



INTERNATIONAL UNION OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

**March 15-19, 2004
SAS Radisson Plaza Hotel
Oslo, Norway**

52nd EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes	
1. WELCOMING ADDRESS	4
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	4
3. 51st EC MEETING, WINDHOEK, NAMIBIA, FEBRUARY-MARCH 2003	4
3.a Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes	4
3.b Actions arising from the Minutes	4
4. ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS	6
4.a President's Report	6
4.b Past-Presidents Report	8
4.c Vice-Presidents' and Councillors' Reports	8
4.d Secretary-General's Report	10
4.e Past-Secretary-General's Report	11
4.f Treasurer's Report	11
4.g Permanent Secretariat's Report	12
4.h Applications for Affiliation of Organisations.....	12
4.h.1 CCOP	12
4.h.2 Fiji Geological Society	12
4.h.3 European Geosciences Union (combined EUG & EGS)	13
5. ANNUAL REPORTS AND FUTURE PLANS OF IUGS BODIES	13
5.a Adhering Organisations	13
5.a.1 Applications for Membership	13
5.a.2 Reports of Adhering Organisations	13
5.b Committees.....	15
5.b.1 Nominating Committee	15
5.b.2 Committee for Research Directions (CRD)	16
5.b.3 Committee for Publications (PC)	17
5.b.4 Committee for Finances.....	19
5.b.5 Ad hoc Review Committee (ARC)	19
5.c Commissions	20
5.c.1 Commission on Geol. Sciences for Environmental Planning (COGEOENVIRONMENT)	20
5.c.2 Commission on Global Sedimentary Geology (CGSG)	21
5.c.3 International Commission on the History of Geological Sciences (INHIGEO)	21
5.c.4 Commission on the Management and Application of Geoscience Information (CGI)	22
5.c.5 International Commission on Stratigraphy (ICS)	22
5.c.6 Commission on Systematics in Petrology (CSP)	24
5.c.7 Commission on the Physics and Chemistry of the Earth (COPSCE)	24
5.c.8 Commission on Tectonics (COMTEC)	24
5.d Task Groups	24
5.d.1 Task Group on Fossil Fuels	24
5.d.2 Task Group on Global Geosites	25
5.d.3 Task Group on Public Affairs.....	25
5.d.4 Task Group on Geochronological Decay Constants	26

5.d.5 Task Group on Geochemical Baselines	26
5.d.6 Task Group on Tectonic and Structural Geology	26
5.e Initiatives	26
5.e.1 Geoindicators Initiative	26
5.e.2 Medical Geology Initiative.....27
5.e.3 Education, Training; Technology Transfer (COGEOETTT)	27
5.e.4 A GEOPARKS Approach (GEOSEE)	27
5.e.5 Solid Earth Composition and Evolution (SECE)	28
5.e.6 New Initiatives	28
5.f Affiliates	29
5.f.1 Arab Geologists Association (AGA).....29
5.f.2 Association of Geoscientists for International Development (AGID)	29
5.f.3 Centre Internationale pour la Formation et les Echanges Géologiques (CIFEG)	30
5.f.4 Commission for the Geological map of the World (CGMW)	30
5.f.5 Geological Society of Africa (GSAfrica)	30
5.f.6 International Association for Engineering Geology and the Environment (IAEG)31
5.f.7 International Association on the Genesis of Ore Deposits (IAGOD)	31
5.f.8 International Association for Mathematical Geology (IAMG)	31
5.f.9 International Consortium on Landslides (ICL)	31
5.f.10 International Federation of Palynological Societies (IFPS).....32
5.f.11 International Geological Education Organisation (IGEO)	32
5.f.12 International Permafrost Association (IPA)	32
5.f.13 International Society for Rock Mechanics (ISRM)	33
6. REPORTS ON COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES	33
6.a IUGS/UNESCO:IGCP	33
6.b IUGS-UNESCO Geological Application of Remote Sensing (GARS)35
6.c IUGS-UNESCO Mineral Resources Sustainability Program (MRSP – ex DMP)	35
6.d Geoparks Initiative	36
7. INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS (IGC)	36
7.a Merger/Integration	36
7.b 32 nd IGC in Florence, 2004.....37
7.c 33 rd IGC in 2008	38
7.d 34 th IGC in 2012	38
7.e Long Term Plans and Rotation of Venues	40
8. INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS (ICSU)	40
8.a Relations with ICSU	40
8.b Proposed Programmes with ICSU	40
8.c Scientific Committee on the Lithosphere (SCL-ILP).....40
8.d ICSU Grants	41
8.e ICSU Committees and IUGS Representatives	42
8.f 4-Unions Meeting, Paris 6-7 Feb, 2004	43
9. IUGS POLICY AND STRATEGIC MATTERS	43
9.a IUGS Statutes	43
9.b IUGS Road Map – Mid-Term Vision Document	45
9.c IUGS Grants Proposal policy	45
10. INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PLANET EARTH (YEAR)	47
11. EXTERNAL RELATIONS	50
11.a UNESCO	50
11.b Other Organisations	50
12. REQUEST FOR FUNDING AND BUDGETS FOR 2004	50
13. PREPARATION FOR IUGS COUNCIL MEETING	53

14. UPDATE	54
14.a IUGS Annual Report 2002 & 2003	54
14.b IUGS Directory	54
14.c IUGS Logo.....54
14.d IUGS Brochure and Flier	54
14.e IUGS Exposure and Advertising Products	54
14.f IUGS Exhibition Policy	54
15. FREE DISCUSSION	54
16. VENUES AND DATES OF THE 53rd & 54th EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS	54
17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	55
17.a IUGS Award	55
17.b Long-term deposit of IUGS funds in a bank.....55
17.c Access to Bureau positions – financial support from IUGS	55
17.d Access of non-EC members to confidential documents	55
17.e Collecting Hutchison Fund donations	55
17.f Membership Categories	55

1. WELCOMING ADDRESS.

The President, Ed de Mulder, who opened the meeting, welcomed those attending and thanked the Norwegian National Committee and the Permanent Secretariat for organising the meeting.

Attending the meeting were; all the Executive Committee except for Jane Plant (Councillor) who sent apologies for her absence, Hanne Refsdal (Permanent Secretariat) and Hugh Rice (Assistant to Secretary-General; taking the Minutes). Present as observers were; Richard Sinding-Larsen (TGFF, Chairperson, Norwegian IGC 2008 Bidding Committee), John Aaron (IUGS Webmaster), Olle Selinus (Medical Geology Initiative), Tony Berger (Publications Committee, Geoinicators Initiative), Wolfgang Eder (UNESCO), Zhang Hongren (*Episodes*), Jacques Charvet (President, French National Committee), Ernesto Abbate (IGC Secretary), Colin Simpson and Joy Pereira (COGEO-ENVIRONMENT) and Ian Lambert (Chairperson, Australian IGC 2012 Bidding Committee).

On the third day, Sinding-Larsen officially welcomed IUGS to Scandinavia on behalf of the Norwegian National Committee and hoped that it had a pleasant stay and a successful meeting. The Committee is happy that the Executive Committee accepted the invitation to come to Oslo. De Mulder thanked Sinding-Larsen for all that the Committee had done for IUGS. The trip to Svalbard had been exciting and was memorable for a great many reasons. In token of IUGS' appreciation, de Mulder presented Sinding-Larsen with a fossil fish, from Wyoming USA. Sinding-Larsen replied by thanking the Executive Committee for being such excellent guests.

De Mulder then said that during this Executive Committee's term, the Union has grown in all areas. These achievements are the result of the work of all the Executive Committee members, the Permanent Secretariat, the Commissions, Task Groups, Initiatives and affiliated organisations.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

De Mulder asked if there were any amendments. Janoschek stated that Bosnia-Herzegovina had applied to join IUGS and this should be added to Section 4. Further, *Episodes* must be mentioned in Section 5.b.3.

The Agenda was approved with minor modifications.

3. 51st EC MEETING, WINDHOEK, NAMIBIA, FEBRUARY-MARCH 2003

3.a Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes

The Minutes were approved with minor corrections. De Mulder said that relevant parts of the minutes could be sent to observers etc to check.

3.b Actions arising from the Minutes

De Mulder said that only the Actions not known to be done would be discussed here.

Several Actions became obsolete during the year:

Action 8 **Obsolete.** Janoschek to prepare a summary of annual reports from Adhering Members, for *Episodes*.

Action 12 **Obsolete.** Plant and Cadet to develop a project in the Deep Earth and Climate area.

Action 62 **Obsolete.** Cadet and Plant to write a proposal on the 'water' theme for submission to ICSU for a major grant.

Other actions still pending are:

Action 6 **Not done.** Janoschek to ask the EC to send suggestions of names for an IUGS task group concerning women and youth.

Janoschek said that he had tried to create a group but more needs to be done prior to the IGC. Names are still needed.

De Mulder said the Executive Committee might also consider what other groups are under-represented – industry is, for example. Janoschek said that industry could not be included in such a group.

Action 20 **Done.** Zhang Hongren/Aaron to set up the on-line discussion of *Episodes* articles system proposed by Aaron.

Zhang Hongren said that Mrs Zhang Huaisu is working hard to finish this. The site is established and the problems have been solved. Essentially the Action is done.

Action 31 **Obsolete.** Selinus to send Janoschek names of suitable persons for appointing to COGEOENVIRONMENT.

De Mulder said that a new leadership of COGEOENVIRONMENT, with new ideas, will be put forward later. Essentially, the action is obsolete.

Action 37 **Obsolete.** Plant to write a Classic Paper series article on Janet Watson.

Zhang Hongren said that Plant had sent a previously published paper, unsuitable for *Episodes*. Berger said that the article sent was an obituary. De Mulder proposed that this Action was obsolete.

Action 42 **Obsolete.** Plant to write an IUGS position statement concerning nuclear waste.

Plant had said she had no time to do this. De Mulder proposed that this action was obsolete as well. Brett noted that Fyfe led a committee on nuclear waste – perhaps Fyfe could do something on this. Cadet said that a report from this committee was sent to the French Academy.

Gupta said IUGS is an international body, so its opinion would be very helpful to members; thoughts and ideas might act as guidelines. Janoschek said that it is the politicians which provide the problem. The 4-ICSU-Unions group could apply more pressure. Brett said that nuclear waste was an ideal topic for an ICSU grant; ICSU would also like to get social sciences involved in its activities.

Action 43 **Obsolete.** Janoschek to ask Aaron to put position statements onto the web, in such a way that they can be retrieved by search engines. Inform Aaron that three statements should be arriving this year (nuclear waste, climate change, creationism and evolution).

De Mulder said that as there are no position papers, this was obsolete.

Action 48 **Done.** Nyambe to ask GSAfrica members for a response to the electronic bulletins.

Bobrowsky said that the action is done. He had received a report from Nyambe; the e-bulletins are well received and are further distributed. It is not known to whom.

Action 50 Not done. Council to be informed about the closing down of IASTG.

De Mulder remarked that this is for the Council.

Action 53 Obsolete. Janoschek to inform the new IGCP Projects that there will be a half-day long 'IGCP open session' at the IGC meeting in Florence, specifically for new projects.

Janoschek said that it had been too late to implement this suggestion.

Action 71 Obsolete. Riccardi to establish whether the S. American network of geological surveys is non-governmental and if so, to ask if they wish to become an Affiliate.

Riccardi said the group is governmental. De Mulder said that in that case, it was not eligible for affiliate status; the Action is therefore obsolete.

Action 72 Done. If CCOP is non-governmental, Janoschek to ask if they wish to be formally affiliated with IUGS. The advantages should be pointed out.

Janoschek said that Refsdal had received an application from CCOP.

Action 77 Done. Bobrowsky to write to IGEO stating that IUGS' new logo must be clearly shown on publications. A free booth spot is wanted. People coming on IUGS money must be made aware of this. Visibility must be good.

Bobrowsky said this was done; everything IUGS had requested was done at the meeting.

De Mulder said that of the 85 actions, only two were not yet done. This is an excellent performance.

The outstanding Actions are:

Action 6 Not done. Janoschek to ask the EC to send suggestions of names for a task group concerning women and youth.

Action 50 Not done. Council to be informed about the closing down of IASTG.

De Mulder thanked Janoschek for his work for IUGS in the past year; he had had by far the most Actions to complete.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS

4.a President's Report

De Mulder reported that 2003 had been hectic. The YEAR took a lot of time, especially after illness forced Schalke to stop working. Schalke is now recovering. The *Strategic Action Plan* was finished and printed together with the *Mid-Term Vision* document.

Much promotion was done – the wall-poster is printed and new ties made, courtesy of China. Several congresses were sponsored, too. Scientifically, the 5th section of IGCP started, specialising on hydrogeology. Two ICSU grants were secured and several ad hoc Reviews undertaken. There were six Bureau meetings and many National Committees were met. Altogether, IUGS progressed well. The

Executive Committee is on track for most things it was charged with and the remainder should be done before the Council, which should be well satisfied.

De Mulder presented a list of his activities:

2003:

- Jan. 20 Egypt. Met National Committee. Presentation to Arabian Geological Society.
30 Meeting of Scientific Programme Committee of YEAR.
- Feb. 4 Paris. Met French National Committee.
17 Nairobi. Met Kenyan National Committee.
24-28 Windhoek. EC meeting. Met Namibian National Committee.
- March 3-5 Argentina. Met Argentinean IGCP Committee. Discussed YEAR with Deputy Minister of Education of Argentina. Met National Committee. Met Secretary-General of the Latin-American Group of Geological Surveys.
24 Moscow. Presentation on YEAR at Sergeev Symposium. Met Russian National Committee,
- April 6-11 Nice, France. Presentation on the YEAR in the EGU Conference. Discussed affiliation with President of EGU. New COMTEC discussed with Passchier and Wortel. Signed contract with Geological Society of London. Met National Committee. Bureau meeting, Villefranch-sur-Mer. Met IUGS Commissions
- May 20 Utrecht. Met director of CCOP.
27 Paris. Bureau meeting.
28-29 Paris. Discussed IGCP with Director of UNESCO's Water Division. Met Rosswall (ICSU) on YEAR. Met CRD Chairman.
- June 23-24 Brighton, UK. Management Team meeting YEAR.
27-28 Rome. Meeting with IGU.
30 Utrecht. Presentation in Geoscience & the Public meeting.
- July 3 Sapporo. Participation in IUGG Executive Committee meeting in Sapporo:
4-7 Beijing. Meetings with Dr Li and Vice-Minister Shou on YEAR.
9-10 Sapporo. Participation in ILP Bureau meeting. Meeting with IGY+50.
24 Reno. Presentation in INQUA. Meeting with SG INQUA.
- Aug. 6-7 Ottawa. Bureau meeting.
25 Met Dutch National Committee on YEAR.
26-27 Oegstgeest, Netherlands. MT on YEAR.
28 Vienna Publication Committee meeting.
- Sept. 15-18 COGEO-Conference in Vilnius, Lithuania
24 Bochum, Germany. Lecture and met Janoschek.
29-30 Jakarta. Invited lecture and met National Committee.
- Oct. 13-14 Bureau meeting Trieste.
21-22 Gran Canaria. MT meeting YEAR
- Nov. 4 Utrecht. Met Osipov, Russian National Committee.
5-7 Utrecht. Chairing and hosting IUGS sponsored SDMS-Conference
10-11 Beijing. Met Minister Sun of L&R + Deputy Minister Ye. Negotiations with MLR on YEAR. Attended IGCP+30 celebration in China.
13-14 Paris. Presentation of YEAR at CNFG. Met Missotten on GARS and MRSP
17 Interview for review IGCP with Elin Dahlin by telephone
27-28 Utrecht. Bureau meeting. Geotourism etc. meeting.
- Dec. 10 Utrecht. Met Cloetingh about ILP.
11-12 Paris. Participated in MRSP meeting. Met Rosswall (ICSU). Met Dutch UNESCO Ambassador.

19 Paris. MT on the YEAR.

2004

Jan. 6-8 Uppsala, Sweden. Presentation on the YEAR. Met with Norwegian IGC bidding committee. Met Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish & Icelandic National Committees. Met Jorn Thiede, Chairman of SCAR. Met with IAEG's Vice-President Lars Persson.
15 Noordwijk, Netherlands. Met Foing & Ocampo, ESTEC (ESA).
23 Naples, Italy. Presented paper on Megacities.
29 Washington. Met with NSF, NAS and NASA.
Feb. 4-13 Paris. Bureau meeting Paris. MT meeting on YEAR. 4-Geo-Unions meeting. Preview meeting of ILP. Meeting of the IGCP Scientific Board. Participation in all-Unions meeting of ICSU. High-level information meeting on the YEAR. MT meeting on YEAR. Met French National Committee. GeoParks Meeting.
25-28 Discussed YEAR Science themes with Derbyshire.
March 2 Meeting with IUSS on partnership in YEAR.

4.b Past-President's report

Brett said that he had corresponded with people wanting information. ICSU held meetings in Washington and Paris. The latter was preceded by the 4-Unions meeting – a very successful event which become a blueprint for other Unions.

The Nominations Committee has been active, looking to the next Executive Committee. This will be discussed later.

Brett added that he had attended a meeting 'Budapest Science Forum – Science & Society', in November 2003. Budapest is now looking to host a 'World Science Conference +5'.

4.c Vice-Presidents' and Councillors' reports

Sato

Sato said that he had designed the mini-compass for IUGS – 1000 were made. IUGS paid for 750, the remainder were a gift from Sato. Some will be sent out to the Executive Committee. Sato added that he had published an article in the Japanese Geological Society Journal, explaining IUGS. A draft of the new statutes for the merger was prepared.

At the start of 2004, Sato said he began lobbying the Japanese National Committee about the YEAR; they are in favour. Together with Komatsu (Chairman of the National Committee) contact was made with the Minister of Education. This is still in progress – not sure if they will give official support.

De Mulder thanked Sato for his work and especially for the compasses; this was a great gesture. The compasses have been widely appreciated.

Bobrowsky

Bobrowsky said that he had been active in outreach. Four e-bulletins had been completed and posted on the website – but there are still distribution problems. Business card holders were made, embossed with the IUGS logo.

Bobrowsky added that he worked with IGEO; IUGS was prominently displayed at their meeting. Lots of meetings made with affiliates. The Publications Committee meeting in Vienna was attended. His travel is supported by the Geological Survey of Canada, which also supported the Bureau meeting in Ottawa.

ICSU representatives were met at the *Health & Wellbeing* meeting in February; Selinus' contribution had a major impact and he will take a lead role in the project. Bobrowsky also represented IUGS at the ICSU Asteroid meeting (Paris, February 2004).

Bobrowsky chaired the 'GEOFUN' meeting in Utrecht, in November. Many groups attended. IGU want to encourage the groups and merge the efforts into a consortium. ToR have been written; elections of officers will be in China later this year. IUGS' role as a catalyst was good.

For the YEAR, the Survey was lobbied and they support it. The Department of International Affairs was contacted and they agreed to consider supporting it.

De Mulder thanked Bobrowsky for his contribution to IUGS. De Mulder asked if there has been any direct contact in UNESCO with the YEAR. Bobrowsky replied that the Canadian representative at UNESCO did not know about the YEAR. However, the Canadians turned up at the YEAR meeting in Paris. They will not send a letter, but hope to support it. De Mulder asked if they could still be persuaded to send a letter of support; these are very important to the Chinese.

Berger asked if the Asteroid group had contacted the Dark Nature project. Bobrowsky replied that contact has been made

Cadet

Cadet said that he had been involved in following up the COMTEC review – there is now a Task Group on Tectonic and Structural Geology. There were two meetings with CGI during a NATO workshop in Poland on the future of cartography. Several meetings with CIFEG were attended. Several papers were submitted to *Episodes*, on behalf of CGMW.

For the Joint Programmes, Cadet helped set up the new group at a meeting in June and went to a meeting in Koblenz to get people for this. An ICSU project proposal was started; we are waiting to see how the new section on water at IGCP works.

For the YEAR, Cadet said he had pushed the French National Committee to accept the idea.

De Mulder thanked Cadet for the work he had done for IUGS

Riccardi

Riccardi said that de Mulder had visited Argentina and met the National Committee and explained the YEAR. There was also a meeting with the State Secretary for Science and Technology, who was receptive to the YEAR. An official request to the Government to support the YEAR was written and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will support China in the declaration.

The Association of S. American Geological Surveys was approached about becoming an affiliate of IUGS – but no response was received. He participated in the S. American evaluation of IGCP and helped organise meetings for Medical Geology in 2004 and Geoindicators in 2005.

De Mulder thanked Riccardi for his report.

Gupta

Gupta apologised for missing the Windhoek meeting due to business commitments. At the IUGG Sapporo meeting there was good interaction with IUGS. IUGG is now a full partner in the YEAR. India, which was at the Paris meeting, will send a letter supporting the YEAR.

Gupta said that he gave the Bruun Memorial Lecture on Gas Hydrates at Paris. There is an important programme on gas hydrates in India.

Hyderabad will apply for the 2012 IGC, in Florence; a report will be given in this meeting.

All Indian Ocean rim countries are involved in the 'Global Ocean Observing Systems' (GOOS). India is the chair now, but this will rotate. IUGS should be more involved in ocean research.

De Mulder thanked Gupta for his contribution to IUGS. There was an IUGS Commission on the Oceans, but it was cancelled in Rio de Janeiro. IUGS could not see how it could contribute – a boat for ocean sciences is expensive. IUGS could have tried to get more scientists from the developing world involved, but this is now a standard procedure.

Janoschek reported that when he says IUGS is not involved in the oceans, people think IUGS is old-fashioned. IUGS must find a way of becoming involved – this is something for the next Executive Committee to work on. Eder said that the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) at UNESCO deals with GOOS. IUGS should join and participate.

De Mulder noted that in the YEAR, oceans are a special topic. As a full partner in the YEAR, IUGG will be involved of course. Eder noted that he had been asked by the IOC to give a presentation on the YEAR in September.

4.d Secretary-General

Janoschek said that he had been busy with the actions from the Executive Committee and Bureau meetings. He then presented a list of the major activities undertaken during the year.

2003:

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| April | 5-12 | Nice and Villefranch-sur-Mer: Bureau, EGS/AGU/EUG Congress, Exhibition booth. |
| May | 8 | Austrian National Committee for Geology. |
| | 19-21 | Rome: ICL Board. |
| | 24-29 | Paris: Bureau, UNESCO Earth Science Division, Water Division, Permanent Representation, ICSU. |
| June | 9-15 | Granada: SCOPE Board. |
| | 16-17 | Visit of Ian Lambert, Australia: IGC, Membership category of Australia, Associate membership. |
| | 26 | Austrian National Committee for the IGCP. |
| | 27-29 | Joint Bureau Meeting IGU/IUGS. |
| | 30 | Amsterdam: EuroGeoSurveys: Megacities. |
| July | 6-9 | Tadashi Sato in Vienna: preparation of new Statutes IUGS and IGC. |
| | 10-15 | Dublin: Meeting Statutes Committee IUGS and IGC; INHIGEO Conference; Review of INHIGEO; Meeting with Representatives of the Irish National Committee for IUGS. |
| | 17 | Board Meeting of the Austrian Geological Society. |
| Aug. | 5-8 | Ottawa, Bureau Meeting. |
| | 9-15 | Calgary, IGEO Conference with exhibition booth for IUGS, YEAR and IGC Florence, preparatory talks for the IUGS COGEOETTT. |

- 28-20 PC Meeting in Vienna.
- Sept. 4-7 Beograd, Meeting with the Yugoslavian National Committee of Geology (now Serbia and Montenegro) and with the President and Secretary General of the CBGA.
- 12-15 Strasbourg, Council of Europe: Geological Heritage.
- 21-28 Bochum: Board Geologische Vereinigung, Annual Conference of the GV and Annual Conference of the Deutsche Geologische Gesellschaft. Meeting with Ed de Mulder.
- Oct. 1-8 Ian Speden in Vienna.
- 11-14 Trieste, Bureau Meeting.
- 15-17 Peter Bobrowsky in Vienna.
- 22-24 Espoo, Finland: Meeting with the National Committee of Geology of Finland, Retirement celebration for Gabor Gaal.
- 26-1 Nov. Vancouver: ICL Board and Members Conference, Field Trip.
- Nov. 2-6 Seattle, GSA Conference: Many meetings with affiliates, Promotion of the YEAR.
- 7-14 China: Evaluation of the Lushan and Wudalianchi UNESCO Geopark; 30 years IGCP in China, *Episodes*, Ministry of Land and Resources.
- 27-28 Utrecht, Bureau meeting, Geofun meeting.
- Dec. 6-12 San Francisco: AGU Conference, Promotion of IUGS and the YEAR.
- 22-23 Representative of Lushan Geopark in Vienna.

2004

- Jan. 14 Met the Austrian UNESCO Commission.
- 18-22 Florence: GEOHOST, Italian National Committee of Geology, IGC Organizing Committee.
- Feb. 3-13 Paris: Bureau meeting, IGCP, all-Unions of ICSU and 4-Unions Meetings, met Director General UNESCO for the YEAR, ICSU, Permanent Representation to UNESCO of Austria, French National Committee for Geology, UNESCO GEOPARKS.
- March 11-20 EC Meeting Oslo and Svalbard.

De Mulder thanked Janoschek for his very considerable efforts on behalf of IUGS.

4.e Past-Secretary-General

De Mulder noted that Boriani was no longer Past-Secretary-General.

4.f Treasurer's Report

Brambati said that he started his duties after the meeting in Windhoek. The money from Vienna was transferred in March/April. The finances are in good shape. Brambati noted that money for travel etc. must be claimed. Also, IGCP money cannot be paid out until UNESCO approves.

1.25% interest was received from the bank; next year, the rate will be lower.

Vietnam is now active again, but seven Category 1 countries have become inactive.

De Mulder thanked Brambati for his work as Treasurer.

Janoschek said there might not be an IUGS National Committee in these inactive countries. IUGS needs to have personal contacts, to ensure the letter reaches the correct persons.

De Mulder asked how much money IUGS had. Brambati replied that it was essentially the same as last year but there are more expenses than income now. US \$ 20,000 from UNESCO is still expected.

Brett asked if the money sent to AGA and impounded by the US has been released? Janoschek replied that a letter from the US authorities arrived soon after Hussein was deposed – but it is unclear if the money was coming back or going to AGA.

4.g Permanent Secretariat's Report

Refsdal said that there are two persons in the Secretariat. The money from the Ministry this year (US \$ 150,000) is the same as for last year. The increase in Union activities this year caused a big rise in workload.

A new booth display was made for the IGC, promoting the YEAR. The flier was updated and a small display poster made. A glossy poster was printed. The brochure is near completion.

De Mulder thanked Refsdal, and Anne Dehls, for their fine work. IUGS greatly appreciates the fact that it has a Permanent Secretariat.

Brett asked if the domicile question had been resolved. Refsdal replied that it will change this year. De Mulder asked if this could be done pre-IGC.

4.h Application for Affiliation of Organisations

Janoschek said that EuroGeoSurveys will not apply. Three new applications had been received.

4.h.1 CCOP

Refsdal said that the application arrived two days ago. There are 11 member countries; Chen Shick Pei is the Director.

De Mulder said that CCOP is an intergovernmental organisation – can it be an affiliate, within the constraints of the Statutes? Bobrowsky noted that the Statutes do not say it is *not* possible. More importantly, they can apply if they support IUGS' aims. Why do we not want intergovernmental bodies?

Janoschek read the statutes; *“(h) Affiliated organizations are international, non-governmental, scientific, autonomous organizations which have obtained affiliation with the Union for the representation of scientific interests and, through the Union in the International Council for Science, for collaboration in arranging scientific meetings, and for planning and undertaking activities of mutual interest”*.

Simpson said CCOP is the main method of collaboration in the area. It distributes data on new programmes. De Mulder said it would give a good entry into SE Asia – IUGS could approach the member countries through CCOP. Unless the Statutes explicitly exclude it, we should support the application.

Bobrowsky said they will improve our visibility. De Mulder noted that IUGS has signed a MoU with CCOP. Brett said that this should be done properly; a clause can be added to the Statutes allowing suitable intergovernmental bodies to become affiliated.

4.h.2 Fiji Geological Society

Janoschek said that he received a letter from the Fiji Geological Society, to which he had replied saying that they should make a consortium of the Pacific Islands societies and apply together. Simpson noted that SOPAC is a governmental organisation including the US, New Zealand and Australia. This works on islands which do not have their own geological survey and could be an affiliate.

4.h.3 European Geosciences Union (combined EUG, EGS)

De Mulder said that EGU had asked about becoming an affiliate; forms were sent out, but have not yet been returned.

5. ANNUAL REPORTS AND FUTURE PLANS OF IUGS BODIES

5.a Adhering Organisations

5.a.1 Applications for Membership

Janoschek said that Bosnia-Herzegovina has applied for Category 1 status, through Hazim Hrvatovic. IUGS should accept their application. Cadet agreed; they have produced new maps of their area; they are trying to re-enter the geological community at the international level.

In the absence of any objects, the application was accepted unanimously by the Executive Committee.

5.a.2 Reports of Adhering Organisations

Janoschek made a summary of the 16 Adhering Organisations' reports received.

Argentina – 11 members. Six meetings in 2003. Discussed the evaluation of IGCP – much of which was done in Argentina. Welcomed the Geoparks idea. De Mulder made a short visit. Supported the YEAR. Informed the geo-community about the IGC.

Azerbaijan – nine members, one meeting. Prepared papers for the 32nd IGC meeting of hydrologists. Reported on IGCP activities. Active in developing modern geological programmes in Azerbaijan. Suggested a special bulletin in their journal showing special achievements of the National Committee.

Canada – no formal meeting in 2003. Financial problems in the payment IUGS' fees. Supports Bobrowsky to become an officer in the next EC. Welcomed the IGCP evaluation. Suggested a workshop on water, but this was postponed.

Columbia – seven members of the Commission on Stratigraphy. No meeting in 2003.

Denmark – 11 persons, two meetings. A new website with a new geological description of Denmark – 90 localities. Supported the Norwegian bid for IGC 2008 in Oslo.

Estonia – nine members – three meetings – disseminated IUGS data. Designed a position letter about the geological survey. Strong support for the merger of IUGS and IGC.

Finland – 12 persons, five meetings. Prepared a 'Day of Geology' for Sept 2004. Supported the Norwegian bid for IGC 2008 in Oslo. Participated in European activities.

Germany – 18 persons, one meeting. Discussed how to inform public about geosciences. Discussed problem of getting money for regional research. Welcomed the IUGS e-bulletins.

Israel – 250 members, two conferences; six executive members, five meetings. Organised first Earth Sciences day. New web site.

Italy – ten persons and ten meetings. Lots of meetings due to IGC. Gave advice to organising committee. Ensured that IUGS bodies involved, GEOHOST, prepared Brambati's nomination for

2004-2008. Happy with integration of IUGS and IGC. Made nominations for IGCP board. Happy with YEAR.

Netherlands – 15 members. Supported the YEAR and commented on organisation.

Russia – 34 members – four Bureau, one Council meeting. Sent an info bulletin to 100 institutions. Distributed 64 free copies of *Episodes*. Happy to have paid for 2001-2003. Preparing for the award of the Spendiarov Prize. Happy with the Annual Report reaching the National Bodies.

S. Africa – 11 members, one meeting. IGCP discussed. Important for S. Africa is the rotation of IGC. Complained that this was not implemented. five congresses in 2003-2004. Fees for 2004 are safe. Suggested some improvements in IUGS. YEAR is keenly anticipated – but developing world must be involved. Welcomed improved contact between secretariat and S. Africa, but no details of Commissions. Not happy that Oslo may get the IGC – two in a row in Europe. Considering a bid for 2008 an/or 2012,

Switzerland – eight members, three meetings. Newly reorganised. Regretted drop in IGCP projects. Appreciate e-bulletins – suggested that they should be expanded.

Chile – 200 members. 11 meetings. Helped 10th Chilean Geological Congress. Several meetings with the government about the closure of the Geological Survey.

Norway – Sinding-Larsen reported. The Committee supports the merger of IUGS and IGC. Very supportive of the YEAR. Worked closely with the Nordic 2008 IGC bidding committee. Would like the e-bulletins to have some possibility for the National Committees to address each other – a forum for exchange.

France – Charvet reported. 90 members. 39 elected, four honorary; rest are *ex officio* from geological associations. Work done by a Bureau of six with a Council of 18. Several specific activities: (1) invited the European National Committees to have a joint meeting in Nice, during the EGS-AGU-EUG Joint Meeting. De Mulder and Janoschek invited. (2) Colloquium last November titled ‘Quels g_ologues pour demain?’ – how to get different courses suitable for future jobs. (3) preparing for IGC – sent Italy a large number of proposals for symposia etc. Most accepted. (4) Prepared financial support for IGC – grants for eight junior and 22 senior participants. (5) Replied to inquiries about the IUGS-IGC merger. (6) Discussed the YEAR at several meetings. Wrote to UNESCO Commission – France was at the February meeting. Official letter sent, giving support of the French National Committee. The Committee asked the government to give support.

Australia – Lambert reported. The National Committee for Earth Sciences was rejuvenated some three years ago, and has developed a National Strategic Plan for the Earth Sciences, released in October 2003. This gives a vision for the future of the geosciences – contributing to the nation's sustainability, wealth and development of knowledge. It is linked to the overall National Research Priorities at government level, and provides independent support for the research themes of IUGS' Planet Earth initiative. In the process of developing this strategic plan for the geosciences, strong support emerged for submitting a bid for the next available IGC, and this has now happened.

India – Gupta reported. The National Science Committee, of six members, is in charge of relations with ICSU and IUGS. In the last years, the importance of the Earth sciences across India has

slowly been recognised. The Committee supports the YEAR – diplomat at the February meeting. A bid for the 2012 IGC at Hyderabad will be made. Large participation at the IUGG meeting in Sapporo. Supporting 50 persons at the IGC.

Cadet noted there were 16 reports but there are 80 active countries. Some very active countries in IGCP/IUGS do not send a report. Countries need to know the value of the report they send. There needs to be a letter explaining this.

De Mulder said they cannot be forced to report. Bobrowsky asked if the National Committee's comments are addressed in detail. The Executive Committee represents the National Committees – it should give more attention to their needs. Janoschek replied that a general reply is sent. The National Committees often want simple information.

Brett said IUGS has a good website and e-bulletins. The National Committees read these. Maybe the letter should ask 'How do you feel about?' This would give them a specific problem. De Mulder said that this had been tried, but with little response.

Sinding-Larsen said that the *Mid-Term Vision* and *Strategic Action Plan* had been distributed. This should have triggered some comments. De Mulder said a draft was sent to all National Committees; 15-20 responded.

Riccardi said that IUGS needs to reach the geologist, not the National Committee. Documents are probably never passed on to geologists. In Namibia, it had been suggested that the world be divided up and each Executive Committee member would get a specific area to interact with the National Committees. Janoschek said that in choosing the Executive Committee, a regional distribution is sought and it was expected that the Executive Committee members should look after their region.

5.b. Committees

5.b.1 Nominating Committee

Brett (Chairman) reported. There were two intra-term elections – for a new Secretary-General and a new Treasurer. Then after the final date for nominations was past, the Austrian government withdrew its support for Janoschek. The Committee has had to re-advertised for a Secretary-General, with a closing date of 1 May.

The Committee met on 16/17 January and produced a slate with two women in it. The Committee also came up with a working plan for future Committees:

Suggested Guidelines for the Nominating Committee:

- 1) The Committee should encourage National Committees to nominate good candidates and encourage good candidates to get nominated.
- 2) Women and geologists from developing countries should be especially sought after.
- 3) The Executive Committee should have a good mix of regions and disciplines.
- 4) Preference will be given to countries that have had little or no representation previously.
- 5) Bureau positions should preferably be diverse so far as regions and scientific discipline are concerned. No one country should have had more than about 20 percent of each of the Bureau positions ideally.
- 6) If more than one candidate is nominated for a Bureau position or more than two candidates for Vice-President, or more than four for Councillor, the Nominating Committee may nominate up to double the number of candidates for the position, provided all are capable. Diversity with respect to region and discipline should not be sacrificed by such nominations.

Brett said that he had proposed a minimum of two candidates per position at the last IGC. However, this makes it very difficult to ensure a spread of the Executive Committee around the world and through the Earth sciences. Cadet said that one candidate gives little resemblance to democracy. Brett agreed. Janoschek said one candidate is within the Statutes.

Cadet added that the Statutes should forbid Committee members from standing for Executive Committee positions. They must stand down in good time. Brett agreed.

Brambati reported that the support by the Italian Government has just been cut to only one trip per year. Brambati said he would go to Rome to clarify the situation. Brett said this will cause problems if, by the end of April, nothing is heard. Nominations must be sent to National Committees three months in advance; 20 May is the deadline. Maybe the position will have to be re-advertised.

Brambati said that if no change of position by the Italian government has been announced within ten days, then the Committee should re-open the Treasurer position and inform the National Committees. If the Italian government then gives the green light, he could be re-nominated by the Italian National Committee. Brett agreed.

Cadet said the Executive Committee must bring this problem before the Council at Florence; obtaining funding for such positions is becoming difficult.

Janoschek noted that Russia is unhappy that they pay US \$ 30,000 membership fees and do not have anyone in the Executive Committee.

5.b.2 Committee for Research Directions (CRD)

De Mulder said the CRD had three purposes:

- Identifying new directions for research;
- Recommending those suitable for IUGS to the Executive Committee;
- Evaluating project proposals.

A topic was selected last year from the CRD's suggestions – “Geological Processes and Human Evolution” – as a Grants Proposal top-down project. However, no submissions came in.

The SPC also developed science issues, but for the YEAR. However, it has now done its job – 22 topics identified with eight selected by voting. The remainder could be included in the CRD programme. It is proposed to combine the SPC and CRD. The Executive Committee must decide on:

- Whether to integrate the non-selected SPC proposals into the CRD;
- Whether to have a full-day meeting of the CRD, in February, 2005.

Cadet asked if there was the link with IGCP. De Mulder replied that the five IGCP Chairpersons are members of the CRD.

Cadet then asked if the Joint Programme proposal he was preparing with Plant would go through the CRD. Berger asked if the CRD is open to ideas at any time, for top-down proposals. De Mulder replied that if someone suggests something, then it goes to the CRD.

Gupta asked if there a order of priority for the remaining 14 topics. De Mulder replied that the CRD will re-evaluate them by their own standards. Bobrowsky asked about the purpose of the full-day meeting. De Mulder said that the CRD needs more time; it can then define new directions clearly.

De Mulder then asked if the Executive Committee agreed to merge the SPC into the CRD and the CRD to meet for one full day, early in 2005. **All agreed.**

5.b.3 Committee for Publications (PC)

Berger reported as Chairman. Two important documents were signed; one with the Geological Society of London and the other with China (*Episodes*' MoU).

Leaders of IUGS' bodies and IGCP projects know about the GSL arrangement – they submit their material to the GSL. If GSL accepts this, it will be published as part of either GSL's Special Publication Series or their Monograph Series. IUGS' logo will be on the front cover and inside as well. The copyright stays with the GSL. A royalty may be paid to IUGS at ~5%; this is not fixed. IUGS will assist by advertising through *Episodes* and fliers. The first title is approved, but will not come out until late this year. Any group with an idea for a symposium volume can send it to the GSL.

One title on groundwater has been declined by GSL. In Windhoek, it was said that if GSL refuses a book then authors can look elsewhere, so long as IUGS is acknowledged and the logo appears on it. IUGS will also assist in promoting such books, as well. Before the IGC, a full list will be made of the titles approved or rejected by GSL.

Berger felt that the arrangement is solving a long-term problem. However, there are two books coming out now which will be outside the GSL deal. They are the ICS book on the Geological Time Scale and a Medical Geology book. But both should promote IUGS on the front page.

Brett asked what would happen to groups that did not submit their material to GSL. Berger said they would not get more money from IUGS.

Simpson asked why GSL rejected the groundwater book. Berger replied that they felt there was no market. Simpson commented that there is no publisher for environmental management.

Brett said that several affiliates now swap advertising with IUGS – we could use this to push the deal. Also it could be pushed in e-bulletins. Berger replied that this was discussed by the PC – GSL will be advertised in both e-bulletins and *Episodes*.

Berger turned to the MoU concerning *Episodes* with China. De Mulder signed this in 2003, but it expires in 2004. *Episodes* publishing went very well in this time. Starting this year, the transfer of copyright of published articles to *Episodes* will be introduced.

The MoU specifies that there should be a review of *Episodes* every four years, before IGC. In Vienna, the PC agreed that the ARC method should be used and that it, the PC, should not do the review. The Bureau was sent a list of items which should be considered in the review. Also, a questionnaire is to go into *Episodes*, to get the readerships' ideas. The PC agreed that China should be asked to continue publishing *Episodes* for the next four years.

Berger then raised a few other points. At the Vienna meeting, Gradstein presented 4-5 proposals for the chart, all en route – a wall poster, a book version, an inset in the June 2004 *Episodes*, a plastic 'field version'. So far, no problems have arisen.

Finally, Berger said that the IUGS website is excellent. It is a major information outlet.

Aaron reported on the website. This year, the site was redesigned with the new logo and matching colour scheme. There are several sections – *Episodes*, IGC and IUGS etc – with all the bodies in IUGS. There is a page of ‘*What is new?*’ linked to the proper place in the site. This is mostly IUGS stuff – annual reports, minutes etc. Also new reports on conferences, workshops etc. can be posted.

There has been a big increase in use. Note that in the statistics given below, an address is counted only once per month, no matter how often it logs onto the site.

Visitors	Year		
	2001	2002	2003
Avg. Countries/Month	80	86 (+8%)	89 (+3%)
Avg Unique Sites/Month	3,090	4,340 (+40%)	5,285 (+22%)
Avg. Visits/Month	5,546	6,817 (+23%)	8,717 (+28%)
Avg. Page Hits/Month	42,412	59,127 (+39%)	70,903 (+20%)
Avg. Visits/Day	175	226 (+29%)	286 (+27%)
Avg. Page Hits/Day	1,457	1,969 (+35%)	2,324 (+18%)

De Mulder thanked Aaron for his report and also for the excellent quality of the site. Gupta then said that a 25% increase in hits is impressive, but compared to the global increase in internet usage, it is low. What can be done to increase this? Aaron agreed that this was a fair point. Bobrowsky asked how IUGS could become the first item on the list of a search engine when ‘geology’ is typed into the search engine. Aaron replied that it is difficult to get *International* (IUGS) at the top of a search for *Geology*.

De Mulder thanked Berger for his excellent work as Committee leader.

Gupta said that the questionnaire could be used in the review. Brett said questionnaires can give biased results – only the lovers/haters reply. Berger commented that the previous survey gave a good overview. Janoschek suggested distributing the questionnaire at the IGC – it would be too late for the review, but 5,000 people are present. Cadet added that the National Committees could be asked directly. Gupta suggested advertising the questionnaire on the website.

Bobrowsky said that the questionnaire will yield important information, but won’t add to the review. Riccardi said why do the questionnaire if it is not in the review? Aaron said that it is important for the ARC to have user comments. Berger said that the PC felt that the questionnaire should be part of the review. However, the Executive Committee must decide if the ARC will be before the IGC, as the MoU stipulates, or later.

De Mulder said that the questionnaire should be published in March. Janoschek said that the questionnaire results must be assessed before the review – thus it could be in June, at the Geoparks Congress in China – Janoschek, Bobrowsky, Eder and Zhang Hongren will attend. Only one person needs to be invited.

Janoschek said that there had been a request to increase the number of free copies of *Episodes* sent to the National Committees. The PC had referred the decision to the Executive Committee. The cost is not much. De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee agreed in principle to the increase and would leave it to the Bureau to decide on the actual numbers. **All agreed.**

Berger mentioned the old Monograph series – the secretariat should keep ten copies and the rest should be shipped to Florence for distribution – but not on display. **All agreed.** Gupta said that they could be advertised on the website.

Zhang Hongren spoke about *Episodes*. There is a new member on the Editorial staff, much younger than the present staff. He has re-established the website of *Episodes* (www.episodes.org). All the back issues printed in China are on the web, except for the first year (1997), when *Episodes* did not have a recorder. The questionnaire can be put onto the *Episodes* website, too.

A system of full electronic editing is being established. However, with electronics the archive has to be updated.

For IGC, *Episodes* can publish postcards of the geological map of the world, with CGMW and also the simplified stratigraphic chart as a postcard.

De Mulder thanked Zhang Hongren, the staff and China for what they have done for IUGS. De Mulder called for a round of applause for the Publications Committee, *Episodes* and the Website.

5.b.4 Committee for Finances

De Mulder said that the Task Group on Finances, in its Washington meeting concluded that only if there were deliverables could a Finance Committee look for financial support for IUGS. Such products are now coming on-line. The next Executive Committee can revitalise the Committee if it so wishes.

Gupta said that IUGG tried very hard to get rid of its FC, which was interfering in the financial aspects of the Union. At Sapporo, it was finally voted out.

Brett said that the SPC called it an FC, but really it is a Development Committee – made of persons who know the right people to bring in money. De Mulder said that, by August, the YEAR should be prominent on the agenda. Probably Shell will put money into the YEAR from which IUGS will benefit. Council will appreciate that this is the only way to generate a higher financial profile. Gupta agreed.

De Mulder then asked the Executive Committee if they agreed to leave the FC dormant. **All agreed.**

5.b.5 Ad hoc Review Committees (ARC)

De Mulder said that two reviews were undertaken this year: the reports can be distributed immediately.

INHIGEO	Sato/Janoschek	Dublin
CGSG	Brambati	Utrecht

De Mulder added that there will be three more this year: TG Fossil Fuels, TG Geochronological Decay Constants and Task Group Public Affairs. Bobrowsky asked how each ARC works. De Mulder said that each is ‘tailor made’ for the body to be reviewed – a couple of Executive Committee members and of external experts. The body sends documents to the Permanent Secretariat and has to make proposals for its future. Riccardi suggested doing some reviews at the IGC, to save money.

5.c Commissions

5.c.1 Commission on Geological Sciences for Environmental Planning (COGEOENVIRONMENT)

Simpson said that in September, COGEOENVIRONMENT was notified that under the rules of IUGS, it would have to close. Thus, in this presentation a plan for the future is given.

COGEOENVIRONMENT has 15 officers from 13 countries and 254 members from 80 countries. There are four working groups and two proposed working groups under construction.

In 2003, the chief accomplishments were the 14th meeting, in Vilnius, nine capacity building workshops, and the development of websites. Several meetings were combined with GEOIN or Medical Geology meetings.

Over the last four years, the total funds raised were US \$ 100,000, including US \$ 40,000 from IUGS. Thus the bulk was from outside sources. Although COGEOENVIRONMENT is now winding up, certain activities will continue, including the four sessions planned for the IGC.

De Mulder thanked Simpson for his report, adding that COGEOENVIRONMENT has the largest outreach in IUGS.

Gupta (rapporteur) complimented COGEOENVIRONMENT on its excellent performance. Good workshops, lots of capacity building – 500 people involved. The group is good at taking Earth sciences to the people. The financial performance was very good – IUGS should be happy.

Simpson said that the Commission's aim is to raise awareness and produce new information. However, there is a need to convince politicians of the relationship between geology and environment – it is difficult to get the message across because science and environmental departments are separated in Governments. The proposed new commission will provide guidance to politicians, planners and other decision makers about geo-related matters outside their expertise.

The commission will also teach geoscientists how to communicate with decision makers – especially in the developing world – where politics is often very big.

The new Commission would take on COGEOENVIRONMENT's Working Groups on Urban Geology, International Borders and Geology & Ecosystems. Similarly, the old bank account *must* be kept – due to the terrorism attack of 11 Sept.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee want to proceed with the new Commission.

Brett said that the ideas are worthwhile, but could be broadened to include energy, disasters, minerals, etc. Lambert said he would like to link with the new group; Geoscience Australia provides a geoscientific input into politics. It would be very good to have an independent body to which one could refer.

Janoschek said that SCOPE has a working group on this topic. The Executive Committee should certainly support the proposed new group.

Berger said that when COGEOENVIRONMENT started 14 years ago, this was one the basic objectives, but was difficult to get going. The concept extends beyond the environment. Geoinicators could very easily move into the new Commission.

Simpson said that there had been discussions about the new name; the most popular one was GEM – Geology for Environmental Management.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee agreed with the proposal of COGEOENVIRONMENT to mutate into the proposed new Commission called GEM. **All agreed.**

De Mulder said that Simpson is stepping down. The unanimous vote at Vilnius was for Pereira to become the leader. Does the Executive Committee approve this? **All approved.**

Pereira said that natural resources and the environment will be a focus of the new group, which will try to understand governments and target international meetings. Advice will be given on how the geosciences can assist governments for sustainable development.

De Mulder thanked Simpson on behalf of the Executive Committee for the excellent work he had done as leader of COGEOENVIRONMENT and for the rapid response to his comments at Vilnius.

Wolff then said that as one of the founders of COGEOENVIRONMENT he was pleased that it continued to operate after he retired. In his time, they tried to make links with the politicians, but this was the only area where they failed. The new commission fits in with the growing awareness in politicians that geo-environmental aspects are very important and cannot be tackled without geological expertise.

5.c.2 Commission on Global Sedimentary Geology (CGSG)

Brambati said that CGSG had been reviewed; it had been ineffectual for several years. The projects lacked a strong personality and money. The ARC concluded that this lack resulted in no-one taking any interest. The ARC had then tried to get ideas for a new Commission – sedimentology is a major part of geology – but with a new name and a new leader.

De Mulder said that he agreed with Brambati. CGSG had reached the end of its term. Cadet added that the sedimentology field is very large, but IUGS must be present. However, no Commission can do everything, so it must have specific targets.

Janoschek said that before 20 May the Bureau must send information to the Council – so something is needed by then. De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee approved the decisions proposed. **All approved.**

5.c.3 International Commission on the History of Geological Sciences (INHIGEO)

Sato (rapporteur) noted that INHIGEO has always been active. The Classic Paper series had two issues this year and will continue. The ARC met in July, in Dublin, with both Pinto and Oldroyd present. They have requested US \$ 4,500 for printing their newsletter, Secretary-General's expenses and translating costs and for a guide book from the Dublin General Meeting.

Janoschek said that the ARC was very good. They have 170 members in 41 countries. The message that they could not remain as a Commission was not a surprise. They might become an Association and be affiliated to IUGS.

The *History of IUGS* and *History of the IGC* was discussed. Each IGC will be written up as a separate article in *Episodes*. They thought the *History of IUGS* was too big a project for the Commission.

De Mulder thanked Sato and Janoschek for their comments.

5.c.4 Commission on the Management and Application of Geoscience Information (CGI)

Cadet (rapporteur) noted that CGI has been reborn; Asch and Jackson have very clear aims. The group is now working well.

Berger asked if they were revising the multilingual thesaurus. Cadet said that they are preparing a new version of this with CIFEG. This will be available on the internet. De Mulder added that the group has very good outreach – it is active at many meetings.

5.c.5 International Commission on Stratigraphy (ICS)

De Mulder (rapporteur) said that ICS submitted a 130 pages report. This included proposals for ratifying the:

- Base of the Ediacaran System/Period (base of Upper Neoproterozoic)
- Base of the Wuchiapingian Stage (=base of the Lopingian Series) in the Permian
- New subdivision on the Series level in the Carboniferous System

Ediacaran System: This GSSP differs from younger GSSPs in that it is not a global biostratigraphic event. It replaces the Neoproterozoic III, directly preceding the Cambrian, and following the Cryogenian Period. The GSSP is between 600 and 635 Ma old. 88% of the ICS officers voted in favour, one against and one abstention.

Wuchiapingian Stage: a GSSP based on conodonts as biostratigraphic marker was determined in South China. All ICS officers voted in favour.

ICS proposes to subdivide both the Pennsylvanian and the Mississippian into Upper, Middle and Lower Series. All Series will comprise one stage only, except for the Upper Pennsylvanian, with Kasimovian and Gzhelian Stages. All ICS officers voted in favour.

ICS had a Subcommittee on Precambrian Stratigraphy until 2000. A team led by Wouter Bleeker (Canada) has volunteered to revitalize the subcommittee, which, by 2008, will develop a comprehensive and internally consistent and practical ‘natural’ time-scale for the Precambrian, with golden spikes and type sections. Most ICS officers voted in favour, with one abstention.

Plans for 2004 include publication of ‘*Geologic Time Scale 2004*’ (Cambridge University Press); an atlas for the Standard Geologic Time Scale, on ICS’ website; preparation of the formation of a Task Group on Quantitative Stratigraphy; preparation of some ten more GSSPs and some new subdivisions for ratifications in 2005.

The ICS Chairman attended the Publications Committee meeting in Vienna, 2003. Concerning the Stratigraphic Chart, it was agreed that:

1. A new chart would be published by *Episodes*, June 2004, to be distributed free at IGC. Berger noted that he had told Zhang Hongren that IUGS would pay for the extra 10,000 reprints ordered.
2. A stratigraphic wall chart with IUGS’ logo, for distribution at the IGC, would be printed in Canada.
3. Other items, such as pocket charts, will be available at IGC as well.

Voting in ICS in 2003 resulted in the following nominations for 2004-2008:

- Gradstein, chair (100% of the ICS officers voted in favour)

Finney, vice chair (85% of the ICS officers voted in favour)

ICS requested an annual budget of US \$ 38,500, with a special IGC request (travel, printing and other costs) of US \$ 15,000 US.

ICS is one of IUGS' major bodies, keeping stratigraphers all over the world under one flag. In 2003, ICS worked hard on developing its future and on consolidating results from the past years. Much preparatory work has been done on the remaining GSSPs.

Gradstein (President of ICS) then gave an excellent presentation, detailing many of the points in the rapporteur's report.

De Mulder asked about the booth at IGC. Gradstein said that ICS is linking with CGMW and UNESCO.

Brett asked if ICS got funding from oil companies. Gradstein said that for GTS 2004, US \$ 60,000 was obtained, but 'oil money' has not been obtained for GSSPs.

Brett asked who will be funded to go to the IGC. Gradstein replied that every Sub-commission (15) has asked for two persons to attend – at US \$ 500, this will be US \$ 15,000. If ICS says that they must organise something, they feel that ICS should pay.

Sato asked how long it will be until the stratotypes are finished. Gradstein said that the Urbino meeting resulted in a big acceleration in the rate. De Mulder said that the stated completion is by 2008 – but there are still 40 to go. Will this be achieved? Gradstein said that he hoped ~35 more will be done.

For the ratification of the Ediacaran, **all agreed** to ratify this.

For the ratification of the Wuchiapingian, in the Permian, **all agreed** to ratify this.

For the proposed internal division of the Carboniferous, **all agreed** to ratify this.

De Mulder then asked the Executive Committee to endorse the decision to create a new Sub-commission on the Precambrian. **All agreed** to endorse this.

De Mulder raised the proposed new leadership. **All agreed** to endorse these results, by acclamation.

Concerning the new edition of the Stratigraphic Wall Chart, Gradstein said they are being printed in China. These too, may be given away at the booth, with the new '*Episodes*' chart. If rolls have to be provided, then it makes a logistic nightmare. Cadet said that CGMW will have a coupon system – and the maps will possibly also be free. The Wall Chart could be included on the Coupon if ICS wishes.

Janoschek added that each commission can present one poster, hanging up throughout the congress. Gradstein asked about the size. Janoschek replied he did not know.

Berger asked Gradstein whether IGC had any objection to IUGS' plan to dispose of the old special publications free, at the IGC. Gradstein said that was no problem.

De Mulder then said that to get the US \$ 15,000 to cover the costs of ICS officers attending IGC, ICS must have a meeting. Gradstein replied that a five hour workshop/meeting has been organised.

De Mulder then said that INQUA insisted that Quaternary is used again. Gradstein said that the whole thing is very complex; Quaternary is not a formal name. De Mulder said that IUGS only wants a resolution without upsetting INQUA.

De Mulder thanked Gradstein and all of ICS for their excellent work.

5.c.6 Commission on Systematics in Petrology (CSP)

Sato (rapporteur) said that the group has 15 members and three sub-commissions – one each on metamorphic, sedimentary and igneous rocks. SSIR was investigating the possibility of using the TAS classification for plutonic rocks. The group on metamorphic rocks will finalize its recommendations by late 2004. The sedimentology group is still lagging.

De Mulder thanked Sato and asked if the Commission had exceeded its term? Brett commented that it had, ages ago, but CSP is like ICS – keep it forever. Classifications are always revised. They do not need much money and do an excellent job. De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee agreed with this opinion. **All agreed.**

5.c.7 Commission on the Physics and Chemistry of the Earth (COPSCE)

De Mulder noted that this group had been closed down last year. The new body will be discussed under initiatives.

5.c.8 Commission on Tectonics (COMTEC)

De Mulder said that this had been replaced by a Task Group.

5.d Task Groups

5.d.1 Task Group on Fossil Fuels

Riccardi reported. During 2003, TGFF promoted research supporting an efficient exploitation of fossil fuels, under an environmental/resource management perspective, to offer access to information on related issues and to provide a forum for communication between countries and organisations within the fossil fuels field. To promote these goals, TGFF developed guidelines in line with the main directions of the IUGS *Strategic Action Plan*.

Following the Executive Committee's recommendations, TGFF incorporated new members, representing 28 countries. During 2003, TGFF, through a seminar with representatives from mining and oil directorates in Chad, Niger and Sudan, promoted regional co-operation between those countries. As a follow-up, it organised the Central African Hydrocarbon Resource Management Initiative. This resulted from collaboration initiated by TGFF with the International Peace Research Institute, in Oslo.

For 2004, TGFF requests that Commission status be granted. The year will be used to engage the enlarged membership with priority issues related to developing countries in general, with special emphasis on the Central African region. The 2004 activities will be a pilot phase which for 2006-2008 will be proposed as a YEAR project. The feasibility for a similar project in the Caspian region will be investigated. In connection with all these developments, it is also planned to have an expanded version of the Geointelligence web page in operation by the end of 2004.

The US \$ 3,500 allocated by IUGS in 2003 was used for the Central African seminar. Other funds were obtained from the World Bank section of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, the French Embassies in Norway, Niger and Chad and

the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo. For 2004, TGFF requests US \$ 5,000 as seed money to bring scientists from developing countries into the group.

The goals, activities, and results of this group are very important and should receive full IUGS support.

De Mulder thanked Riccardi for his report and invited TGFF's leader to make a short presentation.

Sinding-Larsen said that TGFF is centred on developing exploitation of fossil fuels. IUGS can directly relate to EITI (Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative) instigated by Blair (UK), which has been applauded by governments, NGO's and even the industry. Firms declare how much revenue money governments receive. EITI is now trying to get a method to increase the transparency of where the money goes. IUGS is well suited to respond to this.

NGOs have no geological knowledge. IUGS could give independent, non-governmental advice in EITI. TGFF is trying this in Chad. There are many resources in Central Africa. On the 7 January, representatives of N and S. Sudan met and agreed to share oil revenues. Discoveries up to now can predict future discoveries – so one can plan for these new discoveries. This can only be done if there is peace in Sudan.

De Mulder thanked Sinding-Larsen for his report. The Executive Committee were happy that the Task Group followed its suggestions. De Mulder asked if the scope of the work can be enlarged, as Riccardi proposed. Sinding-Larsen said that it is possible but the mining industry is more fragmented than the oil industry.

Gupta asked if the analyses are based on existing data. Sinding-Larsen said that it is all published data. Gupta asked if there is much exploration – does TGFF give advice here? Sinding-Larsen said no, TGFF only gives a long term view.

Lambert asked if TGFF works with coal. Sinding-Larsen replied that TGFF ended up concentrating on hydrocarbons, but if it is raised to a Commission, it would include coal in its activities.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee approve the forward look of the TGFF and upgrading it to a Commission, pending a review **All approved.**

5.d.2 Task Group on Global Geosites

Janoschek noted that this was disbanded last year.

5.d.3 Task Group on Public Affairs

Brett (rapporteur) said that there was little to report on. Applegate established a network of contacts but has moved to a major new job in USGS. There are many topics on which IUGS can give advice. The Task Group will meet for the first time at the IGC. Applegate has been in this for some time; IUGS needs someone new.

De Mulder thanked Brett. TGPA will be reviewed prior to the IGC. Seeking new leadership will be a part of the review. Berger said that there had been a threat of closing the Columbian Geological Survey. This could be a theme for a statement – and useful. De Mulder said that IUGS had written several letters supporting surveys under threat. Janoschek said that often the survey is placed in another ministry, but the workforce remains.

5.d.4 Task Group on Geochronological Decay Constants

De Mulder said that there is no report and the rapporteur, Plant, is absent. There will be a review, under Riccardi, on Saturday.

5.d.5 Task Group on Geochemical Baselines

De Mulder noted that Plant (rapporteur) was absent, but a report was sent. The group is active and there is a big budget. Bobrowsky said that they have asked about the results of the EoI for the Grants Proposal. De Mulder replied that this will be discussed later.

5.d.6 Task Group on Tectonic and Structural Geology

Cadet (rapporteur) said that COMTEC was disbanded last year. Passchier agreed to develop a new group. A good meeting was held at the EGS-AGU-EUG conference to set up Terms of Reference. The aims of the group are to develop standards in rheology, promote education in the developing world, to advise IUGS on structural/tectonic matters at need and develop a website.

The ToR are good. The problem is to get a solid work plan and list of officers from Passchier. The final decision on whether it goes forward or not will be at the IGC. Passchier must get the group going. IUGS cannot be absent in this field.

De Mulder thanked Cadet for his report and said that the Bureau will push Passchier on this.

5.e Initiatives

Aaron asked for a definition of Initiatives. De Mulder replied that they are unofficial bodies, directly under the Executive Committee, transitional to either an official IUGS body or an independent body. They are not mentioned in the Statutes.

5.e.1 Geoinicators Initiative

Bobrowsky (rapporteur) said that the Geoinicators concept was to track rapid geological changes. Last year, it held two meetings and this year, one. Reports of these are coming out in *Episodes* and are on-line at the IUGS website. Geoinicators has an active website as well. IUGS cannot maintain Geoinicators forever; it must get financial independence. This Executive Committee cannot tie down the next Executive Committee with financial commitments to old Initiatives. The next Executive Committee may have new ideas; this Executive Committee has done all it can.

Berger said that at each meeting, a follow up is encouraged. Many organisations attended, including non-geological ones. Information was exchanged on a state and national level, giving a good meeting.

Forward plans have changed gear. Geoinicators is now working with the two-year Dark Nature project (ICSU), with Leroy as the leader. Five meetings are planned, each on different areas, regions, problems etc. The next is in Mozambique on mega-river flooding. Then Argentina – an area of rapid lake level change. Geoinicators wants to take the same message from one meeting to the next, to get an archaeological and anthropological background. Geoinicators is collaborating with INQUA, IGCP 490 and ICSU. This is good for IUGS.

A problem is that the Geoinicators checklist needs updating and revision. This is very complex and we have been at it for three years now.

Geoinicators left COGEOENVIRONMENT so that the Executive Committee could give it more support and more flexibility. But how long will this support last? It would help Geoinicators to mature if it knew what its future in IUGS was. De Mulder said initiatives are flexible, but they are

expected to leave in the end. So the question can be turned around – what is Geoinicators long term vision. Berger replied that the next Executive Committee will get a document covering this before the next Executive Committee meeting.

5.e.2 Medical Geology Initiative

De Mulder noted that Plant (rapporteur) is absent and asked Selinus to make his presentation. Selinus said that the Initiative is linked with ICSU, UNESCO, IGCP, IUGS, USGS, AFIP and COGEOENVIRONMENT. It has a website, publishes a newsletter and runs short courses and is developing a registry in the US. There are ~800 members on the mailing list in ~70 countries, from all parts of the world. Selinus added that three billion people are affected by medical geology.

Accomplishments in 2003 include five short courses (Lithuania, Australia, Malaysia, UK), each adapted to the countries needs – 50 % of the scientists at such sessions are non-geologists. A syllabus and a CD were prepared and sent to the Secretary-General and rapporteur.

A 30 page brochure is in preparation with AGI. Proposed journals are being discussed with Elsevier and the Geological Society of London.

A centre for medical geology research and education is being financed by the US in S. China. There will also be one in S. Africa.

There are now some 47 sponsors. The Initiative is planning to become an Association (International Medical Geology Association) – there are three directors (Finkelman, Centeno & Selinus) and Figueredo, Tatu, Ndiweni, Fordyce, Zheng and Weinstein as Councillors – there will be ten in all.

Plans for 2004 includes a workshop in India, IGC sessions, meetings of the planned association, courses in Hungary, S. Africa, India and Australia and a special issue in SEGH. The Initiative is asking for US \$ 15,000.

De Mulder thanked Selinus. Janoschek said this is an example of a small IGCP project growing up to a major effort. The Association is a great idea – hopefully it will be an IUGS affiliated organisation.

5.e.3 COGEOETTT

De Mulder said Gary Lewis, the GSA education director, will be the Chairman of COGEOETTT, which will be established before the Council meeting. Janoschek added that an IUGS officer will meet Lewis in Atlanta in early April, at the National Association of Teachers (12,000 present) and discuss COGEOETTT. The group so far consists of Lewis, Chris King (IGEO), a Korean (planning the Olympiade) and Brönte, from Australia and two Executive Committee members. Brett said that this sounds good. IGU is also strong in education and would be a good partner. De Mulder agreed; in the 4-Unions meeting, education was one of the cross-border topics selected.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee approves this plan. **All agreed.**

5.e.4 A GEOPARKS Approach (GEOSEE)

Bobrowsky said that the group does not deal just with geoparks, but with all aspects of geotourism, geosites, etc. Their tag line is “A **GEOP**arks approach – science, heritage, **Socio-Economics and Education**.”. The first meeting was at Utrecht, to assess interest. IUGS will bring things together initially and then the group can go on alone. After Utrecht, there was a meeting in Paris (February 2004) – with UNESCO and IGU, at which ToR were written.

Many groups are involved, including ProGeo, European Geoparks Network (EGN), IGU, COGEOENVIRONMENT, UNESCO. The Initiative will coordinate activities to assist exchange of information. IUGS does not want to remain in charge.

Each group has its own interest, but there is a common thread. It was suggested that they should meet and discuss the issues together. This was agreed; they will form an organisation, to be implemented at the First International Geoparks Conference in China, in June, 2004.

If they cannot get the organisation established within a year, it will have failed, in which case IUGS will cut its losses and terminate the activity. China will provide a permanent secretariat. IUGS and IGU will provide US \$ 7,000 seed money each.

De Mulder thanked Bobrowsky and asked how he thought the group would look in four years. Bobrowsky replied that the groups will remain autonomous, but exposure will have increased by maintaining IUGS and IGU affiliation. They will share experiences and ideas, too. They should tell us what their long term vision is.

Cadet asked if UNESCO is contributing or does their money go to their own Geoparks Initiative. Janoschek replied that UNESCO's Geoparks is essentially the EGN. The new group may act as UNESCO's evaluators of geoparks. IUGS should be responsible for the scientific part of the geoparks; the IUGS logo will then be up there with UNESCO's.

Brett said he felt that IUGS had enough to do. This is bureaucratic, with a lot of travel money required. De Mulder said that it was part of IUGS' mandate to increase exposure. Financially, it is seed money only. At present, it is important to know if the Executive Committee are in favour of pushing the initiative along. **A majority was in favour.**

5.e.5 Solid Earth Composition and Evolution (SECE)

De Mulder said that SECE is the proposed follow-on body from COPSCE. Discussions were held with the former and new leaders (Yaoling Niu) were met in Nice, 2003. Yaoling Niu was invited to submit proposals for the new body. A document was sent – they want to remain a commission. This is pending the Executive Committee's approval.

De Mulder said there are new and relatively young people in the group. They have broadened the scope and have a new mission statement. The Bureau suggests agreeing with this plan and that they start as a Task Group and will be promoted to Commission by the Council. Brett said this proposal seems OK, except that they could keep the name COPSCE until the Council approves them as the new SECE commission. The Council's permission is needed to cancel a Commission. Why not let them stay as COPSCE until the Council approves the reformulation. They need the name status for the link with Elsevier. **All agreed.**

Gupta said that there is nothing new in the programme; it lacks fundamental points. For Item 5, the answer is known to be 'No, it is not uniform'. This needs to be reformulated to 'Why is it not uniform?'

5.e.6 New Initiatives

Nothing was discussed under this item.

5.f Affiliates

De Mulder said that only affiliates where there is something important to discuss will be dealt with. The reports from the other Affiliated Organisations, which have been read by the rapporteur, have been incorporated into the Annual Report. Refsdal said that nearly all bodies sent in a report.

5.f.1 Arab Geologists Association

Cadet (rapporteur) said that he received a report from Al Hashimi. In 2003, AGA supported a conference in Egypt. De Mulder gave a presentation at this meeting; 300 people attended the meeting. After the Iraq war started, there were great difficulties. They are now trying to get the 6th AGA meeting in Abu Dhabi off the ground. The money they ask for will be to help AGA restart. AGA is good for IUGS visibility. Hashimi is the driving force and he says that there is a strong decline. However, Lebanon says that AGA is the only body doing anything like this – and they definitely want AGA to restart.

Financial request US \$ 2,000. Approved by the Executive Committee.

De Mulder thanked Cadet for his report and asked if there were any comments. Bobrowsky wondered if the AGA could get involved with the USA redevelopment programme in Iraq. Brett said USGS is tapping this fund.

5.f.2 Association of Geoscientists for International Development (AGID)

Cadet (rapporteur) said that AGID still has problems with the growing number of NGOs taking space away from them. AGID's Secretary-General, Reedman, says that the group had a postal ballot. At the IGC they will either regroup or close down. The group is, however, still distributing second-hand books – mostly from Canada. But they are facing a big funding problem. Decentralising to Asia and India may help this – they have a conference in Bangladesh coming up soon. AGID wants closer links with IUGS – they are keen to develop a joint project on geoscience education. It would be good to send a positive message. Few associations are doing their type of work. The money given last year was used for funding students.

Financial request US \$ 500. Approved by the Executive Committee.

De Mulder thanked Cadet for his summary. Gupta said that AGID had been going well until a few years ago. Cadet replied that their funding dropped – so they reoriented their activities.

Berger said that AGID has always been close to IUGS. Since the last Council when a close-down was first discussed, there has been little more discussion. Only the life members are left. There has been no call for an assembly at Florence. The core support from the Canadian CIDA has been cut down. The Council members are trying to figure out what to do. Many other affiliates now support the developing world – with assistance from companies etc. Essentially, the world has changed. IGCP developed since AGID formed and the Internet is now very powerful. Berger added that he felt AGID should retire proudly from the scene.

De Mulder said IUGS should continue to support this fragile body until Florence, when they should decide on their future.

Gupta said that AGID must have a good network – this could be used in the future for other programmes. If a new project is suggested they could take this on and use the existing network of contacts etc.

Janoschek inquired what the US \$ 500 is for. Cadet replied it is for supporting field work in Bangladesh.

5.f.3 Centre Internationale pour la Formation et les Echanges Géologiques (CIFEG)

Cadet (rapporteur) said that, since last year, CIFEG has made a big increase in its activities and their finances are better. They are working with CGI in developing a thesaurus for geoscientists, with EuroGeoSurveys and UNESCO. CIFEG is a good and useful affiliate. No financial request made this year.

5.f.4 Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CGMW)

Janoschek (rapporteur) said that CGMW had sent in an excellent report. CGMW maintains strong links with IUGS and UNESCO and produces geoscience maps. It is largely financed from the BGRM and gets some income from sales, which increased by 3.2 times last year. UNESCO provides money for specific projects. There are also membership fees, but only 44 of 90 member countries paid. They also get money from IUGS. CGMW increases geoscience visibility; their main problem is understaffing. They ask for more than US \$ 2,500 which is what they got last year, without specifying exactly how much more.

De Mulder thanked Janoschek for this report. Eder said UNESCO gives US \$ 25,000 for individual map projects.

5.f.5 Geological Society of Africa (GSAfrica)

Riccardi reported. During 2003 the GSAf was active: 1) co-sponsored/funded the Abuja Geocongress, incorporating the 15th African Colloquium on Micropaleontology and the 5th Colloquium on Stratigraphy and Palaeogeography of the South Atlantic; 2) supported a workshop on the role of African Geological Surveys Organisations; 3) assisted the establishment of geological societies in Eritrea and Mozambique; 4) provided funds to the 3rd International Conference on the Geology of Africa; 5) supported an Urban Geology workshop on cities of Southern Africa; 6) participated in the 6th International Symposium on Environmental Geochemistry; 7) participated in the Sustainable Mineral Development in the Developing World Workshop; 8) continued with the publication of the Newsletter *AFRICAN GEONEWS*; 10) participated through a number of its members in IGCP projects and 11) attended the Executive Committee meeting in Namibia.

There are problems in: obtaining funding, particularly from industry, for specialist meetings; maintaining communications with membership; limited availability of time and energy from council members due to their full-time duties.

For 2004, GSAf will sponsor the 20th Colloquium of African Geology, International Conference on the East African Rift System, International Geological Congress, International Conference on Water Resources in Arid and Semi-Arid Regions of Africa; GSAf 13 International Conference. It will also publish *AFRICAN GEONEWS* (also via Internet), and participate in the YEAR.

Expenditure was £ 42,037.12, of which £ 1,114.12 went to congress support and £ 923 to travel grants. The financial allocation from IUGS is warmly acknowledged and appreciated.

Budget for 2004 is US \$ 14,500. Including US \$ 500 for administration, US \$ 4,000 to attend local/regional meetings, US \$ 5,000 for IGC travel grants and US \$ 5,000 for the GSAf International Conference 2005. There is a specific request to IUGS for US \$ 8,000, and it is remarked that given the present difficulty in raising funds from industry, the continued support of IUGS at the higher level requested is vital, and will be very much appreciated.

De Mulder thanked Riccardi for the report. Janoschek noted that 75% of GSAf's budget is from IUGS. De Mulder said it is a good use of the money. Brambati said that last year they had requested US \$ 5,000 but only got US \$ 4,000. If they received 8,000, they could do so much more.

Brett said that they want a lot for IGC. Janoschek said that although many countries had applied to GEOHOST there were few per country. Eder said only 40 Africans had applied and all were supported. Brett stated that IUGS has not supported other bodies for IGC attendance. IUGS used to give support but after 1989 there was only US \$ 13,000 in the bank, so it was stopped completely. Bobrowsky agreed; the request from IGEO was for IGC support. IUGS should support IGEO but not for IGC, for the same reason.

Gupta said that of those who applied, only half will get travel money and be able to attend. De Mulder said that perhaps potential applicants knew that they would not get travel money, so they regard applying for GEOHOST as pointless.

Financial request US \$ 8,000. The Executive Committee approved an allocation of US \$ 5,000.

5.f.6 International Association for Engineering Geology and the Environment (IAEG)

Bobrowsky (rapporteur) said that IAEG is a large organisation doing important work. However, their financial request seems unrealistic as they are well off. They have 6,000 members and, taking a likely membership fee of US \$ 100 suggests they have a bigger income than IUGS.

Financial request US \$ 8,500 over three years.

De Mulder said that the money would be used to sponsor people from developing countries to attend their 2007 International Conference. Bobrowsky replied that this was not a good idea.

The Executive Committee decided to make no allocation to IAEG.

5.f.7 International Association on the Genesis of Ore Deposits (IAGOD)

Gupta (rapporteur) said that the group was active and in good form. The US \$ 1,000 given by IUGS last year was used to support the membership of five former USSR republics. No financial request was made this year.

5.f.8 International Association for Mathematical Geology (IAMG)

Bobrowsky (rapporteur) said that he was unable to report on how the money given to IAMG was spent last year. The US \$ 5,000 they ask for is to support Russians to go to their next meeting. The group is stable, with not a lot of money in the budget. Their meetings are well attended.

De Mulder thanked Bobrowsky for the report and said that IUGS should ask how the money was spent. Bobrowsky said this should be in all the letters.

The Executive Committee decided to make no allocation to IAMG.

5.f.9 International Consortium on Landslides

Gupta (rapporteur) said that the group is active. The Symposium on Landslides in January 2002 led to the formation of the group, with Sassa as President. It registered as a non-profit organisation in Kyoto and ICL became an affiliate of IUGS. Several meetings have been held since then. They want US \$

10,000 for publications; this seems too much, although they should be supported. UNESCO is also giving some money.

Financial request US \$ 10,000. The Executive Committee approved an allocation of US \$ 2,000.

Eder said it is a joint project – IGCP-UNESCO-IUGS. The IGCP project was very successful. Many other bodies support ICL. UNESCO gives US \$ 20,000 per year (US \$ 10,000 from Earth Sciences, US \$ 10,000 from Water Division).

Janoschek said that money could be given for specific projects – but the projects must be evaluated. Brett added it is not clear why they need money for a Springer-Verlag journal.

5.f.10 International Federation of Palynological Societies (IFPS)

Riccardi (rapporteur) said that IFPS has 19 active affiliated societies. IFPS is a member of IUGS and IUBS. In 2003, IFPS lost one of its member societies: The International Association for African Palynology, and four did not pay their affiliation dues (US \$ 1.50 per member). IFPS published two issues (26/1, 26/2) of its Newsletter *PALYNOS* (300 copies), available online through the IFPS website. IFPS is preparing the 11th International Palynological Congress, and is ready to publish, in book and electronic formats, an updated “*World Directory of Palynologists*”, to be distributed free at the congress.

Total expenditure was £ 4,720.62; £ 1,037 was for *PALYNOS* and £ 3,683.62 as advance expenses for the 11th IPC. IUGS contributed with US \$ 1,000; this boosted funds to help disadvantaged researchers attend the 11th IPC.

No financial request made; Riccardi strongly suggests giving US \$ 1,000

De Mulder thanked Riccardi for his report.

5.f.11 International Geological Education Organisation (IGEO)

Plant (rapporteur) was absent. Janoschek said that at the Calgary meeting (2003) the support of IUGS was prominently displayed. Most IGEO members are secondary level teachers and university teachers, but they include primary education in their field. They are looking to develop a permanent membership. They have asked for US \$ 5,000 – but it is not clear why. Their next congress is in Germany in 2006. They participate in other meetings and will be in COGEOETTT.

De Mulder said the money was for a website/publications and a meeting in Florence.

Financial request US \$ 5,000. This was conditionally approved by the Executive Committee; the money was not to be used for IGC.

Eder said it is a small, enthusiastic group, with a long tradition at the World Congress on Earth Science Education. UNESCO could be more involved – there is a platform for joint activities.

Simpson asked if they were aware of the YEAR. Janoschek replied that they are very keen on it – and had suggested a Geosciences Olympiade.

5.f.12 International Permafrost Association

Bobrowsky (rapporteur) said that the association, which publishes *Frozen Ground*, is very active. It is organising a workshop and needs money for it. The Executive Committee met the Permanent

Secretariat on Svalbard, but volunteers do the groundwork. There is lots of interest within the group which would really appreciate support.

Financial request not specifically defined. The Executive Committee decided to allocate US \$ 2,000.

De Mulder thanked Bobrowsky for his report.

5.f.13 International Society for Rock Mechanics (ISRM)

Sato (rapporteur) said that ISRM encourages international collaboration, to encourage teaching, research and advancement of knowledge in rock mechanics and promotes a high professional standard. ISRM held its 10th International Congress in South Africa. ISRM Regional symposia were convened in France, Sweden and Norway. The Annual Meeting was in South Africa, in which the Board, Council and Commissions had their meetings. Forthcoming International Symposium and meetings are planned in Kyoto, Japan. Award of the Rocha Medal 2003 and the 4th Muller Award were conferred. ISRM publishes *ISRM News Journal*. ISRM requests US \$ 5,000 for partial support for the adjustment of its web site and for financing its activities.

Financial request US \$ 5,000. The Executive Committee decided no support will be provided.

6. REPORTS ON COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES

6.a IUGS/UNESCO: IGCP

Janoschek said that currently, 40 projects are running; with three on extended term and two not funded.

After negotiations, IGCP expanded to include a 5th Working Group in May, 2003. This is being financially supported by UNESCO's Water Division, which wanted the prestige and the system of IGCP; this division does not usually have any budget problems. The expansion, which was welcomed by the National Committees, together with the normal replacement scheme, resulted in many new members on the Scientific Board.

Financing IGCP projects is now more complex – bureaucratic and scientific persons speak different languages. The next Executive Committee and Earth Science Division leader will have to watch the finances carefully.

The US sent money for 2004. An IUGS Annual Report on IGCP was sent early this year, with a request for US \$ 75,000. The US contribution was sent to UNESCO, with a request that the money for IUGS goes to ICSU and then to IUGS and then to projects.

In 2003, there was an internal evaluation of IGCP by UNESCO. The interim report seemed to be bad, but the full report was very positive.

In 2004, the total budget is unchanged, but the distribution is different, because UNESCO needs more money for decentralised projects.

Sums involved are (all US \$):

US contribution		75,000
IUGS		20,000
UNESCO	180,000	88,500 via IUGS
		91,500 via decentralised offices

For 2005, there will be a hard fight for the budget; unclear what will replace the US \$ 75,000.

Eder thanked IUGS for the partnership in an excellent global programme. The Executive Committee should not get too confused by the concept of the decentralised funding. Eder said he had worked in it for 12 years, with Cordani, Fyfe, Brett and de Mulder. Each was pleasant to collaborate with.

Each section has four representatives, which, with the President, Secretary-General and Treasurer of IUGS makes 23 now. There are also UNESCO representatives. The number of women in the group has increased to 7.

The evaluation of IGCP was an internal UNESCO affair, covering 1997-2002. This is done regularly, with external assessors, independent from UNESCO and IGCP. There was an advisors group, chaired by Derbyshire. The assessors did not understand the mix of pure and applied projects. They had to be persuaded to let this balance remain. The final report was long and had several principle findings:

- how to increase the visibility of IGCP
- the role of the National Committees must be increased
- the role of women must be increased

One finding was to increase the role of the developing countries; the problem is with the developing countries. Africa is not in a good shape in projects and the Arab countries are poorly represented. UNESCO urges IUGS to help in spreading IGCP around the world. This leads to the IGC; it needs better representation of the developing world. The Scientific Board expressed interest in popularising Earth sciences. This is a golden opportunity for the next Executive Committee.

De Mulder thanked Eder for his comments.

Sato said that Eder had praised Japan, but the volume from Japan has decreased. Eder replied that the quality from Japan has risen. Projects of regional to global scale are best – sea level changes, global climate etc. But scientific quality is very important. Sato noted that the young people tend to be very specialised and not so regionally oriented.

Riccardi asked what the role of the regional Offices is. Eder replied the idea is to make the programme more visible in the regions. This works partly.

Cadet asked about the new section. It has only one project proposal submitted – on dry lands. This is not easy – there are many agencies in this field. Need to get a proper niche for the 5th section. Also, the water people must collaborate with the Earth science people. We met in Koblenz and Paris – so far, four topics have been selected:

1. Water circulation in sedimentary basins – use petroleum geology to assist;
2. Earth stresses (seismic) and water – USGS and earthquakes;
3. GRACE programme (Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment) – this uses satellite data to follow trans-border water reserves;
4. Coastal groundwater aquifers – problems of salt-water interaction.

The next step is to get an exchange between the Water and Earth Science Divisions – and then to advertise. The hydrogeological community is not so wide – they do not know of IGCP. IUGS should advertise it to its affiliates.

Eder noted that the cooperation between non-governmental (IUGS) and governmental (UNESCO) bodies serves as a role model. The International Basic Science Programme, which is a new body in

UNESCO, has used the IGCP model for their operations. Brett said that ICSU were moving in this direction too, for handling grants.

Cadet said that IUGS is not involved in the oceans. IUGS could promote the idea of another section in IGCP, on oceans. Both Haldorsen and Eder said that they would support this. Eder said he would contact the Ocean Sciences Division, to see if they want to set up an oceans section in IGCP.

De Mulder said this would expand IUGS' network in science and in UNESCO. It would need external money – from IOC (Intergovernmental Oceanic Commission).

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee approved this suggestion for IGCP. **All approved.**

Lambert asked if IUGG is involved in IGCP. De Mulder replied that IUGG is not yet directly involved in IGCP, but if a Working Group on Ocean Studies develops in IGCP, it would be logical to invite IUGG to participate.

6.b IUGS-UNESCO Geological Application of Remote Sensing (GARS)

Brambati (rapporteur) said that there was a detailed report from Marsh (GARS Chairman), with details of the programme. GARS was reviewed in 1998 – changed from pure research to a network. The result was that in 2003, some 40 institutes were involved, from 29 countries – most from the developing world. GARS focussed on volcanic hazards and on landslides – the results were presented in several meetings. UNESCO will establish a new GARS secretariat in UNESCO. They will distribute the IGOS results in many conferences in the future.

De Mulder thanked Brambati for his report.

Eder said that GARS is an IGCP outgrowth, which developed into an autonomous programme. It is now a well recognised international programme, in the IGOS setup – this mirrors the latest development of space technology and space agencies to look in detail at the Earth's surface. Agencies are looking for funding and projects which justify their existence. UNESCO is happy to be involved via GARS. GARS is small and so cannot run the scheme on its own – but IGOS has accepted GARS as the leader in the geohazards theme – up-doming due to volcanoes, changes in stress fields, earthquakes, landslides, eruptions etc.

De Mulder said that this was impressive progress. At the start of this Executive Committee's term, GARS was a sleeping beauty. This is a real opportunity for the Union to get access to the space agencies. Gupta said that the new areas opening in the geosciences via space are critical. The Executive Committee must try and bring more space technology into IUGS.

Brett said that the US has little interest in GARS – has this changed? Eder replied that GARS is much better and the US is back in UNESCO. There is a new MoU with the USGS in remote sensing. The situation is improving.

Berger asked if it was possible for GARS to expand from landslides into all the Geoindicators. GEOIN could link with GARS. Eder said there is no reason why other parameters cannot be logged; they should be involved.

6.c IUGS-UNESCO Mineral Resources Sustainability Program (MRSP – ex DMP)

De Mulder said that they were notified last year that their new vision had been approved. The leadership was met in Paris. MRSP will be a co-sponsor of an IGC session.

Eder said that UNESCO is concerned by the continuing problems; MRSP/DMP is 20 years old. In 2002, they developed a new vision to use mineral resources in a sustainable way – a critical topic. The plan is good but action is lacking.

Brett said that it used to be a good programme – experts visited the developing world and showed models of resources whilst the locals showed the experts their rocks. But there is a time limit on Chairpersons; the Executive Committee must instigate a new leadership. Cadet agreed; every year MRSP is discussed and nothing happens.

Simpson said that communications are poor. MRSP comes into a country – but is not officially heard of. The MRSP approach has been that the US needs commodities and they need to know where they are. This is very bad.

Eder said that IUGS and UNESCO should look critically at MRSP and then start afresh. New people are needed.

De Mulder asked if MRSP should be cancelled now or left to the next Executive Committee. Brett suggested that they have their IGC meeting but should be told that the Chairperson had been in place for two terms, which was the limit under IUGS rules; they must get a new leadership.

6.d Geoparks Initiative

Eder said that the Geoparks idea, born ten years ago, was to have exciting landscapes with good features to popularise the geosciences and for socio-economic development of the region. Then came the idea of a global inventory of sites. The IUGS Secretariat was involved. The idea was to use the list as a source for establishing World Heritage Sites.

A convention was signed in 1992. In the last ten years, several institutions have developed to popularise the geosciences. In 1997 GEOPARKS formed in UNESCO, but this did not work because competition was felt by the Man and the Biosphere Programme which also has sites. UNESCO's Executive Board decided in 2001 to not support GEOPARKS, but to let the Earth Sciences Division offer help if nations actually asked. A set of guidelines were printed and are electronically available. An International Advisory Group was established, with IUGS help. The European Geoparks Network acts as an assessor. In Paris, eight new Chinese Geoparks were integrated into the system – together with the existing 17 parks. The system is booming. EGN has strict rules for defining a region as an EGN Park. UNESCO uses the same rules to define a UNESCO Geopark. It is a good programme – and IUGS is on the board.

Simpson said that COGEOENVIRONMENT keeps a watching brief to see if it should get involved. However, as there is already a high level of activity, it seems unnecessary for COGEOENVIRONMENT to become involved.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee agreed to IUGS becoming involved. **All agreed.**

7. INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS (IGC)

7.a Merger/Integration

Nothing was discussed under this item here; the topic was covered elsewhere.

7.b 32nd IGC – Florence

De Mulder noted that the new Statutes proposed had been approved. He then invited Abbate to comment about the IGC.

Abbate said that, on Dec 15, letters to the IUGS National Committees were sent out, with the new statutes of IGC. IGC will consolidate the statutes and give them to the Council.

There are many titles for the plenary session. Over 10,000 people have pre-registered; 8,192 abstract were submitted to 323 sessions. These will be held as 27 parallel sessions. Convenors are from 54 different countries. 80 field guides will be published – even if the trip itself does not take place. For the presentations, only power point or OHP will be available. An exhibition booth space is 3 x 4 m. There are 70-80 business meetings in 26 meeting rooms; this is nearly all organised.

Geohost' budget was € 408,000 – this has been awarded already

Income:

Italian research Council input	85,600 €
European Community	450,000 €
Italian Govt. (2003)	1,350,000 €
SUB-TOTAL	1,885,600 €
Italian Govt. (2004)	500,000 €
Registration	1,500,000 €
Geo Expo	800,000 €
GRAND TOTAL	4,685,000 €

Expenses

Circulars/guides	600,000 €
Congress Centre	1,100,000 €
Security is in the Congress fee – it includes insurance for participants.	
Technical equipment	300,000 €
Catering	600,000 €
Social programme	500,000 €
Geohost	408,000 €
Bureau	600,000 €
Agency fees	300,000 €
Press agency	150,000 €
GRAND TOTAL	4,558,000 €
SURPLUS	127,600 €

Janoschek noted that the Hutchison fund is in \$, not €. Similarly, the contribution of the registration fee to IUGS is given as 20 € in the circular.

Janoschek added that the date of the Council meetings is important. 20 August is set aside for the first, separate IUGS and IGC Council meetings, with the IGC General Assembly in the evening. Will the merged Council be late, as IGC wants it, or early, as IUGS wants it, to avoid lobbying. Abbate replied that this will be decided before the end of March. Cadet said that Wednesday is very late – a second day may be needed for the Council meeting.

Lambert asked how many will attend – there is nowhere near 10,000 spaces in Florence. Abate replied that it is thought that c. 5,000 will turn up. Berger asked when the programme will be finalised. Abate said that this will be done before May.

Abbate said that persons who have not paid will not have their abstracts in the abstract volume. One must request a printed version – everyone gets a CD.

Brett asked about publications arising from the congress. Abbate said that convenors were asked to look for these themselves. IGC will print the workshops. Maybe a volume of the colloquia will be printed.

Janoschek then gave a run-down on the Hutchison Fund. The interest gave money enough for seven participants. They are all 20-28 years old and will get ~US \$ 1,000 each – depending on how far they have to travel.

7.c 33rd IGC in 2008

De Mulder reminded the Executive Committee that both Norway and Egypt had put themselves forward as official candidates.

De Mulder then invited Sinding-Larsen to give a presentation on the Norwegian bid.

Sinding-Larsen said that the first version of the circular was sent to the IGC in 2002. From this, the Steering Committee gave recommendations. Norway chose an Arctic view, an area where a lot has developed since the last Nordic IGC (1960, Copenhagen), almost 45 years ago. The Arctic is still largely untouched but is threatened. The geosciences are well exposed – good examples of resource extraction in a fragile environment. We have the oldest rocks on Earth (3.8 billion year old rocks at Isua) and can study processes in younger rocks. There is lots of hydrocarbon activity. The Arctic might be the future Middle East.

The bid is a cooperative Nordic bid – Norway, Sweden, Iceland, Denmark and Finland and also including The Faeroes. Such collaboration is critical in the modern world. The geological surveys all support the bid. Support has been obtained from the Prime Minister. There is a new Congress area in Oslo. Sponsors are NGU, NPD, NGI, Norsk Hydro, Statoil, PGS, OER oil, Shell and Norwegian Research Council – the latter were very generous

Field trips will be held to the Kola Peninsula and Novaya Zemlya. There will be Special Symposia, focussing on Arctic matters, Topical Symposia on special themes, such as Medical Geology and General Symposia, covering everything else people want.

The planning is finished – we are now in the promotion stage. The implementation stage will start directly after the vote, if we win it. The second circular has already been drafted.

De Mulder thanked Sinding-Larsen for his presentation.

7.d 34th IGC in 2012

De Mulder said that there were so far two applicants – Australia and India. De Mulder invited Lambert to present Australia's plans.

Lambert thanked de Mulder for the opportunity to present Oceania consortium's plans. The idea for a bid came up during the Australian Strategic Action Plan. New Zealand and Papua New Guinea have been given the opportunity to be fully involved. SOPAC is interested in principle. 'Oceania' may be extended to include The Philippines, E. Timor, Indonesia.

The area is of great interest – it has the oldest mineral in the world and is part of a presently fast moving plate. The major issues are climate and sea level changes, rapid onset of hazards, like volcanoes, earthquakes and the problems of salinity. Further energy – nuclear fuels and CO₂ sequestration – are important, as are mineral rights, rising urban pressures, and the regolith.

The title for the Congress would be Earth Dreaming – Unearthing our Past and Future. This is based on the Aboriginal spiritual feelings and relationship to the land – called 'dreaming'.

What are the advantages to IUGS – synchronicity with the YEAR. Oceania has reefs, glaciers, abundant geohazards, etc. The scientific programme reflects the needs and strengths of the area. We believe we can do a good job. Strong commitment has been given by the Prime Ministers of New Zealand and Australia.

Brisbane is the venue – between the Golden and Sunshine coasts. Australia August is a good time – the temperature is in the upper 20s – late winter. Hotel costs are low – one-third of the price of Florence.

De Mulder thanked Lambert for his presentation.

Aaron asked what Oceania will do apart from field trips. Lambert said that everyone supports in the ways that they can. Brett asked about Timor and The Philippines – many people would be interested to visit these areas. De Mulder asked whether they thought many people would attend – it is a long way. Lambert replied that many recent congresses in Australia have been packed. The cost of a congress in Australia is less than in Europe, offsetting the travel costs.

De Mulder then asked Gupta to present a review of India's plans for the IGC in 2012.

Gupta said that the bid is based on a bid for the IUGG Congress in 2003. Many of the proposals India is making are very similar to that presented by Australia. The Delhi Congress in 1964 was very successful. This time it will be held in Hyderabad – which IUGS already knows well. This is a very beautiful old city – but also modern in many ways. In August, the temperature is 21-29°C. The Geophysics Institute there was founded in 1962. Adequate accommodation is available – and growing. There is space for 6,000 people. Hyderabad is centrally located in India – a 7-hour flight from Europe. Much excellent geology is available, with the Deccan traps nearby, and the Himalayas to the north. A full presentation will be made in Florence.

De Mulder thanked Gupta for the presentation and asked about the convention centre. Gupta replied that there are places where 5,000 people can be seated – other meeting places are available in the Geophysics centre. However, it would not be in a congress centre as such, except for the 5,000 seater room.

Janoschek noted that S. Africa had sent a document insisting on a strict rotation of IGC. However, IUGS is not the proper place to ask for the IGC. S. Africa should be told that there were already two bids in place for the 2012 IGC.

7.e Long term plans and Rotation of Venues

Brett said that the idea, pushed by Frick in Rio de Janeiro, is to divide the world into regions and let each in turn host the Congress. This was accepted in conceptual form, but not in practice.

De Mulder said that it will be discussed at the IGC. Abbate said that the National Committees have been asked for their opinion. A document will be submitted to the IGC Council. Lambert asked if the document will cover all issues and how flexible will the system be? Abbate replied that the document will be comprehensive. Gupta said both the pros and cons must be given to the Council. New representatives will be not be familiar with the discussion.

Brett said that only three countries can do it in Africa – S. Africa, Morocco and Egypt – so they will get it far more often than countries in Europe. Charvet said it is easy to agree in principle – but the practice is very difficult. The subject needs careful preparation; France's National Committee is not unanimous on rotation.

Janoschek reminded the Executive Committee that they are voting members of the IGC Council. The whole Executive Committee must be present at the IGC Council. It must be clear at the IGC Council that even if rotation is adopted, it cannot start until after 2012. Thus 2016 is the first chance for it to be implemented.

8. INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS (ICSU)

8.a Relations with ICSU

Brett said that the stock of geosciences has gone up in ICSU. There are 12 people on the ICSU board – representing all sciences. Relations with the Executive Director (Rosswall) are getting better – he is very interested in the geological sciences. He is involved in asteroids and comet collisions.

Also, IUGS scored a real coup when De Mulder instigated the 4-Unions meeting. The geosciences are now perceived as working together. Other bodies want to get together, next year. IUGS is leading the way, so far as ICSU is concerned – getting the interdisciplinary side going. Previously, ICSU spent a lot of dollars on multidisciplinary committees (SCOPE, SCAR etc). If the Unions can do this, then the resentment of the Unions of the Committees will go away.

De Mulder said that IUGS, IGU, IUSS and IUGG get together again in early September in Boulder (USA).

Janoschek said that Rosswall was keen to come to the opening ceremony, as ICSU representative. Brett added that Rosswall is improving things slowly, but well. The main problem is money – the US funds will be cut. ICSU has been talking in terms of losing half of its grants. Maybe some countries will leave.

8.b Proposed Programs with ICSU

Nothing was discussed under this item.

8.c Scientific Committee on the Lithosphere (SCL-ILP)

Janoschek said that ILP has performed badly in the last two years. This was discussed at their annual meeting in Sapporo. In Windhoek, the Executive Committee decided to reduce its funding level to ILP from US \$ 20,000 to US \$ 15,000. This was a clear sign to ILP, but no improvements have emerged.

During 2003, ICSU proposed to withdraw from SCL-ILP and in Sapporo, de Mulder suggested a review of SCL-ILP. The Secretary-General and President are overloaded with work. A review was

planned for Nice, early in 2003 – but nothing happened. In November a meeting was held at the AGU meeting. It was decided to keep ILP, but it needs new leadership. IUGG and IUGS agreed on moving from a review to a preview by a new leader; Sierd Cloetingh was proposed.

De Mulder added that IUGG, IUGS and Cloetingh met in Paris, February 2004. Allan Green was invited but left early for personal reasons. Cloetingh, as the proposed new President of SCL was asked to give a preview on how ILP should develop. He was asked to write it down as a position paper. This said that ILP links the deep and shallow Earth and also combines geology and geophysics. They are still searching for a Secretary-General – this will be someone in the GFZ in Potsdam, which has offered to support the position. Shamir diplomatically told Shedlock that she had to stand down.

Gupta said that ILP is important. Some of the best science was the 60-70 geotranssects done. ILP did the world stress map – focal map, borehole blowout data and in-situ stress measurements. Recently, they produced a global seismic hazards map – 500 people worked on this, around the globe.

De Mulder added that ILP will come good again; ICSU may regret leaving. Funding may be a problem - IUGS and IUGG should support ILP at an equal level.

Brett said that ILP will be happy to go back to IUGS-IUGG. There are many good things in ILP – it sprang from the International Geodynamics Programme. Much of the deterioration is due to the death of the US Geodynamics Programme. Brett said he would try to get the US Geodynamics Programme moving again.

Cadet referred to the list of items – the last item “Palaeoclimate changes ...etc”; by no definition is the atmosphere a part of the lithosphere. De Mulder said that he had commented on this at the meeting with Cloetingh – they should focus on the lithosphere – the geology-geophysics interface.

Riccardi said that the report is a great improvement on that of last year – last year they had many projects not directly relevant to the lithosphere. Cadet added that there are many Working Groups in ILP, going very well. De Mulder said that existing groups will be allowed to finish off properly.

De Mulder then asked if the Executive Committee approved the report by SCL-ILP. **All approved.**

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee approved of the new leadership. IUGG have already approved. Does the IUGS Executive Committee also approve – this is required by the by-laws. **All approved.**

De Mulder proposed that IUGS should pay the same amount of money as IUGG this year – US \$ 17,000. **All agreed.** Gupta asked if ILP got money from ICSU – they might be short of funds. De Mulder replied that they have US \$ 114,000 in the bank.

8.d ICSU Grants

Janoschek said that, in 2003, IUGS got no grant. For 2004, the project of Leroi (Dark Nature) was awarded US \$ 100,000. The first project, a meeting in Mauritania was pre-financed by IUGS (US \$ 25,000). Brambati noted that the ICSU money has arrived.

Janoschek said that for 2005, eight submissions arrived, all asking for support, one week before the final date. Another weak project arrived, but it was suggested that they improve it and submit it again next year; the proposers agreed. Projects submitted by ILP were sent with an accompanying letter

saying that if ICSU leaves SCL, then IUGS/IUGG will take over the project responsibility. ICSU agreed to this.

IUGS has signed now

1 project in Category 1 as lead applicant

1 project in Category 2 as lead applicant

6 more projects as a supporting applicant.

8.e ICSU Committees and IUGS Representatives

De Mulder reviewed the ICSU committees with IUGS representation.

CODATA (Committee on Data for Science and Technology) – Fabbri – he has now retired from ITC and could be replaced by someone in CGI. Can that be left to the Bureau? **All agreed.**

COSTED (Committee on Science and Technology in Developing Countries) – Gupta – he was on the ICSU review panel. COSTED is asking for regional centres – in Middle East (Jordan), S. America, Africa (S. Africa), Asia (Shanghai). A good programme.

Brett said that ICSU's method of selecting people for Committees is not transparent. The committee that was looking into how the environment works (replacing COSTED) was decided without consultation. No geoscientists in it. ICSU just does not understand the importance of geosciences. Having made the finances transparent, the next thing is to make the committees transparent. Brett said he will do this.

Janoschek said that the request for a name for the energy committee came at short notice. Plant suggested Durukat and he is on the committee. De Mulder asked if he knows that he is the IUGS representative. Will he report back to us? Brett said that he probably did not know.

Brett added that Shamir could be asked to tell IUGS/IUGG about what is going on in the Committee Looking at the Environment

COSPAR (Committee on Space Research) – Singhroy – Janoschek said that they met in Vancouver in 2003; keen to be IUGS' representative, but he never sends a report. He could be replaced by someone from GARS/IGOS.

SCAR (Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research) – Ricci – he never reports.

SCOR (Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research) – Bonatti – again, no reports.

Cadet said that if they do not report, why have them. Janoschek replied that IUGS gives no money so they cannot be forced. De Mulder said it would be better to support a few persons and get a report.

SCOPE (Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment). Janoschek said that he had met the group in Granada, in 2003, and suggested that they should contact Geoinicators – but they never did. The Secretary-General of IUGS is an *ex-officio* member the committee – and writes a report.

IGBP (International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme) – Bobrowsky (replaced Derbyshire).

8.f 4-Unions Meeting

De Mulder said that, the 4-Unions meeting was held in Paris on the 6-7 Feb – IUGS (host) with IUGG, IGU and IUSS. Attending were the Presidents and Secretary-Generals, with Brett and Goldfarb (ICSU), and Cadet. The meeting started with a Tour de Table – to see what the other unions do, what the problems are, how they operate. That was a very good and open discussion. Then fields for future scientific and administrative cooperation were identified. On the scientific side five topics: health, hazards, groundwater, desertification and megacities were selected. Cross-union teams of four persons, with each union represented, will be made and will prepare position papers, plans and budgets, for discussion in Boulder, September 2004. Each Union will insert some money – the amount is uncertain.

Four of the topics are in the YEAR. These will be connected – possibly with the same chairpersons. Representative of the Unions will be invited to be in the teams developing issues for the YEAR – so that they do not diverge too much and overlap is also avoided. Projects will look for an interface with social sciences and education. IUGG will be leading two of the teams; IUGS is leading one, on Health (medical geology). The Bureau suggested Selinus for the Health topic and he agreed

Names are needed for positions in the other Task Forces.

Administratively, there should be mutual participation in Executive Committee meetings, cooperation and partnership in international years, potentially acting as proxies at meetings.

Brett commented that the five topics are also in the ICSU high-priority list – all have a high societal impact. ICSU is happy with this development.

Lambert said that Australia's plans for IGC are based on a failed bid for the IUGG meeting in 1999. Is their potential for a joint IUGG-IUGS meeting in Brisbane? Some of the people from the IUGG bid are now working in the IGC bid-team. Would this be welcomed? De Mulder replied that IUGS has close cooperation with IUGG. However, there is no plan yet to join the IGC and IUGG meetings.

Brett commented that just as an IUGS affiliate can propose session for the IGC, so can other bodies. Thus IUGG's seven constituent Associations could submit proposals. And if the Australians want to form their IGC in this way, then that is their independent right. Gupta agreed; this would not be a merged meeting, but it would be good. Simpson added that in Oceania there are subduction zones, hot-spots, volcanoes – things of common interest to the two unions.

Brett commented that there is a big move in ICSU towards working with the Social Sciences. The President of IGU is a social scientist and historian. IUGS could also work with the psychology Union. There is talk of broadening the definition of ICSU – to let less 'scientific' bodies in. ICSU is forming a committee to look at the criteria for joining.

De Mulder noted that social sciences are an absolute must in applied sciences. Bobrowsky added that Rosswall requested the Asteroids group to involve Social Sciences. The International Astronomical Union was unable to accomplish this, but with IUGS participation (via Bobrowsky) this has been done.

9. IUGS POLICY AND STRATEGIC MATTERS

9.a IUGS Statutes

Janoschek said that IGC must be considered in this item. The two bodies want to merge/integrate. After discussions with the Steering Committee, it had been agreed that there would be one Council. The IGC people in the Steering Committee have been careful to keep the maximum possible

independence of IGC from IUGS, contrary to IUGS' wishes. Draft Statutes and Byelaws of IUGS and IGC were distributed last year. It is hoped that these will pass both Councils without much trouble.

In the work done on the Statutes (by Sato and Janoschek) the two bodies were kept separate as far as possible. Thus there must, at least initially, be two voting methods.

IUGS matters – One (active) country, one vote, except for budget matters, which is by the IGC method.

IGC matters – Active IUGS members have votes equivalent to their IUGS membership category. Inactive countries and non-IUGS members have one vote.

A crucial problem in IGC is that the IGC Steering Committee (SC) exists between Congresses but is not permanent. The SC comprises is entirely dependent on the next host country, so it is a very weak body. IGC agreed that this is a weak point and thus the Congress should be in IUGS. But the position of that body in IUGS is unclear. IGC want it parallel to the Executive Committee – so that the Council deals with the Executive Committee and a Congress Committee. IUGS would also like to have some Congress experts on the Committee, but IGC are unhappy with this. Janoschek concluded that he was not really happy with the Draft Statutes of 16 October 2003 – but it was the best compromise possible with IGC.

The Councils of IUGS and IGC will convene for ~90 minutes at the start of the meeting in Florence, on the same day, and with only one agenda item – the Statutes. Then there will be the IGC General Assembly. This should ratify the new IGC Statutes and then permanently dissolve itself. Presently, all IGC Council decisions must be ratified by the General Assembly. It could become very complex if Council accepts something and the General Assembly does not ratify it, so dissolving the General Assembly is important.

After dissolution, the 32nd IGC will open and the new Council (merged) will meet – for a full day, with the agenda from previous IGCs.

What is needed is a formal adoption of the proposed new IUGS Statutes. Then the Permanent Secretariat can forward these to the National Committees. We should add a copy of this to the letter to the adhering bodies.

Janoschek added that the alteration of the Statutes to allow CCOP in must be approved by Council. It would be best if a group of countries proposes in the merged Council that the Statutes should be totally rewritten. It is not possible to change the Statutes from the floor.

Gupta asked what will the name of the new Council be – IUGS or IGC or what? Janoschek said that the IUGS draft statutes has IUGS Council and IGC accepted it.

Sato said that the whole thing is very complex. Cadet agreed – a 90 minute meeting is a very short time to do this in. A short, very clear document sent in advance is needed, explaining it all very simply and signed by both IGC and IUGS. It would be a catastrophe if the discussions were very long and it did not go through. Gupta agreed; delegates will want to be up to date on their information.

Cadet said that the new Executive Committee will be elected by the merged Council. Who is elected on the IGC? Janoschek replied that this is the weak point – no-one is elected.

Brett asked if the objections by the IGC were strong. Janoschek replied that they had been very strong. So, if we cannot accept amendments from the floor, the whole thing will be delayed by four years if any amendments are proposed from the floor.

Gupta referred back to the letter Cadet proposed, asking whether it could ask for votes in advance – so that there is no discussion from the floor. It would simplify everything. Janoschek said that a basic support from a core group of countries was needed. If we can be sure we have the required majority, then the statutes can be changed. De Mulder added that when the new statutes are adopted and the General Assembly is dissolved, the National Committees have to say who their representative in the new Council is. Janoschek said that the letter to the National Committees must state there will be two voting procedures in the new Council and that they must be fully prepared for this.

De Mulder said that the complexity may be advantageous – it may make the merged Council request the new Executive Committee to prepare a new set of simplified Statutes.

Brett said that when they get the Statutes, they should also be told that they should send written comment back immediately. Thus we can be prepared. Bobrowsky agreed that a written comment shows that they have given the issue priority. (See Action 80, below).

Gupta suggested that the draft letter should be written now so that it could be discussed. This was agreed; a draft was prepared and commented on by the Executive Committee at the end of the meeting.

De Mulder then asked if the draft 16 October 2003 Statutes, covering the merger of the IUGS and IGC Councils are approved by the Executive Committee and can be sent to the National Committees. **All approved.**

9.b Road Map – Mid-Term Vision Document

Riccardi said he received a letter from the US National Committee – from Grant Heiken; this may come up in the Council. De Mulder replied that the letter had been sent very late and the comments were based on an earlier, preliminary version. IUGS received several other comments which were dealt with in the final text.

Janoschek added that his reply to Heiken came back three months later with ‘Addressee not known’ stamped on it. Brett said this was very bad; it should have been forwarded to Heiken or to the new leader of the National Committee.

9.c Grant Proposal policy

De Mulder recalled that at Windhoek it was decided to invite the IUGS family *sensu lato* to make proposals via an Expression of Interest (EoI). After approval, some of these would be asked to develop a full proposal. This was announced on the website, in *Episodes* and in letters.

Several EoIs were received, collated by the Permanent Secretariat and sent to an evaluation group consisting of Derbyshire & Wörner (CRD) and de Mulder, Janoschek & Brett (Executive Committee).

Of the submissions two are ineligible. The results for the remaining six are comparable. The ranking was:

- 1 Application of Geosciences for Sustainable Development of Cross-Border Areas (M. Graniczny et al.).
- 2 Societal and Environmental Consequences of Rapid Geological Change (T. Berger).

- 2 Assessing Trade-offs Between Mineral Development and Ecosystem Health (J. Pereira; K. Johnson).
- 4 East Africa Geochemical Database for Environmental Applications (T. C. Davis; P. Schmidt-Thomé).
- 5 The Global Geochemical Reference Network: East and Southeast Asia and India (J. Plant, D. Smith).
- 6 Future Directions in Stratigraphy (F. Gradstein).

De Mulder said that the Executive Committee should choose a few to be made up to full proposals.

Cadet said he had reservations looking at the proposals; all are from names well known in IUGS. It has a very internally oriented character. Bobrowsky said that the Committee has done a good job with what they got. But the Executive Committee is not committed to spend any money. The money could be kept until next year; long-term commitments are bad. IUGS has been overly biased towards COGEOENVIRONMENT, essentially a Quaternary group; IUGS is now doing more geography and social sciences than geology. Bobrowsky thought that IUGS should move away from Quaternary aspects. Palaeontology is a great success in the world, via dinosaurs. But IUGS has done *nothing* to bring palaeontology back into IUGS. The grants proposals must be pushed in e-bulletins and in letters.

De Mulder thanked Cadet and Bobrowsky for their comments. However, the system was properly advertised – but it may take time to get going fully.

De Mulder said that there was no intention to allocate more money than currently available. Bobrowsky suggested that less could be spent, so that this Executive Committee leaves some for the next Executive Committee. Alternatively, the money could be kept for pushing the YEAR projects. De Mulder said that the Grants Proposal scheme is set up – it cannot be now ignored. At least one project should be funded. Janoschek added that one project got a score of 2.8 (maximum 3) – it cannot now be rejected.

Janoschek said that the Bureau had calculated that three projects could be funded for 3-4 years based on the money *currently available* (US \$ 100,000) and based on what projects have asked for – not what they necessarily get. Bobrowsky said that only one project should be funded, but fully. Brett said that projects are often inflated financially; since it is known that they will be trimmed.

Rice noted that these were only EoIs. The idea of EoIs is that *all* the good ones are asked to expand their document to a full proposal. Project 4, which got the best EoI review, may submit a poorer final project than another project. Janoschek agreed but said that at present there is no process to review the full project proposals once submitted, after the EoI stage. The system needs to be rethought. Sato asked what would happen if the project (4) was not good. De Mulder said it would not be funded.

De Mulder summarised, by saying that the feeling of the Executive Committee was that only one project, the one on cross-border problems (nr 4) should be funded. **A majority agreed.**

De Mulder said that project 7, from the International Permafrost Association is good; this is part of the IPY. But the project was not linked to an IUGS body and was thus rejected on technical grounds. Janoschek added that it had no budget. De Mulder suggested that IPA be told to resubmit it, in proper form.

10. International Year of Planet Earth (YEAR)

De Mulder re-iterated that the International Year of Planet Earth is an IUGS initiative which was immediately followed-up by UNESCO's Earth Science Division which is thus labelled as co-initiator. The YEAR's logo, reflecting the position of the solid Earth in the Earth system, was provided by the organisers of the German Year for the Geosciences in 2002. The tag-line, *Earth Sciences for Society*, reflects our intention of the YEAR, which is in fact a three year period (2005-2007). The middle year (2006) is aimed for proclamation by the United Nations. The website (www.esfs.org), flyers and brochures provide much information about this endeavour.

Essential in the YEAR is the dual approach on both science and outreach which makes our International Year different from most ICSU or UNESCO years. As a first step towards UN-proclamation, a high-level information meeting was held at UNESCO's HQ on February 11, 2004, in Paris. 58 UNESCO ambassadors and many scientific or non-scientific bodies were present. six UN member countries gave official support at the meeting (Argentina, Brazil, Russia, Italy, Jordan, and China). India and Mexico followed shortly later. Full partners, ready to share the responsibility for the Year, include IUGG, IGU, ILP, later followed by IUSS. Some ten Associate partners have provided their moral support.

The eight science themes focus on the interaction of the geosciences and society. These were selected by voting from a list of 22 themes developed by the Science Programme Committee (SPC). Key Text Teams of 4-6 scientists will now write brochures with key questions to be addressed in the YEAR and inviting the geoscience community to propose projects for implementation. Publication of the science brochures before the IGC is planned. The science themes partly coincide with the science topics selected by the four collaborating ICSU geo-unions. Redundancy is prevented by mutual personal representation in both groups.

There is positive interaction with the organisations behind IPY and IGY+50 (IUGG). After a (modest) start in 2005, the UN Year in 2006 will be followed by a culmination in 2007, which partly coincides with IPY and IGY+50. It is hoped that by 2008, the level of awareness in politicians will be significantly increased. Further, many items will continue after the YEAR is technically finished by 2008.

The total budget needed for the YEAR is roughly estimated at US \$ 20 million; US \$ 1 million for each science topic, ten million for outreach and two million (10%) for administration.

To get the YEAR approved by the UN General Assembly, more political support by UN nations, through their Ministries of Foreign Affairs is needed. Individual countries are encouraged to declare their own 'YEAR'. Financial support has to be collected and the media has to become involved. De Mulder finished by apologizing for Schalke's absence, due to a serious illness, and by thanking him for his contributions.

Eder mentioned that the YEAR's subtitle, *Earth Science for Society*, has societal, human and economic aspects and is therefore important for the whole UN, including its Millennium Goals on Human Rights, Poverty Reduction etc. UNESCO considers the high level meeting in February as having been extraordinary successful. IGCP, as a UNESCO-IUGS programme, produced a statement on the YEAR which proved to be of great value to get political support by UNESCO member countries. The UN highly appreciates communication between governments and NGO's. In its June meeting, IOC will probably support the YEAR. A German exhibition on underground space may herald the YEAR prior to the UN official sanction. Eder was confident that the YEAR will receive the official support of UNESCO's Executive Board in October.

Sato said that the National Committee of Japan gave full support to the YEAR. The next step is to get support at ministerial level, via Japan's Science Council. A Japanese Committee for the YEAR is in preparation aiming at a national YEAR in cooperation with the international initiative. Pereira said that the Science Council of Asia – strong on sustainable development issues – might be a good entry for the YEAR in Asian countries.

Janoschek said that there is a gentleman's agreement in Europe not to actively support UN International Years. They are perceived as being too costly, with a minimal output. But, as shown by the UN Years of Rice, and against Slavery (both 2004), and of Sport & Physical Education (2005), launched by Tunisia, European countries do not vote against such events, but abstain. Brett said that the US does not favour UN Years either; Charvet added that France will not vote against it.

Brett said that the YEAR was a good and potentially successful concept but that he was very concerned about its implementation. A UN proclamation would not guarantee the active participation of individual geoscientists. The scientific themes are top-down and time is running short. In contrast, the International Polar Year works bottom-up, resulting in many science proposals. He agreed that outreach is very important, but how should that be done? What would be the role of the full partners? Why through the UN and why not all Years (IGY+50, IPY) under one umbrella? Brett also had concerns on funding, as no financial commitments by sponsors had been made so far. ICSU endorsed IPY and the YEAR was noted. Is there a fall-back scenario if the YEAR is not proclaimed? Finally, he commended the efforts by the Management Team but expressed concern on the small size of the team.

De Mulder replied that the more difficult route through the UN General Assembly had been deliberately chosen, so as to generate maximum impact at the political level. Political support should be collected from UN-diplomats based in Ministries of Foreign Affairs which is a rather complex process. To that end, the YEAR's Management Team determined a three steps approach is chosen: 1. collect support from national geoscience communities; 2. get support at a ministerial level; 3. get support from UN-diplomats, housed in the ministries of Foreign Affairs.

As to the science programme, de Mulder replied that, in order to avoid chaos, the Management Team of the YEAR deliberately chose to bring some structure into the programme before scientists were invited to submit their proposals once the science brochures are published. Four months remains before IGC takes place, where we can communicate our plans to geoscientists and invite them to submit proposals. The science brochures should be printed by then.

The Outreach programme is chaired by Nield – the science editor of Geological Society of London. If the UN comes in, then other bodies will come in and this will hopefully generate much of the financial support. Potential supporters have said they will give money upon UN proclamation. Cadet suggested a clear focus on educational material and involvement of teachers in outreach. De Mulder confirmed that education is a vital element in the YEAR.

Bobrowsky said that he would like to see a detailed management plan for preparing the YEAR, given its financial dimensions. There should also be an exit strategy if either major delays occur or if no or insufficient funding would arrive.

Eder advocated an optimistic but realistic view. The Year of the Oceans (1999), the Year of the Mountains (2002), and the Year of Fresh water (2003) were UNESCO years only. Those years had limited impact. Thus the YEAR should go for a UN Year. He reiterated that companies will only give money if the UN proclaims the YEAR.

De Mulder replied to Bobrowsky that a full document covering all management aspects of the YEAR is still missing, mainly due to the illness of Schalke. Nevertheless, the team, now *de facto* chaired by de Mulder, is in good shape, although small. It also includes Eder for UNESCO, Nield for the Outreach Planning Committee (OPC), Derbyshire for the SPC, Janoschek, and Zhang Hongren.

De Mulder then said there were several questions to consider:

(1) Does the Executive Committee approve the Status Report of actions for the YEAR for the past year? **A majority approved.**

(2) Prolongation of the preparatory phase. Implementation can only start when China tables the YEAR for the UN Agenda. **A majority approved.**

(3) As to the Implementation Phase, de Mulder listed ten items to be addressed. One of them concerns developing a professional implementation body for the YEAR, once proclaimed, preferably linked to UNESCO. Cadet was concerned about the very high proposed salary costs for a director of that body. Riccardi proposed approving the implementation phase in general, pending more details. Janoschek said that if the YEAR runs, the work cannot be done by the Executive Committee. So, UN proclamation of the YEAR implies creating a professional body with its financial implications. **All agreed** on this view and that the professional body should be led by a geoscientist and be controlled by a Board with strong membership related to IUGS. The proposed elements in the Implementation Phase were agreed upon, on the condition that sufficient money would be available.

Brett raised concerns on the anticipated financial contribution by ILP, as IUGS is one of their main sponsors. De Mulder replied that their financial position gives no reason for concern. Apart from the initiators, full partners and Shell, also the geological surveys of Austria and the Netherlands, as well as the Geological Society of London and maybe China are contributing financially to the preparations for the YEAR. The total income for 2004 is anticipated to be ~US \$ 280,000. The expenses will mainly comprise printing costs, travel for MT members and bureau costs.

Responding to a question raised by Bobrowsky, de Mulder replied that the Executive Committee will be informed about the names of the Key Text Teams.

Cadet suggested splitting the budget requested from IUGS into a sum to be provided now and one to be allocated at the Executive Committee meeting in August. **All agreed.** The budget for 2003 was presented. A surplus of US \$ 33,000 was transferred to 2004. The same holds for US \$ 16,000 of commitments. **All approved.**

Brett said that specific benchmarks should be set to decide if the YEAR will proceed or not. De Mulder said that the MT identified the February Paris meeting as such a benchmark. That went very well. Next will be China's decision to bring the YEAR into the UN system. If this is not done in 2004, the fall-back scenario is for UN proclamation in 2007 (ie a one year delay). If no proclamation through the UN system is possible, the MT will cease pursuing the matter and there will be no International Year of Planet Earth.

Riccardi said that more input is needed from the National Committees. De Mulder said that all IUGS National Committees have been approached and invited to cooperate. May positive replies have been received and no negative replies, although some are cautious. Riccardi asked what they can do

scientifically. De Mulder said that they can push the eight themes along in their national research programme.

11. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

11.a UNESCO

Nothing was discussed under this item

11.b Other Organisations

De Mulder said these were covered previously.

12. REQUEST FOR FUNDING AND BUDGETS FOR 2004

De Mulder said that the Bureau had held a preliminary discussion on how much money should be given; the Executive Committee can of course change this.

The Executive Committee went through the proposed **EXPENDITURES**. All sums listed were **agreed** on by the Executive Committee

Joint Programmes funding (all agreed by EC):

MRSP (no request made)	US \$	0
GARS	US \$	7,000
ILP (same contribution as IUGG)	US \$	17,000

Commission funding (all agreed by EC):

COGEO. (to be given to GEM)	US \$	10,000
CGI	US \$	5,000
CSP	US \$	3,430
INHIGEO	US \$	4,500

De Mulder proposed that CGSG be given a budget of US \$ 3,000 on the basis that it develops a real proposal and that it is established as a Commission. **All agreed.**

CGSG (no budget yet)	US \$	3,000
ICS (requested US \$ 53,500)	US \$	50,000
<i>(Regular support for ICS)</i>	<i>US \$</i>	<i>35,000</i>
<i>(Florence meeting)</i>	<i>US \$</i>	<i>15,000</i>

Riccardi asked why ICS gets so much when GSAf does not get what they asked for. De Mulder said that the extra money GSAf had asked for was for IGC and this is covered by the GEOHOST programme. Brett said this is simply a trick. De Mulder said that at the ICS discussion today it was explicitly asked if they will have a review meeting at IGC. Brett replied that ICS is not god given – fifteen years ago all commissions got such money. Now only ICS gets so much. Why? Bobrowsky said they produce results and it is important; they should be fully supported. Janoschek said that it was decided in ICS to have a heads of sub-commissions meeting every two years – but it is cheaper to hold it at Florence than to delay till next year. Brett said that if you want a meeting during the Congress it is to save funds.

COGEOETTT (via IGEO)	US \$	5,000
----------------------	-------	-------

(For COPSCE/SECE funds, see initiatives, below.)

Proposed Task Group funding (**all agreed by EC**):

TGTSG (IASTG money)	US \$	5,162
TG Fossil Fuels	US \$	5,000
TG Public Affairs (none requested)	US \$	0
TG Decay Constants (none requested)	US \$	0
TG GGB (requested US \$ 20,0000)	US \$	1,500

Brett asked what the US 20,000 requested by TGGGB was for. Bobrowsky said TGGGB does great work. De Mulder said that the money was for fundraising – not for scientific purposes.

Proposed Initiative funding

Geoindicators	US \$	15,000
---------------	-------	--------

Bobrowsky said this is a banner year for the Dark Earth project – lots of money for similar activities. What is the money for? Refsdal said that the report is on the web, as agreed in Windhoek. The report states there will be workshops in several countries. Bobrowsky said that there was a commitment of Geoindicators to pay Dark Nature US \$ 10,000 – is this part of the request? (This was later established to be the case.) De Mulder suggested approving the US \$ 15,000, but payment was pending clarification from Berger as to what the money was for. **All agreed.**

De Mulder said that Medical Geology requested US \$ 15,000; the Bureau suggested US \$ 10,000. Bobrowsky wanted to know why. The group does lots of workshops. As rapporteur, Bobrowsky strongly recommended the full US \$ 15,000 should be paid. **All agreed.**

Medical Geology	US \$	15,000
GEOSEE	US \$	7,500

Brett asked if this was for the meeting in China. Bobrowsky replied no, the money is for future travel for the GEOSEE executive, yet to be elected. This is not for Executive Committee travel or travel to China. De Mulder noted that this is on the basis that IGU also pays US \$ 7,500. Brett asked if UNESCO were paying anything. De Mulder replied, only in kind. **All agreed.**

SECE (no request made)	US \$	0
------------------------	-------	---

Proposed Committee funding (**all agreed by EC**):

Finances (still dormant)	US \$	0
Publications (requested US \$ 12,500)	US \$	10,000
ARC (no budget fixed)	US \$	0
CRD (no meeting in 2004)	US \$	0

Grants Proposal funding (**agreed by EC**):

De Mulder said that one EoI had been chosen and if the subsequent project was up to standard, it would be funded

Funding this year (2004)	US \$	14,000
Total funding (3 years)	US \$	44,000

Thus surplus is US \$ 50,000 (from last year) and US \$ 36,000 from this year, of which US \$ 30,000 is committed for the next Executive Committee if the reports are good. Thus the overall surplus from this year is US \$ 6,000, giving an effective surplus of US \$ 56,000 in the Grants Proposal fund.

Funding for the Hutchison Fund US \$ 8,000 **(agreed by EC)**

Proposed Affiliates funding **(all agreed by EC)**:

IAEG (requested US \$ 8,500) US \$ 0
IAMG (requested US \$ 5,000) US \$ 0

The Executive Committee agreed that these bodies are not financially poor.

ICL (requested US \$ 10,000) US \$ 2,000

Janoschek said the money was to start a journal. Bobrowsky said that is not possible; money can be used elsewhere, but the journal is self-sufficient. Bobrowsky suggested US \$ 2,000 as seed money.

IPermaA (requested US \$ 15,000) US \$ 2,000

Janoschek said that this was for a huge borehole project – it sounds like the funding for the Grants Proposal. Suggest that US \$ 2,000 be given in goodwill. Brett said that their Grants Proposal project was excellent – hopefully they will resubmit it next year.

AGID US \$ 500
AGA US \$ 2,000
CGMW (requested >>US \$ 2,500) US \$ 4,000

Brett said that the US \$ 8,000 GSAfrica requested included money for the IGC. All the GEOHOST applicants from the developing world were supported. Riccardi suggested giving US \$ 5,000 to be used only for activities in Africa.

GSAf (requested US \$ 8,000) US \$ 5,000
IFPS (no request made) US \$ 1000

Riccardi said that although none was requested, IUGS usually supports the group. US \$ 1,000 would be a good sum.

IGEO – see budget for COGEOETTT, above

Other payments **(all agreed by EC)**:

YEAR (first tranche) US \$ 22,500

ICSU fee US \$ 9,500
ICSU Dark Nature (in & out) US \$ 10,000

IGCP contribution US \$ 20,000

Administrative expenses

Permanent Secretariat US \$ 2,000
Routine Meetings US \$ 30,000
Representation at scientific meetings US \$ 5,000

Promotional Items

Exhibitions (Booth) US \$ 5,000

Annual Report	US \$ 7,000
Brochure	US \$ 7,000
Stratigraphic chart reprints	US \$ 4,000

Proposed funding for *Episodes* (all agreed by EC):

Contribution to China	US \$ 23,000
Reserve fund for <i>Episodes</i>	US \$ 15,000
<i>Episodes</i> dist. (UNESCO, in & out)	US \$ 3,000
Website (no request made)	US \$ 0
Bank Charges	US \$ 3,000
Contingency	US \$ 30,000

Brambati said that this came to a total of US \$ 398,592. This is less than actually requested this year, but more than requested last year. Brett asked how much there is in the bank. Brambati replied plenty – in the order of US \$ 750,000, but money is still coming in from 2003.

Janoschek noted that in 2003 the US Tax Office had taken an Audit of the IUGS tax returns; there had been no problems with this and IUGS ‘passed’.

13. PREPARATION FOR IUGS COUNCIL MEETING

Janoschek said that the first Council meetings of IGC and IUGS have been discussed already. Brett commented that one could say that no new total changes to the Statutes will be accepted and that parts not discussed in writing beforehand cannot be discussed at the meeting. De Mulder asked if this complies with the Statutes. Brett said that it does.

Bobrowsky asked how long the second Council meeting would be. Janoschek replied more than one full day.

Berger asked if Commissions made a verbal report and who approves the proposed new leaders. Janoschek said no verbal reports are made. The Executive Committee must approve the new leaders and the Council ratifies them, after it accepts the report of that body.

De Mulder suggested that it was important to know which heads of Commissions will be available at the Council – to answer questions which the Executive Committee defers to them. Brett said such questions are rare.

Brett noted that if there was to be a meeting with the affiliates, a space and a time needs to be designated.

De Mulder asked if there were any scrutinizers of the budget. Janoschek replied that that is done in the country of the Treasurer. Bobrowsky commented that in that case there should be an auditors report at the Council.

14. UPDATE

14.a. IUGS Annual Report 2002 & 2003

Rice said that the Annual Report for 2002 was finished. Refsdal had two copies here for final corrections. The Bureau decided in Utrecht that this report will be posted on the website as a pdf file. The format was done by Refsdal and is very good.

The 2003 report is well under way; the styling will again be done by Refsdal. This report will be distributed at the IGC but the text will be sent to the Executive Committee to read first.

14.b. IUGS Directory

Brett asked if the Directory can be sent out to the Executive Committee. Refsdal said it is on the website. Bobrowsky commented that this is not enough – people need to be able to sort it by keywords, for special reasons.

14.d. IUGS Logo

Nothing was discussed under this item.

14.d. IUGS Brochure and Flyer

Refsdal said that the flyer had been updated. The brochure will be finished by the IGC. It will be an unfolding hard cover with eight sides each a bit smaller than A4. It will be distributed to the Executive Committee for comments.

14.e IUGS Exposure and Advertising Products

De Mulder said that he had made a PowerPoint presentation about IUGS. Rice had improved it slightly. This also includes material on the YEAR.

De Mulder said that a poster had been printed in China, using the usual IUGS picture. Zhang Hongren asked where they should now be sent. De Mulder suggested sending 25 to each Executive Committee member. The rest could be distributed free at the IGC.

De Mulder listed the other promotional items – mini-compasses (Sato), business card holders (Bobrowsky), IUGS ties (*Episodes* office). Janoschek said that all items at the IGC must be given away free – for tax reasons.

14.f. IUGS Exhibition Policy

The new IUGS booth was on display in the meeting room, promoting IUGS and the YEAR. Janoschek said a new panel is needed directly after Florence, promoting the 2008 IGC and the YEAR, as well as IUGS.

De Mulder asked where it should be displayed – it needs people to man it, but it can go as ordinary luggage (25 kilos). Gupta said he can use it in December 2004, in Hyderabad – there is an IUGG supported meeting, with lots of overseas attendees.

15. FREE DISCUSSION

Nothing was discussed under this item

16. VENUE AND DATE OF THE 53rd & 54th EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

De Mulder said that the 53rd meeting in Bologna will prepare the Executive Committee for the merger discussions. The 54th meeting, during the IGC will be the transfer of the old to the new Executive Committee. The venue for the 55th meeting, the 2005 Annual Meeting is undecided.

De Mulder said that the Bologna meeting is important – the Council meeting is a major event. Each Executive Committee member will represent specific items. **All agreed** that all Executive Committee members must be present. Janoschek commented that this will be Executive Committee only, with no observers.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

17.a IUGS Award

De Mulder asked the Executive Committee what they thought about the idea of having an IUGS award, for outstanding achievement within IUGS; for persons who are not active members of the Executive Committee. A good title might be the James Harrison Award, after the first IUGS President.

Brett said this was a good idea; Harrison is a good label – he was a good man, an excellent leader and great scientist. Sato agreed. De Mulder suggested a plaque and support to the IGC could be the total award. Brett agreed and added that a nice mineral specimen could be added.

Bobrowsky said that ToR were needed – who will decide on the winner, who can nominate, when etc. De Mulder said he will write ToR.

17.b Long-term deposit of IUGS funds in a bank

De Mulder said that US \$ 300,000 could go into a long-term bank account. Brambati added that 3.5% interest guaranteed is paid if the money is left for more than one year. After that, the money can be taken out. IUGS gets 1.25% at present; the difference is up to US \$ 7,000. Brambati said that a € account would pay tax in Europe, but a US \$ account does not.

De Mulder asked if the Executive Committee agreed that the Bureau should arrange this. **All agreed**.

17.c Access to Bureau positions – financial support from IUGS

De Mulder said the Bureau seeks the Executive Committee's approval to lay its concern before the Council. The support of the Nominating Committee is particularly sought. The Bureau will come with some ideas and invite the Council to charge the next Executive Committee to look into the matter. **All agreed** the matter should be brought to the Council.

17.d Access of non-Executive Committee members to confidential documents

Bobrowsky noted that people are obtaining documents to which they should not have access. Refsdal said that she would change the password immediately.

17.e Collecting Hutchison Fund donations

Brett said that someone else was needed to collect the donations to the Hutchison fund, as he was leaving IUGS now. Bobrowsky suggested sending the money to the IUGS Treasurer; this was agreed on.

17.f Membership Categories

Sato asked why there were no countries in Membership Category 6. Janoschek said that the Statutes say that each country should decide its Category for itself. In IUGG, it is different; the country proposes a Category, but IUGG can put it to a higher one if their Executive Committee think that proper. Sato said that the Council meeting in Washington decided that the GDP per capita must be the criteria. De Mulder said that the next Executive Committee must look into this in detail.

-//-

De Mulder then officially closed the meeting, after thanking the Norwegian hosts *in absentia* and all those who participated in what had been a long, but very productive Executive Committee meeting.