



**IANAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING**

**Monday, November 28, 2022**

Attendees: Helena Nader and Karen Strier, IANAS Co-chairs; John Boright (US National Academy of Sciences); Beatriz Caputto (National Academy of Sciences of Argentina), Marcos Cortesao (Brazilian Academy of Sciences); Enrique Forero (Colombian Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences); Alberto Gago (National Academy of Sciences of Peru); Rosalba Lagos (Chilean Academy of Sciences); Jeremy McNeil (Royal Society of Canada); Mónica Moraes (Academia Nacional de Ciencias of Bolivia).

After every member of the Executive Committee joined the Zoom meeting, the Co-chairs greeted everyone. Helena Nader, before starting to discuss each point of the agenda, clarified that the minutes of the last EC meeting held during the IANAS General Assembly (September 20, 2022) were not going to be revised in this reunion. In this way, everyone will have enough time to read them carefully, and in case they have any corrections, send them to the Secretariat. These minutes will be approved at the next meeting. Karen Strier then took the chair and apologized for the short notice of the meeting and noted that this would not occur in the future.

1. The first point of the agenda was the incorporation of the Academy of Sciences of Haiti (ASH) as a member of IANAS. Helena Nader explained that she had been waiting for ISC to provide the information they had on the Haitian Academy before bringing the matter to the EC. According to the ISC the group that has applied for membership claims to be representative of Haitian scientists, but this is incorrect. Helena explained that she tried to check the scientific records of the researchers listed as members on the Academy's website but did not find the publications or other scientific activities one might expect. She noted that ISC contacted a person in the Haitian government, who stated there were many different groups claiming to be academies. Given the information available she recommended that they not be accepted as a member Academy of IANAS.

Jeremy McNeil noted that as we have no clear information regarding the actual status of the "Academy", we should say no. However, he emphasized the need to ensure a clear and concise reason to justify the decision to avoid further requests from the group. Helena agreed that the letter the EC sends should be polite but straight forward, without many specifics.

Mónica Moraes then proposed there should be a better criterion to decide which Academies are eligible to be members of IANAS. Rosalba Lagos agreed with Mónica, adding that they did not present evidence of scientific activity from their academy. Karen suggested the EC could inform Haiti that we are unable to accept them as a participating member of IANAS since they are currently revising the criteria for eligibility. Helena explained that according to



IANAS statutes, the Haitian Academy does classify to be a member, so she will try to find something in the statutes that helps the EC respond to Haiti accordingly.

During the discussion, it was pointed out that the statutes are quite clear (see below) what we do not have is evidence that they are the real representative of the Haitian community. Also, the fact that there may be more than one “recognized” Academy is not an excuse, as seen in the case of Argentina.

## I. Members and Organization

I.1 Academies of Science of the countries of the Americas – including those that comprise Social Sciences, Engineering and Health Sciences - may be members or observers of IANAS provided they represent national scientific communities through a peer selection process and play an acknowledged nationwide role. Acceptance is decided by the General Assembly.

I.1.1 If a country or region does not have an active Academy of Sciences that is a member of IANAS, an equivalent organization may be admitted to membership.

We have been told by ISC that there are several groups in Haiti that claim to be Academies of Science so Jeremy suggested if we could get data to support this claim then we would be in a good position to state that ASH is not representative of their country. Marcos, on the other hand, raised the point of the current political situation in Haiti and suggested we could tell the ASH we are holding off any decision until there is greater stability. Helena, however, did not agree with the latter as IANAS should not be involved with politics at all; Mónica supported Helena. Helena and Karen will write a draft letter for ASH and circulate it among the EC members.

2. The second point of the agenda related to the budget for the next IANAS fiscal year. Karen presented an overview of the points that she, Helena and Beatriz Caputto (IANAS Executive Director) recommend should be included. Beatriz then provided details of how the funds were used in the 2021-2022 budget. All members of the EC agreed that while there would not be specific funding for in-person meetings for focal points of the four programmes, the completion of projects from the Water and Women for Science programmes approved last year but not yet completed should receive appropriate funding in the upcoming budget to complete the work.

Both Co-chairs agreed on the importance of the Women for Science program for IANAS and women working in the field. It was unanimously agreed to approve the budget the WfS program proposed for this new term, so that their prizes could continue to be supported.

Karen and Helena proposed that a major component of the upcoming budget should be to provide some level of financial support for initiatives from different National Academies that encourage capacity building and strengthen relationships with policy makers, such as seminars, workshops, and national events. However, no Academies provided specific

examples of possible activities to the Co-Chairs' request for expressions of interest prior to the GA, although several requested additional information on exactly how the funds might be used and how much might be allocated to any specific activity. This lack of information could explain why Academies did not submit proposals. It was agreed that we should contact all Academies noting that IANAS would provide roughly US\$ 5K for five or six events, as long as the hosting Academies ensured the participation of policy makers.

3. The last point of the agenda related to areas of interest in which IANAS had not previously engaged. Karen suggested the protection of Amazonia, as this is interdisciplinary and directly touches a number of countries with IANAS member Academies. Helena noted that several Academies are already involved in different projects related to this topic through the Science Panel for the Amazon, but that such an IANAS initiative would also allow for further collaboration. The EC was in favour of pursuing this idea.

Karen also mentioned the possibility of IANAS following up on the lecture given by Prof. Martin Forde at the IANAS GA, who discussed the impact of climate change on the islands in the Caribbean.

It was noted that both topics could be the subject of a request for funding for meetings involving policy makers and could involve several Academies.

Prof. Enrique Forero mentioned that the regional office of ISC is organizing a conference in the context of the International Year of Basic Sciences for Sustainable Development and suggested that IANAS should collaborate in this initiative. All members of the EC were in favour of this idea and Enrique agreed to provide the Co-chairs more information about this initiative.

To conclude the meeting, Karen quickly summarized everything that was discussed and decided during the meeting:

1. Helena and Karen will take care of writing a draft letter to the Haitian Academy letting them know that they will not become a IANAS Member Academy.
2. The Co-chairs and the Secretariat will work on making a more solid budget proposal taking into account what was discussed regarding the programs and asking for general funding.
3. The EC will try to communicate more with each other, send new ideas around and encourage academies to come up with new initiatives for IANAS to develop.

These items, and especially that at the next meeting the different initiatives will be discussed to develop a more concrete work plan, were agreed upon.

Formal EC meeting adjourned at: 03:44 PM (Buenos Aires, Georgetown).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Following Jeremy McNeil's suggestion, it was approved by the Executive Committee to start adding the time of adjournment at the end of meeting minutes.