

# International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry

77<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF BUREAU

14-15 September 2002

Paris, France

MINUTES

<b>1.</b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND FINALIZATION OF AGENDA</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b><u>MINUTES OF 75<sup>TH</sup> AND 76<sup>TH</sup> MEETINGS OF BUREAU</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
2.1	<u>MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES (NOT COVERED BY ITEMS ON AGENDA)</u> .....	1
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>MINUTES OF 129<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
3.1	<u>RECEIPT OF MINUTES BY BUREAU</u> .....	1
3.2	<u>HIGHLIGHTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT ITEMS NOT ON BUREAU AGENDA</u> .....	1
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b><u>DIVISIONS – RECEIPT OF WRITTEN REPORTS</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>STANDING COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES REPORTING TO COUNCIL AND BUREAU - RECEIPT OF WRITTEN REPORTS</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b><u>ORAL REPORTS</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
7.1	<u>INORGANIC CHEMISTRY DIVISION</u> .....	2
7.2	<u>CHEMISTRY AND HUMAN HEALTH DIVISION</u> .....	3
7.3	<u>ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY DIVISION</u> .....	4
<b>8.</b>	<b><u>SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS, 2002</u></b> .....	<b>5</b>
8.1	<u>CURRENT PROJECTS</u> .....	5
8.2	<u>REPORT FROM PROJECT COMMITTEE</u> .....	5
8.3	<u>REPORT FROM EVALUATION COMMITTEE</u> .....	5
<b>9.</b>	<b><u>DIVISION ELECTIONS</u></b> .....	<b>6</b>
9.1	<u>NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF DIVISION COMMITTEES</u> .....	6
9.2	<u>REDEFINING THE DIVISION ELECTORATE AFTER 2003</u> .....	7
<b>10.</b>	<b><u>ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MEETING OF DIVISION PRESIDENTS</u></b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b><u>VICE PRESIDENTIAL CRITICAL ASSESSMENT</u></b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b><u>IUPAC-INDUSTRY INTERACTION</u></b> .....	<b>8</b>
12.1	<u>REORGANIZATION OF COCI</u> .....	9
<b>13.</b>	<b><u>STRATEGIC PLAN</u></b> .....	<b>10</b>
13.1	<u>BIENNIAL REPORT ON IUPAC ACTIVITIES, 2000-1</u> .....	10
13.2	<u>STRATEGIC PLAN, 2002-3 AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION</u> .....	10
<b>14.</b>	<b><u>REPORT OF TREASURER AND FINANCE COMMITTEE</u></b> .....	<b>10</b>
14.1	<u>WORKING PARTY ON NATIONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND RELATED FINANCIAL MATTERS</u> .....	10
14.1.1	<u>Calculation of National Subscriptions Using Five Year Averages</u> .....	10

**Bureau Minutes  
Paris 2002**

14.1.2	<i>Payment of Expenses for Council Delegates</i> .....	11
14.1.3	<i>Invoicing National Subscriptions in National Currencies</i> .....	11
14.2	<b>ACCOUNTS, BUDGETS, AND ALLOCATIONS</b> .....	12
14.3	<b>LONG TERM ACCOUNTS</b> .....	12
14.3.1	<i>Performance of Long Term Account</i> .....	12
14.3.2	<i>Investment Policy Statement Review</i> .....	12
14.3.3	<i>Reorganization of Funds and Fund Policy Statement</i> .....	13
<b>15.</b>	<b><u>GENERAL ASSEMBLIES AND CONGRESSES</u></b> .....	<b>13</b>
15.1	<u>41<sup>ST</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 38<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (BRISBANE, 2001) FINAL REPORT</u> .....	13
15.2	<u>42<sup>ND</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 39<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (OTTAWA, 2003)</u> .....	13
15.2.1	<i>Arrangements</i> .....	13
15.2.2	<i>Scientific Program</i> .....	14
15.2.3	<i>Support for Young Scientists from Developing Countries</i> .....	14
15.3	<u>43<sup>RD</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 40<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (BEIJING, 2005)</u> .....	14
15.4	<u>44<sup>TH</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 41<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS – 2007</u> .....	14
<b>16.</b>	<b><u>WORLD CHEMISTRY LEADERSHIP MEETING: OTTAWA, 15 AUGUST 2003</u></b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>17.</b>	<b><u>SPONSORSHIP OF CONFERENCES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES</u></b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>18.</b>	<b><u>REPORT FROM CONFERENCE POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE</u></b> .....	<b>16</b>
18.1	<u>IUPAC VISA POLICY STATEMENT</u> .....	17
<b>19.</b>	<b><u>PUBLICATIONS</u></b> .....	<b>17</b>
19.1	<u>STATUS REPORT ON PUBLICATIONS</u> .....	17
19.2	<u>PUBLICATION OF IUPAC REPORTS IN JOURNALS OTHER THAN <i>PAC</i></u> .....	18
19.3	<u>PLANS FOR SPECIAL ISSUES IN <i>PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY</i></u> .....	18
19.4	<u>BOOKS</u> .....	18
<b>20.</b>	<b><u>REORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU: PROPOSAL FROM NORDIC NAOS</u></b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>21.</b>	<b><u>SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS AND THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION</u></b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>22.</b>	<b><u>PROPOSAL TO CREATE NEW COMMISSION ON MACROMOLECULAR TERMINOLOGY</u></b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>23.</b>	<b><u>FUTURE OF THE JOINT IUPAC-IUBMB BIOCHEMICAL NOMENCLATURE COMMISSION (JCBN)</u></b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>24.</b>	<b><u>REPORT FROM TRANSFERMIUM JOINT WORKING PARTY</u></b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>25.</b>	<b><u>FELLOWS AND AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>26.</b>	<b><u>STATUS REPORT ON IUPAC SECRETARIAT</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>

**Bureau Minutes  
Paris 2002**

<b><u>27.</u></b>	<b><u>IUPAC WEB SITE AND OTHER PUBLICITY ABOUT THE UNION</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b><u>28.</u></b>	<b><u>IUPAC PRIZE FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b><u>29.</u></b>	<b><u>UNESCO-IUPAC INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CHEMISTRY</u></b> ....	<b>20</b>
<b><u>30.</u></b>	<b><u>RATIFICATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF SYMPOSIA</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b><u>31.</u></b>	<b><u>RATIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS TO IUPAC BODIES</u></b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b><u>32.</u></b>	<b><u>DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT BUREAU MEETING</u></b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b><u>33.</u></b>	<b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b> .....	<b>21</b>

# International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry

77<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF BUREAU

14-15 September 2002

Paris, France

MINUTES

Attendees: Prof. P. S. Steyn, Chairman, Prof. P. W. Atkins, Prof. C. Bai,  
Dr. E. D. Becker, Dr. C. F. Buxtorf, Prof. S. Chandrasekaran,  
Prof. R. G. Gilbert, Dr. A. Hayes, Dr. A. Kallner, Prof. W. Klein,  
Dr. A. D. McNaught, Dr. D. S. Moore, Prof. N. J. Moreau,  
Prof. O. M. Nefedov, Dr. P. M. Norling, Prof. H. Ohtaki,  
Dr. E. P. Przybylowicz, Prof. J. Ralston, Dr. G. M. Rosenblatt,  
Prof. G. M. Schneider, Dr. A. Smith, Prof. G. Somsen, Prof. R. F. T. Stepto,  
Prof. L. Sydnes, Prof. T. T. Tidwell, Dr. A. N. Wright  
Guests: Prof. J. W. Lorimer (in part), Dr. F. Meyers  
Secretary: Dr. J. W. Jost, Executive Director

## 1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND FINALIZATION OF AGENDA

Prof. Steyn welcomed the Bureau to the meeting and thanked Prof. Moreau, the Maison de Chemie, and the Soci t  Francais de Chemie for the excellent arrangements.

Prof. Steyn asked that the members keep in mind the question "Are we serving the world chemistry community?" during their work over the next two days. He noted that the Bureau should work in the new spirit of IUPAC. He then thanked Dr. Becker and the Secretariat staff for the preparation of the agenda.

## 2. MINUTES OF 75<sup>TH</sup> AND 76<sup>TH</sup> MEETINGS OF BUREAU

There were no comments on the Minutes of the 75<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> meetings of the Bureau at Brisbane. The Minutes had been approved by correspondence.

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

There were no matters arising.

## 3. MINUTES OF 129<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### 3.1 RECEIPT OF MINUTES BY BUREAU

The Bureau noted that the Minutes had been approved by correspondence.

### 3.2 HIGHLIGHTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT ITEMS NOT ON BUREAU AGENDA

Prof. Somsen asked what was the composition of the Working Party on National Subscriptions, as this had not been given in the Minutes. Dr. Buxtorf replied that this would be covered in Item 5.1 of the Agenda. Prof. Somsen then asked about the renaming of the funds in the revised Fund Policy Statement mentioned in the Minutes. Dr. Przybylowicz replied that this would be discussed in Item 14.3.3 of the Agenda.

Prof. Gilbert asked if any progress had been made on the new Division Rules. Dr. Becker replied that a revised set of model rules would be distributed to the Divisions this year and the new rules would be ready for approval by Council

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

at Ottawa.

### **4. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Dr. Jost noted that the Action Items were given for information and that updates should be given to him as soon as possible after the Bureau meeting. Prof. Gilbert asked that Item 49, Prepare Division Brochures, be replaced with Prepare Division presentations (PowerPoint).

### **5. DIVISIONS – RECEIPT OF WRITTEN REPORTS**

Written reports were available for all Division except I and II.

Prof. Gilbert noted that a number of Divisions had expressed concern about the difficulty in generating new projects.

Prof. Steyn noted that Division V was using modern communication technology, especially e-mail, very effectively to manage the work of the Division.

### **6. STANDING COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES REPORTING TO COUNCIL AND BUREAU - RECEIPT OF WRITTEN REPORTS**

There were no comments on the written reports received from the Standing Committees.

### **7. ORAL REPORTS**

#### **7.1 INORGANIC CHEMISTRY DIVISION**

Dr. Rosenblatt began by noting the input of the Division to the Strategic Plan had helped the Division in its planning. He then described the excellent cooperation with Division VIII in the transfer of nomenclature projects. He noted that the Division had divided its work into three areas:

- Atoms
- Molecules
- Materials

The Atoms area includes work on atomic weights and isotopic abundances as well as the names of the elements. While the work on atomic weights is becoming a less significant activity, the work on isotopic abundances is becoming a major activity.

The Molecules area had traditionally been concerned with nomenclature. With the transfer of this work to Division VIII, there were no current projects in this area. The Division was actively seeking to develop projects in coordination chemistry and other subjects in this area.

Dr. Rosenblatt then described the Materials Initiative being led by the Division. A Materials Chemistry Subcommittee has been formed, with representatives from Divisions I, II, IV, and V. The Subcommittee had developed the following near term objectives:

- Hold a meeting before the Ottawa General Assembly

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

- Canvass the community
- Develop a portfolio of projects
- Organize forums at the High Temperature Materials Conference and at the Workshop on Advanced Materials

A long-term issue is the possible creation of a Division of Materials Chemistry. The Division has identified a number of issues it feels are important for its future:

- Sources of new projects
- Communication with the community
- Division between the “workers” and the Bureau
- Diversity of the Division Committee
- Procedures for project submission and approval not as simple as they seem
- Workload needed to run the Division
- Project reviews-review the project not the proposal

Dr. Hayes suggested that the issues raised could be better discussed at the end of the meeting. Prof. Ohtaki commented that a new Division would greatly influence other Divisions.

### 7.2 CHEMISTRY AND HUMAN HEALTH DIVISION

Dr. Kallner began by reviewing the history of the formation of the Division from the Clinical Chemistry Division and the Medicinal Chemistry Section. The Division faced two challenges: changing to a project driven system and merging the different cultures of the two groups that had been merged to form the Division.

The Division has formed three subcommittees.

- Nomenclature, Properties, and Units
- Toxicology
- Drug Discovery and Development

The Nomenclature, Properties, and Units subcommittee is responsible for a database that contains a universal system for naming properties that are measured in clinical chemistry, microbiology, and hematology. The database currently contains 22 000 entries. The terms described in the database have been translated into most European languages and also Arabic and Cantonese.

The work of the Toxicology subcommittee is focused on education and standardization. Current areas of activity are: a database on chemical disasters-biological markers and effects, assessment of workplace exposure, effects on children.

The work of the Drug Discovery and Development subcommittee is developing glossaries, databases for drug metabolism, and education.

Other projects being actively worked on are:

- Metrology (VIM, Vocabulaire International des Termes Fondamentaux)

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

et Généraux de Métrologie)

- In vitro standardization (ISO/CEN, European Committee for Standardization)
- Traceability of calibration (BIPM/JCTLM, Bureau International des Poids et Mesures/ Joint Committee on Traceability in Laboratory Medicine)
- Nanotechnology for laboratory medicine: glossary and terms

Projects being developed are:

- Biomarkers for therapeutic and diagnostic purposes
- Nutraceuticals
- Gene modified organisms
- Bioinformatics, proteomics, genomics

Dr. McNaught asked about the relation of the Division with IUPHAR (International Union of Pharmacology). Dr. Kallner replied that while there is no formal relationship, there are cross memberships. Dr. Buxtorf noted that there should be opportunities for obtaining funding from the pharmaceutical industry for some of the projects described. Prof. Gilbert commented on the possible connection in the nanotechnology area with the materials initiative of Division II.

### 7.3 ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY DIVISION

Dr. Moore stated that the role of the Division is to catalyze the interaction between the scientific community and the users of analytical nomenclature and data. The goal is to take inconsistent user and defined data and procedures and transform them into consistent data and procedures.

The goals of the Division are to:

- Define positions in the Division Committee
- Communicate internally and externally
- Achieve relevance
- Lead the field
- Maintain continuity

The Division plans to “activate” people by assigning TMs to an area and then assigning new TMs, AMs, and NRs to the experienced TMs as tutees. Each TM has developed an advisory group in their area. The Division communicates with the members of task groups through a newsletter, “Teamwork” and through a semiannual report on projects.

The Division is actively soliciting project proposals by presentations at conferences and plans to have meetings with target industry groups. The Division is also developing a database of expertise. The Division Committee has developed guidelines for funding projects using a contested system. Dissemination is the responsibility of a TM on the Division Committee as well as the Task Group Chairman.

Dr. Moore noted that the work on Solubility and Equilibrium Data is

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

continuing in the new system. The Orange Book is now available online. The chapters will be updated systematically. One mechanism to achieve this is by requiring that all recommendation projects must update the relevant chapters of the Compendium.

The Division is addressing the issue of continuity by electing half the TMs every two years. The Nominating Committee has been asked to consider diversity both by geography and by expertise.

Prof. Ohtaki noted that the former members of the Solubility Data Subcommittees are no longer listed in the Handbook. Dr. Jost commented that the next edition of the Handbook would list task group members with projects and not only in the directory part of the Handbook.

Prof. Gilbert asked if the new initiatives have been in effect long enough to show results. Dr. Moore replied that it was still too early to see results. Prof. Gilbert then asked if the requests for updates were working. Dr. Moore replied that they were. Prof. Steyn asked that the Division provide a five-minute update on their new initiatives at the next Bureau meeting.

### **8. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS, 2002**

#### **8.1 CURRENT PROJECTS**

Dr. Jost noted that the written materials provided and additional reports were available on the web site.

#### **8.2 REPORT FROM PROJECT COMMITTEE**

Prof. Lorimer began by reviewing the membership of the committee and the operating methods it had developed. Twelve projects have been considered since May 2001, decisions were made on seven of these at the meeting on Friday, 13 September 2002, including three projects that were denied.

The Project Committee plans to use the model proposal developed by Division V to generate a sample proposal for general use. The Committee is working on revisions to the guidelines and on policy statements in the following areas:

- Travel expenses
- Donations by industry
- Check list for Division Committees in submitting proposals

Dr. Becker summarized the “projects” meeting held on Friday. He noted that a major issue was the slow pace of decision making on interdivisional projects. He commented that misunderstandings on the process seem to have caused delay in some cases.

#### **8.3 REPORT FROM EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

Prof. Schneider reviewed the Terms of Reference and composition of the Committee. He noted that the Committee had agreed that it would begin evaluations with projects that had been submitted as part of the new system. The committee felt that it was unrealistic to evaluate projects that had been started before the current system was in place since the task group members



## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

were not aware that their work would be reviewed by the Committee. He emphasized that the Committee felt that its role was to draw general conclusions regarding projects based on reviews of the individual projects, rather than providing reviews of individual projects. Any comments on individual projects would be made directly to the relevant Division or standing Committee.

The Committee has developed guidelines for its work and as result of its test evaluations has developed a document called Advice for task Group Chairmen. This latter document was considered by the Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen to be a significant piece of work and of potentially great value to Task Group Chairmen.

Prof. Schneider then reviewed the following documents from the written material provided to the Bureau:

- Fundamental Criteria
- Review Process
- Standard Measures
- Issues to be Addressed
- Advice for task Group Chairmen

Prof. Gilbert asked if there should be an incentive created to have a “successful” project as determined by the Evaluation Committee.

Prof. Schneider replied that the Committee felt that its role was to provide general observations rather than to grade individual projects. Dr. Przybylowicz commented that the incentive should be publicizing of successful projects.

Dr. Hayes commented that the work of the Evaluation Committee is key to providing information to determine if the Project System is working as planned.

Prof. Sydnes noted that the Project Committee has discussed how to improve dissemination plans.

## **9. DIVISION ELECTIONS**

### **9.1 NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF DIVISION COMMITTEES**

Dr. Becker noted the tremendous responsibility of the Division Committees in the new structure and the need for a diverse membership both by area and geography. The Strategy Development and Implementation Committee in its recommendations emphasized the need to select good nominees. To ensure this they recommended a Nominating Committee that contained three external and two internal members with an external Chairman. This would reduce the chances for inbreeding. One major change since the SDIC made its report is the addition of National Representatives to the Division Committees.

Dr. Becker then described the process used at Brisbane to select the members of the Division Committees. After the Nominating Committee had done its work the Titular Members were elected by the Division, Associate Members were then selected, the NAOs were asked to nominate National Representatives, and then the Division Committees select national

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

Representatives from those nominated. This process had extended well beyond the General Assembly because the composition of the Division Committees, TMs and AMs, had to be known so that the NAOs could nominate candidates to those Committees where they were not represented. The Division Presidents felt that in general the candidates nominated by the NAOs had been of uniformly high quality.

The following proposal has been developed based on the experience gained with the process used at Brisbane. The NAOs would be requested to provide suggested names for candidates for Division and Standing Committees by 15 January 2003; these names would be provided to the Nominating Committees for consideration as candidates for Titular Member. The Nominating Committees would be asked to seek names also from other interested groups, such as Fellows, Advisory Committees, and Associated Organizations. After the election of Titular Members, the Division Committee could use the pool of names of those not elected to Titular Membership as input in their selection of associate Members and National Representatives. In addition, it is proposed that the Chairman of the nominating Committee no longer be required to be an outsider.

Dr. Norling asked that CHEMRAWN be included in those Committees for which candidates would be solicited from the NAOs.

This proposal was accepted by the Bureau.

### 9.2 REDEFINING THE DIVISION ELECTORATE AFTER 2003

Dr. Becker reviewed the background that had led to the current situation. The electorate defined in the Bylaws is the Titular Members, Associate Members, and National Representatives of the Division Committee. The Bureau is authorized to add to this electorate members of other IUPAC bodies as appropriate. At Cobham the Bureau approved an electorate that also included the Task Group chairmen of current projects and projects scheduled to be completed in the current biennium, as well as outside members of the nominating committee. Prof. Ralston reported that the Division Presidents at their meeting on Friday had concluded that with a sufficiently broad nominating process, the electorate does not have to be large. A number of Division Presidents had strongly supported as large an electorate as possible, however, after some discussion, it was agreed that wide consultation, including soliciting proposed candidates from Fellows, would address the concern about a too small electorate. The following proposal is therefore recommended by the Division Presidents to the Bureau for approval.

The proposed electorate, in addition to that defined in Bylaw 4.103 is:

- Task Group Chairmen for current projects
- Current Nominating Committee and that for the previous Biennium

Prof. Ralston commented that the election process needs to be transparent, fair, consistent, and workable. Consulting large groups should result in good slates of nominees. The Division Presidents unanimously support the proposed electorate.

Prof. Somsen commented that the Task Group Chairmen might have a limited

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

view of the needs of the Division. Dr. Becker replied that this was the situation when the Commission Members comprised the bulk of the electorate. In the current situation the number of Task Group Chairmen is small and would not be expected to have an overwhelming effect.

The Bureau approved the proposed definition of the electorate.

### **10. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MEETING OF DIVISION PRESIDENTS**

Prof. Ralston reported that all the Division Presidents felt that project generation is a key issue. There had been extensive discussion of how to nurture projects. There are no obvious ways to do this, each Division trying to do this in different ways. There had been discussion of how to manage database projects. It was agreed that databases should be physically located at the server in North Carolina from the beginning of a project. Service would be provided by the Secretariat while maintenance would be the responsibility of the Division. Issues relating to service and maintenance should be addressed at the proposal stage, not after the project is completed. There had also been discussion of how to fund maintenance. It is important to consider this issue when the project is reviewed to be sure all parties are aware of the commitments that are being made.

The proposal from the Nordic NAOs had been discussed and comments would be made when Item 20 is discussed.

### **11. VICE PRESIDENTIAL CRITICAL ASSESSMENT**

Prof. Sydnes reported that his topic would be communication both within the Union and outside. In addition to analysis he plans to visit many NAOs and national chemical societies. During these visits he will try to improve the links between the NAOs and national chemical societies, when these are different. He plans to visit ~30 NAOs between now and the General Assembly. It is planned to have a discussion of the VPCA at the Council meeting.

During the discussion a number of points were raised:

- Many NAOs have many responsibilities other than IUPAC
- Many national chemical societies have a domestic focus
- Many ANAOs find it difficult to become NAOs because they cannot raise the funds to pay the National Subscription
- Prof. Sydnes' visits should be used not only to promote the image of IUPAC but also to increase the information available to the NAOs
- It is important to stimulate the interest of NAOs in participating in IUPAC
- The Bureau members should be asked to help

### **12. IUPAC-INDUSTRY INTERACTION**

Dr. Hayes noted that the members of the ad hoc Committee were, in addition to himself, Dr. Buxtorf, Mr. Fourie, Dr. Ishitani, Dr. Norling, Dr. Thompson, and Dr. Wright. The Committee had exchanged views by e-mail and had met on Thursday, 12 September, in London.

Dr. Hayes commented that the majority of chemists worked in industry while the

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

majority of participants in IUPAC are from academia. This situation is also true for most national chemical societies. The perception is that IUPAC is not well known, or known not at all, to industrial chemists. What does IUPAC have to offer to justify industrial participation?

- Independent and authoritative statements on chemical issues of public interest
- Organized to arrange global standards
- Can convene meetings of the chemical community to discuss global issues
- Good relationship with UN agencies

How to improve matters?

- Industrial representatives to Division Committees?
- Ask for more help from industry?
- Improve the value of Company Associate program?
- Better communication: more sustained, more relevant, more marketing style.

Prof. Steyn commented that it is not a question of do we want more industrial participation, but rather that we need industrial participation. He thanked Dr. Hayes and the Committee for their work.

A wide-ranging discussion followed Dr. Hayes' presentation. The suggestion was made that Green Chemistry could be promoted in the same way that Plant Safety and the Environment were promoted by COCI. Dr. Wright reviewed the COCI efforts in the Plant Safety and the Environment area. This is viewed as being a helpful program both by industry in developed countries and the target audience in developing countries. The suggestion regarding Industrial Representatives to Division Committees was discussed and it was concluded that this needed to be discussed with trade associations before a specific proposal could be made. The comment was made that industry is interested in supporting specific projects rather than providing general organizational support. It was suggested that industrial and governmental participation should be invited in the early stages of project development. The general reduction in R&D by the traditional chemical industry, as opposed to the pharmaceutical industry, was noted.

The need to encourage more active involvement by Company Associates was noted. Efforts to do this in some countries, especially in Japan, were described, but were judged not to be very successful. It was suggested that Prof. Sydnes in his meetings with NAOs and national chemical societies should address the issue of improving communication with industry. The role of IUPAC in providing an early warning system for industry of societal concerns was noted.

### 12.1 REORGANIZATION OF COCI

Dr. Hayes reported that the Committee had discussed the draft reorganization plan prepared by Dr. Becker only two days earlier and had not prepared a recommendation at this time. A recommendation would be prepared soon for the Executive Committee.

**Bureau Minutes  
Paris 2002**

**13. STRATEGIC PLAN**

13.1 BIENNIAL REPORT ON IUPAC ACTIVITIES, 2000-1

Prof. Steyn thanked the Secretary General for preparing an excellent document that reflected well on the work of the Union. The Secretariat was asked to distribute a copy of the Biennial Report to all newly appointed members of Division and Standing Committees.

13.2 STRATEGIC PLAN, 2002-3 AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Dr. Przybylowicz reviewed the process by which the revised Mission Statement and Long Range Goals had been prepared and the reasons for the addition of a Vision Statement. He noted that the Goals had not been significantly altered, only rearranged to give a more concise set of Goals. The SWOT (Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats) analysis had developed information that was of great use to the officers in the management of the Union's work.

The Bureau approved the proposed Vision Statement, Mission Statement, and Long Range Goals.

**14. REPORT OF TREASURER AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

14.1 WORKING PARTY ON NATIONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND RELATED FINANCIAL MATTERS

Dr. Buxtorf began by reviewing the charge to the Working Party and its composition. He then noted that the National Subscriptions and Publications income comprised more than 90 % of the Union's income. He next reviewed the proposals made by the French and Czech NAOs at the Brisbane Council meeting. The Working Party had discussed these proposals and concluded that they were both unworkable and could threaten the existence of the Union if adopted.

The Bureau, in the resolution adopted by the Council, had noted three issues:

1. Exchange Rates
2. The reduction in funds available from governments and other sources
3. The cost of sending delegates to Council meetings

Dr. Buxtorf then described the guidelines he had provided for the Working Party and noted that the three proposals made by the Working Party were described in detail in the material provided to the Bureau for the next three items on the Agenda. He then drew the Bureau's attention to some of the other comments made by the members of the Working Party, especially the concern of many members that the membership of Division and Standing Committees be equitably distributed among the NAOs.

14.1.1 Calculation of National Subscriptions Using Five Year Averages

Dr. Jost noted that this was a technical change and could be readily implemented. The proposal was approved.

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

### 14.1.2 Payment of Expenses for Council Delegates

Dr. Becker commented that the major benefit of this proposal was increased participation at Council meetings. He noted that full participation by all NAOs in the major direct activity of an NAO, the Council meeting, is highly desirable. With the elimination of Commissions and their routine meetings at the GA, there will be a smaller number of Titular Members paid to attend the GA. The Working Party was concerned that many NAOs would need to pay the full cost of their delegates to Council, and that participation could suffer.

Payment will be made for actual transportation costs [usual IUPAC restrictions to economy APEX fare] and the standard subsistence rate for one delegate to Council, but with a limit of \$2000 or 70% of the NAO's National Subscription for the current biennium, whichever is less.

Each NAO will benefit from this expense reimbursement, but it is clear that the amounts will generally be a greater percentage of the National Subscription for the smaller NAOs. This is one desirable aspect of the proposal, since it has the effect of reducing the net financial contribution from the smaller countries. The proposal was approved.

### 14.1.3 Invoicing National Subscriptions in National Currencies

Dr. Jost reviewed the method used to calculate National Subscriptions. He commented that the fact that the National Subscriptions were invoiced in USD caused two problems for some NAOs. The first was that the request to governments for funding of the National Subscriptions was usually made in the national currency. If the value of the national currency declined with respect to the USD during the time it took for approval, the NAO was faced with a shortfall. The second problem was more significant but less common, on occasion the value of the national currency declined dramatically and the amount of the National Subscription became very large in local currency.

The proposal described in the material provided was not identical to that discussed by the Working Party since a preliminary review of that proposal by the Executive Committee had concluded the potential losses to the Union were too large. The revised proposal addressed those concerns. The effect of the proposal would be to fix the value of the National Subscription at that calculated using the exchange rate for the period when the national subscription was calculated, the first quarter of the year of the General Assembly. Changes in exchange rates would affect only the revenue of the Union, not the amount to be paid by the NAO, as expressed in national currency. Thus, the risk associated with fluctuations in exchange rates would be born by the Union, not the NAOs. As indicated in the model calculations, the changes in the Union's revenue would vary from year to year. It is expected that for long time periods these fluctuations should average to a small value, although they could be large in any given year.

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

There was some discussion of the value of the Union operating a Euro account to reduce the size of the risk, but it was concluded that this was impractical. Prof. Somsen commented that the proposal to bill in national currency was sensible and should be presented to the Council.

Prof. Schneider noted that he did not feel in a position to judge this proposal due to its highly technical, financial nature and he could not express an opinion in favor. Dr. Becker commented that in the short term there would be winners and losers but that it is a valuable thing to do.

A number of comments were made that the description of the proposal given in the prepared material was difficult to follow and should be extensively revised before presenting it to the Council. After further discussion, the Executive Director was asked to prepare an alternative set of National Subscriptions calculated using the proposed method for the 2004-5 biennium for consideration by the Executive Committee and, if approved, by the Council. The description should be revised as suggested by some of the Bureau members and should include a flow chart of the calculation process.

### 14.2 ACCOUNTS, BUDGETS, AND ALLOCATIONS

Dr. Buxtorf noted that the written material provided was for the information of the Bureau and he would not be discussing it unless there were specific questions. He then discussed the method used to determine allocations to Divisions. The use of a zero based budget approach or one based on picking priority areas is not feasible for an organization like IUPAC. He then presented for the Bureau's consideration a proposal based on rewarding those Divisions that obtained extra project funds by increasing their allocations.

Prof. Gilbert noted that in many cases significant in kind contributions are made to projects and that these are difficult to measure. Dr. Rosenblatt commented that this approach could be subject to game playing by Divisions. The Treasurer was asked to reconsider his proposal and present a revised proposal at the next Bureau meeting.

### 14.3 LONG TERM ACCOUNTS

#### 14.3.1 Performance of Long Term Account

Dr. Przybylowicz reviewed the written material, noting that the performance of the Union's investment portfolio had been quite good considering the dramatic declines in the values of equities in the global markets. This was due to the decision of the Finance Committee in 2000 to move the portfolio to a more conservative posture and to sell a number of higher risk equity investments.

#### 14.3.2 Investment Policy Statement Review

Dr. Przybylowicz distributed a corrected Investment Policy Statement. After some discussion, the statement was approved (see Attachment 1).

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

### 14.3.3 Reorganization of Funds and Fund Policy Statement

Dr. Przybylowicz distributed a corrected Fund Policy Statement. The number of funds has been reduced from four to three, and two of the three funds have been renamed. The situation is summarized as follows:

- The Southern Hemisphere Sinking Fund is renamed the General Assembly Special Fund to better express its purpose.
- The Young Scientists Award Fund is combined with the Endowment Reserve into a single Fund to be called the IUPAC Endowment Fund.
- The Biennium Operating Reserve Fund remains unchanged and is set at an amount equal to the total approved budget for the next biennium.

The Endowment Fund will be treated as an Endowment, that is only the income will be available for use. The amount of the Fund will be recalculated each biennium based on the amounts needed for the Biennium Operating Reserve and the General Assembly Special Fund. This amount will be used to calculate the amount available as income, based on an average bond yield, available for use to fund the IUPAC Prize and other special activities.

After some discussion, the statement was approved (see Attachment 2).

## **15. GENERAL ASSEMBLIES AND CONGRESSES**

### 15.1 41<sup>ST</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 38<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (BRISBANE, 2001) FINAL REPORT

The Bureau noted the written report that had been distributed before the meeting.

### 15.2 42<sup>ND</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 39<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (OTTAWA, 2003)

#### 15.2.1 Arrangements

Dr. Jost reviewed the schedule of meetings for the General Assembly. He pointed out that the World Chemistry Leadership Meeting had been scheduled for Friday afternoon. Plans for the WCLM would be discussed under Item 16. Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen were asked to provide information on meetings not yet on the schedule by 1 October if they were to be part of the Information Booklet distributed to General Assembly Participants in October. If a planned meeting was not to appear in the Information Booklet, the Secretariat should be informed by 1 February 2003 so that a meeting room could be arranged.

Dr. Becker noted that the schedule had been arranged to allow time for interdisciplinary meetings and urged the Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen to consider planning such meetings.

Dr. Jost presented a proposal to subsidize the Congress registration fee for General Assembly participants. The proposal is intended to promote participation in the Congress by General Assembly participants. The



## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

amount of the subsidy would be determined by negotiation with the Congress organizers. A subsidized fee of as low USD 100 is contemplated. Prof. Gilbert noted that the participation by General Assembly participants in the Brisbane Congress was disappointing.

After some discussion, the proposal was approved.

### 15.2.2 Scientific Program

Dr. Jost noted that a list of sessions planned for the Congress was available in the Agenda Book. Speakers in the different sessions were not yet available. Prof. Steyn expressed concern about the number of topics. Prof. Tidwell commented that this was typical of the Canadian Chemical Society Conferences.

### 15.2.3 Support for Young Scientists from Developing Countries

Dr. Meyers reviewed the written material. In addition to the support provided for young scientists from developing countries funded by IUPAC, the organizers, and UNESCO, she had arranged with the US Army a program to fund young scientists from both developing and developed countries.

## 15.3 43<sup>RD</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 40<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS (BEIJING, 2005)

Dr. Jost reported that at the meeting in Turin the Executive Committee set the dates for the General Assembly and Congress as 13-21 August 2005. The EC also agreed to continue the current practice of having overlapping dates for the General Assembly and Congress at Beijing. The venue is the Beijing International Convention Center and the Beijing Continental Grand Hotel (approximately 9 km north of Tiananmen Square). Dr. Jost noted that he planned to visit Beijing in 2004 to discuss arrangements with the local organizers.

## 15.4 44<sup>TH</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND 41<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS – 2007

Dr. Jost reported that the Italian NAO had suggested that they might be interested in hosting the General Assembly and Congress in 2007. In order to explore the possibility they provided a tour of the proposed venue, in Stresa, to some of the Officers after the Executive Committee meeting in Turin. While attractive in many ways, this venue was judged to be unsuitable and the Italian organizers were informed of this. There have been continuing discussions with the Italian organizers concerning criteria for selecting a suitable venue and estimates of the number of attendees to be expected at both the Congress and the General Assembly.

Dr. Jost noted that the untimely death of Prof. Garcia Dominguez has removed the champion of the Spanish bid. Attempts to contact the Spanish NAO on this subject have been unsuccessful.

Dr. Jost then commented that the parallel format used at Brisbane and that is planned for Ottawa and Beijing has certain disadvantages. The chief is that for

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

many of the participants in the GA it is very difficult to attend the Congress due to schedule conflicts. The other is that it is difficult for the organizers to find a combination of suitable venues for both the Congress and the General Assembly. He proposed that when the letters of invitation are sent to the NAOs, it be left open as to parallel or serial schedule. In the case of a serial arrangement, the Congress and the General Assembly would be expected to be on successive weeks in the same city.

The Bureau approved this proposal.

### **16. WORLD CHEMISTRY LEADERSHIP MEETING: OTTAWA, 15 AUGUST 2003**

Prof. Steyn reviewed the background of the WCLM, noting that the precedent had now been established that this meeting would be organized by IUPAC with an agenda arranged by IUPAC in consultation with the National Chemical Societies. The steering committee for the WCLM had met on Friday and agreed on the following agenda for the meeting:

1. Progress on Brisbane proposals
2. Public Image of Chemistry
3. Relationship of IUPAC, NAOs, and national chemistry societies

Prof. Steyn asked that the Bureau members inform the Secretariat of contacts with R&D directors, or equivalent, who might be invited to participate.

### **17. SPONSORSHIP OF CONFERENCES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

Prof. Ohtaki reviewed the background of the program. He noted that in the most recent group of conference applications had consisted of four applications for support from conferences in Russia. The committee had decided to fund the 3rd International Symposium on Separations in BioSciences.

Prof. Nefedov commented that the Committee should consider the impact of a conference on the country. Some conferences are typical international conferences and have little local participation. The position of the national chemical society regarding which conferences to fund should also be considered.

Dr. Becker noted that the program had been authorized by the Council for four years and would continue in its current format for one more year. A proposal to change the program would be made as part of the recommendations of the Conference Policy Development Committee report to be discussed in Item 18.

Prof. Ohtaki then briefly reviewed the work of the Membership Development Committee, of which he is Chairman. He reported that visits had been made to six countries that are currently ANAOs to persuade them to become NAOs and to one, Mexico, which had subsequently become an ANAO. He noted that Africa was a difficult area to work with. Prof. Gilbert noted that the chemical societies in these countries were small and needed government and industry support to pay the National Subscription if they became NAOs.

Dr. Becker noted that a document "Reasons for Joining IUPAC" had been drafted. Dr. Hayes suggested that perhaps what is needed are multiple documents to address different audiences and this should be done professionally. Prof. Steyn suggested that in addition to the rational reasons given in the draft document, an emotional appeal

**Bureau Minutes**  
**Paris 2002**

should be made; membership in IUPAC is a sign of full participation in the chemical community. The Secretariat was asked to distribute the draft document to the Bureau after some further revisions.

**18. REPORT FROM CONFERENCE POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Dr. Becker noted that conferences are one of IUPAC's best-known products, but that the actual conduct of conferences is in the hands of individual organizing committees. The Committee had not considered the possibility of IUPAC directly running conferences as this was felt to be impractical. However, the CPDC had proposed a number of steps that should be taken by the Secretariat to improve policies and procedures for IUPAC-sponsored conferences, as follows:

1. Develop new guidelines, forms, policies and procedures for IUPAC sponsorship of conferences along the lines recommended in the CPDC report. Consult closely with Divisions and relevant Standing Committees. Submit proposals to CPDC for review prior to formal adoption by the Bureau or Executive Committee.
2. Develop guidelines to clarify the role and responsibilities of the official IUPAC representative to sponsored conferences.
3. Work with the Divisions and individual conference organizers along lines recommended in the CPDC report to promote both the development of IUPAC projects and the dissemination of the results of IUPAC activities in IUPAC-sponsored conferences.
4. Consider and implement additional mechanisms for publicizing the IUPAC conference program, as well as individual conferences.
5. Discuss with the Evaluation Committee ways by which series of IUPAC-sponsored conferences could be readily evaluated.

The Bureau was asked to act on five proposals.

1. Approve the reorientation of the New Directions in Chemistry series of conferences to a program that seeks competitive proposals from the Divisions.
2. Approve the redirection of the program for financial support of Conferences in Developing and Economically Disadvantaged Countries along lines recommended in the CPDC report to respond to initiatives of the Divisions and Standing Committees for novel conferences and IUPAC Lectureships in developing and economically disadvantaged countries. This redirection is intended to be implemented in 2004, subject to concurrence by Council in 2003.
3. In developing the budget for 2004-2005, plan to transfer the total of \$65,000 currently allocated to the New Directions conferences and the Conferences in Developing Countries programs to a conference support fund administered by the Project Committee.
4. Approve the re-establishment of the position of Scientific Editor for *PAC* with responsibilities as outlined in the CPDC report.
5. Authorize the continuation of the term of CPDC to oversee completion of these actions and the actions listed above.

After some discussion, all five proposals were approved. It was agreed that Item 2

## Bureau Minutes Paris 2002

should apply to conferences in both NAOs and ANAOs. It was noted that the concept of IUPAC lectureships could be implemented immediately. The comment was made that the role of the IUPAC representative had changed over the years and the focus in the future should be on promoting the work of IUPAC to conference attendees. It was suggested that conference reports should be requested as appropriate and assessments should be made only for conferences not sponsored by Divisions or Standing Committee.

### 18.1 IUPAC VISA POLICY STATEMENT

Dr. Becker commented that the current problem in the USA is not a general ban on granting visas to citizens of certain countries but a series of individual problems. Pressure needs to be applied by the national Academies and the national chemical societies. Dr. Jost pointed out that while the examples given in the agenda book referred to visas for entry into the US, similar problems have been reported elsewhere. A major part of the problem is the much longer times required for the visa review process. It was suggested that problems with obtaining visas should be considered when approving sponsorship for conferences.

A related issue is the call for a boycott of Israeli scientists by international organizations. A current, highly publicized, instance is the removal of two Israeli scientists from the boards of journals operated by a scientist at University of Manchester/University of Manchester Institute of Science & Technology. Prof. Stepto distributed a message from the UMIST administration noting that the journals in question were independent of the University and that the University has strongly condemned the action by one of its faculty members.

## 19. PUBLICATIONS

### 19.1 STATUS REPORT ON PUBLICATIONS

Dr. Jost referred to his report in the agenda book, noting that while institutional subscriptions to *PAC* had not declined from 2001 to 2002, the long-term outlook was for a continuation of the trend to decreased subscriptions. The publication income of the Union increased slightly from 2001 to 2002. The journal continues to be published slightly behind the cover date. This has been due to delays in the review of IUPAC reports by ICTNS, but the late publication of *PAC* is expected to continue due to a lack of material over the next few months. Dr. Jost pointed out that the Impact Factor and rank among General Science journals of PAC had increased from 1999 to 2001. For the years 2001 and 2000 in the field of chemistry, multi disciplinary. There are 118 journals in the ISI list. PAC is number 31 in both years with an impact factor of 1.257 in 2000 and 1.535 in 2001. These results are a distinct improvement from the rank of 35 and Impact Factor of 1.144 for 1999. The change in staffing assignments and a possible new hire as a result of the departure of Dr. Senzel were also discussed. The new person to be hired would concentrate on communication with IUPAC's constituencies more than on editing *PAC*. *Chemistry International* continues to be published on schedule with improved

## **Bureau Minutes Paris 2002**

readability and content. A redesign of the magazine will be completed in time for implementation with the January 2003 issue. The Bureau congratulated Dr. Meyers on the improvements in *CI* during the past year.

At its meeting in June the Committee on Printed and Electronic Publications recommended that the subscription rates for *CI* remain the same and those for *PAC* should be increased for institutional subscribers, both print and electronic only. The proposed increases are Institutional from USD 1200 to USD 1300 and Electronic Only from USD 892 to USD 900. The proposed rates were approved.

### 19.2 PUBLICATION OF IUPAC REPORTS IN JOURNALS OTHER THAN *PAC*

Dr. Jost noted that the issue of publication of IUPAC reports in journals other than *PAC* was a recurring one. He proposed that such publication be allowed only if the Division President recommends to the Secretary General that a report be published elsewhere than in *PAC* and that the Secretary General be authorized to approve the request. The proposal was approved.

### 19.3 PLANS FOR SPECIAL ISSUES IN *PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY*

Dr. Jost noted that Prof. Bull had prepared an extensive report on his work and asked if there were any questions. There were no questions and the Bureau commended Prof. Bull for his excellent work on Special Issues.

### 19.4 BOOKS

Dr. Jost noted that while the report on sales of books by the Secretariat showed that more than half the cost of acquisition of the back stock from Blackwell and the publishers of the Solubility Data Series had now been recovered, this was not the purpose of the venture. The purpose was to make the books available and in this IUPAC had been very successful.

## **20. REORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU: PROPOSAL FROM NORDIC NAOS**

Dr. Kallner reviewed the proposal he had submitted to the Bureau. The intent of the proposal was not to advocate a particular form of reorganization, but rather to initiate discussion of the issue. He suggested that a group be set up to look at the issue of reorganization of the EC and Bureau.

Prof. Ralston commented that the overall operation of the Council, Bureau, and EC, including the Division Presidents, should be studied, especially the decision making process and communication with the members of other IUPAC bodies, such as Division Committees, Standing Committees, and Task Groups.

Prof. Steyn proposed that the Bureau approve the formation of a Working Party, to be named by the EC, to study the issues raised and to report to the Bureau in Ottawa. The proposal was approved.

Dr. Rosenblatt suggested that part of the charge to the Working Party should be to consider the issue of effectiveness, as was being done elsewhere in the Union.

Dr. Hayes proposed that the Working Party be asked to have a discussion paper available to initiate a discussion at the Ottawa Council meeting. Prof. Steyn agreed that the Working Party should be asked to complete its work in time for the EC

**Bureau Minutes**  
**Paris 2002**

meeting so that a discussion paper could be prepared for Council.

**21. SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS AND THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION**

Dr. Becker reviewed the background as presented in the written material. He noted that the Workshop in Bergen had been very successful. He distributed a draft of the report from the Workshop that would be presented to the Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). He noted that the NAOs and national chemical societies had a role to play by bringing the report to the attention of the appropriate government authorities. He invited the Bureau members to send any comments on the draft report to him by 30 September.

Prof. Steyn expressed the appreciation of the Bureau for the outstanding work done by Dr. Becker, Dr. Hayes, and Prof. Sydnes in bringing this project to a successful conclusion.

The Bureau then approved the report as an IUPAC document.

**22. PROPOSAL TO CREATE NEW COMMISSION ON MACROMOLECULAR TERMINOLOGY**

Prof. Stepto informed the Bureau that Division IV had decided that there was no need to create a new commission. The recently created Subcommittee on Macromolecular Terminology was functioning well and the creation of a Commission was therefore no longer viewed as necessary. The ad hoc Committee was therefore discharged with thanks.

**23. FUTURE OF THE JOINT IUPAC-IUBMB BIOCHEMICAL NOMENCLATURE COMMISSION (JCBN)**

Dr. McNaught reviewed the background and his written report. Dr. Becker proposed that a three-person committee be created to discuss with the IUBMB how to best continue the work of the JCBN. The Bureau approved the proposal and asked the President to appoint the committee.

**24. REPORT FROM TRANSFERMIUM JOINT WORKING PARTY**

Dr. Rosenblatt reviewed the background of the formation of the Joint Working Party. He noted that cooperation with IUPAP had been excellent. The report of the JWP on the claims for discovery of elements 110, 111, and 112 had been published in *PAC*, Vol. 73, No. 6, pp. 959-967 (2001). The report had confirmed the synthesis of element 110 by the GSI (Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung) group. Subsequent reports in the literature had confirmed the decision of the JWP to not confirm the synthesis of elements 111 and 112. The GSI group had been asked to propose a name for element 110, but no response has been as yet received. If no proposal is received in six months from the date of the request, the Division of Inorganic Chemistry has the responsibility to suggest a name. Prof. Corish has been leading this project to avoid the appearance a conflict interest since Dr. Rosenblatt is associated with one of the institutions involved in this work.

IUPAC and IUPAP have asked that the JWP continue its work by examining claims for the synthesis of elements of atomic number greater than 110. A preliminary report is expected by the end of 2002.

**Bureau Minutes  
Paris 2002**

**25. FELLOWS AND AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS**

Dr. Jost reviewed his written report for the Bureau. He pointed out that the number of Fellows had increased significantly with the termination of most Commissions. Some confusion as to their status was evident among some Fellows who joined task Groups and therefore changed status to Member in the listings on the web. After the end of their service on a Task Group, their status would revert to that of Fellows, but there would be no additional letter reappointing them Fellows.

The finances of *CI*, including the costs for the AMP and Fellows programs, continue to be in balance and these programs are no longer a drain on the resources of the Union. Dr. Jost pointed out that there was a need to work with the sponsors of the AMP in each country to expand the program by recruiting new members. This was expected to be one of the responsibilities of the new person to be hired at the Secretariat this year, as mentioned in Item 19.1

**26. STATUS REPORT ON IUPAC SECRETARIAT**

The report prepared by Dr. Jost was accepted as presented. The Bureau expressed its appreciation of the continued good work of the Secretariat staff, especially in the face of the significant staff changes that had occurred over the past year.

**27. IUPAC WEB SITE AND OTHER PUBLICITY ABOUT THE UNION**

Dr. Jost briefly noted a number of instances where IUPAC had received favorable publicity for its work in various chemistry newsmagazines, both print and online. He also noted that the IUPAC web site had changed in character from a mechanism for providing organizational information to IUPAC members to a destination for the general chemistry community.

Dr. Meyers reviewed the improvements in the site, especially the continuing effort to make navigation more intuitive for those in the general chemistry community. The Bureau thanked Dr. Meyers for her excellent work in making the IUPAC web site a significant source of information for the worldwide chemistry community.

**28. IUPAC PRIZE FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS**

Dr. Hayes reported that the applicants for the IUPAC prize had been of uniformly high quality and the geographic diversity of the applicants and the prizewinners was a tribute to the awareness of the prize in the global chemistry community. He thanked the members of the Committee for their excellent work in selecting the winners from among so many well-qualified applicants.

**29. UNESCO-IUPAC INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CHEMISTRY**

Prof. Steyn informed the Bureau that there were no recent developments to report. He also noted that a group of officers would be visiting UNESCO headquarters on Monday, 16 September. Prof. Ohtaki asked whether UNESCO could be requested to support the formation of a regional chemical federation in Africa.

**30. RATIFICATION OF SPONSORSHIP OF SYMPOSIA**

**Bureau Minutes**  
**Paris 2002**

The Bureau ratified the sponsorships approved since the last EC meeting.

**31. RATIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS TO IUPAC BODIES**

The Bureau approved the appointment of Prof. Hale Bayram of Turkey as a National Representative on the Committee for Chemistry Education.

**32. DATES AND PLACE OF NEXT BUREAU MEETING**

Dr. Jost reminded the Bureau that the next meeting of the Bureau would be on Wednesday afternoon and all day Thursday, 13-14 August 2003 in Ottawa.

**33. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

Prof. Steyn thanked the Bureau for its hard work over the past two days and again expressed his appreciation for the excellent arrangements by Prof. Moreau and her colleagues.