# **International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry**

# 131<sup>st</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

# Bangalore, India, 3-4 April 2004 MINUTES

1.	Introductory Remarks and Finalization of Agenda	1
2.	Minutes of 130 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of Executive Committee	1
2.1	Matters Arising from Minutes (Not Covered by Items on Agenda)	1
<b>3.</b> <i>1</i>	Action Items from Previous Meetings	1
4.	Vice President's Critical Assessment	1
<b>5.</b> 1	Union Advisory Committee	2
6.	GSC Proposals: Future Actions	3
<b>7.</b> ]	Membership Development Committee	4
<b>8.</b> ]	Finance Committee	5
8.1	Report from Finance Committee Meeting, 9 February 2004	5
8.2	Statement of Accounts for 2003	5
8.3	Review of Budget for 2004-5	6
8.4	National Subscriptions	6
	8.4.1 NAOs and ANAOs in Default	
3	8.4.2 National Subscriptions for 2004-5	6
9.	Plans and Schedule for GA/Congress, Beijing, 2005	6
10.	IUPAC Prize	8
11.	Conferences and Symposia	8
11.	.1 New Program for Conferences in Developing Countries and on New Direct in Chemistry	
11.	.2 Ratification of Sponsorship of Symposia	8
11.	.3 IUPAC Poster Prizes	8
12.	Fellows and Affiliate Membership Programs	9

# MINUTES

13.	Status Report on IUPAC Secretariat	9
14.	Publications	9
14.	1 Status Report Chemistry International	9
14.	2 Status Report Pure and Applied Chemistry	10
14	3 Book Publication and Book Sales	10
15.	IUPAC Web Site and Publicity about the Union	10
<i>16</i> .	Value of Chemistry Web Site	11
17.	Propagation of Chemistry Task Force	11
18.	IUPAC Bodies	12
18.	1 Ratification of Memberships Approved by Correspondence	12
18.	2 Funding for Commission II.1	12
19.	Projects	12
19.	1 Summary of Current Status: Commitments, Expenditures, and Under review.	12
20.	Name and Symbol of Element 111	13
21.	Interactions with Other Organizations	13
21.	1 UNESCO and ICSU	13
21	2 UNIDO and IAEA	13
22.	"Strategic Challenges"	14
23.	Dates and Place of Next Executive Committee Meeting	14
24.	Any Other Business	14

# **International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry**

# 131<sup>st</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Bangalore, India, 3-4 April 2004 MINUTES

Present: Prof. L. K. Sydnes (Chairman), Prof. C. Bai (first day, Items 1-12),

Prof. D. StC. Black, Prof. B. R. Henry, Prof. O. M. Nefedov,

Dr. E. P. Przybylowicz, Prof. P. S. Steyn

Absent: Dr. C. F. Buxtorf

Secretary: Dr. J. W. Jost

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

Prof. Sydnes welcomed the members of the Committee, especially the new Members, Prof. Bai, Prof. Black, and Prof. Henry. He thanked Prof. Chandrasekaran and the Indian Institute of Science for the excellent arrangements and their generous hospitality.

Prof. Black noted that the Project proposal on International research funding in chemical sciences would be discussed as part of Item 24, Any Other Business.

# 2. MINUTES OF $130^{TH}$ MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

2.1 MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES (NOT COVERED BY ITEMS ON AGENDA)

There were no matters arising from the Minutes of the 130<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee.

#### 3. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Dr. Jost noted that the Action Items were presented for information and asked that any corrections or changes be sent to him.

#### 4. VICE PRESIDENT'S CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Prof. Henry reviewed his plans for his VPCA, *The Project System: Review, Assessment and Analysis*. He briefly reviewed the history of the adoption of the project system. He noted that he had identified concerns expressed by some Division Officers and issues to investigate. He commented that he would also investigate concerns expressed that went beyond the Project System. He reported that he had arranged to attend a number of Division and Standing Committee meetings in 2004. Additional topics to be considered in the VPCA were the CHEMRAWN Future Actions Committees, "what have they accomplished?" and the relation of IUPAC and the chemical industry. Prof. Henry plans to review his VPCA at the Bureau meeting and have a first draft available for comment by November 2004.

Prof. Steyn commented that it was important to have more involvement of the chemistry community in the work of IUPAC. He suggested that Task Group Members be assured that the reports published in *Pure and Applied Chemistry* are cited in the literature. He suggested that an article be published in *Chemistry International* on the improvement in the Impact Factor for *PAC*.

#### **MINUTES**

Dr. Przybylowicz commented that the way COCI approaches the chemical industry needs to be changed. Prof. Henry suggested that the NGO role of IUPAC vis a vis industry should be emphasized. The work of CCE and COCI in the area of the public appreciation of chemistry should be stressed. Prof. Nefedov suggested that the Union Advisory Committee could play a role in this area.

Prof. Sydnes asked how many Nobel Laureates really were active in the past in IUPAC; do the Divisions interact with each other. He also noted that there is a danger in too much industrial involvement, as this could lead to the perception that IUPAC's independent role has been compromised.

Prof. Henry commented that non-tariff barriers to trade were an important issue for the industry; does IUPAC have a role to play on this issue?

Dr. Jost commented that not only high profile issues were important to industry, but also subjects such as thermodynamic databases, process analytical instrumentation, and similar technical subjects.

Prof. Nefedov suggested that workshops on projects, completed and new, should be organized at IUPAC sponsored conferences. Prof. Steyn commented that IUPAC has done much that is industrially relevant but the work has not been well publicized to the industry.

Prof. Bai commented that the Chinese chemical industry needed to become more involved in IUPAC.

Action: Article to be published in Chemistry International on the improvement in the Impact Factor for PAC.

Responsible: Prof. Bull.

Action: Determine how many Nobel Laureates really were active in the past in IUPAC.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### 5. Union Advisory Committee

Prof. Sydnes reported that 41 NAOs had named members to the UAC; the four NAOs that had not yet named members were Croatia, Greece, Portugal, and Puerto Rico. He proposed that the EC develop a list of items on which the UAC could be asked to comment. He also suggested that one item be sent out at a time to avoid overwhelming the UAC and to avoid confusion on what was being asked.

Prof. Black reviewed the Terms of Reference of the UAC. Prof. Steyn commented that, while the members serve in their personal capacity, they also need to communicate with the local chemistry community. Prof. Black emphasized the need to ask one question at a time. Dr. Przybylowicz described the plans of the US National Committee to use ACS meetings to get input.

Prof. Nefedov agreed that it was important to give the UAC some items to consider. He also suggested that the UAC members could be used to activate national bodies to work on IUPAC projects. Prof. Bai noted that the UAC has members of different status within their NAO.

Prof. Sydnes proposed the following items for consideration by the UAC:

#### **MINUTES**

- 1. Report on the "Value of chemistry Project" ask for feedback.
- 2. Company Associates IUPAC needs to avoid perception that it is in competition with the national chemical societies.
- 3. Young Observers especially the question of how to increase industrial involvement.
- 4. The GSC proposals presented to Council.

Prof. Sydnes then suggested that the Value of Chemistry report should be the first issue submitted to the UAC for comment. Dr. Jost commented that the Company Associates and industry relations questions were operational issues for which IUPAC needed new concepts. Prof. Sydnes then suggested that COCI should be informed that the UAC was available to provide feedback on proposed concrete actions. Prof. Black suggested that the UAC could be asked how to expand the Company Associate program in their country. He then asked if the Young Observer issue were related to or separate from the Company Associates program. The UAC could be asked how Young Observer programs might be built in their countries. Prof. Henry commented that the issue of relations with industry was complex and it is unclear what to ask the UAC. He suggested that the second issue that should be put to the UAC was the GSC report. Prof. Black then noted that the Young Observer program is really an issue for the NAO directly.

# 6. GSC Proposals: Future Actions

Prof. Sydnes then suggested that the Executive Committee approve continuing to pursue GSC proposals for reorganization. He noted that the comments at the Council were that the NAOs had insufficient time to digest the proposals. He proposed that the governance proposal be extracted from the GSC report and the UAC be asked for comments. The following steps would lead to the submission of a new proposal to the Council:

- 1. UAC comments by 1 August 2004.
- 2. Bureau review, October 2004.
- 3. Distribution of proposal to NAOs for comment, November 2004.
- **4.** EC review of NAO comments and final decision on submission of a proposal to Council, April 2005.

Prof. Henry cautioned that while the reorganization is desirable, is this the time to undertake another major change? Dr. Przybylowicz commented that while the project system is new, the Union's governance is still the same as in the 1950s. The comments from scientists working on IUPAC Committees and Task Groups suggest that the governance of the Union should be reorganized now. Prof. Henry commented that the proposed Executive Board would have reduced the representation of the NAOs in the governance of the Union. Should we wait to see how the UAC functions? Prof. Black commented that if the Bureau continues, then there is less incentive to make the UAC work. If the GSC proposals are not pursued now, then the momentum that has been created will be lost. Dr. Przybylowicz noted that the EC could still decide at its next meeting not to put this on the Council Agenda for Beijing.

#### **MINUTES**

Prof. Henry noted that the EC should consider whether to pursue reorganization at the next Bureau and EC meetings. He commented that the correct action had been taken at Ottawa in not pursuing a vote on the GSC proposals; a matter this important needs consensus, not a bare majority. Prof. Sydnes then reviewed the proposed process for considering the issue of reorganization. Prof. Steyn emphasized the need to involve the NAOs as early as possible. Dr. Jost noted the different roles of the UAC and NAOs: the role of the UAC is to comment on a work in progress, they are not being asked to take an official position.

Prof. Sydnes noted the increased contact of the Officers with Division and Standing Committees. He noted that the National Contacts concept has still not been implemented. A message should be sent to the NAOs with a copy to the UAC asking for nominations for National Contacts.

Action Items: Ask UAC to comment on GSC proposals and ask NAOs to nominate National Contacts.

Responsible: Prof. Black.

#### 7. MEMBERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Prof. Sydnes reviewed the current composition of the Committee and noted that he had replaced Prof. Ohtaki as Chairman. Dr. Jost reported that contacts had been made with organizations in Malaysia, Lebanon, and Iran regarding possible membership in IUPAC as NAOs. Prof. Steyn then raised two questions: should the MDC meet to develop a strategy and can IUPAC interact through federations of chemical societies? Prof. Steyn commented that it was important to remember that service to the current members was our first priority. He then described the history of the efforts to recruit NAOs and ANAOs in Africa. He noted that he would be attending the ICCA in Tanzania. He also reported that he had participated in the meeting in Mauritius to inaugurate the Mauritius Chemical Society. Prof. Sydnes reported on his visit to Bangladesh. He also recalled the meeting at Kazan and the interest expressed by many of the participants. Prof. Nefedov commented that there was still interest on the part of many of the National Academies and chemical societies of the former Soviet Union in participating in IUPAC. A preference was expressed in participating on a regional basis. One possible group is the Central Asian countries. If they cannot, as a group, become an ANAO, then perhaps they could become an AO. Prof. Sydnes commented that regional membership would be difficult, and he encouraged them to consider participation as an AO. Dr. Jost noted that a change in the Statutes would be required for membership as either an NAO or ANAO by a regional federation. A regional federation could be an AO, as are the FECS, FLAQ, and FACS. He also noted that participation in the work of IUPAC by individual scientists does not require that their countries be NAOs or ANAOs. Prof. Henry suggested that the individual countries should consider becoming ANAOs. Prof. Sydnes noted that full membership as NAOs could be accomplished by arranging that that payment of the full National Subscription be made in steps. Prof. Nefedov stated that he would correspond with the appropriate people and then draft a letter to Prof. Sydnes with a definite proposal.

Dr. Jost proposed that the officers arrange to represent IUPAC at the meetings of the

#### **MINUTES**

regional federations of chemical societies, FACS, FECS, FLAQ, ICCA, and others if appropriate. This has been done on an ad hoc basis in the past, but a more formal arrangement might be useful.

Action: Arrange representation by officers at meetings of Chemical federations.

Responsible: Prof. Sydnes, Prof. Black.

#### 8. FINANCE COMMITTEE

### 8.1 REPORT FROM FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING, 9 FEBRUARY 2004

Dr. Przybylowicz reviewed the situation with respect to the Union's official address. He proposed that the material in the Agenda Book be taken as read. He noted that two new members had joined the Committee, Dr. Iwan Thonus and Dr. Hans - Luzius Senti. He noted that his term as Chairman and as a member of the Finance Committee would end at the end of 2005. He proposed that the EC approve the nomination of Dr. Senti as Chairman from 2006 for a two-year term. Prof. Steyn asked if it was normal to have the Chairman of the Finance Committee not be member of the Bureau and EC. Dr. Przybylowicz noted that this had been the normal situation until Dr. Ward's term as both Treasurer and Chairman of the Finance Committee.

Dr. Przybylowicz reviewed the decision to invest part of the Union's reserves in Euro denominated investments. This had been done not as a way to improve returns on the Union's portfolio, but as a way to diversify the portfolio. He then reported that the yield on the endowment fund had been 5 % for 2003. He noted that the Finance Committee had discussed the possibility of moving the Union's investment portfolio from Merrill Lynch to Wachovia Bank. Dr. Senti planned to visit Research Triangle Park in June to discuss the possibility with a Wachovia banker. Dr. Przybylowicz noted that the performance of the Union's portfolio had improved in 2003 in line with the general improvement in financial markets. He then drew the attention of the Committee to the two policy statements included in the agenda Book and noted that these were reviewed by the Finance Committee each year and adjusted as necessary. He also noted that the increase in the total National Subscription had been only 1 % for the past two biennia. Dr. Jost noted that the Endowment fund income had been dedicated to special projects, including the Young Scientists program at the Congress.

#### 8.2 Statement of Accounts for 2003

Dr. Jost distributed a preliminary Audit Report for 2003. The report contained no exceptions. He then reviewed for the benefit of the new members of the EC the distinctions among operating expenses, project expenses and project allocations.

#### **MINUTES**

#### 8.3 Review of Budget for 2004-5

Dr. Jost noted that this was presented only for information, no changes were proposed from the budget approved by Council at Ottawa.

#### 8.4 NATIONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

#### 8.4.1 NAOs and ANAOs in Default

The Committee discussed the sanctions proposed for Argentina, Brazil, and Chile if payment was not received by the deadlines given. The messages sent to the NAOs had stated that no funding would be provided to members of IUPAC bodies from the NAOs that remained in arrears. It was agreed that the phrase IUPAC Bodies referred to division and standing Committees, not to Task Groups. The Committee approved the following sanctions for the NAOs in arrears:

- 1. No support for members of Division and Standing Committees.
- 2. No new sponsored Conferences approved that are to be held in a country under sanction.
- 3. No payment for delegates to attend the Council meeting.
- 4. Council to be asked to withdraw membership if payment is not received by 1 August 2005.

The letter from the Brazilian NAO offering to change status to ANAO was discussed. The Committee agreed that the statutes did not permit a country to withdraw without the approval of the Council. The EC approved the application of the above sanctions to Argentina, Chile, and Brazil if payment was not received by the deadline each NAO had been given.

Action: Write to Argentina, Brazil, and Chile to inform them of the sanctions to be applied if payment is not received.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

# 8.4.2 National Subscriptions for 2004-5

This item was presented for information only.

#### 9. PLANS AND SCHEDULE FOR GA/CONGRESS, BEIJING, 2005

Dr. Jost reviewed the schedule in the Agenda Book. He noted that the question of the time and date of the WCLM and UAC meetings should be discussed by the EC. The preliminary schedule showed both meetings on the Friday before the Council meeting, the WCLM in the morning and the UAC in the afternoon. There was a possibility of a conflict with the closing ceremony of the Congress, if the Congress planned a closing ceremony.

Prof. Steyn and Prof. Bai suggested that the WCLM and UAC meetings could be combined since the participants were largely the same. Prof. Henry noted that the two meetings have a different focus and the participants, while there was some overlap,

#### **MINUTES**

were different. Prof. Black suggested that the WCLM be held on Sunday afternoon, after the Council meeting. Prof. Sydnes noted that if the topic of the WCLM were to be the Propagation of Chemistry, we would be looking for both input and participants.

Prof. Henry commented that one of the purposes of the WCLM was to promote the exchange of views and experience among chemical societies and therefore the discussion of one topic would be too restrictive. Prof. Sydnes noted that this is very broad subject and input was required from a broad group. Dr. Jost commented that the UAC meeting was intended to be forward looking. Prof. Sydnes then commented that if the UAC were held after the Council meeting it would be easier to be forward looking. Prof. Black noted that the UAC meeting is restricted to members of the UAC while the WCLM is more open and has a very different agenda.

Prof. Henry commented that as the UAC is more important to IUPAC, it should be held first, on Friday afternoon. Prof. Sydnes then suggested that the WCLM be held earlier in the week. Dr. Jost reviewed the consequences for the schedule of other meetings and the group agreed that this was not possible. After further discussion, the EC voted on the alternatives of holding the WCLM or the UAC on Friday and on Sunday. The Committee voted four in favor of holding the WCLM on Friday and the UAC on Sunday and three in favor of the alternative.

Dr. Jost reviewed the subsidy offered at the Ottawa General Assembly to participants who registered for the Congress. The EC approved the continuation of the subsidy for the Beijing General Assembly.

Dr. Jost reviewed the program for selecting IUPAC Young Observers for the Ottawa General Assembly from those selected to receive Young Scientists awards to attend the Congress. Prof. Black noted that it was important to select top people for the Young Observer program. Prof. Henry commented that the Young Scientists awards had been made only after careful scrutiny. After some further discussion, the Committee approved the continuation of the Young Observer Program as operated at the Ottawa GA.

Prof. Bai reported that significant funding had already been received for the Congress. He also noted the proposals for sessions to be organized at the Congress by Divisions and Standing Committees. He then noted that a detailed schedule for the Congress would be developed after Dr. Jost's visit to Beijing in May.

Prof. Black commented that the plenary lecturers for the Congress were mostly also members of the International Advisory Board. He suggested that the instructions for future organizers of IUPAC Congresses be modified to advise against this practice. The Committee asked Dr. Jost to revise the instructions for Congress Organizers to include this advice.

Action: Revise instructions for organizers of IUPAC Congresses to advise against the practice of having IAB members selected as plenary lecturers.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### **MINUTES**

#### 10. IUPAC PRIZE

Prof. Steyn reported that the applicants for the IUPAC prize were not only geographically diverse, but also represented the different disciplines of chemistry. He expected to be able to announce the winners by early May.

#### 11. CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

# 11.1 New Program for Conferences in Developing Countries and on New Directions in Chemistry

Prof. Black noted that the Project Committee had issued revised Guidelines for this program and asked if there were any comments. Prof. Henry commented that that while the Guidelines specify that well-established conferences would not be supported, a number of the conferences supported seemed to fall into this category. Prof. Sydnes noted that while a conference may be one of a series, it could be held in a developing country. Prof. Nefedov observed that some of the conferences supported were in places that seem to be developed. The Committee asked that Dr. Jost write to the Project Committee and suggest that either the guideline regarding well established series of conferences be followed or be changed.

Action: Write to the Project Committee and suggest that either the guideline regarding well-established series of conferences be followed or be changed. Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### 11.2 RATIFICATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF SYMPOSIA

The Conferences approved since the Bureau meeting were ratified.

#### 11.3 IUPAC POSTER PRIZES

Prof. Sydnes reviewed the history of this proposal at Council and then described the action of the Chinese Chemical Society in Taipei in awarding an IUPAC Poster Prize at their national meeting. He then suggested that the IUPAC Congress be added to the Guidelines. The number of Poster prizes to be awarded at the Congress will be decided later.

The Guidelines for IUPAC Poster Prizes are as follows:

- 1. Prizes will be awarded at all Division-sponsored meetings where poster sessions are held.
- 2. Prizes will be awarded at National meetings if requested. Not more than one meeting a year will apply, and that meeting should be selected by the relevant NAO.
- 3. There will be normally two, but a maximum of three prizes per conference.
- 4. Selection of prizewinners is in the control of the conference organizers.
- 5. Each prize will consist of (i) a certificate signed by the President (ii) a copy of the Gold Book (iii) two years' subscription to *Chemistry International*.

Action: Add the IUPAC Congress to the Guidelines for awarding IUPAC Poster

#### **MINUTES**

Prizes.

Responsible: Prof. Black.

#### 12. FELLOWS AND AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS

Dr. Jost briefly reviewed the written material and then noted that the role of *Chemistry International* was not to make money but to publicize the work of the Union. There was some discussion of the report and the Committee agreed that while it was useful to know the cost of providing *Chemistry International*, this cost should be viewed as part of the cost of publicizing the work of the Union and that *Chemistry International* should not be expected to recover its costs from subscriptions and AMP fees.

#### 13. STATUS REPORT ON IUPAC SECRETARIAT

Dr. Jost noted that the major events this past year at the Secretariat had been the resignation of Ms. Laura Abernathy and the addition of Mrs. Linda Tapp to the staff. He then described his plans to replace Ms. Abernathy and the role of Mrs. Tapp.

Prof. Henry suggested that future reports on the Secretariat should include a section on the future work of the Secretariat and a vision of its role. Prof. Sydnes suggested that an assessment of the capacity of the Secretariat to do the work required be added to the standard report. Prof. Steyn suggested that a memo be sent to IUPAC officers and others delineating the responsibilities of the Staff and providing some rules for interaction with the staff. Prof. Sydnes asked that if there were any comments on the work of the Secretariat they should be sent to the Secretary General and the Executive Director.

Action: Include a section on the future work of the Secretariat and a vision of its role to the report on the Secretariat prepared for EC and Bureau meetings. Include an assessment of the capacity of the Secretariat to do the work required in the standard report.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### 14. Publications

#### 14.1 STATUS REPORT CHEMISTRY INTERNATIONAL

Dr. Jost noted that he would be taking the written material as read and then asked if the members of the EC had any comments on the changes that had been made in *Chemistry International* over the past two years.

Prof. Henry suggested that Dr. John Malin be asked to write an article on CHEMRAWN and its Future Actions Committees. Prof. Sydnes suggested that more articles be included on people and IUPAC. Dr. Przybylowicz commented that the Public Appreciation of Chemistry subcommittee of CCE be asked to provide web site reviews for *CI*. Prof. Sydnes proposed that an interview be published with Prof. Atkins, Dr. Evans, and Dr. Przybylowicz regarding the projects on the Propagation of Chemistry and the Value of Chemistry. He also

#### **MINUTES**

thought there should be more from COCI regarding its activities and perhaps a profile of the new member of COCI representing CEFIC. Prof. Sydnes then suggested articles on the new member countries, Bangladesh (NAO) and Mauritius (ANAO). Dr. Jost commented that a letter from the President reminding the Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen of the importance of providing timely reports on their committee meetings for *CI*. Prof. Nefedov proposed that a section be added on the meetings of IUPAC bodies. Prof. Steyn suggested a series of articles on young chemists active in IUPAC. Dr. Przybylowicz commented that articles on Young Observers might be of interest. He suggested Prof. Frank McDonald as a possible subject and the new member of Division Committee V as another. Prof. Black commented that the role of *Chemistry International* is to both inform members of IUPAC bodies of what is happening elsewhere in the Union and to publicize the work of IUPAC to the broader community.

Action: Write a letter to Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen stressing the importance of providing timely reports on their committee meetings for CI.

Responsible: Prof. Sydnes.

#### 14.2 STATUS REPORT PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY

Dr. Jost noted that he would take the written material in the Agenda Book as read and asked if there were any comments.

Prof. Henry commented that one issue he learned about while attending a Division Committee meeting was how to get rid of a Provisional Recommendation. Dr. Jost noted that the Provisional Recommendation cannot be deleted, but a comment can be added that it had been withdrawn by the division.

Dr. Przybylowicz noted the continued decline in institutional subscriptions to *PAC* and the uncertain long-term future of the current revenue from PAC. He proposed that CPEP be asked to study this issue and provide the EC with a report. Prof. Sydnes suggested that the NAOs and ANAOs should be reminded that recommendations are available on the IUPAC website.

Action: Study the effect of the decline in institutional subscriptions on the long-term revenues from PAC.

Responsible: CPEP.

#### 14.3 BOOK PUBLICATION AND BOOK SALES

Dr. Jost noted that he would take the written material in the Agenda Book as read and then briefly reviewed a report from the Royal Society of Chemistry on the sales of Red Book II that had arrived after the Agenda Book had been compiled.

# 15. IUPAC WEB SITE AND PUBLICITY ABOUT THE UNION

Dr. Jost noted that he would take the written material in the Agenda Book as read and

#### **MINUTES**

asked if there were any comments.

Prof. Steyn asked if the article from the *National Geographic* web site on the special issue of *PAC* on *Endocrine Active Substances* should be reprinted on the IUPAC website, or at least a link provided to the article. Prof. Henry suggested that the article might be too focused on one aspect of the report to highlight. Prof. Steyn proposed that Prof. Werner Klein be asked if the article should be reprinted. Prof. Black proposed that perhaps a paraphrase from Prof. Klein along with some context would be better than reprinting the original article.

Action: Ask Prof. Klein to write a paraphrase of the National Geographic Article along with some context to be added to the website.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

# 16. VALUE OF CHEMISTRY WEB SITE

Dr. Przybylowicz reviewed the background of the project and the material in the Agenda Book. He then commented that the question now was how to proceed. Three possible short-term actions could be taken.

- 1. Put links on the IUPAC website to the material found in the report.
- 2. Put model pages on the website.
- 3. Do reviews of the existing websites in *Chemistry International*.

Prof. Sydnes commented that these all seemed reasonable next actions. Prof. Black suggested distributing extracts from the report using e-Press.

Action: Distribute extracts of the report on the Value of Chemistry using e-Press. Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### 17. PROPAGATION OF CHEMISTRY TASK FORCE

Prof. Sydnes reviewed the background of the proposal in the Agenda Book. Prof. Henry noted the issues raised during the Council debate on the UK proposal. A number of members commented that the funding and the staff support requested seemed to be too large. Prof. Black suggested that this is a task for the national chemical societies. He then noted that this project could lead to the same goals as the Value of Chemistry project. Prof. Steyn commented that it was not clear to him how this kind of activity could affect individual countries. Prof. Nefedov commented that the concept could be similar to clearinghouse project on chemistry education in Russia and the former Soviet Union. Prof. Black noted that the project assumed that there was a reduction in the number of students attracted to chemistry. This might not be the case for all countries. He suggested that the UAC be used to investigate this assumption. Dr. Jost commented that this project was not aimed at the same target audience as the Value of Chemistry project. He agreed that the assumption of declining interest in chemistry might not be true globally. Prof. Henry commented that the EC should not foist a Chairman on the group; the Task Group members should select the Chairman. Dr. Przybylowicz proposed that a letter be sent to Prof. Atkins and Dr. Evans with a critique of the project based on the comments from the EC. Prof. Sydnes agreed that the project was not well defined and that the assumption

#### **MINUTES**

of a decline in interest in chemistry is perhaps not correct on a worldwide basis. Prof. Black commented that it should be emphasized that it is not clear that the international situation is as assumed.

Action: Write letter to Prof. Atkins and Dr. Evans.

Responsible: Prof. Black.

#### 18. IUPAC BODIES

#### 18.1 RATIFICATION OF MEMBERSHIPS APPROVED BY CORRESPONDENCE

Dr. Jost reported that there were no memberships approved by correspondence to ratify.

#### 18.2 Funding for Commission II.1

Prof. Sydnes reviewed the background of this situation and recalled that he had met with commission II.1 at Ottawa. He noted that by planning to meet at the Beijing General Assembly, the costs of the proposed projects were higher than they would be for a meeting in North America or Europe. Prof. Henry commented that the Commission seemed to have the funding necessary to carry on their work. Dr. Przybylowicz observed that the process does not seem to need fixing. He proposed waiting for a response to Prof. Sydnes' letter to Dr. Rosenblatt. Prof. Black noted that attendance at the general Assembly is still not a Commission right. Prof. Sydnes reviewed the letter he sent to Dr. Rosenblatt on the subject. In the letter, he pointed out that the Division could allocate funds to the Commission for operating expenses. He proposed waiting for a response from Dr. Rosenblatt. Prof. Black noted that funding for project 2003-033 had been specifically approved by the EC. The EC unanimously approved the letter sent by Prof. Sydnes to Dr. Rosenblatt.

#### 19. PROJECTS

# 19.1 SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS: COMMITMENTS, EXPENDITURES, AND UNDER REVIEW

Dr. Jost reviewed the material in the Agenda Book and asked for any comments. Prof. Sydnes asked if the Evaluation Committee should review projects on which no spending had occurred. It was noted that the role of the Evaluation Committee was to review completed projects, not to oversee the management of current projects by the Divisions and Standing Committees. After some discussion, it was agreed that the Secretary General and the Project Committee be asked to revise the project guidelines to include a definite cut off point for the termination of funding after the project completion date given in the project proposal. The Task Group could reapply for funding if necessary.

Action: Revise the project guidelines to include a definite cut off point for the termination of funding after the project completion date given in the project proposal.

#### **MINUTES**

Responsible: Prof. Black and Project Committee

#### 20. NAME AND SYMBOL OF ELEMENT 111

Prof. Black reviewed the situation and noted that Division II has not acted on the request of Prof. Corish to begin consultation with outside experts and to draft a Provisional recommendation. He proposed that Prof. Sydnes write to Dr. Rosenblatt on the need to act. Prof. Henry suggested that Prof. Sydnes wait for a response to his letter. Prof. Sydnes proposed that he would call both Dr. Rosenblatt and Prof. Corish to discuss the situation. Prof. Sydnes noted that if the Provisional Recommendation is posted on the IUPAC website on 1 June 2004, it could be approved by the Bureau at its meeting in October, pending no significant objections after the meeting. Prof. Henry commented that meeting the naming deadlines was less important than healing the rift with Division II.

#### 21. Interactions with Other Organizations

#### 21.1 UNESCO AND ICSU

Prof. Sydnes reported that he had met with Dr. Nalacz, the Director of UNESCO's Division of Basic and Engineering Sciences in Paris. Dr. Pokrovsky retired on 1 April 2004. A replacement will be coming from the New Delhi office. This person will have one and a half years of service before retirement. He expects that it will be difficult to obtain extra budgetary funding from UNESCO in the future for IUPAC projects. He also noted that microscience workshops were planned for Norway, Sweden, and Finland. He also reported that Dr. Pokrovsky and Prof. John Bradley would like to operate as an ad hoc committee for the dissemination of microscience and DIDAC. The Committee agreed that Dr. Pokrovsky and Prof. Bradley be encouraged to make a project proposal to CCE.

Prof. Sydnes reviewed the meeting of ICSU Union Presidents and their representatives in Paris. There seem to be opportunities for joint projects with other Unions. He noted that the meeting had observed that too many ICSU documents are not self-contained. IUPAC should be more active in ICSU, but this will require work on the part of IUPAC. Prof. Henry commented that it would be important to contact the new Executive Director of ICSU. He also noted that IUPAP wishes to discuss how to change the voting at ICSU General Assemblies.

#### 21.2 UNIDO AND IAEA

Prof. Henry reported that while in Vienna for the Division V meeting he had visited UNIDO. They were interested in collaboration but it was not clear how this could be done. He suggested that one possible area of collaboration could be non-tariff barriers to trade. He also noted that UNIDO was looking for technical help. He noted that the IAEA would like to expand their collaboration with IUPAC beyond Division V.

#### **MINUTES**

# 22. "STRATEGIC CHALLENGES"

Prof. Sydnes commented that this had been done in the course of the meeting and there seemed to be no need for further discussion.

There was a discussion of the work of the Evaluation Committee. The EC recognized that there had not been any completed projects to evaluate, but they were looking forward to the first report from the Evaluation Committee.

#### 23. Dates and Place of Next Executive Committee Meeting

After some discussion, it was agreed to hold the 2005 meeting of the Executive Committee in Puerto Rico. The Executive director was asked to request the Colegio de Químicos de Puerto Rico to host the meeting. The date was set as 9-10 April 2005. After the meeting, it was discovered that not all the members could attend on that date and it was agreed to change the date to 16-17 April 2005.

Action: Write to the Colegio de Químicos de Puerto Rico to ask if it would be willing to host the EC meeting on the dates proposed.

Responsible: Dr. Jost.

#### 24. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Prof. Black reviewed the project proposal from Dr. Becker for the Meeting of Chemistry Funding Organizations, 2004-014-1. The EC approved the funding requested for this project.

Prof. Sydnes noted that he had received a letter from Prof. Marinov regarding the process for determining the priority for discovery of element 112. A letter has also been received from the BIPM that should be referred to ICTNS for review.

Prof. Henry reported that he had discussed the proposal from Prof. George Atkinson for a project to train scientists from developing countries, provide instruments for their use when they return to their home countries where they would make measurements of atmospheric properties. Prof. Henry will meet Prof. Atkinson in June to discuss this proposal in detail.

Prof. Sydnes thanked the members for their hard work and again thanked Prof. Chandrasekaran for the excellent arrangements. He expressed the best wishes of the Committee for Prof. Bai's recovery from the illness that had prevented his participation in the second day of the meeting.