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