

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Officers of the Analytical Chemistry Division,
Research Triangle Park, Durham, NC, November 30 - December 1, 2002

Present: D. Moore (President), K. Powell (Vice-president), F. Ingman (Past President), R. Lobinski (Secretary)

1. Welcome and agenda approval

D. Moore welcomed the participants who appreciated the selection of the meeting venue (IUPAC Secretariat). K. Powell suggested the agenda of the meeting, prepared earlier by D. Moore, be completed with the following items:

- the ACD participation at the SEANAC conference (South African Educational Conference)

- whole life management of projects

- discussion of the request of H. Gamsjäger for funding

- discussion on generating links/organizing meetings with industry

- the distribution of Teamwork: whom should it be sent to?

- discussion of old proposals that may need to be rewritten (Spitzer, Imasaka)

The agenda of the meeting was approved with the additions.

2. Constitution of the Nominating Committee

In view of the approaching elections of the TMs a nominating committee (NC) should be formed. The NC role is to provide nominees for vacant positions of TMs on the Division Committee. According to the policy set by the Bureau the NC should include five members. Two of them should be members of the Division Committee; the three others should be from outside and preferably not to have recently served on the Division Committee. The chair of NC should be associated with IUPAC and have an extensive experience of IUPAC work. The NC should be set as soon as possible in order to complete the elections before GA in Ottawa.

K. Powell noticed that IUPAC had already asked (letter of 4/10/2002) NAO's for nominations with the deadline set for 15/01/2003. Therefore it would be desirable that the NC starts working soon after this day, taking into account that a week or two may be necessary to obtain the Secretary General's approval of each of the NC members.

K. Powell suggested that the immediate Past President become the chairman of the NC; the suggestion was approved. In terms of the second DC member several names of past and present ADC members were evoked. The discussion focused on the choice between R. Byrne and R. Smith. The latter, in view of his increased commitment to the Orange Book updating, was considered rather a potential new Division Secretary than a NC member. For external NC members the names of F. Adams, A. Hulanicki and B. Cattrall were proposed and after a short discussion, approved. The members of the NC will then be, unless somebody declines, F. Ingman (Chairman), F. Adams, R. Byrne, B. Cattrall, and A. Hulanicki. D. Moore will send e-mails to them asking for approval and then send the list to the Secretary General for approval. The work of the NC should be carried out by e-mail.

3. Elections for the Division Committee TMs

D. Moore will address an e-mail to Fellows formerly associated with the ACD, sub-committees and Advisory Groups, DC members and Task Group leaders asking for nominations. The latter should be sent by mid-January to F. Ingman. Candidatures for the nominees should be presented to the NC by the Division Committee by mid-February 2003.

The internal policy line of the Division with regard to the elections was then discussed. The main remarks were as follows:

vacancies on the DC should be categorized to assure representation of various specialties in the Committee. ACD should alert the NC to the fact that a sufficient coverage of disciplines is needed. It was reminded that the TMs should fit into certain categories: general, spectrochemical, electroanalytical, nuclear, environmental and health,

geographic diversity should be assured. A measure should be taken to restrict the number of nominations from any NAO. A recommendation should be addressed to the NC that if a NAO sends more than two names, the NAO should be asked to specify its priorities,

A TM or AM should provide links to Working Parties on Solubility and on Quality Assurance,

the need for representation of young and female scientists was highlighted.

An overview of TMs likely to continue and of those whose term on the DC expires was made. G. Gauglitz, V. Kolotov and R. Smith cannot be elected again. K. Matsumoto, Y. Umezawa and Y. Vlasov are eligible.

D. Moore suggested elections of officers should be organized per e-mail till January 15th. F. Ingman completes the term. D. Moore will become automatically the Past President. Candidatures of K. Powell for the President's position and R. Lobinski for the Vice-President's were approved. The candidature of R. Smith as the Secretary, in view of his increased commitment in the Orange Book updating was approved. Provided that K. Powell, R. Lobinski, and R. Smith are elected it leaves 6 TM positions to be subject to vote.

The possibility of having one nominee per slot was discussed. An objection of this not being democratic enough was made and on the other hand a continuity allowing the Division Committee to work efficiently was emphasized. Keeping one name for a given position on the ballot might offer a possibility to keep certain TMs continuing working.

Candidatures for new TMs were discussed. In this context the name of Z. Chai was evoked. According to a previous discussion R. Lobinski had with him, he would be motivated to serve on the DC and that would offer an advantage to have a representative of China, particularly attractive in view of the 2005 GA location in Beijing. R. Lobinski should contact him by e-mail and ask for agreement to his candidature. The need for a TM in the field of proteomics/analytical chemistry of GMOs was evoked.

A question regarding what information should be sent to prospective nominees was raised. It was suggested that they receive the TM job description, a copy of the biennial report and are encouraged to consult the IUPAC Web site. It was emphasized the need for the name on the ballot cards to be accompanied by half to one page statement of commitment written by the Nominee. It was judged to be in the interest of the Division Committee to have a commitment for more than 2 years. The need to write a statement will also have an activating function on the present DC members who will present themselves to elections. This would make things easier for voters. A list for vote should be ready end of March.

The term of the newly elected starts on January 2004. F. Ingman raised the question whether some money could be found to sponsor the trips of newly elected members to the GA in Ottawa. D. Moore answered that it would depend on the ACD project money. A similar question was raised regarding the sponsoring of the Solubility and Quality Assurance WP members.

Associate members are recommended by DC and approved by the Bureau in the fields that are weakly covered. Working party should be connected via chairs being associate members.

The question of activating TMs after election was discussed. It was suggested that they send their profiles for Teamwork. A congratulation letter will be sent indicating that the term of election is 2 years with a possibility of a second 2-year term, and the possibility of being reelected is greatly enhanced by the level of their participation.

4. Division Committee Activities

The discussion of the DC activities confirmed the general feeling that the ACD Committee should be a think-tank and generation of new proposals should be one of its principal tasks. It was emphasized that the conception of all the current projects was fairly old; those people involved have had experience in the IUPAC work whereas a shortage of new proposals is becoming more and more evident. The ways to change this situation were discussed. The discussion focused on the role of advisory groups and on the organization of a think-tank workshop associated with the DC meeting in Ottawa.

4.1. Advisory groups and directory of expertise

It is evident that the TMs need some guidance in their work but the concept of advisory groups seems not to have worked as desired. Out of TMs only Y. Umezawa V. Kolotov, and Y. Vlasov constituted their Advisory Groups. Other TMs should be asked to bring the list of advisory groups to the GA meeting. The constituted advisory Groups were looked at in detail and especially that of Y. Y.Vlasov gave the impression of being put together ad hoc and the commitment of the members was judged unsure. A discussion on the potential function of an advisory group followed. It should not be confused with the Directory of Expertise and the commitment of the members of advisory groups should be more salient.

The point of contact for the maintenance of the Directory of Expertise should be the vice-

president. The directory should be sent (as attachment to the minutes) to TMs members twice per year to begin with these minutes. Directory of Expertise should be updated by TMs prior to each DC meeting.

4.2. Workshop on challenges to analytical chemistry

A discussion lead to an idea of organizing a meeting of ACD with participation of external invitees aimed at generating ideas for new generic projects at the cutting edge of analytical chemistry. This meeting, later called a workshop, on current trends and needs in analytical chemistry should discuss the role of IUPAC in front of the challenges to modern analytical chemistry. The approved guidelines for the workshop were as follows:

the workshop should be held on Sunday (10 August) morning. The issues raised will be discussed by the Division Committee during an afternoon meeting on the same day. The invitees to the workshop will also be invited to join the DC members for dinner on Saturday evening.

a per-diem will be paid to the invitees. D. Moore will prepare a project proposal that will be treated as a priority project

the topics to be discussed include:

mass spectrometry in proteomics and combinatorial analysis

analysis of genetically modified organisms (GMOs)

scientists from industry should be considered and asked to give a talk

J. McLaren will be contacted for the GMOs. R. Lobinski will screen the congress people under the angle of their potential contribution to the workshop. Ales Fajgelj will be invited to this meeting.

Think-tank session/workshop: a signal that a different level of involvement is required. Each TM will be encouraged to give a 10 min presentation on a relevant topic of choice. An e-mail will be addressed to TMs by D. Moore. A message should be sent to other Divisions to send an observer to the workshop

5. Projects

5.1. Current project status

The general state of the art is considered as satisfactory but problems with having new ideas are clearly seen on the horizon. 15 projects are currently in progress. K. Powell mentioned the arrival of the report by J. Hala. The detailed discussion focused on the reports below:

Projects of the Subcommittee on Solubility and Equilibrium Data (SSED, Chair: H. Gamsjäger)

demonstration of a stakeholders and end users involvement and of the IUPAC involvement in the reviewing, outcome and dissemination plan was not found satisfactory. The previous mail of D. Moore raising these issues in the “umbrella”

proposal projects was not satisfactorily answered. D. Moore will reiterate the points raised via another e-mail.

Project 2002-03-02 (Y. Umezawa)

A specific report is required after attending the Matrafured 02 conference by Lindner. It would be also good to have a paragraph for the Teamwork on this issue. WPQA may be recommended to work with if issue of detection limits is important. B. Hibbert could be invited to join the task group for a new proposal

Project 2001-041-2-500 (B. Spivakov)

Joining the project by another Task Group member (A. Berthod) should not be considered as a reason for one more meeting. If additional funds are sought, this should be a matter for a new or revised project with a suitable justification. A recommendation will be given to have a successful meeting in Moscow to complete the proposal rather than organize an additional meeting. K. Powell will ask B. Spivakov for a contribution to the Teamwork summarizing the results of the meeting in Beijing in April 2002.

Project by L.D. Pettit: SIT program

It was suggested to consider the project as not completed so that funds could be used for the extension of the project.

5.2. Project proposals

Two proposals by Vanderdeelen and Scharlin arrived in frame of the SSED “umbrella” proposal. Additional information was considered necessary. It should include:

- demonstration of a stakeholders and end users involvement as recommended by E. Becker in Brisbane. In this case it could be a marine, environmental chemist or geochemist
- demonstration of the IUPAC involvement in the reviewing, outcome and dissemination plan.

Establishing a link with L.D. Pettit was recommended. A discussion between H. Gamsjäger and L.D. Pettit and the outcome should be reported to the Division President. A commitment to make the data available for (selective) inclusion in the stability constants database was suggested.

D. Moore will prepare a draft of comments to be sent to H. Gamsjäger. K. Powell suggested that it should make clear that the project will not be funded until these objections are eliminated.

A request from the Bureau to keep proposers continuously informed on the status of their project was discussed. A conclusion was reached that nothing more can be done with this regard in comparison with the current policy of the Division.

5.3. New proposals

Proposals of Imasaka and P. Spitzer were considered beyond the Division's funding capacity. D. Moore will send them a message suggesting the proposals be re-written and

resubmitted.

A proposal for the Workshop on trends and needs of analytical chemistry (*cf.* item 4.2) will be prepared by the Division Committee (D. Moore) for a budget of 2500 \$

A project proposal will be prepared to support (1500 \$) attendance of R. Smith at the SEANAC conference.

New projects being considered were discussed. One is V. Kolotov and M. Bonardi on terminology of radiopharmaceuticals and another is a spin off of Umezawa's current project to deal with detection limits and calibration. D. Moore will consult K. Danzer whether he is interested in finalizing his project. The Division could help to find the right sponsors in analytical chemistry. Two others from the nuclear methods AG: Radioecology (behaviour of radionuclides in nature, including their speciation), and nuclear medicine (production of radionuclides and their species for purposes of diagnosis and therapy) are apparently in the formulation stage.

A green light to the ICSU proposal on Metrological Traceability by P. DeBièvre and A. Fajgelj was given. The Division Committee should provide any effort necessary for this proposal to be put together.

5.4. Modifications/improvement in project submissions and evaluation

Modifications to the project submission form and preparation of a flowchart summarizing the pathway a project go after submission was discussed.

Regarding project submission D. Moore suggested to prepare a checklist out of the notes in the project submission form and put it on the WEB. K. Powell proposed himself to do the job. He would send the checklist to D. Moore who would see with the Secretariat to put it on the WEB. In particular, the need for identification of stakeholder should be emphasized. The leader of a task group should be asked how the training of the end users will be organised.

It was noticed that the model application form by Sjoeborg did not precise end users! And should be revised. D. Moore will see with J. Lorimer, head of the Project Committee whether there are any criteria for relevance of an IUPAC project for user groups.

5.5 Project whole management process

Some measures relevant to the project management were discussed

a project tracking system should be implemented. A flow chart should be made available to the authors at which stage his project is. The flow chart drawn by K. Powell is in attachment. A checklist should be set once a project nears the completion. A TM should be attributed to each of the project reports. It was noticed that some project reports would have benefited from language editing.
half year reports and follow up which includes conference reports should be publishable in Teamwork

6. General Assembly in Ottawa

The participation of DC members in meeting during the GA in Ottawa was discussed. K. Powell will participate at meetings with Pieter Steyn and Leiv Sydnes. K. Matsumoto and R. Lobinski meet with Biophysical and Health Division. A separate meeting with Environmental Chemistry Division should be set up. V. Kolotov will be asked to participate at this meeting. D. Moore will represent ACD in the meeting with the Inorganic Chemistry Division if F. Adams cannot attend.

A message should be sent by the Secretariat to the participants of the World Chemistry Congress about the General Assembly with an encouragement to make contact with relevant Division Presidents. A message by D. Moore should be addressed to the previous observers and task group leaders to take part in the GA. In particular, ACS should be asked to send an observer for GA.

Some questions related to funding the participation were raised. The general answer is that no funding is available to DC members other than TMs. Upon request for funding the person interested should approach his/her NAO since each of them has funds to sponsor travel and per diems of one representative. A one-off exception should be made to the SSED for the Ottawa meeting because of the need to clarify the relationship of the SSED to the Division, its objectives and review processes. H. Gamsjäger will be asked to make a presentation to the Division meeting outlining the strategy of the subcommittee and indicating how the inclusion of end users and industry will be achieved, and showing the connectivity to the IUPAC review and dissemination processes. For this purpose a lump sum of 700 \$ will be offered to H. Gamsjäger.

It was judged reasonable to send an observer to the Worlds Chemistry Congress. D. Moore volunteered to participate at the WCC. The Secretariat will be asked to organize a poster session for ACD (6-8 slots) and to waive the registration fee for D. Moore.

7. Database projects

Databases are located on the UC server, which requires open source software. The DC is unsure what other energy the Division could put to the organization and maintenance of databases.

8. Updating Orange book

The recognition of the Orange Book updating as a major ACD task was repeated. The scope of three projects: (i) Analytical Electromigration Techniques (Jönssen), (ii) Electroanalytical Techniques (Kutner), and (iii) Countercurrent Chromatography (Spivakov) was judged to fit into that of the Orange Book.

The issues of the identification of chapters urgently needing an update (prioritization) and of the quantification of the up-to-dateness were discussed. The concerned chapters are those in which

- terminology is not sufficiently explicit or has been totally superseded
- developments need to be addressed for which there is no terminology
- contemporary references are missing

D. Moore will send a message to the DC members asking them to take the position regarding the above issues. A danger was evoked that due to a rapid turnover of the DC membership a person that sends the comments now may not be involved in the future updating process.

9. Public relations

The improvement of the visibility of the ACD activities was discussed. K. Powell was congratulated on the Team Work edition that is becoming an important tool of the communication of the ACD with the outside. The mailing list of Teamwork includes the Secretariat, TMs, AMs, NRs, presidents of other divisions, task group chairs and members, subcommittee chairs and members. Project leaders should be asked for contributions to teamwork once milestones of their projects were reached.

Other means of increasing the ACD visibility included:

- a note on Analytical Chemistry Division in the F section of "The Analyst". R. Lobinski will contact S. Day, the Managing Editor to discuss the feasibility and format
- project leaders will be asked to submit a Letter to the Editor of Analytical Chemistry summarizing the salient points of the project once the latter has been terminated. The commitment to write such a letter and its approval to press will be judged as an integral part of the project evaluation process
- submission of information on ACD to analytical chemistry journals with impact factor. The list of such journals will be sent to D. Moore by R. Lobinski
- the use of conferences for the dissemination
- writing short articles to Chemistry International. K. Powell proposed himself to write a progress report on stability constants data base project and ask A. Fajgelj whether he does not have any idea to do the same.

The need for an increase in the visibility of ACD to industry was emphasized, for example by the organization of a short course for industry. A project should specify a user group; the presence of industrial person on each task group should be requested.

10. IUPAC prize for Analytical chemistry

The establishment of an IUPAC prize for a forefront scientist of a discipline in mid-career was suggested. The prize, in any field of applied analytical chemistry, should be sponsored by industry that would become part of the evaluation process. D. Moore summarized his (unsuccessful) efforts to get a sponsorship of a prize from industry. After a discussion the idea was judged interesting but workload was likely to be considerable. The idea was finally abandoned.