2.4 to contribute to the advancement and understanding of pure and applied chemistry in all its aspects.
- S2.5 In pursuing these objectives, the Union will observe the basic policy of political nondiscrimination and affirms the rights of chemists of any country to adhere to or to associate with international activity in the field of chemistry without regard to race, religion, or political philosophy.

The EvalC agreed on a plan of action essentially following the 'Information for Task Group Chairmen', launched in January 2011. Its main feature was to request information from the Divisions using two forms (attached as one .pdf-fio). These were developed from experience by Division V.

The term "Task groups" was taken as a broad concept, including all projects. It was further assumed that all projects were formally administered by a Division or Standing Committee. Consequently, one of the forms was designed for a regular report by the Task Group Leader to the administrative body. The other is a report by this body to the Evaluation Committee three years after the completion of a project.

With few exceptions this was not a successful strategy. Division Presidents complained that the request added an unnecessary bureaucracy and declined to submit the summary form or introduce the annual report to their project management.

## **COMMENTS**

### *Quality system and quality management*

I recognize that there may be particular requirements of, and conditions for, an assessment of a voluntary operation like that of IUPAC. However, officers and members of the various groups have entered a kind of contractual relation with the organization and are expected to follow its rules and regulations. I believe that this is essentially the case and that the membership is a dedicated, very competent and ambitious group.

I believe it is necessary to have a continuous assessment of the activities of any organization and in particular organizations with such a complex operation as IUPAC. A well-structured quality managing system is required. The EC might even consider certification of the system according to ISO 9000. A key is a "Controller" with a free and independent status, directly reporting to the top management. That was the anticipated role of the Evaluation Committee. It

should have the power and acceptance by the many actors in IUPAC, to collect and report data on the performance of the IUPAC activities.

The present organization has well developed mechanisms to supervise and audit the financial aspects of the operations, i.e. when the money is finished, it is finished. There is, however, little or no independent assessment of to what extent the goals of the projects, their timeline, deliveries and other products are achieved, nor if the outcome of the projects has any measurable impact on the target groups (statutes 2.2 and 2.4).

### *IUPAC branding*

It may not be easy to find general method to assess, or rate, the quality of the scientific and intellectual work of the Union. “Quality” and “science” are never mentioned in the objectives of the Union. Nevertheless “IUPAC” is branded as “quality” and “science”. Undoubtedly there are many IUPAC core activities where the Union is recognized as the world authority e.g. in naming of elements, assigning atomic masses, nomenclature etc. this does not necessarily spill over on other projects and using the IUPAC name in various connections e.g. congresses and conferences. The statutes, however, indicate (items 2.3 and 2.4) that the Union will engage in all types of activities that have chemical implications and indeed strive to take the lead in many highly important, far reaching, large and even controversial problems e.g. sustainability, green chemistry, chemical weapons, teaching, chemical safety. Quality management can ensure that all IUPAC activities are associated with “Quality” and “science”.

### *Project system*

The basic structure of the Union was created almost 100 years ago. Some changes of the organization have been made in recent times; e.g. merging some activities and creating a new Division and Standing Committee but most importantly the Union has switched to a ‘project system’ which was eventually introduced at the GA in Brisbane 2001.

The reorganization intended to introduce a dynamic workflow by inviting anyone to suggest and convene projects. Commissions were suspended with a view to limit the time allowed for a project and to inject “fresh blood” into the organization and “prevent inbreeding” of activities and ideas.

The reorganization was not received with a great enthusiasm by all Divisions. To my surprise not all Divisions have yet defined projects or changed to a project-driven activity. In some Divisions the Commissions have been reborn under other names, e.g. “Subcommittees” and then “business as usual” commenced.

I believe that the reorganization has improved the financial guidance and control.

The project system has not been evaluated. There are many questions that need to be asked e.g. have the stated objectives been reached? Has the project system given a coherent set of projects? Would that be desirable? Is the project system applicable to horizontal projects? Are the statutes updated and reflecting modern objectives of the IUPAC?

### *The Bureau*

The Bureau is presently composed of the members of the Executive Committee, the Division Presidents, Chairs of the Standing Committees and a number of elected members. The tasks and mission of the Bureau are unclear. My experience from the Bureau is a lack of insight, initiatives and tasks other than endorsing those coming from the EC. There was practically no communication or information between Bureau meetings. The involvement in and awareness of the Bureau members of IUPAC affairs was too marginal to be of importance. Presently there seems to be just one specific task reporting to the Bureau, i.e. CCRF, a biannual event.

Elected Bureau members may be a basis for recruiting candidates to EC and Standing Committees but is that necessary, efficient or an argument to retain the present design and operation?

It seems unlikely that the Bureau members “at large” can be given any satisfactory and stimulating tasks and thus a justifiable role in the Union. A three-stage management model (Council-EC-Bureau) might have been justified in the past but other management tools are now available.

Therefore, I believe the time has come to dissolve the Bureau and create a new efficient meeting-place for Task group chairs and Division Presidents where the affairs of the Union can be discussed under the leadership of EC.

The influence of the IUPAC stakeholders, i.e. the NAOs will then be concentrated to the Council. The recently proposed “putting a face” to the NAOs i.e. identifying an individual in the organization might make it possible disseminate more information and obtain responses and thereby improve the interest and functionality of the Council.

### *Divisions*

Divisions have defined “territories” in IUPAC. In broad terms the divisions I, II, III and VIII are mainly devoted to what might be characterized as Pure whereas Divisions IV, V, VI and VII have a more Applied character. One is not more prestigious or valuable than the other but it may not be an optimal structure if IUPAC wants to play a role in “horizontal” projects. These can be larger and might need to be defined, initiated and run centrally; the “green chemistry”, IYC and Rio+20 are good examples. Some Divisions have announced difficulties to generate viable projects, that is no shame but it illustrates that a rethinking of the IUPAC structure would be timely.

### *Division Members*

The present system of appointing NRs to Divisions without any statutory assignment seems doubtful. Likewise the use and usefulness of AMs could be questioned. In theory members of projects have no status in IUPAC. However, AMs are actively chosen by the Division with a view to contribute to and be included in projects. NRs are suggested by the NAOs and listed but there is again no statutory position of the NRs in the work of the Division. There is a limit to the

allowed number of NRs in a Division and the only formal requirement is that there must not be NR from the same country that is already represented by a TM.

It is probably more likely that AMs make their way into projects than NRs due to the appointment procedures. The AMs and NRs may be a basis for recruitment to the Division, something that should not be underestimated. However, the basis for the work of IUPAC is the project and project members or affiliates are stated in the project proposal. Is the present system with AMs and NRs rational?

### *Summary*

The performance of any activity may be viewed from different perspectives. It may very well be that from the view of the Divisions and Standing Committees the present decentralized and largely independent activities are optimal. Therefore it becomes a Union strategic question of to what extent a central guidance, auditing and report system should be established and maintained. My personal thoughts are that the tasks for the Union in the 21<sup>st</sup> century will – and should – move in a direction to more horizontal projects i.e. chemistry in the service of society. This requires an increased transparency and open information policy e.g. seeking projects in particular fields but also requiring candidates to the positions in the Union to declare possible conflicts of interests.

The organization needs to be slimmed, vitalized and modernized; in particular the function of the Bureau and the ‘territories’, tasks and member structure of the Divisions should be reviewed.

It will necessarily require a considerable time to consider a revised strategy and implement it through the administrative highways defined by the core rules of the Statutes particularly if changes may require an overhaul of the Statutes.

Submitted by,

Dr. Anders Kallner  
Chair, Project Evaluation Committee  
29 December 2011