



ICSU

International Council for Science

strengthening international science for the benefit of society

Review of the ICSU Grants Programme, 2001-2006

Report of a CSPR Review
Committee

February, 2007

List of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	History of the ICSU Grants Programme	4
3	Scope and conduct of the Review	5
4	Input from Members and Interdisciplinary Bodies	6
5	Overall Assessment of the Past Programme	7
5.1	Quality and Nature of grant-funded activities.....	7
5.2	Success rate and Impact of the grants programme.....	7
5.3	Operational aspects	8
5.4	Other lessons learnt from individual projects	9
6	A future grants programme	10
6.1	Aims and Priorities.....	10
6.2	Applicants and Process.....	11
7	Funding options.....	12
7.1	ICSU funding	12
7.2	UNESCO.....	12
7.3	Other funders.....	13
8	Annexes.....	14
8.1	Sources of funding for the grants programme (2001-2006).....	14
8.2	Overall statistics on grant applications (2001-2006).....	15
8.3	Members of the review committee.....	16
8.4	Documents available to the Review Committee	17
8.5	Priorities addressed (2001-2006)	18
8.6	Success rate of individual Unions and Interdisciplinary bodies (2002-2006)	19
8.7	Applicant profiles on successful grant proposals (2001-2006).....	21
8.8	Funding leveraged (2002-2006)	22

1 Executive Summary

The main conclusions of the Review Committee that was established by the ICSU Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR) to review the ICSU grants programme are as follows:

1. On the past programme, 2001-2006

The programme was good value for money overall and supported a variety of successful projects. These projects were in line with the priorities agreed by UNESCO and ICSU.

2. On a potential future programme

There is a strong case for ICSU to support a revised and more focussed grants programme in the future. This should focus on promoting new and genuine collaborations between ICSU's Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies in the areas of i) Capacity Building in a broad sense, and ii) New Scientific Frontiers, i.e. cutting edge scientific developments at the interface between different disciplines. Such a programme can be an important mechanism for implementing ICSU's vision and addressing these two strategic priority areas. It also provides a practical and measurable link to the activities of the Scientific Unions, in particular.

3. On funding

In the absence of additional funds, a proportion of the ICSU core funds provisionally allocated for a grants programme in 2008 and 2009 should be used for this purpose. However, it is recognised that in the longer-term additional funding will be necessary to maintain a viable programme. Hence, a revised grants programme should be a very high priority in the negotiations for the new ICSU-UNESCO Framework agreement for 2008-2013 and the idea of a joint funding programme with UNESCO and other partners should be explored further.

2 History of the ICSU Grants Programme

ICSU has always provided some financial support to its Scientific Union Members and Interdisciplinary Bodies (IBs) via a system of annual awards. A proportion of this funding has come from UNESCO (initially via an annual subvention to ICSU and since 1996 under the arrangements of 2 successive Framework Agreements). Up until 2000, awards were approved by the ICSU Executive Board, on the basis of recommendations from the Committee on Finance and Fundraising. Unions and IBs had to apply for the funding but the guiding principle was that all applicants should receive an award with the aim being to help these organisations achieve their own missions. There was no attempt to prioritise this funding in terms of ICSU's own strategic priorities nor was there any serious attempt to evaluate the quality of the applications *a priori* or the impact of the funded activities *a posteriori*. The assumption was that this quality control function was performed at the level of the organisations who applied the funding, although a financial audit and final report were requested by ICSU.

An External Assessment of ICSU in 1996 made a number of important recommendations on ICSU policy and structure that were approved at an extraordinary session of the General Assembly in Vienna in 1998. Principle amongst these was that ICSU should become more strategic in its scientific planning. A new Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR) was established in 2000. This committee was charged with reforming and managing the distribution of funds from ICSU to its Unions and IBs. The resultant ICSU grants programme has been managed by the Committee on Scientific Planning and Review (CSPR) since 2000. CSPR's first action was to introduce a competitive review process for grants awarded in 2001. From 2002 onwards it has been further stipulated that proposals must be interdisciplinary (involving at least two eligible Unions and/or IBs) and address one or more of five defined priority areas:

- Science and Technology for Sustainable Development
- Capacity building and Science Education
- Science-Policy Interface
- Dissemination of Information on Science and Technology
- Emerging Science and Technology – Creation of New Knowledge

These priorities were defined by CSPR and are in line with those laid out in the ICSU-UNESCO Framework Agreement 2002-2007. The money transferred under this Agreement provided part of the funding for the Programme. Additional funding was also provided by the US State Department in lieu of the US contributing directly to UNESCO, but this contribution did not have any stipulations attached in terms of specific priorities ([annex 8.1](#)). The five priority areas agreed by CSPR predated the development of the ICSU Strategic Plan, which was approved in October 2005.

Since 2002, there have been two broad categories of grant – less than \$50k and \$50k-100k - and in the transition period, during 2001, non-reviewed small block grants (\$5k) were also available to Unions. Grants had to be spent during the funding year and a final report submitted for evaluation by CSPR and UNESCO at the end of that period. Initially, the success rate for applicants was ~30%, although in 2005 and 2006 this was lower due to a decrease in available funding ([annex 8.2](#)).

The annual budget for the grant scheme up until 2005 was between \$714k-820k, with this coming in approximately equal parts from ICSU's own funds, UNESCO and the US State Department. There has been increasing financial pressure on all of these funding sources. ICSU itself suffered during the period 2003-2006 with a reduction (~25%) in its overall income in real terms due to the dramatic fall in the strength of the US\$ versus the Euro. The USA rejoined UNESCO and so the State Department funding that came directly to ICSU was withdrawn in 2006. UNESCO's overall science budget was also reduced and there was a policy decision to distribute more of the remainder *via* Regional Bureaux. The result was that the grants programme had to be much reduced in 2005 and 2006 ([annex 8.2](#)).

In the light of the funding situation, and as the competitive programme had now been running for six years, the Executive Board recommended to the 28th General Assembly of ICSU (Suzhou, October, 2005) that a review be carried out. This was endorsed by the General Assembly and the decision is reflected in two specific actions that are included in the ICSU Strategic Plan, 2006-2011 (Section 5.3.2 Seeding New Initiatives):

- The grants programme will be reviewed in 2006-2007, as a basis for efforts to attract additional funding to secure its continuation;
- Depending on the outcome of this review and available funding, CSPR will further develop the grants programme in line with the priorities set out in the Strategic Plan and those of any other co-funding organizations.

CSPR was entrusted with the review and reporting back to the Executive Board and Members. Given its previous role as a major sponsor of the programme, it was also proposed that UNESCO be invited to provide input to the review. UNESCO subsequently chose not to be represented on the Review Committee but rather to await the outcome of the review before providing any comments.

3 Scope and conduct of the Review

The formal terms of reference for the review were defined by CSPR as follows:

Taking account of the input from ICSU Member Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies:

1. *to review the performance and management (but not administration) of the ICSU grants programme over the award period 2001-2006, including:*
 - *number, nature and quality of applications received;*
 - *the prioritization and peer-review process.*
 - *project outputs and impact, as described in final reports;*
 - *strategic relevance to ICSU and UNESCO;*
2. *to consider how the programme might be revised in line with ICSU's Strategic Plan, 2006-2011;*

3. *to assess what funding is necessary for the future programme to be viable and identify potential co-sponsors. Both limited short-term and more ambitious longer-term funding scenarios should be considered.*

A Review Committee was established by CSPR after consultation with the Scientific Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies (IBs). This committee included both past and present members of CSPR as well as 2 nominees each from the Scientific Unions and IBs (in the event, only one of the selected IB nominees was able to participate). See [annex 8.3](#) for the full committee membership. CSPR also defined 4 specific questions to be addressed to all ICSU Members and IBs prior to the review (see ahead, section 4).

The Review Committee met on one occasion for 2 full days in Paris on 9-10 November, 2006. They considered the input from ICSU Members and the collated statistics and information provided by the Secretariat, with regards to the profile and performance of the grants programme 2001-2006. A list of all documentation available to the committee is at [annex 8.4](#) and the majority of this information is provided in the other annexes to this report. The key recommendations and outline for the review report were agreed at the meeting and the report itself was initially drafted by the Chairman, with support from the ICSU Secretariat, and then circulated to all committee members for consideration. The final report, as presented here has been agreed by all members of the Review Committee.

It should be noted that although a considerable amount of documentation was made available to the Committee this did not allow for a very detailed in-depth review of the performance and impact of the grants programme up to 2006. The Review Committee agreed at the outset that the main focus should be on the future, with this being informed by the major lessons learned from the past. The available material was considered to be wholly adequate for this task.

4 Input from Members and Interdisciplinary Bodies

As input to the review, all ICSU Members and IBs were asked to respond to the following questions:

- i. What do you consider to be the main value of the ICSU grants programme?
- ii. In the light of your response to 1, and considering the priorities laid out in ICSU's Strategic Plan, 2006-2011, is there a unique niche that this programme can fulfil, which is not provided for by other funding sources?
- iii. How could the programme be modified to better meet the strategic priorities of ICSU and its Members?
- iv. Considering the financial restraints and other ICSU activities, should the programme be continued and, if so, what priority do you attach to this and how should it be funded?

The response rate to these questions was extremely poor with only 6 Unions (out of 29) and 4 National Members (out of 104) providing any response. No Interdisciplinary Bodies responded. It may be that the 6-week deadline for responses was too short or that Members

decided that they wanted to await the outcome of the review before formulating their own views.

The majority of those who did respond considered that the grants programme should be continued and despite the small sample size, a number of generic messages arose out the consultation.

With regards to priorities and focus:

- The programme should focus on interdisciplinary activities, linking Unions together in unique niche areas:
- Hazards and Health were identified as examples of areas of focus that would align with ICSU's Strategic Plan.
- There should be a focus on Capacity building and greater involvement of ICSU's new Regional Offices

With regards to process:

- Better communication of the requirements and application process are required
- The application process can still be improved and a 2-stage process could be considered;
- Multi-annual grants should be introduced;
- If overall funding is severely limited a programme of small (€20k) grants should be considered.
- A broader set of the ICSU Membership should be attracted to the programme

5 Overall Assessment of the Past Programme

Taking into account the limited but helpful input from Members, the review committee considered the various information and materials that were provided on the grants programme, 2001-2006 (see [annex 8.4](#))

5.1 *Quality and Nature of grant-funded activities*

Overall the grants programme has provided good value for money and the activity reports indicated that a varied collection of successful projects had been supported. The funded activities were largely conventional in format, e.g. workshops and planning meetings, but were often uniquely inter-disciplinary and international.

The funded projects were predominantly in the area of geosciences and the environment. This was reflected in the participants with several Unions and IBs being recurrently successful in obtaining funding and many others having limited involvement ([annex 8.6](#)). It was noted that 50% of the Unions had never received a grant as lead applicant.

5.2 *Success rate and Impact of the grants programme*

The quality of grant proposals improved with time ([annex 8.2](#)) as Members and IBs adapted from the previous subvention system to the competitive programme. Whilst initially all ‘A’ rated proposals were funded and the success rate was ~30%. As funding declined in later years a number of ‘A’ rated proposals went unfunded.

With regards to the overall aims of the grants programme, the priorities defined by C SPR have all been addressed in multiple projects ([annex 8.5](#)). However, the major aim of promoting collaboration between different ICSU Unions and IBs has only been partially achieved. Both the final summary reports and the experiences of the committee members themselves indicated that true joint proposals, with multiple partners actively involved, were rare. Nevertheless, the grants programme has gone some way towards promoting collaboration ([annex 8.7](#)).

A full impact assessment of the programme was beyond the capacity and scope of this review. In particular the long-term impact of projects is difficult to assess (and thought should be given to monitoring this more systematically in any future programme). However, the members of the Review Committee, who had been involved previously in assessing the final reports on grants, were confident that several projects had certainly had a visible impact and/or led to longer term activities. Another indirect measure of impact was the amount of additional resource leveraged by the programme. This varied considerably from project to project with an average of ~50% additional funding being raised for grant funded activities ([annex 8.8](#)). This figure was perhaps lower than might have been expected for a seed-funding programme but it does not take into account any subsequent investments for projects that continued after the initial year of ICSU support.

During the period 2003-2006, ICSU had been going through a major strategic planning process, which resulted in the Strategic Plan, 2006-2011. The grants programme overall, and the outcomes of individual grants, had very little impact on the planning process. This largely reflects the mechanisms in place at time. Whilst C SPR had recognised the potential of the programme to influence, as well as implement, ICSU’s strategic priorities, it had not devised an effective process for linking the grants outcomes to strategic planning. This is something that needs to be considered in developing any future programme.

5.3 Operational aspects

The process for evaluating grants, as of 2002, was as follows:

1. A lead Designated Member (DM) and two supporting DMs were allocated to each grant application. The DMs were C SPR members and they were allocated by the ICSU Secretariat on the basis of disciplinary expertise, taking care to avoid any conflicts of interest.
2. DMs were sent their allocated applications at least 6 weeks before the C SPR meeting and asked to evaluate and rate them independently and send their assessments to the lead DM.
3. The lead DM then produced a consensus evaluation taking into account the comments from the supporting DMs and resolving any conflicting views by correspondence. A consensus grade (A, B, C) was agreed or, where conflict was not resolved, the differing views were reported.

4. All applications and evaluations from lead DMs were made available to all CSPR members for consideration at the meeting.
5. Discussion at the meeting focussed on potentially fundable and conflictual applications (although any CSPR member could ask for any proposal to be fully discussed in committee). Final Grades (A+, A, B+, B, C) were agreed by consensus in committee and, if necessary, similarly graded proposals were prioritised on the basis of strategic importance.
6. Final reports were requested on all grants and, as of 2004, these were reviewed by CSPR with a single DM for each report being asked to present to the committee.

Taking into account the size and nature of the grant applications, this process was considered to be largely appropriate and adequate by the review committee. It was noted that the main role for CSPR members was to assess the proposals against the criteria and priorities of the programme and this was not in *sensu strictu* scientific peer review. It was implicit that the scientific quality of the proposals was mainly assured by the Organisations (Unions or IBs) that approved their submission. However, this was not necessarily the case and those members with previous experience on CSPR considered that there was a small minority of proposals for which additional review by scientific experts in a particular field may have been informative. Whilst CSPR members did have the option of identifying and consulting external scientific reviewers this option was not generally adopted for logistical reasons.

Members of the Review Committee, who had not served on CSPR, had not previously understood the review process even if they had been involved themselves as applicants to the grants programme. Whilst the process was considered adequate for the programme as run previously, several lessons could be drawn as to the future:

- In designing any future programme it would be important to communicate clearly what the review and ranking process is.
- A two-stage process (as proposed in the consultation with Members) could help to ensure applications fit with the aims and objective of the programme
- Despite the need to limit the overhead and administrative costs for a relatively small programme, the appropriate use of external reviewers with expertise not present on CSPR should be adopted, when an understanding of the substantive nature of the proposal requires such expertise.
- Feedback on declined applications and final reports is important for applicants and an area which could be improved.

5.4 Other lessons learnt from individual projects

As stated previously, the aim of this programme review was not to assess individual projects in detail. However, in reading and discussing the summary reports of grant activities two specific issues did come to light that the committee felt should be flagged for future consideration.

Interactions between the applicants and CSPR or the ICSU Executive

It was noted that on at least 2 occasions, successful applications had been developed following feedback and advice from CSPR and/or the ICSU Executive in response to an

initially unsuccessful proposal. Whilst it was important to avoid any potential bias, such communication could help ensure that proposals were in line with ICSU's strategic directions and the criteria for the programme.

Ownership and policy statements

On several occasions ICSU was approached to endorse and take shared ownership for the publications arising out of grant-funded activities. The current ICSU policy, as developed for position statements, meant that it did not formally endorse such products. This potentially deprived both ICSU and the grantees of additional visibility and impact. A revised policy and mechanism should be considered that would enable shared ownership, where appropriate, and ensure the necessary quality guarantees.

6 A future grants programme

Taking into account both the input from Members and the assessment of the grants programme up to 2006, there is a strong case for ICSU to continue to support a more focused programme in the future. This type of funding provides an important and very practical mechanism for linking the ICSU Executive to the scientific expertise of its Unions and Interdisciplinary Bodies. It also provides a simple mechanism for implementing (and further developing) some of ICSU's strategic priorities. At the same time it is recognised that in order to ensure its long-term viability additional funding for the programme is necessary.

6.1 Aims and Priorities

After careful consideration, the Review Committee proposes the ICSU implement a revised grants programme with the following characteristics:

1. The overall aim of providing seed funding for international scientific activities, preferably of a truly interdisciplinary nature, that cannot be readily funded by other sources should be maintained. To this end, and depending on the overall funding available, a limit for individual grants of €50k (absolute maximum €75k) is appropriate;
2. In addition to promoting interdisciplinarity, there should be an explicit aim of developing genuine collaboration between scientific communities that do not normally work together;
3. The ICSU vision and Strategic Plan should guide the programme, which should focus on two specific areas:
 - i) Capacity Building, taking into account the need to embed education and training activities in institutions and research programmes that meet the identified needs of host countries¹.
 - ii) Exploring New Horizons and emerging scientific issues at the interface between scientific disciplines².

¹ One example of such an activity that was discussed by the Review Group was the idea of interdisciplinary summer schools to train local researchers and encourage both North-South and South-South networking. Such schools might, for example, be envisaged on topics such as natural hazards or health.

² This is identified in the ICSU Strategic Plan (p33, section 4.4) as being an area where ICSU should facilitate collaboration amongst its Members and IBs. The Plan includes a list of several specific topics arising from the report of the CSPR Foresight analysis in 2004.

Within these two priority areas, activities should be practical and research oriented rather than specifically designed to try and influence policy.

4. All proposals should explicitly include and benefit early career and women scientists

Such a programme should be attractive to the broad ICSU community and build on the particular disciplinary strengths of the Scientific Unions and interests of the IBs. There is also potentially an important role for the new ICSU Regional Offices in working with ICSU Unions and IBs to address priority i), in particular.

6.2 Applicants and Process

In addition to focusing the overall aims of the programme, several modifications to past processes are recommended:

1. Applications should be the result of genuine partnerships. A minimum of 2 co-applicants, including at least one Scientific Union, must be involved. The co-applicants should be held jointly responsible for the grant, with their roles and contributions being clearly defined in the application. Additional supporting applicants can also be included and should demonstrably add value.
2. IBs should no longer be able to submit proposals without partnering with a Union and National members will only be eligible to be supporting applicants (as previously).
3. Multi-annual grants should be permitted but not too simply to fund a series of similar activities.
4. A two-stage submission process should be implemented:

Stage 1: Out line submissions of ideas are submitted by Unions and IBs and posted on a shared space in the Members zone on the ICSU web-site. Interested partners and supporting applicants are encouraged to contact the originators.

Stage 2: Full partnership applications are submitted for review by CSPR

5. The review process should be similar to that previously deployed, with greater use of external reviewers where appropriate expertise is not available amongst the CSPR membership. Particular attention should be paid to feedback to unsuccessful applicants and, in the case of resubmissions; the response to such feedback should be explicitly assessed.
6. In addition to the assessment of final reports submitted at the end of the funding period, consideration should be given to requesting an additional report 2 years after completion

The revised eligibility criteria and application process should promote genuine collaboration between different Unions and IBs and the 2 stage submissions should also help to raise the visibility of the programme and ensure the scientific quality of the final applications.

In addition to revising the programme, a concerted and continuous effort must be made to communicate the aims, priorities, criteria and review processes to all ICSU Members and IBs. In this regard, it was noted that the turnover of Officers and/or staff in many organisations is quite rapid and so it should not be assumed that the key individuals are aware of the programme details from one year to another.

7 Funding options

It is recognised that there is a critical level below which the long-term sustainability of a competitive grants programme is doubtful. If funding for individual grants is very small and the success rate low, then interesting proposals will not be submitted. Moreover, even with a streamlined review system, the overhead cost in terms of Secretariat and CSPR time, becomes too high below a certain critical level of funding for the overall programme.

With a limit for individual grants of €50k, a minimum overall funding envelope of ~ €500k would be sufficient to make the programme viable in the short-term. In the medium to long-term considerably more funding should be aimed for.

7.1 ICSU funding

In the outline budget that was approved by the General Assembly in 2005, €475k had been provisionally allocated to the grants programme for 2008 and 2009. This was based on the assumption that additional funding could be attracted and/or UNESCO funding maintained for this activity. In the absence of such additional funding, the maintenance of this level of funding from ICSU's core income alone will substantially affect the implementation of other strategic initiatives. This was noted by the Review Committee, who also noted that the large majority of ICSU's core income comes from National Members, many of whom also support the Unions and IBs directly.

Despite the limited resources available to ICSU, the Review Committee considered that a revised grants programme should be a very high priority for ICSU core funds. It could provide an important mechanism for implementing ICSU's vision and Strategic Plan and it provides a critical and measurable link to the activities of the Scientific Unions, in particular. **Even in the absence of any other funding, ICSU funds should be used to re-start a revised grants programme for 2008 and 2009**, with efforts being made during this period to attract additional sponsors.

Whilst it was beyond the specific remit of the Review Committee, it was recognised that the funding for the grants programme was inevitably tied to the funding for other ICSU activities and the implementation of the Strategic Plan as a whole. In the longer term it might be easier to attract external funding for some of the other strategic initiatives than for a competitive grants programme but this could free up money to be invested in the grants programme.

The option of 'a la carte' funding from ICSU Members for the grants programme was also considered. In practice this might entail a small number of the more wealthy National Members providing dedicated funding for ICSU to distribute as grants. It was noted that these National Members already provide considerable direct support to Unions and IBs but this is for them to pursue their own disciplinary or thematic objectives. An ICSU grants programme, focussed on bringing these organisations together to address interdisciplinary priorities identified in the ICSU Strategic plan, would be quite distinct and could potentially attract financial support from some National Members. This should be explored further.

7.2 UNESCO

The Review Committee did not have any direct views from UNESCO available to it as to the value of the past grants programme or likelihood of support for a new programme. The

priorities and types of activities supported up to 2006 were encompassed by a Framework Agreement between ICSU and UNESCO. In this context, the review's favourable assessment of the programme up to 2006 should also be considered positively by UNESCO. The proposed revisions to the programme, to strengthen partnerships between ICSU's Unions and IB's could also be adapted to ensure closer involvement of UNESCO, particularly at the project development and review stages. The proposed priorities – Capacity Building and Exploring New Horizons should also be of high priority to UNESCO.

Every effort should be made to ensure that UNESCO becomes a full partner in the revised grants programme. The value of UNESCO should go beyond its financial contribution and one of the potential additional aims of a joint programme could be to facilitate and promote partnerships between ICSU's Scientific Unions and IBs and relevant UNESCO programmes. **The revised grants programme should be a very high priority in the negotiations of the new ICSU-UNESCO Framework agreement for 2008-2013.**

7.3 Other funders

Other potential funders, including private foundations and industrial sponsors, normally have their own strategic priorities and goals. Identifying and approaching these foundations to establish a portfolio of funders requires a major marketing approach, which ICSU is not currently equipped to carry out. Moreover, such funders are rarely willing to give money to organisations on the basis that this will be re-distributed to secondary bodies. Achieving funds from foundations and other prospective partners will require a careful assessment of the link between ICSU strategic priorities and those of prospective new sponsors. This in itself will require a significant commitment of resources.

However, if UNESCO support for a revised grants programme can be secured for 2008-2013, this could make it more attractive to some potential sponsors. UNESCO itself already has established relationships with a large variety of funders and dedicated personnel to develop these. **The idea of a joint funding programme with UNESCO and other partners should be explored further.**

8 Annexes

8.1 Sources of funding for the grants programme (2001-2006)

Year	Total Grants Budget	ICSU core funds	UNESCO (USD)	US State Dept. (USD)
2006	187734 (150k €)	43805(€35k)	144000(€115k)	0
2005	475000	0	205000	270000
2004	838976	386576	205000	225000
2003	877800	327800	350000	200000
2002	714600	164600	350000	200000
2001	739300	224800	314500	200000
Total	3,833,410 (USD)	1,147,581 (USD)	1,568,500 (USD)	1,095,000 (USD)

For 2006: the €\$ exchange rate was taken as 0,799

8.2 Overall statistics on grant applications (2001-2006)

Year	No. of applications received	No. 'A' Rated	No. awarded	% success rate	awards ≥\$50k	Budget	Awarded
2001	85	-	44	52%	3	\$900000	\$779300
2001	Block Grants of \$5000 to all Unions						\$120000
2002	46	4	17	28%	4	\$714600	\$714600
2003	41	3	14	34%	6	\$877800	\$877800
2004	36	10	11	31%	8	\$816776	\$816776
2005	40	11	7	18%	5	\$556150	\$556150
2006	13	4	3	23%	3	150,000 €	150,000 €

8.3 Members of the review committee

John Marks, Chair

European Science Foundation
Director of Science and Strategy
France
[Ex-CSPR member]

Christopher Leaver

Department of Plant Sciences
University of Oxford
UK
[serving CSPR member]

Ranjan Ramasamy

Institute of Medicine
Jalong Tunku Link
Brunei Darussalam
[Serving CSPR member]

Pierre Ritchie

School of Psychology
University of Ottawa
Canada
[Serving CSPR member and IUPsyS Secretary General]

Angelo Azzi

Tufts University
Boston,
USA
[nominated by IUBMB]

Marcia Barbosa

Instituto de Física
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
Porto Alegre
Brazil
[nominated by IUPAP]

Peter Willmore

Birmingham U.K.
[nominated by COSPAR]

An additional female member from South Africa, representing an Interdisciplinary Body, was invited but could not participate.

8.4 Documents available to the Review Committee

- 1) Background and Terms of Reference for the review
- 2) Statement and Schedule of Grants Programme / Grants Application and Evaluation Forms
- 3) Grant Reporting and Evaluation Forms
- 4) Two examples of completed Grant Applications, final reports and Evaluation Forms
- 5) Responses to CSPR Questionnaire from ICSU Members
- 6) Overall statistics on ICSU Grants Applications [[annex 8.2](#)]
- 7) Applicants profile on successful applications (2001-2006) [[annex 8.7](#)]
- 8) ICSU Priorities addressed (2001-2006) [[annex 8.5](#)]
- 9) Comparative table: ICSU Grants / Additional Funds leveraged and total cost of activity [aggregated in [annex 8.8](#)]
- 10) Full listing of ICSU Grants and Grades (2004-2006)
- 11) Table on Sources of funding [[annex 8.1](#)]
- 12) ICSU Grant Awards vs Breakdown of Expenditure by activity (2005)
- 13) Brief final reports on all Grant Awards, as per ICSU Annual Reports (2002-2005) [see http://www.icsu.org/1_icsuinscience/GRANTS_1.html]
- 14) Evaluation of Final Reports and Classification (2004-2005)
- 15) ICSU Strategic Plan 2006-2011
- 16) Discussion Paper on Future Options prepared by the ICSU Secretariat

8.5 Priorities addressed (2001-2006)

N.B. This information is extracted from what applicants self-designated as being the priority areas which their proposals addressed. In some cases proposals were designated as being relevant to more than one area.

Year	Total projects awarded	No. of awarded projects that addressed each Priority area				
		ST	CB	S/PI	DI	EI
2001	44	14	25	-	7	-
2002	17	12	7	3	6	-
2003	16	10	5	5	5	6
2004	11	7	1	5	3	2
2005	6	4	2	2	3	3
2006	3	1	0	0	0	2

ST: Science & Technology for Sustainable Development

CB: Capacity Building

S/PI: Science / Policy Interface

DI: Dissemination of Information

EI: Emerging Issues

8.6 Success rate of individual Unions and Interdisciplinary bodies (2002-2006)

Scientific Unions	Successful applns		Unsuccessful applns	
	Lead Applicant	Supporting Applicant	Lead Applicant	Supporting Applicant
International Astronomical Union (IAU)	1	7	2	4
International Brain Research Organization (IBRO)	0	1	0	4
International Geographical Union (IGU)	2	6	7	1
International Mathematical Union (IMU)	1	3	2	1
International Union for QUAternary Research (INQUA)*	1	2	0	0
International Society for Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing (ISPRS)	0	2	1	2
International Union of Anthropological & Ethnological Sciences (IUAES)	0	1	3	0
International Union of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology (IUBMB)	0	3	4	1
International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS)	2	2	5	2
International Union of Crystallography (IUCr)	0	1	1	2
International Union of Food Science & Technology (IUFoST)	0	2	1	1
International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO)*	0	0	0	0
International Union of Geodesy & Geophysics (IUGG) (incl SCL-ILP)	3	8	3	8
International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS)	2	5	6	4
International Union of History & Philosophy of Science (IUHPS)	1	0	2	0
International Union of Microbiological Societies (IUMS)	0	0	3	0
International Union of Nutritional Sciences (IUNS)	0	1	2	2
International Union for Pure & Applied Biophysics (IUPAB)	1	0	4	0
International Union of Pure & Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)	0	7	4	1
International Union of Pure & Applied Physics (IUPAP)	1	3	3	5
International Union for Physical & Engineering Sciences in Medicine (IUPESM)	0	1	0	0
International Union of Basic & Clinical Pharmacology (IUPHAR)	1	1	0	1
International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS)	0	2	6	0
International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS)	1	3	2	0
International Union of Soil Sciences (IUSS)	1	1	2	1
International Union of Theoretical & Applied Mechanics (IUTAM)	1	0	0	1

International Union of Toxicology (IUTOX)	0	1	2	0
Union Radio Scientifique International (URSI)	0	1	1	0
	19	64	66	41

Interdisciplinary Bodies	Successful applns.		Unsuccessful applns	
	Lead Applicant	Supporting Applicant	Lead Applicant	Supporting Applicant
Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE)	8	4	3	0
Committee on SPACe Research (COSPAR)	3	0	1	0
Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR)	0	0	1	0
Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research (SCOR)	2	2	1	1
Scientific Committee on Solar-Terrestrial Physics (SCOSTEP)	0	0	2	1
DIVERSITAS	2	4	3	2
International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) (incl.START)	7	1	2	6
International Human Dimensions Programme on GEC (IHDP)	1	5	1	7
World Climate Research Programme (WCRP)	1	5	1	2
Global Climate Observing System (GCOS)	0	0	0	0
Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS)	0	0	0	0
Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS)	0	0	1	0
Integrated Global Observing Strategy (IGOS)	0	0	0	0
Committee on DATA for Science & Technology (CODATA)	5	1	3	1
Federation of Astronomical & Geophysical Data Analysis Services (FAGS)	2	0	3	0
International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP)	0	1	0	1
Scientific Committee on Frequency Allocations for Radio Astronomy & Space Science (IUCAF)	1	0	0	0
World Data Centres (WDC)	1	0	3	1
International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP)	0	1	0	0
Pacific Science Association (PSA)**	1	0	0	0
	34	24	25	22

*INQUA and IUFRO became full members of ICSU in 2005

**PSA is a scientific associate and not a Union. Associates were eligible to be lead applicants in 2002 only

8.7 Applicant profiles on successful grant proposals (2001-2006)

Year	No. Projects awarded	Lead Applicants		Supporting Applicants			Joint Applications involving both Unions and IBs
		Union(s)	IB(s)	Union(s)	IB	NM	
2001	44	20	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2002	17	10	7	6	7	9	9
2003	16	5	11	6	14	6	5
2004	11	5	6	10	4	2	5
2005	6	3	3	8	8	0	1
2006	3	1	2	18	3	0	2

Note: For 2001 information on supporting applicants was not requested.

It was noted from final reports that the supporting applicants were often not truly involved in the activity.

Abbreviations:

IB: Interdisciplinary Bodies

NM: National Members

8.8 Funding leveraged (2002-2006)

Year	Total Projects awarded	Total grant funding awarded as (USD)	Additional funding leveraged# (USD)	Total cost of activities (USD)	Ratio: grant funding/additional
2002	17	714,600	997,303	1,706,903	0.72
2003	16	877,800	688,663	1,348,463	1.27
2004	11	739,000	2,641,860*	3,480,836	0.28
2005	6	475,000	431,070	906,070	1.10
2006	3	150,000	264,200	414,200	0.56

These figures are extracted from the final financial reporting forms for completed grants, except for 2006, where the estimates on the submitted grant proposals have been used.

* In 2004, one grant of \$100k was for a nested activity within a major initiative that had additional support of €1.85m. This is included in the total figures for 2004 but cannot necessarily be interpreted as leveraged funding.



ICSU Mission Statement

In order to strengthen international science for the benefit of society, ICSU mobilizes the knowledge and resources of the international science community to:

- Identify and address major issues of importance to science and society.
- Facilitate interaction amongst scientists across all disciplines and from all countries.
- Promote the participation of all scientists—regardless of race, citizenship, language, political stance, or gender—in the international scientific endeavour.
- Provide independent, authoritative advice to stimulate constructive dialogue between the scientific community and governments, civil society, and the private sector.

51, Boulevard de Montmorency
75016 Paris, France
Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 25 03 29
Fax: +33 (0) 1 42 88 94 31
Email: secretariat@icsu.org
www.icsu.org