

What membership strategy should ISC adopt for the long-term?

Richard Catlow
Vice President and Foreign Secretary



The BIG picture

Context

- ISC's vision for itself as a Global Voice for Science
- What role could/should members play in this – what can/should they do for ISC
- What can/should ISC do for members



Overview

To consider

1. Membership
2. Dues
3. Voting



Current membership categories

1. **Category 1** (Full Member): Scientific unions, associations and similar bodies, being international scientific organizations devoted to the practice and promotion of specific scientific disciplines or areas.
2. **Category 2** (Full Member): Academies of sciences, research councils or analogous not-for-profit scientific bodies representing a broad spectrum of scientific fields or disciplines in a country, region, territory or globally.
3. **Category 3** (Affiliated Member): Other bodies, being governmental and non-governmental organizations, whose activities are in a field cognate to those of the Council.

Membership options

1. Status quo – considering new membership applications from current categories as they arise
2. Reduce and streamline
3. Proactively increase membership eg
 - Individual members
 - Engineering and/or academies of medicine
 - Others eg additional members which meet membership criteria (which may also need to be examined)
4. Whichever option decided on, need to consider structure

Considerations relating to membership

- Representation as the voice of science – breadth
- Scientific excellence – depth
- Income
- Complexity of management, and related dues and voting
- Overlap eg CAETS, IAP, TWAS

Criteria for membership

- Excellence
- Funding
- Outreach
- Diversity
- Multiple members per country – approval system

Simplifying the structure

Options

- self selected tiers of membership – this could cover ALL types of members (and offers options for individual members too down the line)
- within current categories of membership ie union/national/other affiliated but less complicated

Dues

System	Pro	Con
Current system	Relatively fair as based on GDP	Complicated if more than one national member Two parallel tiers for national and union
Tiered system with self selected membership tier	Could simplify voting Could accommodate multiple members per country	Some members might “under” pay
Allocated (Non self selected) tiered simplified system	Simpler – one system for all types of member	Members might not be happy with allocated tier
Other ??		

Voting

Currently three different categories of voting

1. Scientific – one member one vote – with union and national members weighted so they have equal shares
2. Elections – one vote per NATIONAL member – with union and national members weighted so they have equal shares
3. Finance – weighted according to position on dues scale