

ANNEXES

Annex 1 - Comments from the Unions

A-1-1 Call for comments from the Unions for preparing the “White paper” on the future of the federation (April 2006)

Dear Colleagues,

I thank you very much for the participation of your Union in the FAGS meeting that was held last week in Paris and also for the strong Unions' support to the FAGS Services and the FAGS activities.

There have been, during the FAGS Council meeting of Wednesday 29 March with the Service Directors, the Unions and the ICSU Representative, an interesting and positive discussion. Preliminary views have emerged from the Service Directors, the Unions and ICSU on the current FAGS strengths and weakness and on a recommended organization for a future Federation of Services that could (i) be a benefit for the Services and the Unions and (ii) fit the current ICSU strategic plan.

According to the decision of the FAGS Council meeting with the Unions, on Thursday 30 March morning, I am in charge, as the incoming FAGS Council President (in replacement of David Pugh), of preparing with Phil Wilkinson (one of the URSI Representatives on the Council and incoming FAGS Council Vice-President) and Ruth Neilan (one of the IUGG Representatives on the Council), the first draft of a "White paper" on the prospects for a future Federation of Services. This should be done in close coordination with the Service Directors and the Unions and with consultation with ICSU.

The aim of that paper will be to summarize the views from the FAGS Council, the Service Directors and the Unions, on what should be the most appropriate organization to replace FAGS. In parallel, the future relationships with the WDCs should be explored, given that the WDC's situation within ICSU is also intended to evolve along the lines of the ICSU strategic plan. As the final version of this "White paper" should be ready by the end of July 2006 in order to be then presented to the Services, the Unions, the ICSU, etc. before important ICSU meetings on scientific data, a first draft should be prepared shortly. In order to best prepare this first draft including a brief summary of the Union's views, I would like to ask you if you could send me some Notes on what your Union would expect from a federation of Services within ICSU and from the Services that would belong to that Federation.

Thank you in advance.

Best regards

Nicole Capitaine

Individual answers from the three Scientific Unions

A-1-2 Input from the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG) (From Joan Jocelyn; IUGG General Secretary, DRAFT 8 May 2006)

Prospects for a future ICSU Federation of Permanent Scientific Information Services

For the past several years there has been open discussion of the rationale for support of the 50-year-old ICSU Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical Data Analysis Services (FAGS). The individual Services report that it is important, to the point of survival, that their contributions be acknowledged and supported by a prestigious international organization, such as ICSU. IUGG has had ample time to discuss the matter in meetings of our Executive Committee and also with our sister Unions, and has identified the following points relevant to the continuation of the Federation.

- 1) ICSU considers issues regarding data and information to be critical and timely, as evidenced by the goal of element 6.2 in the 2006-2011 ICSU Strategic Plan: "To facilitate a coordinated global approach to scientific data and information that ensures equitable access to quality data and information for research, education, and informed decision-making." In addition, there have been a number of recent and ongoing ICSU activities directed toward the World Summit on the Information Society and the Earth Observation Summit (Global Earth Observation System of Systems).
- 2) IUGG considers issues regarding data and information to be critical and timely, as evidenced by its eGY (electronic Geophysical Year) initiative, which resolves to make past, present, and future geoscientific data readily, rapidly, conveniently, and openly available
- 3) Data and information services, including the original time series of observations as well as analyzed data products such as images, charts, and maps, sit at the interface between science and society. In addition to advancing science research itself, these products provide the basis for management of geophysical assets and risks and informed decision-making.
- 4) Services validate, document, and archive input observations and yield products based on accepted scientific techniques and procedures and current scientific research. Most services convene advisory councils that draw on the expertise of their sponsoring Unions.
- 5) Geophysical permanent services also define international data standards, exchange formats, models, and conventions for data, products, and meta-data, and are committed to providing this support to science for the foreseeable future.
- 6) Efforts addressing capacity building must include improved access in developing countries to data products and information networks, as well as the ability to contribute data and information.
- 7) Several Services draw from and benefit the work of more than one Union. Those Services must necessarily engender cooperation among, and efficiently serve these diverse requirements to the benefit of all.

IUGG concludes that it is indeed important to have a coordinating body to bring together appropriate independent Services to consider general and specific matters related to data and information collection, analysis, archiving, generation of information products, and access to and cross-connections among the various data banks.

IUGG was asked to consider and state what we expect from a renewed Federation of Permanent Services.

1. The present list of Services included within FAGS is largely historic. There are others that could be introduced, and would greatly augment the collective value of a Federation.

A list of possible additions is shown in Appendix A. This list will likely expand when other ICSU Unions are invited to propose additions.

2. An ICSU Federation of Services should consolidate astronomical and geophysical regimes and complement those data and information services of the World Meteorological Organization, including their network of 187 National Meteorological and Hydrological Services, 40 Regional Specialized Meteorological Centres, and three World Meteorological Centres.
3. IUGG is a federation of disciplinary Associations. A Federation of scientific information services would enjoy similar benefits, such as the following.
 - Identification as a member of a family – a Federation provides recognition of derived geophysical products and a strengthened voice to the greater scientific community and encourages national agencies to continue to support the Services within their countries.
 - A framework and structure including a website, a managed (continuously updated) list of permanent services and contact information that makes it easier for products to be referenced
 - Improved recognition and visibility of niche services
 - Synergy: coordination of common interests and sharing of information, resources, and customers through regular meetings of delegates
 - Joint creation of standards and procedures that could improve product quality and enable cross-communication between different data sources and types
 - Opportunity to share best practices and identify economies of scale
 - Opportunity for interdisciplinary alliances or shared services such as a network of related products
 - Opportunity to absorb feedback from ICSU, ICSU Interdisciplinary Bodies, National Members and the Unions including suggestions for new products/services (e.g., asteroid impact evaluations) and/or the evolution of present products
 - Fund-raising (at present, 3 Unions provide a small base of funding to support the work of the Federation. It may be possible to increase the base of scientific and financial support)
 - Coordination with data providers and data archival centers, as discussed further below.

A reconstituted Federation of Information Services could be augmented some significant ways. For example, observation networks organize data providers and ensure that data is accessible in a common format. INTERMAGNET (www.INTERMAGNET.org) is a case in point: this is a network of 100 geomagnetic observatories worldwide that supply data in near real-time. Several permanent services use this data to produce value-added products, and recognition of the network, as well as recognition for the Services, would lend support for its continuation. Other examples are the International Ocean Network (ION; www.deos.org/ION) which organizes long-term ocean observatories, and the IASPEI Federation of Digital broadband Seismograph Networks (FDSN; www.fdsn.org).

Concerning data archival, IUGG scientists reported that they deposit and retrieve data in the following Centres. However, this list is undoubtedly not complete. In addition, many services archive their own source data and products.

WDC Atmospheric Trace Gases (Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA)

WDC Climate (Hamburg, Germany)

WDC Aurora (Tokyo, Japan)

WDC Earth Tides (Brussels, Belgium)

WDC Geomagnetism (Centres in Copenhagen, Denmark; Edinburgh, United Kingdom; and Kyoto, Japan)
WDC Glaciology (Boulder, Colorado, USA)
WDC Ionosphere (Tokyo, Japan)
WDC Meteorology (Asheville, No. Carolina, USA; Beijing, China; Obninsk, Russia)
WDC Paleoclimatology (Boulder, Colorado, USA)
WDC Rotation of the Earth (Obninsk, Russia; Washington D.C., USA)
WDC Seismology (Denver, Colorado, USA)
WDC Solid Earth Geophysics (Boulder, Colorado, USA)
WDC Solar Activity (Meudon, France)
WDC Solar Terrestrial Physics (Boulder, Colorado, USA; Didcot, U.K.; Sydney, Australia)
WDC Sunspot Index (Brussels, Belgium)
National Oceanographic Data Center (NODC), USA
National Snow and Ice Data Centre (NSIDC), Boulder, Colorado, USA)
Global Land Ice Measurements from Space (GLIMS, Boulder, Colorado, USA)
Global Runoff Data Center (GRDC, <http://grdc.bafg.de> ; Koblenz, Germany)

To summarize, astronomical and geophysical permanent services add critical value to the interpretation of data and information, and significant advantages could result if a federation of such services worked to achieve common goals. Because this view is shared by multiple Unions within ICSU, the federation should continue to be organized under the auspices of ICSU.

Appendix A: Additional Services that could be included in an expanded Federation of Services

Suggested by the International Association of Geodesy (Please see <http://www.iag-aig.org> for details)

- IAG Bibliographic Service (IBS)
- International Gravity Field Service (IGFS)
- International Centre for Global Earth Models (ICGEM)
- International Geoid Service (IGeS)
- International Doris Service (IDS)
- International VLBI Service for Geodesy and Astrometry (IVS)
- The International Laser Ranging Service (ILRS)
- Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM) - Time Section
- International Altimetry Service (IAS) a joint service with IAPSO

Suggested by the Union Commission on Geophysical Risk and Sustainability

- World Stress Map Service (<http://www.world-stress-map.org/>) - a fundamental database for Earth System Management. It is a standard global stress compilation of recent tectonic stress data.
- International Seismological Center (<http://www.isc.ac.uk/>) - a non-governmental organisation charged with the final collection, analysis and publication of standard earthquake information from all over the world.

A-1-3 Input from the International Astronomical Union (IAU)
(From Oddbjørn Engvold, IAU General Secretary, Paris, June 2006)

Brief notes and comments presented at the FAGS Council meeting, Paris, March 30, 2006. on FAGS's (Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical Data Analysis Services) future relation to ICSU

1) *Visions and aims of the future FAGS*

- Ensure a good scientific basis of its activities and products
- Guard open data policy
- Ensure quality assurance and control of output
- Ensure stable funding basis
- Interactions of related services will
- Stimulate and broaden the scientific bases for the activities
- Foster increased cooperation and exchange of information
- Enhance visibility and recognition
- Common standardization of products and output, when useful and meaningful
- Possible sharing of some administrative costs
-

2) *What is the value of being under the ICSU umbrella?*

- Enhance visibility and recognition under an international organization, like ICSU
- Develop funding strategies under an international organization with broad experience with national and international policy and decision making
- Increased contacts with other relevant scientific programs and milieus.
- Secures contacts with other activities and services that may strengthen the scientific bases of the FAGS
- The FAGS services to society fulfill principal objectives of ICSU (see for instance Statutes of ICSU, II. OBJECTIVES, a) “to encourage and promote international scientific and technological activity for the benefit and well-being of humanity” available at:
http://www.icsu.org/Gestion/img/ICSU_DOC_DOWNLOAD/216_DD_FILE_Statutes_October_2005.pdf)
- The IAU welcomes the creation of a coordinating panel as an efficient forum for the interactions and cooperation listed above.

A-1-4 Input from the Union Radio-scientifique internationale

URSI reply to FAGS (16 November 2006)

1. Endorsements and Commitments

1.1 Background

The Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical data analysis Services (FAGS) was formed as an ICSU (International Council for Science) Interdisciplinary Body in 1956 with the task of providing a focus for astronomical and geophysical services. At that time, FAGS was given the prestige of the ICSU name, which was felt likely to assist the service agencies gaining national funding for their work, while remaining almost entirely a Scientific Union (IUGG, IAU, URSI) responsibility. The FAGS Statutes formed the constitution under which FAGS operated and identified the qualities a Service must have as well as levels of over-sight for the Services made up of the Council, Service Boards and a General Committee.

For a Service to join FAGS, there are three requirements:

- Services must satisfy a comprehensive description of what a service is;
- each Service will have a Director nominated by the National host for the Service;
- and the work of each Service will be carried out under the supervision of an expert Board nominated by the responsible Scientific Unions and approved through the FAGS Council.

The original FAGS evolved out of the IGY and the style, culture and communications of that time. While there has been some evolution, more significant changes can revitalise the community, maybe providing a new forum for geophysical and astronomical services of the future. The potential was clear at the 2005 combined Council and Directors Meeting. None of those present were familiar with the intricacies of all the services, and the Service Directors recognised the common problems and solutions each Service had developed, together with the scope of the collective services. While some services are small and others are major enterprises (IGS for instance), the identity each has under FAGS formed a useful bond.

The Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR) is the ICSU Committee responsible for all Priority Area Assessment (PAA) and it appoints an *ad hoc* PAA Panel for each major priority scientific area identified for assessment. At the 27th General Assembly of ICSU (2002) the CSPR recommended carrying out two PAA, both of which passed comment on FAGS. The first, *PAA Report on the Environment and its Relation to Sustainable Development*, (ISBN 0-930357-59-0), was critical of FAGS and recommended that it should no longer be an Interdisciplinary Body under ICSU. The second PAA, *Panel on Scientific Data and Information*, (ISBN 0-930357-60-4) endorsed this view. At the 2005 ICSU General Assembly, these recommendations were put to the Assembly, but were set aside. Consequently, FAGS retained its Interdisciplinary Body status for a further three years.

ICSU has now formed an ad hoc Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID) to oversee the implementation of the key recommendations in the PAA reports and in particular those that concern ICSU Interdisciplinary Bodies such as the World Data Centre (WDC) and FAGS. In outlining the task for the SKID, ICSU has noted the following two (a third point covered CODATA) relevant Terms of Reference for the SCID:

- To guide and oversee the reform of the World Data Centre (WDC) system and Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical data analysis Services (FAGS);
- to advise CSPR on any other actions that might be appropriate for ICSU to consider in order to facilitate a coordinated global approach to scientific data and information, including the potential need for a Scientific Data and Information Forum (SciDIF).

A reasonably tight timeframe has been adopted leading to WDC / FAGS reforms being identified by July 2007.

It is within this context that URSI wishes to endorse its support for FAGS and renew its commitment to seeing a re-invigorated FAGS evolve out of the forthcoming process. At the time

of writing, the exact role of the Unions in this process is unclear, but we expect we will have a significant role to play.

1.2 Value of the Services

1.2.1 General

A key role of FAGS is to prepare, validate and preserve observational data of long-term value to science, and to investigate directions for the future. By its nature FAGS promotes the collection and distribution of common formatted observations that are then used to produce indices, or other measures of the geophysical and astrophysical environment. These composite indices are passed back to the waiting science community.

The individual Service Directors feel that it is important, to the point of survival, that their Services are acknowledged and supported by a prestigious international organization, such as ICSU. There are also concerns that many important data series could be fragmented and lost if FAGS ceased to exist.

1.2.2 Specific URSI interests in FAGS

URSI commissions have a direct interest in 8 of the 12 FAGS services:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Unions</u>	<u>URSI Commissions</u>
CDS	Centre de Données astronomiques de Strasbourg	IAU, URSI	J
IERS	International Earth Rotation and Reference system Services	IUGG	J?
IGS	International GPS Service for Geodynamics	IUGG, URSI	A, E?, G
ISES	International Space Environment Service	IUGG, IAU, URSI	E, J, G, H
ISGI	International Service of Geomagnetic Indices	IUGG, URSI	E, G, H
IVS	International VLBI Service For Geodesy And Astrometry	IAU, IUGG URSI,	J
SIDC	Sunspot Index Data Centre	IAU, IUGG, URSI	G, H
QBSA	Quarterly Bulletin on Solar Activity	IUGG, IAU, URSI	J, G, H

These are all important scientific services providing key support for research programs covering a significant part of the scientific interests of URSI.

1.3 Outlook

URSI has a long-term interest in the continued production of the scientific services. The current arrangements have served URSI needs well, although these recent discussions suggest it is worth re-visiting the present arrangements with a view to strengthening and enhancing them. A revitalised scientific services forum may attract further services to join FAGS. The scope exists. On the matter of funding for FAGS, the primary funding for the Services come from the parent organisations, while the much smaller FAGS funding is an endorsement, and explicit demonstration of the ongoing value the services have for the scientific community. Until recently, the supplementary FAGS funds came from ICSU and are currently, and less conveniently, provided directly by the Unions. URSI, along with the other Unions, is committed to continuing support for FAGS.

2. Proposals for change

Although URSI is happy with FAGS performance, given the criticisms of the two ICSU PAA, and the proposed SCID review, changes are likely to be proposed. A range of options is possible:

- (i) Fine-tune the current arrangements that define FAGS,
- (ii) Seek wider ranging changes, leading to a new body arising out of the current FAGS,

- (iii) Position FAGS for coalescence with some other body, or bodies,
- (iv) Accept the conclusions of the PAA and abandon FAGS.

The main criticism that needs to be addressed is that FAGS does not add anything to the Services, or at least adds an insufficient amount to require it to have the status of an Interdisciplinary Body under ICSU. However, from the perspective of the Services within FAGS, the FAGS Council, the FAGS Service Boards and the supporting Scientific Unions, FAGS is functioning correctly. Thus, those within the ambit of FAGS do not appreciate the conclusions of those external to the body. Although the PAA recommendations failed at the ICSU Assembly, probably ICSU still feels option (iv) is appropriate while many within FAGS feel option (i) is best. Given the tensions, it will be wise to always keep option (iv) in view while developing ideas about change. In what follows, option (i) is considered first. Here evolutionary changes are suggested that capitalise on the current views in FAGS. Following that, the wider opportunities options (ii) and (iii) offer FAGS are suggested.

2.1 Fine-Tune FAGS

URSI feels FAGS should look to its strengths, consolidate these nearer the head of the body and develop a stronger public image, for instance by proposing international standards and procedures for homogenisation between FAGS services and services from potential ICSU partners (information society, Earth observation, ..), to counter the type of criticism levelled in the ICSU PAA. As suggestions:

- Since each Service Board under-writes the validity of the Service for which it is responsible, make the Service Boards much more visible, giving them a clearer role in the management and value of the Services. This will mean making certain there is a current, active Board for each Service. The members of the Board should appear on the FAGS Website alongside their respective Services. Ideally, the most recent Board review of the services should also be available on the website. The Boards are the key external expert oversight of the Services. The Board needs to become an integral part of each Service's strategic plan and may also contribute to the overall FAGS strategic plan (is there one?). While much of this is cosmetic, it is important for the image of FAGS.
- The FAGS Council reviews the distribution of funds made available by the FAGS funding agency – currently, the Scientific Unions. This is an important function, but it is possible the process of the oversight may have lead to some of the criticisms of FAGS. The value of meetings cannot be under-estimated since the synergies of face-to-face contact often results in significant innovations. Nevertheless, it is unclear to what extent the FAGS Council meetings add to the overall success of FAGS. These meetings need to be considered thoughtfully. (Note that the CSPR Feb. 2006 meeting report acknowledged the inclusion of the FAGS meeting of Service Directors at the 2005 FAGS Council Meeting.)
- Shift the emphasis of the FAGS meetings to a Service Directors meeting, rather than the Council meeting. The Service Directors are the most important people within the FAGS structure. Under the FAGS Statutes, a General Committee includes all the people in the Boards, the Council, and the Service Directors. It is worth considering the merits of General Committee meetings, however, as the numbers increase the meeting will become more formal, with the danger of eroding potential cross-disciplinary links. The Service Directors plus Council form a useful sized meeting. These will be specialist meetings for exchanging experiences, skills, techniques and ideas on data-handling policies. Because the Services are data-centric it is natural they will have direct experience and opinions on many of the current and likely future data problems (for instance: data ownership and intellectual property issues; data management, storage and archiving; data exchange standards and formats; possibly issues related to metadata; the potential list is long). As these and other data topics impact scientific research FAGS could speak with a common

experienced voice about these issues. The collective practical knowledge of the FAGS members might well be invaluable to data gatherers of the future.

- It is vital that FAGS develops an out-reach programme. The scope of the FAGS services demands this since the individual members of the Council, and the Service Directors themselves are not fully aware of the scope of the FAGS services. The depth, range and potential of the services may benefit from an internal outreach programme, and it will certainly help FAGS supporters externally. This outreach should embrace a number of levels, for example: general education about each service; exploration of service synergies; the service role within FAGS; and so on. This information should appear on the FAGS Website.
- The annual Service reports to the Council could be valuable documents for providing regular Service visibility updates. Currently, these reports provide Council with evidence of how the FAGS funds are being used, and where they are expected to be used. However, the reporting should be extended (as it often is already) to account for the development of the Services. Again, the reports should be made available on the FAGS Website.

Some of the suggestions above would be relatively easy to implement. Others will require (non-existent) resources, thereby placing a significant strain on the Services and people concerned with seeing FAGS continue.

2.2 Opportunities

It is unlikely the suggestions above will lead to a rapid change of opinion about FAGS. It is therefore important to at least position FAGS to capitalise on opportunities as they arise.

2.2.1. Upcoming programs: IPS, eGY

FAGS will play a largely invisible key role in the forthcoming International Polar Year (IPY) program given the fundamental nature of the Services. As part of an outreach programme, this role should be highlighted. At the very least, some contrasts about what could happen during IPY both in the presence and absence of the FAGS services would be a useful way of highlighting Service value. More importantly, direct contributions to IPY programmes need to be highlighted. For a long time, data has been subordinate to scientific output and the main aim of the electronic Geophysical Year (eGY) is to put the emphasis on data and data issues. There is no deliberate focus on any one data activity (although virtual observatories clearly embody the eGY ideas) but rather to demonstrate what can be achieved with good quality data and data shared widely, freely and in a timely fashion. The ideal outcome for eGY would be that all data would flow like water from a tap – just turn on the virtual data-tap and out would flow the exact data needed to work on a problem. FAGS should naturally find an identity within this environment and should use eGY as part of a FAGS outreach programme.

2.2.2 Web presence

Web presence cannot be under-estimated.

Collectively, FAGS has a significant Web presence. However, this is distributed across many websites leading to a minor impact for the central FAGS site. FAGS needs to seek ways of increasing the weight and impact of its prime Website. A few comments have been suggested above for increasing the FAGS content on the primary site. However, this may raise the issue of how the website is hosted.

2.2.3 Extended Service Forum

Is it possible for FAGS to encourage other Service to join the Federation and to develop collaborations with potential ICSU partners. A number of Services exist within the International Association of Geodesy (IAG) that would appear to fit comfortably within the FAGS environment. These services are all more closely allied to IUGG interests than URSI so it is hard to judge whether they can be attracted to FAGS or be ready to collaborate on the basis of

international standards and procedures . Are there other Services in other Unions of ICSU that might benefit from joining FAGS or collaborating with FAGS?

3. Summary

Of the four options suggested earlier, option (i) alone will not be sufficient to ensure the long-term existence of FAGS. Alternatively, option (iv) is not acceptable as the risks of losing some Services are unacceptably high. Consequently, FAGS must change. While those within and near FAGS might regret this, change is essential if it is to survive as an entity. Furthermore, if FAGS is to have long-term relevance, it also needs to grow, which means it needs to become a more attractive forum than at present.

The key change that appears essential is to develop FAGS into an active data forum centred on FAGS meetings. At least initially, these could be exclusive meetings for Service Directors (and maybe a limited number of Service adherents), the FAGS Council and people the meeting feels it is valuable to invite. The direction FAGS then takes will depend on the collective opinions of this group. The FAGS Statutes need to be re-drafted to reflect this altered vision. This will be a useful first step. In addition, FAGS needs to develop an outreach program and the FAGS Website is a suitable medium to promote this venture.

Long-term funding may remain a problem for FAGS if it does not develop a wider range of reasons for Services to belong to it. One worry is that the Union funds are unlikely to increase in the future, so that an increased membership will dilute the currently small funds available to FAGS. While it will be valuable to seek larger, stable sources of funds, it may also be possible to increase the value of FAGS to the member Services so that membership alone becomes the key driver. To do this, FAGS must look to its strengths and develop them.

FAGS is a data community with a potentially unique role to play. FAGS should seek to become a more vocal player in the data world of the future. It should capitalise on the wide range of experience within the federation of services and speak with a common voice on data issues. This could be the FAGS vision for the future. It is a forum likely to encourage other services to join it. While the past FAGS was passive, the future FAGS will at least be an active, if not pro-active forum.

Finally, it is unclear whether there is a true, long-term distinction between options (iii) and (iv). Hopefully FAGS can react quickly enough to define its identity for the near future and consolidate within option (ii) forming a new body with the flavour and name of a greatly enhanced FAGS.

Annex 2 - Comments from FAGS Service Directors

A-2-1 Call for comments from the Unions for preparing the White paper on the future of the federation (April 2006)

Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2006 8:13 PM

Subject: Re: NEW: CAGS meeting in Paris, March 29, 2006, 11-18

To FAGS Service Directors; CC: David Pugh, Niels Andersen

Dear Colleagues,

I thank very much those of you who have participated in the meeting of the FAGS Council with the Service Directors, the Unions and the ICSU Representative on Wednesday 29 March in Paris. I also thank you for the interesting presentations on the activities and projects of the Services that have been given during the meeting.

Preliminary views have emerged from the discussion during this meeting on the current FAGS strengths and weakness and on a recommended organization for a future Federation of Services that could (i) be a benefit for the Services and the Unions and (ii) fit the current ICSU strategic plan.

Following this discussion and according to the decision of the FAGS Council meeting with the Unions, on Thursday 30 March morning, I am in charge, as the incoming FAGS Council President (in replacement of David Pugh), of preparing with Phil Wilkinson (one of the URSI Representatives on the Council and incoming FAGS Council Vice-President) and Ruth Neilan (one of the IUGG Representatives on the Council), the first draft of a "White paper" on the prospects for a future Federation of Services. The aim of that paper is to summarize the views from the FAGS Council, the Service Directors and the Unions, on what should be the most appropriate organization to replace FAGS. In parallel, the future relationships with the WDCs should be explored, given that the WDC's situation within ICSU is also intended to evolve along the lines of the ICSU strategic plan. As the final version of this "White paper" should be ready by the end of July 2006 in order to be then presented to the Services, the Unions, the ICSU, etc. before important ICSU meetings on scientific data, a first draft should be prepared shortly. This paper should be prepared with close coordination with the Service Directors and the Unions and with consultation with ICSU.

In order to best prepare this first draft, I would like to include a summary of the Service Director's views on a recommended organization for a future Federation of Services based on the FAGS experience. I would therefore appreciate receiving a Note from you on this issue. For those who have participated in the Paris meeting, this should in the same time be sent to Niels for the minutes of the meeting.

Thank you in advance (and thank you to those who have already sent such a Note).

Best regards

Nicole Capitaine

A-2-2 Comments from FAGS Service Directors: *Individual answers*

1) PSMSL views on FAGS

You asked for remarks on what support each Service needs in a future structure from ICSU. I think the main things are below.

1. That the parent body (ICSU or whatever) is ITSELF recognised internationally - getting a seal of approval from a poorly- recognised body doesn't do much good (I would include IAG, IAPSO and the other unions individually in that). ICSU would be fine, at the moment. If its reputation suffers further, then we all suffer.
2. That the Service is then recognised by the parent body as the global focus for that activity, in terms of data banking and other service functions. THIS IS THE MAIN POINT.
3. National funding is likely to pay most of the bills in most cases, but the parent body must not be slow in prompting the national organisations when a Service needs help e.g. when more resources needed. That means the parent body has to keep on top of how the Service is performing and be proactive. At present ICSU and FAGS are passive.
4. In particular, the parent body should review from time to time how the Service is relating to IPCC (for example) and to parallel governmental activities (GLOSS for example).
5. The parent body must be more active than now in publishing the work of a Service. (It has to show that it cares.)
6. The 'World Data Centre' label could work well (better than 'member of FAGS' for example) as long as it is not devalued by some of the more dubious centres already in the system (so it was said in Paris).
7. There is also need for flexibility (new Services/WDCs added fast as technology changes) and new groupings come about (e.g. GGOS). In a larger WDC club I guess the 'GGOS and the others' concern expressed in Paris would not apply as the others would have some friends.
8. I am less concerned by data management aspects (standardised methods, XML etc.). I am sure most Services know what they are doing with regard to their own data types - the only questions are whether the data are being provided efficiently and (in most cases) freely.

There could be some advantages in data handling I guess, but PSMSL gets most of its advice via BODC and IODE.

9. One data aspect is that some Services now have 'operational' as well as 'delayed mode' interests (e.g. for the PSMSL there are some real time tide gauge data interests in addition to MSL; the IERS forecasts LoD). That need not though change the character of the long term responsibility of the Service.

3 April 2006

Philip Woodworth, PSMSL Director

2) SIDC views on FAGS

We expect from FAGS to help us for

1) ***visibility and recognition***: the adherence of the SIDC to an international body gives a certain degree of recognition to our work and attaches a "stamp of approval". As has been repeated several times at the meeting, the name FAGS is not sufficiently known to give great weight, so it is far more important to be seen as an organisation falling under ICSU (or another well-known international body such as UNESCO).

However, this seal of approval should also be seen by the community as a quality label, so it comes with the need to maintain a standard. An organisation like ICSU is too broad in scope and too limited in staff to be able to do this. But this is precisely the role that could be attributed to FAGS: an emanation of ICSU responsible for the maintenance of the quality standard. Two types of quality could be measured:

- quality of the provision of a service (e.g. are all documents available delivered in time, is the website kept up-to-date?)
- quality of the contents of the service: more difficult but also important. This could be related to Michel Menvielle's request to have some FAGS meetings with scientific content too. For example, each year a few of the services could be asked for a detailed description of their data, procedures and services, on which basis their quality can be assessed.

2) ***representation***: the FAGS Council represents the services to defend our interests in international and national agencies, which should help us secure funding. Again, the ICSU stamp weighs heavier, but ICSU is not sufficiently familiar with the nature of the Services.

3) ***coordination***: since it has been recognised that the services have many common issues and problems, it is necessary to coordinate the discussions about joint approaches for these problems (such as the lack of referencing to the Services), and the implementation of these approaches.

In addition, the ***seed funding*** provided by FAGS is a bonus, but cannot be the main justification for its existence.

What should be improved with respect to the current situation:

- 1) Some definition of the membership should be made: what is a "Service"?
- 2) There should be some time dedicated about the type of problems encountered by the Services and their joint resolution.

04/04/2006

Ronald van der Linden, SIDC)

2) WGMS needs concerning a future federation of international data services

The federation of the international data services should:

- strengthen the visibility and credibility of the data services and their monitoring networks towards the national funding organisations, the scientific community, international monitoring and assessment programmes (in the case of WGMS, for instance, GCOS, IPCC, GEOSS) and the public.

- strongly support the services regarding a continuous funding base for the operational business. The importance of long-term monitoring, active data collection and the maintenance of corresponding database systems is not always recognised by the scientific communities and the funding agencies, as past and present experiences show. A minimum amount of funding from the federation might, thereby, emphasise such a commitment. In addition, a more active lobbying on international level and support on national level would be appreciated.

- represent and defend the common interests of the data services inside ICSU, the Unions and also towards other international organisations (e.g., UNESCO, WMO). The federation could organise workshops with the services directors to define the needs and recommendations of the services concerning common issues, such as for instance data/information policies, copy writes, scientific and non-science users.

- provide a common data gateway. This could be a website, listing and linking all data services, which would increase visibility and also the rating of all websites in online search machines (e.g., Google). A more sophisticated (and more expensive gateway could include a common search engine for (meta) data provided by the services.

Especially in our (the WGMS) case, a close collaboration with the World Data Centre on glaciology (NSIDC in Boulder, Colorado, USA) is essential.

We, therefore, would appreciate if a future federation of the international data services is closely linked to the framework of the WDCs (and CODATA), i.e. the ICSU.

18 April 2006

Michael Zemp, World Glacier Monitoring Service

4) ISGI views on FAGS

Lien avec les WDCs :

Je pense que ce lien est naturel.

Il faut seulement que le nom de l'ombrelle ait une connotation un peu moins poussiéreuse que 'WDC'. Je sais personnellement que les WDC ont fait beaucoup d'efforts pour la mise en ligne des données, mais j'ai l'impression que l'image des WDCs reste bien poussiéreuse dans la communauté. De ce point de vue, FAGS est un acronyme neutre, qui ne masque pas le soutien d'ICSU qui est, lui, fondamental pour étayer nos demandes de soutien aux tutelles.

Un lien plus étroit avec les WDCs aurait un intérêt majeur : faciliter les négociations avec les WDCs pour obtenir que les WDCs fonctionnent comme site miroir des sites des Services FAGS concernés. Cela implique, en particulier, que les WDCs doivent - à mon sens - ne se fournir qu'auprès des Services en ce qui concerne les données dont les Services sont responsables. Je prend l'exemple des indices. Ce sont des données qui sont souvent utilisées comme des 'boîtes noires', et qui sont disponibles en de nombreux endroits (dont le site Internet du Service de indices). Malheureusement, la mise en disposition en ligne de données préliminaires et provisoires calculées sur la base des données disponibles à un moment donné conduit à une situation où les séries mises à disposition sur les différents sites sont différentes, parce que copiées à des moments différents sur le site du Service des indices, voire sur d'autres sites. Il en résulte une confusion sans nom, et nous allons enager des discussions avec les sites diffusant les indices pour leur demander de fonctionner comme site miroir du site Service des indices afin de résoudre le problème.

Activités scientifiques :

Les Services de FAGS constituent une communauté couvrant de nombreuses disciplines. FAGS constitue d'ailleurs probablement une communauté unique de ce point de vue. Il faut valoriser cette richesse. Une des solutions est de profiter des Congrès EGU ou AGU, et des Assemblées des Unions et de leurs Associations pour organiser des sessions pluridisciplinaires sous la

bannière de FAGS. En ce qui concerne les relations Soleil-Terre, il y a aussi les Semaines de météorologie de l'espace qui sont maintenant régulièrement organisées. Il faut alors mettre en place une veille qui anticipe les opportunités et fasse circuler l'information parmi les Services avec des suggestions. C'est le rôle du Conseil FAGS, et je crois que c'est un de ses rôles fondamentaux.

Je pense qu'il serait très utile d'avoir une réunion des Directeurs Durant tous les congrès majeurs. Il est clair qu'il y aurait toujours des absents, mais cela ne serait pas trop grave dans la mesure où il y aurait plusieurs réunions par an.

27 April 2006
Michel Menvielle
Director ISGI

5) Considerations about the status of the International Centre For Earth Tides activities which could be used to prepare an "announcement of opportunity": IAG Service, FAGS Service and World Data Center C

From Bernard Ducarme (April 2006) at the occasion of his planned retirement as ICET Director

The present ICET (International Centre For Earth Tides) terms of reference and main activities are:

- *as World Data Centre C, to collect all available measurements on Earth tides;*
- *to evaluate these data by convenient methods of analysis in order to reduce the very large amount of measurements to a limited number of parameters which should contain all the desired and needed geophysical information;*
- *to compare the data from different instruments and different stations distributed all over the world, evaluate their precision and accuracy from the point of view of internal errors as well as external errors;*
- *to help solving the basic problem of calibration by organizing reference stations or realizing calibration devices;*
- *to fill gaps in information and data;*
- *to build a data bank allowing immediate and easy comparison of earth tides parameters with different Earth models and other geodetic and geophysical parameters ;*
- *to ensure a broad diffusion of the results and information to all interested laboratories and individual scientists.*

These terms of reference could be updated with the agreement of the Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical Data Analysis Services (FAGS) and IAG.

These goals are now achieved essentially by the diffusion of information and software, the data processing, the organization of schools, the training of young scientists and the welcome of visiting scientists. Due to the reduced staff at ICET, visiting scientists became of primary importance for the development of ICET activities.

The diffusion of information was, until recently, mainly insured by the publication of the Bulletin d'Information des Marées Terrestres. Now the ICET site is the primary source of information and of software retrieval (at: <http://www.astro.oma.be/ICET/index.html>). This tendency will certainly be confirmed in the future.

Recently ICET took part to the organization of several “Summer Schools”: "Terrestrial Gravity Data Acquisition Techniques" with BGI in 2002, "International Seminary on the Applications of the Computer Program VAV-03 for Tidal Data Processing" in 2003 and “Microgravimetric Methods: static and dynamic aspects” with BGI in 2005.

ICET is also involved in one project: The Global Geodynamics Project (GGP), a network of 20 stations equipped with superconducting gravimeters. This network is in operation since July 1997, using similar hardware and the same procedures for data acquisition. ICET has the scientific responsibility of evaluating the content of the database. This project will continue at least until July 2007.

ICET tightened its links with the “Bureau Gravimétrique International” (BGI) in the framework of the “International Gravity Field Service (IGFS). The two services are organizing common schools (2002, 2005) and made a common bid for funding to FAGS for the merging of their bibliographic data bases.

Organization

As responsible of a Service, the ICET Director has to be appointed by IAG, with the agreement of FAGS.

The Director is assisted by a Directing Board including the President of the sub-commission of Earth Tides and a FAGS representative, plus elected members. In the past the elected members were chosen by the Earth Tides Commission. Due to the change of IAG statutes ICET is no more depending from the Earth Tides Sub-commission and it will be necessary to revise this procedure. The directing board should meet once a year but it is often difficult to organize a meeting outside large International conferences, such as IAG or IUGG Assemblies, or the Earth Tides Symposium.

The Director has to report to IAG Executive Committee on one hand and to FAGS Secretary on the other. As ICET is receiving financial support from FAGS, the accounts and budget are submitted to FAGS.

At the last IUGG General Assembly (Sapporo, 2003) the International Gravity Field Service was officially created to increase the coordination in the field of Gravimetry. It is a Confederation of existing Services (BGI, ICET and IGeS) and newly created ones. The ICET Director is a member of the IGFS board.

Annex 3 - Current status of FAGS components

FAGS Council

According to the FAGS statutes, the FAGS Council is composed of 2 representatives of IUGG, 2 representatives of IAU, 2 representatives of URSI, the Secretary, the past Secretary, restricted to a period of two years following his/her terms of office (if need be).

2007-2008 membership

Nicole Capitaine (France)	IAU	<i>President</i>
Philip Wilkinson (Australia)	URSI	<i>Vice-President</i>
Philip Woodworth (UK)		<i>Secretary</i>
Niels Andersen (Denmark)		<i>Past Secretary</i>
Frederic Clette (Belgium)	URSI	
David Pugh (UK)	IUGG	
Ruth Neilan (USA)	IUGG	
Ray Norris (Australia)	IAU	

Current Unions General Secretaries

IAU (International Astronomical Union): Karel A. van der Hucht (Netherlands)

IUGG (International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics): JoAnn Joselyn (USA)

URSI (Union Radio-scientifique internationale): Paul Lagasse (Belgium)

Current FAGS Services

Service	Title	Sponsoring Unions	Interested Unions	Director
BGI	Bureau Gravimétrique International	IUGG	IUGG	R. Biancale (interim), CNES, Toulouse, France
CDS	Centre de Données astronomiques de Strasbourg	IAU	IAU, URSI	F. Genova, Starsbourg, France
ICET	International Center for Earth Tides	IUGG	IUGG	B. Ducarme, ORB, Bruxelles, Belgique
IERS	International Earth Rotation and Reference systems Service	IAU, IUGG	IAU, IUGG	B. Richter, BKG, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
IGS	International GNSS Service	IUGG	IUGG, URSI	R. Neilan, JPL, Pasadena, USA
ISES	International Space Environment Service	URSI, IAU, IUGG	URSI, IAU, IUGG	D. Boteler, Ottawa, Canada
ISGI	International Service of Geomagnetic Indices	IUGG	IUGG, URSI	M. Menvielle, CETP, Saint-Maur des fossés, France
IVS	International VLBI Service for geodesy and astrometry	IAU, IUGG	IAU, IUGG, URSI,	D. Behrend, GSFC, Greenbelt, USA
PSMSL	Permanent Service for Mean Sea Level	IUGG	IUGG	L. Rickards, POL, Liverpool, UK
SIDC	Solar Influences Data Analysis Center	URSI, IAU, IUGG	URSI, IAU, IUGG	R Van der Linden, ORB, Bruxelles, Belgique
QBSA	Quarterly Bulletin on Solar Activity	IAU	IUGG, IAU, URSI	K. Shibasaki, NAO, Minamimaki, Japan
WGMS	World Glacier Monitoring Service	IUGG	IUGG	W. Haeberli, Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Annex 4 - ICSU Document about SDIC

Background and Terms of Reference for an *ad hoc* Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID)

Background

The nature and use of scientific data and information, the conditions under which scientific data and information are produced, distributed, and managed, and the role of scientists and other actors in these processes have been changing rapidly in recent years. These changes are partly a result of the revolution in computational capacity and connectivity that together have expanded the quality and quantity of research data. They are also related to the emergence of new questions in scientific research that require different types of data. Taken together, these changes are providing scientists throughout the world with more and enhanced access to research data and information. The benefits of this include the growing involvement of scientists in international research projects and increased scientific and policy interest in global scale and comparative research activities.

The Priority Area Assessment (PAA) on Scientific Data and Information (ICSU 2004) includes over 50 recommendations on future needs and priorities. It highlights the importance of professional data and information management and the need to build capacity in this area in all countries; the importance of coordination within the ICSU family and beyond, and the need to modernize or replace existing structures. Its overall conclusion is that there is a need for a new coordinated global approach to scientific data and information. It is recognized that such an approach will require considerable national and international investment but the potential returns in the longer-term are enormous.

ICSU Strategy

On the basis of the PAA recommendations, the ICSU Strategic Plan, 2006-2011 (pp41-42), includes the following goal:

“To facilitate a new coordinated global approach to scientific data and information that ensures equitable access to quality data and information for research, education and informed decision-making.”

In order to achieve this it proposes that ICSU will establish an *ad hoc* Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID) and also explore the need for multi-stakeholder Scientific Data and Information Forum (SciDIF).

A number of specific commitments with regards to the re-focusing of ICSU’s existing data and information services are made, including:

- The World Data Centre (WDC) system and the Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical data Services (FAGS) will be reformed taking account of user needs, including those of existing and new ICSU programmes. This will form part of development of the broader strategic framework for data and information.
- The Committee on Data for Science and Technology (CODATA) will be encouraged to develop a long –term strategy.

An *ad hoc* Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID)

The proposed remit for SCID is to oversee the implementation of the key recommendations in the PAA report and in particular those that concern ICSU Interdisciplinary Bodies. A key conclusion of the PAA was that ICSU should foster greater communication, coordination, and collaboration within and across members of the ICSU community and with other partners on issues, practices and structures for scientific data management. A multi-stakeholder Scientific Data and Information Forum (SciDIF) was proposed as a mechanism to achieve this. However, since the publication of the PAA report a number of significant multi-stakeholder forums have already been established. These include the planning exercise for a Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) and the launching of a Global Information Commons for Science Initiative, both of which have been supported by ICSU. The electronic Geophysical Year (eGY) is also acting as a focus for coordination and collaboration on data issues and the International Polar Year is having a federating effect on all those involved in data and information management as regards polar research. The need and potential structure, for SciDIF needs to be re-evaluated by the *ad hoc* Committee (SCID) in the light of these developments.

Reform of WDC and FAGS

The World Data Center system consists of over forty designated World Data Centers (WDCs), which collect, manage, and distribute a wide range of defined geophysical, solar and environmental data. The World Data Center programme was created during the International Geophysical Year of 1957-1958, and in 1968, ICSU established a Panel on World Data Centers to coordinate and monitor the activities of the centers. Financial support for specific WDCs is obtained from a variety of sources, usually national governments.

FAGS was established in 1956 and includes 12 permanent data services, each operating under the authority of one or more of the three sponsoring unions: Astronomy, Geodesy and Geophysics and Radio Science. The services are maintained nationally and their role is to collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate observations, information and data related to astronomy and geophysics. The services are independent, but ICSU and the union co-sponsors contribute to the overarching coordinating function which is performed by the Council of the Federation.

The PAA on Data and Information, as well as an earlier PAA on The Environment and its Relation to Sustainable Development (ICSU, 2003), concluded that, whilst there are distinctions between the WDCs and FAGS, both networks need restructuring to meet the current and future needs of the international scientific community. For example, both the geographical and disciplinary spread of these networks is still principally dictated by the nature of the International Geophysical Year 50 years ago.

CODATA

CODATA was established as an ICSU interdisciplinary body in 1966. Its principal objectives are improvement of the quality and accessibility of scientific data, as well as the methods by which data are acquired, managed and analyzed; the facilitation of international cooperation on data issues; the promotion of awareness of data issues in the science and technology community; and consideration of data access and intellectual property issues. Its core funding (~€200,000 *per annum*) comes from member subscriptions. It has 23 national members and 15 international union members. A mixture of policy and operational activities are performed mainly by special task groups, which are established and/or renewed at biennial general conferences. It also organizes a number of *ad hoc* activities and was actively involved in the World Summit on the Information Society (Geneva, 2002, Tunis, 2005), which has led to the development of a Global Information Commons for Science Initiative (GICSI). These activities are coordinated by an Executive Director based in Paris, who is supported in her direction by an Executive Board.

The PAA on Data and Information observed that “the recent direction of CODATA is to be complimented for its energy and foresight”. However there was some concern as to the lack of future focus and strategy. It concluded that:

“CODATA should develop a clear long-term strategy that focuses on key international data management and policy issues, giving special attention to the needs of developing countries.”

Terms of Reference for an *ad hoc* Strategic Committee on Information and Data (SCID)

Taking the report of the CSPR Assessment Panel on Scientific Data and Information as its starting point, and in the light of developments subsequent to that report:

1. To guide and oversee the reform of the World Data Centre (WDC) system and Federation of Astronomical and Geophysical data analysis Services (FAGS);
2. to liaise with CODATA in the development of its strategic plan;
3. to advise CSPR on any other actions that might be appropriate for ICSU to consider in order to facilitate a coordinated global approach to scientific data and information, including the potential need for a Scientific Data and Information Forum (SciDIF).

Proposed *ad hoc* Committee composition

The membership should include a number of independent data experts covering both the provider and user perspectives. It should include representatives of the following bodies/activities:

CSPR
FAGS
WDCs
CODATA
eGY
IPY
GEO/GEOSS

Timetable

September 06 CSPR agrees ToR for *ad hoc* committee
Sept-Dec consultation with relevant bodies on Membership
Feb 07 CSPR agrees final membership
April 07 Unions meeting
May 07 WDC Directors meeting (attended by members of *ad hoc* committee)
July 07 1st meet. of *ad hoc* committee (plans for WDC/FAGS reform)
Sept 07 interim report to CSPR
Nov 07 2nd meet. of *ad hoc* committee
Feb 08 report to CSPR
March 08 3rd meet of *ad hoc* committee
October 08 General Assembly

Annex 5 – UNESCO Centres
(considered as a possible option by FAGS in 2005)

The following notes on various categories of UNESCO Centres are extracted from a paper presented to the 167th Executive Board of UNESCO (167EX/16) date August 2003.

CATEGORY 1

Category 1 centres are generally owned, funded and staffed by UNESCO

CATEGORY 2

Category 2 institutes and centres are not legally part of the organisation but are associated with it through formal arrangements approved by the General Conference. They are to contribute to the execution of UNESCO's programme through capacity building, through exchange of information in a particular discipline, theoretical and experimental research and advanced training, etc. They also contribute to technical cooperation among developing countries. In general UNESCO is represented on their governing bodies and provides technical, and in certain cases, financial assistance on an ad hoc basis. However, as a rule, they are neither headed by a staff member nor do they apply UNESCO's rules and regulations.

Creation/association

Category 2 institutes and centres are created or associated with UNESCO by a decision of the General Conference. Such a decision should specifically state that the entity in question is to be "under UNESCO's auspices". In certain cases, the General Conference may wish to authorise the Executive Board to take a decision on its behalf in designating a category 2 entity.

Legal responsibility of UNESCO

Category 2 institutes and centres are associated with UNESCO but are legally outside of the Organisation (i.e. UNESCO is not legally responsible for them and bears neither responsibility nor liabilities of any kind, be it managerial, financial or otherwise).

Contribution to UNESCO's strategic objective

The activities of any such entity should make a substantial contribution to UNESCO's strategic objectives and programme priorities. This must be demonstrated in the request for creation/association and the related feasibility study, and reconfirmed through subsequent regular evaluations.

Representation

UNESCO must be represented as a full member in the governing organ of a category 2 institute/centre.

Direction

As a matter of principle, the Directors of category 2 institutes and centres should not be appointed by the Director-General, who may indeed be consulted on the choice of candidates; the actual appointment should be the responsibility of other appropriate authorities; and each existing arrangement should be carefully examined in consultation with the entity concerned with a view to bringing it into conformity with the prevailing principle.

Financial contributions

UNESCO may contribute financially to concrete activities/projects of category 2 institutes and centres if those are deemed in line with UNESCO's programme priorities; it should not, however, provide financial support for administrative or institutional purposes.

Financial accountability

While being accountable for any financial contributions provided, UNESCO is not responsible for managing accounts/finances of category 2 entities.

Employment of UNESCO staff

Category 2 institutes and centres should neither be headed by nor employ UNESCO staff members. However, they could occasionally benefit from the temporary detachment of UNESCO staff, such detachment to be decided by the Director-General on an exceptional basis if justified by the implementation of a joint activity/project within a priority area as approved by UNESCO's governing bodies.

Use of UNESCO's name and logo

Category 2 institutes and centres should be allowed to use UNESCO's name and/or logo in accordance with the conditions and procedures established by UNESCO. The title of each institute and centre should always refer to their status as institutes/centres "under the auspices of UNESCO".

Additional information

As a follow-up to the discussion on this matter that took place at the 165th session of the Board and in order to ensure improved coherence of purpose and action, while providing for greater flexibility and improved monitoring, the following new criteria are proposed as part of an overall UNESCO strategy:

Sunset clause: The designation of a Category 2 institute or centre should be reviewed by the Secretariat every six years in the context of the preparation of a new Medium-Term Strategy for the Organisation (C/4 document). This should ensure that the focus and coverage of the activities of a Category 2 entity is in line with the strategic objectives of the Organisation and the agreed criteria. Unless such a complementarity is determined, a renewal should not be recommended to the Executive Board and its designation as Category 2 institute/centre should lapse.

Global or regional scope: The scope of activities of Category 2 institutes and centres must be global or regional in nature. Alternatively, they should be supported by a broad coalition of Member States so as to ensure sufficient outreach.

Geographical representation: Efforts should be made to ensure a more equitable geographical representation of Category 2 institutes and centres, particularly in developing regions.

Programmatic and thematic coverage: Efforts should be made to ensure that the programmatic and thematic coverage of Category 2 institutes corresponds to the various strategic objectives of the Organisation as well as to programme priorities established in the various C/5 documents during the period of a Medium-Term Strategy.

CATEGORY 3

There is a third category for centres and institutes "loosely associated with UNESCO".

Category 3 entities are expected to contribute to UNESCO's programme and strategy, but the links are often tenuous and informal. These entities are required to describe themselves as "Institute/centres FOR UNESCO"