



XXXII SCAR Delegates' Meeting

Portland, USA, 23-25 July 2012

Agenda Item: 13.1

Person Responsible: MC Kennicutt
II

The SCAR Development Council Update – July 2012

Executive Summary

Title: SCAR Development Council – Update July 2012

Authors: MC Kennicutt II, SDC Chair

Introduction/ Background: SCAR's Strategic Plan calls for the creation of a Development Council to manage and facilitate external fund raising for SCAR.

Important Issues or Factors: The SCAR Development Council has been formed and conducted initial consideration of its Terms of Reference. SDC discussions have been conducted electronically.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1 - Solicit volunteers and appoint a new Chair to the SDC.

On a go forward basis instruct the SDC to:

Recommendation 2 – Further consider the model for SDC membership as it enters its active solicitation phase and decide on an optimal model for membership. Revise SDC membership in accordance with any changes in the model.

Recommendation 3 – Identify a limited number of high priority SCAR activities and develop the types of promotional material needed for fund raising based on these activities over the next biennium. These activities should be carefully matched with organizations and/or individuals for direct solicitation that have the highest likelihood of successful outcomes

Expected Benefits/Outcomes: Supplemental funds to support SCAR's mission.

Partners: Partnerships are to be explored as one aspect of a strategy for external fund raising. Partners will vary depending on the target and topic for fund raising

Budget Implications: Funds are requested for a face-to-face meeting in the 2013-2014 timeframe. Total request: \$5000

The SCAR Development Council – Update July 2012

The SCAR Strategic Plan 2011-2016 calls for the formation of a committee to identify sources of external funds and develop a strategy to diversify SCAR's financial resources beyond membership fees. This paper provides an update on establishing this committee and initial thoughts on membership and terms of reference.

Terms of Reference

The Development Council is to develop a strategy to solicit funds to partially fund SCAR activities from external organizations. The Council is expected to identify opportunities to supplement SCAR's base income derived from national membership fees.

Terms of Reference:

1. Consider various organizational models for development councils or groups for organizations like SCAR with similar goals and evaluate their applicability to SCAR.
2. Identify the types of promotional materials that are needed to represent SCAR to external organizations and recommend development of advertising materials.
3. Identify those aspects of SCAR's mission that have the highest likelihood of resonating with external funders (capacity building, training, education and outreach, early career, etc.).
4. Build a library of potential organizational targets for solicitation of funds with profiles.
5. Identify the advantages of partnering with other organization in fund-raising efforts and identify those partners that bring the greatest added value to the efforts.
6. Consider the membership of the group and how it might be adjusted to greatest impact in regard to the organizational model recommend from item 1.
7. Choose a few high probability targets and develop solicitations for funds once items 1 to 6

Update – July 2012

The SCAR Development Council (SDC) membership was agreed (Appendix 1). As initially recommended membership was based on representatives from the regions of the world that represent SCAR membership. The SDC began to conduct a systematic consideration of its Terms of Reference in July 2011. The ToR were reviewed and an initial work plan was agreed by the SDC. The following provides summaries of discussions for each ToR and recommendations that flow therefrom. A detailed record of comments by SDC members categorized by ToR is provided in Appendix 2 for future reference. Individual members of the SDC were asked and agreed to “keep watch” for opportunities for the

SDC in regard to major aspects of SCAR's mission as Vice Chairs for scientific advice, education and outreach, early career scientists, capacity building and training, and science.

Models for a Development Council – As an initial model, regional representation drawn from those active in SCAR, was adopted. It was recognized that in the longer term a different model for memberships might be more effective. Various aspects of the SDC model were discussed including expanding membership outside of SCAR, inclusion of experts with experience with foundations, and possible formation of a Donors Board of current donors. It was noted that fund raising in most organizations was conducted/lead by professionals and that substantial time and resources are often committed to the effort. It was emphasized that successful fund raising was promoted in the context of how a particular donor's investment would “make a difference”. This infers that specific targets for funding need to be developed that emphasize the excellence and relevance of whatever activities are being promoted as targets for funding. It was discussed that the uniqueness of SCAR and its area of expertise, Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, were strong selling points to donors and of high general interest. A related suggestion was that the next generation of SCAR SRPs fit the criteria for activities that would be expected to be of high interest to funders. One approach is for SRP leaders to join with SDC members to develop appropriate promotional material with specific budget requests that build on the “seed monies” provided by SCAR.

Promotional Materials – There was general agreement that SCAR needs to develop specific and explicit promotional materials for its fund raising efforts. Concise one-page descriptions of high profile themes are needed for marketing. These profiles need to be explicit with “what would be produced if additional funds” were available. Many opportunities were seen within SCAR's portfolio of scientific and advisory activities. A “menu” of several types of efforts/activities to market to interested parties showing how their funds would be expended to produce specific outcomes need to be developed. The SCAR Climate Communications plan is an example of one such activity. General pleas for funds to support the organization generically are unlikely to be productive.

High Likelihood Targets for Fund Raising – Education and public outreach, capacity building and training, and early career scientists were seen as high likelihood targets for fund raising. High profile science coordination efforts, as outlined above that are relevant to societal needs should be a high priority, i.e., climate change, sea level rise, etc. Specific targets such as fellowships, horizon scanning efforts, climate communications, conservation efforts and others are likely fund raising targets. Specificity in goals, timelines, and the funds needed are essential. High profile outcomes are expected. It was also noted that the SCAR Secretariat has little or no excess capacity to take on additional efforts related to new activities, so the most effective approach is to fund science coordination efforts managed by the community or to bring additional funds to activities already underway within SCAR but that are currently underfunded. Capitalizing on existing programs also provides an indication of a successful track record in conducting such activities and an unmet demand, i.e., the Fellowship or Visiting Professor Programs.

Potential Targets for Solicitation of Funds – A wide range of Foundations and individuals were discussed (see Appendix 2). Those that SCAR already has a relationship with, such as the Sloan Foundation and the Tinker Foundation, should be high priority targets. Effort needs to be made to carefully research the mission and goals of target organizations/individuals to ensure that SCAR's activities are relevant. Soliciting in regions

of the world not historically involved in the Antarctic might be one target, such as the Middle East and Africa. Targets organizations/individuals for future efforts need to be prioritized and highest likelihood targets identified otherwise much effort could be exerted with little return. Personal contacts and visits will be essential to building relationships. The current economic times are not conducive to fund raising and special effort will be needed as most sources of fund are highly oversubscribed. Committed volunteers must be identified to champion specific efforts if they are to be successful.

Partnerships – Fund raising partnerships with other organizations should be pursued when beneficial to both organizations. Minimizing competition for the same funds can be effective in improving outcomes. Other polar organizations and organizations with a polar interest are natural partners. Partnerships with organizations with a special expertise or niche that complements SCAR’s missions can be effective, such as APECS..

Summary and Recommendations

The current Chair of the SDC has announced his intention to resign at the end of his Presidential term in July 2012.

Recommendation 1 - *Solicit volunteers and appoint a new Chair to the SDC.*

On a go forward basis the SDC should:

Recommendation 2 – *Further consider the model for SDC membership as it enters its active solicitation phase and decide on an optimal model for membership. Revise SDC membership in accordance with any changes in the model.*

Recommendation 3 – *Identify a limited number of high priority SCAR activities and develop the types of promotional material needed for fund raising based on these activities over the next biennium. These activities should be carefully matched with organizations and/or individuals for direct solicitation that have the highest likelihood of successful outcomes.*

APPENDIX 1 .SCAR Development Council Membership

1. Honorary Executive Chair – to be determined
2. Chair – **M Kennicutt II**, President of SCAR, USA
3. SCAR Secretariat – **M Sparrow**, Executive Director of SCAR, UK
4. North America – **D Wall** - USA
5. Africa – **S Chown** -South Africa – **Vice Chair for Scientific Advice**
6. Scandinavia – **O Orheim** - Norway Vice Chair for Education and Outreach
7. Central Europe – **J Lopez Martinez**, Spain; **B Danis**, Belgium
8. Western Europe - **J Xavier**, Portugal – Vice Chair for Early Career Scientists
9. Russia- **A Klepikov** - Russia
10. Eastern Europe - **C Pimpirev**, Bulgaria
11. Mideast - **R Ravindra** - India – Vice Chair for Capacity Building and Training

- 12. Pacific Rim - **S. Azizan, Malaysia**
- 13. Northern Pacific Rim - **YD Kim - Korea**
- 14. Southern Pacific Rim – **P Barrett, New Zealand** – Vice Chair for Science
- 15. Southern South America – **S Marensi, Argentina**
- 16. Central and Northern South America – **J Simoes – Brazil**

Honorary Members – to be determined

Appendix 2. SCAR Development Council - Record of Discussions

Correspondence by the Chair

Date	Description	Details
2/3/2012	Correspondence #1	<p>Initiating Discussions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>First request</u> for action is confirmation by those named in the attached list that they are willing to serve as Vice-Chairs in each aspect of SCAR's mission indicated. 2. <u>Second request</u> for action is your agreement on, or suggestions for alternative, approaches to the above described plan of action to accomplish the SDC's tasks. 3. <u>Third request</u> for action is to review the draft ToRs and provide any suggested deletions, additions or changes in wording or emphasis. 4. <u>Fourth request</u> for action is to bring to the attention of the SDC any potential opportunities that you are currently aware for raising of external funds that the SDC might take immediate action on (STANDING REQUEST).
3/23/2012	Correspondence #2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <u>Fifth request</u> to describe and/or propose possible models for the SCAR Development Council and describe the advantages and disadvantages for the model. 6. <u>Sixth request</u> to Identify different types of advertising material necessary to support the work of the SDC.
6/29/2012	Correspondence #3	Summary and Delegate's Report

Responses to Action Items – General Comments (if relevant to more specific items in the future these comments will be copied under the relevant ToR topic)

Dates	Author Initials	Comments (abbreviated)
2/2012	All	Action #1 SDC Vice Chairs agreed
2/2012	All	Action #2 Plan of action agreed
2/2012	All	Action #3 SDC ToR agreed with some minor additions
2/8/2012	PB	<p>I concur about the global interest in the state of the Antarctic and Southern Ocean region. Tomorrow a NZ economist-philanthropist Gareth Morgan sails from NZ leading a one month cruise to the Sub-Antarctic islands and the Ross Sea with scientists, journalists and others to highlight just this. see www.ourfarsouth.com<http://www.ourfarsouth.com> . Some colleagues and I helped him with his first book on climate change www.polesapart.com<http://www.polesapart.com> persuading him that the "alarmists" were actually right. I expect him to be a helpful sounding board for our work for SCAR.</p>
2/8/2012	MCK	I see the role of Vice Chairs as keeping a watch from the various perspectives.

1. Consider various organizational models for development councils or groups for organizations like SCAR with similar goals and evaluate their applicability to SCAR.

Date	Author (init.)	Comment (abbreviated)
11/4/2012	RB	<p>We should also invite people outside the Council if we want to attract funding from new sources. One model is to separate Council members with different functions into two boards - one called the Development Council or the Advisory Council or the Advisory Board (much more advisory in function and members have access to or knowledge of Foundations and their members, rather than money themselves) and the other called the Donor Board - membership to which would be from our current donors.</p>
4/28/2012	PB	<p>VUW has a VUW Foundation, whose purpose it is to raise funds for VUW through donations and bequests. It has a full time paid director, an administrator and a board comprising business-oriented VUW alumni. Antarctic Research Centre has had 3 significant donations in the last few years I was director. One was the result of a good experience that a group of Singaporean accountancy students had 40 years ago (\$500K). This was a consequence of the high profile of our Antarctic work but also luck for reasons too long explain. Another was a good experience that a former student of mine had 30 years ago (\$1million) and the third was the result of being engaged by an economist/philanthropist to represent alarmist scientists for his book on climate change (\$250K). It's hard to generalize from a sample of 3, especially when each donation had different motives. But what I think was common to all three was that the donors felt their donation would somehow make a difference in a specific way that we could identify, whether it was an endowed annual lecture in Antarctic studies (Dr Lee) or funding a PDF for an ice-sheet modeler to grow our modeling group (former student Alan Eggers) or funding a PDF on icesheet modeling and SL rise with a commitment to science communication (economist Gareth Morgan - see www.poles-apart.com). But above all I think the quality and relevance of the work for which the money is sought must be at the head of any pitch.</p> <p>The other organization that is doing this is of course Antarctica NZ, with its NZ Antarctic Institute Project, and a 5 person Board of Trustees selected for science and management credibility and in the case of one member a great fund-raising track record (I'm told).</p> <p>What strikes me as different between these two and the SDC is that they have a much smaller mission - to enhance support for students and research at a small University, or to enhance research in a small national Antarctic program. SCAR's mission is to understand a continent - unique in the sense of being the only ice covered continent and on that account especially vulnerable to global warming. On one hand prospective donors will say "but governments are already doing this and on quite a massive scale ie hundreds of millions of dollars". It seems to me the SDC might look to a flagship project for the fund that links a range of existing research activities in a way that is difficult for individual countries or SCAR to do.</p> <p>As I write this I realize that SCAR will at Portland consider 5 or so such</p>

		<p>flagship projects reflecting the interests of virtually all Antarctic scientists, and for which support for meetings and related activities is minimal. One approach to gauging both targeted research and sums needed would be to ask the leaders of each project to submit budgets not only for the SCAR funding that is available (currently \$20K/year for 6-8 years), but also for an additional sum, say \$200,000/year for 6-8 years, specifying how it would be spent and expected benefits. The role of the SDC (or a subcommittee) would be to provide guidance in developing the case for the additional funding for each project, and then seeking people who might be interested in making such a donation. It would be important for one of the leaders in each group with top communication skills to join with one or two members of SDC in developing and delivering a presentation to prospective donors.</p> <p>The suggestion of a Donor's Board seems to me a good one. I presume this would meet once every one or two years to review progress (linked to OSCs?), allowing them to follow not only the consequence of their own contributions but also those of others like themselves.</p>
--	--	---

2. Identify the types of promotional materials that are needed to represent SCAR to external organizations and recommend development of advertising materials.

Date	Author (init.)	Comments (abbreviated)
2/6/2012	MCK	Develop concise one page descriptions of high profile science themes for marketing ideas to potential donors or funders. Highlight what advances might be expected for an investment creating a series of ideas for consideration by potential funders. A "menu" of several types of efforts/activities to market to interested parties might showing how their funds would be expended producing specific outcomes. The SCAR Climate Communications plan should be part of this discussion.
4/16/2012	JX	<p>I agree with the need of a long term vision for the SCAR DC...for example, do we want more funding for what? (for international science in the Antarctic? more workshop? to provide better quality to the Antarctic scientific community...).</p> <p>Also, we shall focus on what can we offer as a product (i.e. what SCAR will need in 10-20 years to make sure that Antarctic science is maintained at the highest level?)</p> <p>I agree with the production of a document, but we should discuss beforehand who are we trying to approach, as "speaking" to a politician is considerably different to a foundation president.</p>
4/28/2012	PB	I'd expect a visually appealing generic Antarctic-flavored leaflet (3 times folded A4) on the vision and role of the SDC. Then further leaflets in a similar format (i.e., part of a series) could be developed for each proposed project. Each would have a webpage counterpart where the leaflet would be available for downloading.
5/10/2012	SM	I think that our Strategic Plan is excellent but not suitable for the purpose we are dealing with. I think that we should develop brochures showing SCAR products and services and one-page summaries presenting not only hot science issues but also the potential of SCAR as an independent Antarctic science advisor. The strategic plan can be kept as background info when a potential donor has been identified.

3. Identify those aspects of SCAR’s mission that have the highest likelihood of resonating with external funders (capacity building, training, education and outreach, early career, etc.).

Date	Author (init.)	Comment (abbreviated)
2/15/2012	OO	<p>Given the considerable government funding of Antarctic research it may be difficult to get private foundations to fund research programs – they are generally looking for areas where they can make a difference. Exceptions may be where we can show high societal relevance/possibility of profiling the donor.</p> <p>Capacity building/supporting early career scientists may be an area where it is easier to raising funds.</p>
2/15/2012	MCK	<p>Unless there is a special opportunity for research funding, like CAML, trying to orchestrate direct funding of research is not one of the most likely avenues for funding. I also worry that in some ways an aggressive SCAR on this front is in competition with those that are doing the science; we should maintain the facilitator role and not the research administrator/project manager role.</p> <p>Organizing syntheses around important topics, like ACCE, is an important route though that I think will find wide support. We have been discussing a strategic set of “white papers” on timely and high profile issues that include both science and scientific advice to policy makers. Steve Chown is working on a quite expansive strategy for conservation in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean in the 21st century, for example. We also have our “Horizon Scanning” activity that we need to find funding for.</p> <p>Agreed on CBET and in some ways these activities can have the greatest impact and is something SCAR is developing a good record conducting in partnership with APECS. We have existing programs in this arena that are chronically underfunded - so we already have over-subscribed programs with a proven track record that meet a specific need.</p>

4. Build a library of potential organizational targets for solicitation of funds with profiles.

Date	Author (init.)	Comment
11/4/2011	RB	<p>This list is of those foundations with a strong Cambridge connection, and hence we can use the fact that we are based with Cambridge to great advantage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAAS (of the journal Science, and an office based in Cambridge) also give a lot of scholarships and sponsorships. I have a good contact with one of the Editors in the Cambridge office. • Living Oceans - financed by the King of Saudi Arabia, based in the USA, http://www.livingoceansfoundation.org/ <p>From the Middle East:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Qatar) and with fairly strong ties with Cambridge is the Qatar Science Foundation. • the Saïd Foundation (of the Saïd business School in Oxford) • The Arab British Chamber of Commerce Charitable Foundation (http://www.abcc.org.uk/charitable_foundation/sponsorship_funds.cfm)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two foundations with strong links to Astronomy (seeing our newest program is AAA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kavli Foundation (http://www.kavlifoundation.org/) and ○ the Boustany Foundation (http://www.fondation-boustany.org/) • A Portuguese Foundation with lots of dosh: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian (www.igc.gulbenkian.pt) • For getting some participation from Pakistan, the Noon Foundation (http://www.noon-foundation.org/mission-statement) • For New Zealand, the Rutherford Foundation, the Royal Society of New Zealand manage their funds. • For Malaysian citizens, Yayasan Khazanah is a foundation established by Khazanah Nasional Berhad (Khazanah Nasional) – the investment holding arm of the Government of Malaysia. • Cambridge based Foundation, with interest in the Arts and Culture http://www.acefoundation.org.uk/ • Another UK based one, the Arcadia Foundation (http://www.arcadiafund.org.uk/content/). This is an important one and supports conservation based activities in Cambridge already. • The Prince's Trust is also very strong on links with science, conservation, etc. • The Cambridge University Press normally is quite prepared to give 10-20% discounts for students attending specific conferences, generally all the University presses around the world are viable to giving discounts - something to think about for the Portland Conference?
2/5/2012	DW	Will we try to have a web based or drop box for to build a library of potential organizational targets for solicitation of funds with profiles
2/6/2012	MCK	Develop a way for the SDC to access and upload documents. Create a process for easy use and provision of documents to work as efficiently as possible.
2/15/2012	OO	I sit on the advisory committee for the Prince Albert II Foundation. This is a foundation that might give money to SDC. If there are thoughts to approach it then we should discuss this so that my role in the Foundation can be positive for the application and not cause a conflict of interest problem.
2/15/2012	MCK	PA II Foundation is an obvious target and we will need to manage OO's association with them to best advantage and avoid conflicts of interest – but this can be managed
4/16/2012	JX	From my experience, most of the funding in Europe is either through national funding agencies (similar to NSF in US) or through European Union. Getting funding from foundations is not common in Europe. The one opportunity that seems obvious is the Tinker Foundation. In Portugal, we have strong links with the funding foundation but they provide funding more directed to applied science (through international peer reviewed science proposals) we should also focus on "who shall we target to get funding?" national agencies, international bodies (ICSU, WMO, EU), private foundations...if so, we should assess what they will gain with it.

5. Identify the advantages of partnering with other organization in fund-raising efforts and identify those partners that bring the greatest added value to the efforts.

Date	Author (init.)	Comment
2/5/2012	DW	The obvious one is with the Arctic, but there are other cuts I that I think we must consider - Oceans/ biodiversity/Climate change at the Poles/ Greenland-Arctic-Antarctic Sea Level rise - long term monitoring for all segments of the Antarctic - ice, land, etc. so it is a downloadable package for policy makers? We might get funds and indirect costs for SCAR for that... certainly we could consider for the last one - saying that we would provide an international document summarizing Long Term Monitoring
2/6/2012	MCK	Partner organizations will take some thought as well. DW's suggestions beyond polar science are great! Strengthening the polar perspective in global themes is an under-used way of increasing the value of polar science. We need to avoid becoming too isolated and spinning every topic as polar. I think once we generate some explicit ideas to promote, the most effective organizations to partner with will become clear.

6. Consider the membership of the group and how it might be adjusted to greatest impact in regard to the organizational model recommend from item 1.

Date	Author (init.)	Comment (abbreviated)
		See Recommendations

7. Choose a few high probability targets and develop solicitations for funds once items 1 to 6 have been addressed.

Date	Author (init.)	Comments (abbreviated)
		See Recommendations

8. Make recommendations regarding the formation of a second generation Development Council, including terms of reference and membership.

Date	Author (init.)	Comment (abbreviated)
		See Recommendations