

Minutes of the IUPAP Council and Commission Chairs Meeting
Tata Institute for Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India
October 15-16, 2004

Friday, October 15, 2004

Present: Y. Petroff (President), J. Franz (Secretary-General), A. Astbury (President Designate), R. Barber (Interim Associate Secretary-General), M. Barma, P. Wenzel, P. Monceau, V. Lüth, S. Nagamiya, G. Tibell, W. Van Wijngaarden, J. Avron, V. Trimble, T. Takada, E. Zingu, A. Sen, S. Rezende, J. Sahn, H. Fukuyama, P. Ormos, N. Dadlich, P. Nelson

Absent: B. Richter, K. Sharma, M. Skolnick, M. Cooley, R. Slusher, R. Dändliker

Guests: Martinez, Mathur, K. Heinloth, A. Niroomand-Rad

1. Official welcome

President Petroff called the meeting to order at 8:40 am. Prof. S. Bhattacharya, Director of the Tata Institute for Fundamental Research (TIFR), welcomed the participants and then reviewed the history of the Institute and gave an overview of the activities of the Institute.

2. Approval of minutes of Meeting of Council & Commission Chairs, Vancouver, October 10-11, 2003

Corrections to the minutes: In paragraph 20, the reference should be to C14, not C13.

The minutes were accepted as corrected.

3. Report of the President

Petroff noted the Molinari had been unable to complete her term as Associate Secretary-General for personal reasons and that Barber had agreed to serve as Interim Associate Secretary-General for the balance of the term.

The problem with visas for entry of scientists to the USA appears to have improved over the year. He said that Franz would report in more detail later in the meeting. However, it seemed clear that IUPAP must continue to apply pressure so that remaining problems would not be ignored.

In a related matter he reported that the US Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) has required that a licence be obtained to edit journal articles for publication that are received from 7 countries on the black list. The APS has not acceded to this requirement while IEEE has. Further a consortium of major publishing organizations is suing OFAC on this issue. A large class action suit, based on 1st amendment rights, had been filed against the government a week or so ago. IUPAP will continue to monitor this situation.

IUPAP is involved in two large conferences in 2005 that celebrate the International Year of Physics. The conference that will launch the celebrations is to be held in Paris, January 13-15, 2005. (See <http://www.wyp2005.org/unesco/>). A conference on physics and sustainable development is to be held October 31- November 2, 2005 in Durban South Africa, following the General Assembly of IUPAP. (See <http://www.wcpsd.org/>)

Petroff gave a brief survey of the status of the working groups. ICFA has established an important role with respect to the decision on the next collider. It is planned that IUPAP will extend this sort of role into other areas that involve large scale planning on an international scale. The Working Group on Energy has written a report that will be considered later in the agenda. PANAGIC has not been very active. Plans for a role in nanoscience have not been followed up. P. Kalmus wrote a lengthy statement on the importance of basic science to be used by ICSU, but only a brief statement was issued and it ignored Kalmus' work..

Finally he reported that some of the liaison committees have asked for more frequent interaction with IUPAP than once every three years at the time of the General Assemblies. Some have asked for minutes, but wish to have them in several languages. If an initiative is taken to provide this, it will have to come from the liaison committees. In any case, the official version will be the one in English.

4. Business matters

4.1 Financial report

Franz presented the audited financial report, which was circulated with the briefing books.. She pointed out that some money was held in fixed reserves, inasmuch as it was designated for a particular purpose. If external money comes to a commission, it is held in a separate account. Most of the reserve, however, was not in fixed reserves. This meant that IUPAP could initiate action. It also meant that we could approve sponsorship of conferences with a greater lead-time (see item 12 below).

4.2 Budget

The 2003 Operating Budget (circulated with the agenda) shows what happened in 2003. From year to year the income fluctuates greatly. In 2003 it was about k\$400. About half goes to conference support which is regarded as a major part of IUPAP=s core mission. In addition, the Working Groups also perform part of the core mission.

A Council meeting requires about k\$50. There is an allocation for commission expenses that is averaged to be about k\$ 3 for each commission over three years. Franz suggested that this amount might be lowered because the actual use of this money had been much lower than the budgeted amount. Commissions were advised to request money for commission expenses from Franz.

The total for overhead costs for the secretariat, banking, accounting, etc. is about k\$ 50.

In 2004 income has increased, with more than k\$ 416 paid in dues for this year. Franz commented that it is hard to estimate income for a given year. If all members paid their dues, the income would be k\$ 465. This year it may realistically be ~ k\$ 460. We should budget conservatively on the basis of an income of ~ k\$ 420.

In 2005 we have a General Assembly, which is expensive, and in 2006 there will be an extra Council meeting.

In the discussion, Sahm said that C14 group is very active, meeting every year. It is unique in that there are problems for members to attend the annual meetings. Some of the members come from developing countries and there is no conference for which travel funds from other sources can be used. He requested that the C14 be treated as a special case and be allocated more than the \$k3. The decision on this was deferred to the discussion of next year=s budget.

It was agreed that the working groups should be able to draw on similar amounts.

On other items for 2005, the grants for conferences have been increased. For the ICPE newsletter, Tibell thought that the amount might be somewhat decreased, but kept at ~ k\$ 3.

There was some discussion about whether a commission might use the commission allocation for helping a Type C conference or using it to establish a medal, prize or award. The desirability of having prizes for young scientists was noted.

Following the discussion, the 2005 budget was amended as follows:

Income		k \$ (US)
Members' dues		430.0
Bank Interest		20.0
Total Income		450.0
Expenditures		138.
Conference grants	0	
Conference travel grants		56.0
ICTP for publications to developing countries		5.0
ICPE Newsletter		3.0
Commissions		20.0
Council & Commission Chairs meeting		45.0
Working Groups		30.0
General Assembly		25.0
World Year of Physics		52.0
Newsletters/ Reports		1.5
Subscriptions B	ICSU	15.0
	ICSTI	0.65
Secretariat -	Maryland	47.0
	Paris	4.0
Banking and Accounting		12.0
Liability Insurance		1.85
Contingency Fund		10.0
Total Expenditures.		466.0
Surplus/ Deficit		(16.0)

4.3 Policy on airline travel

Franz proposed the following policy on air travel expenses:

"It is the policy of IUPAP that it will reimburse travel at the economy class rate. The exception to this will be if a person's health requires a different class of service. All airline tickets that cost more than US\$2,000 (1,700 i) must be pre-approved by the IUPAP President or Secretary-General."

In the discussion the necessity of making advance bookings and taking advantage of discount fares was noted.

It was agreed that the policy be adopted.

4.4 Member affairs

Many countries who should be Members have not become Members. IUPAP has tried unsuccessfully to invite Greece to become a Member, while Cyprus is a Member.

Argentina is currently having severe financial troubles. Franz has written to them (letter attached to agenda) and recommended that their membership be temporarily reduced to one share. This will be formally moved at the Council meeting. The understanding is that they will return to 2 shares when they can.

The following countries are in arrears:

- \$ Argentina
- \$ Brazil is behind. They have had a difficult time in 2002. Their National Research Council pays the fees to the physical society. It is understood that this will be fixed by the end of the year.
- \$ Bulgaria. They are now six years in arrears. Franz will write a letter to them.
- \$ Chile. They are now five years in arrears. Franz will write a letter to them.

The following countries are two years behind in paying dues:

- \$ Egypt
- \$ Korea
- \$ Switzerland

Rezende commented that in some particular cases it is important that a letter from IUPAP be sent to the liaison committee in order to help them communicate with the adhering body.

Japan was in arrears because they have had a budget problem. It was anticipated that this would not be a long-term problem.

4.5 Policy on the establishment of new IUPAP prizes and awards

A draft policy on the establishment of new awards and prizes was circulated with the agenda. It states:

“A Commission or Liaison Committee that wished to establish a new IUPAP - sponsored prize or award would make a proposal to the IUPAP Council, which would include the following information:

- \$ Name of the prize or award*
- \$ Criteria for selection*
- \$ Procedure for forming the selection committee*
- \$ Size and type of prize or award (monetary, medal, etc.)*
- \$ Source of funding for the prize or award*
- \$ Frequency (annually, every two years, etc.)*

The Council could then approve the proposal, recommend changes, or disapprove. It could also recommend that the decision be left to the next General Assembly.”

It was agreed that this policy be adopted.

4.4 Resolution on the Dalton

The following resolution was approved by a majority of the Council by mail ballot prior to the meeting and included with the agenda for information:

“IUPAP endorses the use of both names, dalton (Da) and unified atomic mass unit (u) for the atomic mass unit and strongly recommends waiting for an extended period to see which physicists and other prefer to use before making any further decisions.”

No further action was required.

5a. Reports from Commissions (C2 B C12)

- C2 No representative. With the agenda, a notice was circulated that the mail ballot prior to the meeting had approved the resolution adopting the dual use of the names dalton (Da) and the unified atomic mass unit (u) for the atomic mass unit.
- C3 Report was attached to the agenda. Mustansir Barma reported on the holding of STATPHYS 22. Attendance was close to 600, from 40 countries, with 240 from India. It was a big event for the Indian community. A pre-conference school was held with ~60 participants along with 12 related satellite conferences. A Commission meeting was also held. The important decision was that the next conference would be held in Genoa, Italy in 2007.

This conference rotates between Europe, Asia, and the Americas. The Boltzmann Medal was awarded.

- C4 Report was circulated at the meeting. Peter Wenzel reported that this was a year without a commission meeting. Business was conducted by e-mail. Their major A type conferences is the ICRC conference series. ICRC-30 is scheduled for August, 2007 in Merida, Mexico, with ICRC-31 possibly in Poland in 2009 (decision in 2005). PaNAGIC meets once a year at the Neutrino or TAUP meetings. They have requested that Rohini Godbole (C11) be named as a liaison member. PaNAGIC has renewed its membership. It was noted that we need to update the IUPAP site under Working Groups http://www.lngs.infn.it/lngs_infn/index.html (See report at <http://> .)
- C5 Hide Fukuyama referred the meetings, [International Symposium on Quantum Fluids and Solids \(http://bec.science.unitn.it/qfs2004/index.html\)](http://bec.science.unitn.it/qfs2004/index.html), [International Conference on Low Temperature Physics \(LT24\) \(http://www.ufl.edu/~lt24/florida.html\)](http://www.ufl.edu/~lt24/florida.html) and [International Conference on Low temperature Physics in 2008, based on the document](#) attached to the agenda.
- C6 Pal Ormos reported that 500 to 600 had attended the ICBP conference in Sweden. It was hoped that it would be kept at this size. Commission had a meeting and will have a close connection with the organization of the next conference. They considered the proposal of members for the incoming commission and discussed the relationship with medical physics.
- C8 Report was attached to the agenda. There was no representative from C8 present. (See)

10:30 Coffee Break

- C9 No representative present and no report.
- C10 Pierre Monceau reported that the commission had met during the APS meeting in Montreal and had reviewed the structure within the commission. They are proposing a working group on synchrotron radiation and neutron sources: past experience and future opportunities. (See under item 19).

C11 Report was attached to the agenda. Vera Luth commented that C11 interacts with ICFA and with PANAGIC. C11 recommends two major conference series for IUPAP sponsorship, the Lepton Photon Symposia (LP) and the International Conferences on High Energy Physics (ICHEP). C11 has approved future conferences for ICHEP and LP. There are continuing visa problems for entry to the US. She noted that it should be possible to make copies of passports so they are not tied up for up to 11 months. C11 is now reluctant to approve conferences in the US. Petroff agreed that people do not want to surrender their passports for a long time and that IUPAP must do something about it.

Luth also observed that there is a problem with the idea of Aauthorship@ in high energy physics arising from the very large number of co-authors on experimental papers. A working group from C11 and the laboratories will look at options regarding the author lists.

C12 Shoji Nagamiya referred the meeting to the C12 report circulated at the meeting. He reported that an International Committee on Cooperation in Nuclear Physics had been appointed. Franz wondered if this should be a working group, but Nagamiya thought that this would be premature. No commission meetings are currently planned to be held in the USA, but it is not yet decided where the next meeting will be held.

C13 Edmund Zingu reported that a commission meeting to be held in Vietnam was cancelled due to SARS. Two conferences sponsored through the commission were held in 2004. Further, individual members of C13 are active. The commission is considering an award to recognize contributors in physics and technology over last 5 years.

An African regional meeting of ICSU took place in Harare, Zimbabwe, 9-11 October 2004, and Zingu represented IUPAP there. He commented that COSTED had been abolished by ICSU and that the Regional African Office was to be up and running in March 2005. There are 15 African members of ICSU, whereas there are only 3 African members of IUPAP.

C14 Gunnar Tibell reported that C14, the ICPE held annual meetings, with the 2004 meeting in Durban and the 2005 meeting to be held in New Delhi. There are 4 working groups within the commission. The 2003 ICPE medal was presented to Laurence Viennot. Sahm observed that such a medal is not expensive, but carries great prestige.

The link from IUPAP page to ICPE home page should be revised to <http://web.phys.ksu.edu/ICPE/index.html>

C15 William van Wijngaarden referred the meeting to the C15 report circulated at the meeting. He observed that there had been serious security issues at the meeting in Rio and suggested that, in such situations, conferences consider having sessions in the evening to keep physicists off the street. C15 is also concerned regarding visas for the USA. See C15 report at .

C16 Abihijat Sen said that the commission had not had a meeting, but one was coming up soon. See C16 report at .

C17 No representative was present.

C18 Joseph Avron reported that the International Conference on Mathematical Physics had taken place in 2003, with the next one to be in Rio in 2006. The conference on group theory is also

supported by the commission. The commission needs to look at new areas, although some sub-disciplines are too small to fit into the conference structure. They have not yet broadened the scope of the commission.

In considering an award they are considering logistics necessary to establish one. They will consider the possibility of using money from the commission budget to do this. See C18 report at .

C19 Virginia Trimble expressed their regret that C19 had needed to replace a member who had died. The commission is promoting the principle that the communication of science to the public is a duty of all scientists. C19 has used some commission funds because they do not have a single meeting that gathers all members of the commission. They are considering a prize and need to define the area. The members of the commission should be more focused. Currently they cover territory that really should be in other commissions. See C19 report at .

C20 Report was attached to the agenda. Toshikazu Takada reported for C20, noting that the regular conference would be held in the USA in 2005.

AC2 Naresh Dadhich reported for AC2, the Affiliated Commission on General Relativity and Gravitation.

AC3 Phil Nelson reported for the AC3, the International Commission for Acoustics, noting that it is not a member of ICSU but it is thinking of joining. AC3 includes some 43 member societies. They have early career awards for people under 40 and have made two awards in 2004. Their General Assembly is on a three-year cycle, so that their next board meeting will be held at the next one in Rio in 2005. Their web site is at <http://www.icacommission.org>

6. World Conference on Physics and Sustainable Development

Material on this conference was circulated with the agenda. The intention is to produce action oriented outcomes. Subjects to be discussed include improved inexpensive instruments for health, the production of inexpensive instruments for education, and energy and the environment. Achievements in such sub-fields will be celebrated.

The program will be structured so that there will be a plenary session to introduce the themes on day 1 followed by a poster session, then on day 2 the conference will be divided into groups on specific themes, and on day 3 the groups will bring back their input to the entire conference. It is intended that the conference not have the developed world telling the developing world what to do.

Franz asked for suggestions regarding sources of funding, possible sponsors, etc. She mentioned that they would be approaching the manufacturers of equipment, e.g., G.E., Siemens.

In order to attract participants, all physical societies, liaison committees, etc., people on the ICTP lists and all members of IUPAP commissions have been notified.

7. Other World (International) Year of Physics activities

The international launch event for the World Year of Physics will be held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris France. It will involve 48 Countries, and include something like 400 students.

The project "Physics Enlightens the World" was discussed. This is not an IUPAP event. The

astronomers object to the precedent, inasmuch as it promotes light pollution. They do not wish to have IUPAP supporting this event.

Some of the reaction was pretty strong. UK did not want anything to do with it. APS passed a resolution against light pollution, but will help publicize the event in the US., IUPAP discussed the issue but decided to take no ac

The EPS website (at <http://www.eps.org>) is keeping track of events for the WYP.

1:00 pm The meeting recessed for lunch, followed by a quick tour of several TIFR labs, and reconvened at 3:00 pm.

8. Proposal for a statement on ethics in publishing

The proposed statement on ethics in publishing from the Working Group on Communication in Physics was circulated with the agenda. In the discussion problems associated with refereeing were identified, e.g., subsequent use by a referee of the material in a paper, the problem of multiple versions of a paper without clearly stating clearly that this is the case. Several concerns about the statement were raised. One had to do with making it explicitly applicable to journal articles, while the other concerned the custom of publishing some that appears in conference proceedings again in regular journal articles. These concerns were to be transmitted back to the Working Group

Action: The statement was approved in principle and is to be presented to the General Assembly.

9. Report from the Working Group on Energy

Heinloth briefly reviewed the report on Research and Development of Future Energy Technologies that was circulated with the agenda. It was decided that it should be put into a form that is easily read by the general public. Then it should be made available and distributed Heinloth commented that it needs to interest the physicists first, and then it can be directed toward the media and the policy makers. The present version was written for physicists.

Franz asked what should be the main messages. Petroff summarized this as a need for much R&D to solve the problems. He noted that there are problems with wind, etc. It is important to show the public that some things are not realistic. We need to spend more money on research and on availability. Heinloth observed that the IAEA reports on availability are reliable. While these differ from some oil companies, the latter are coming closer to the IAEA values. Luth commented that the report does not advocate a particular solution, rather it outlines the problems and advocates the need for R&D. Rezende said that the report is timely and that IUPAP should provide a statement for governments.

Action: It was agreed that Petroff enlist a professional science writer to prepare an appropriate version for government and the general public.

10. Proposal for an Affiliated Commission on Medical Physics

Shoucri (secretary of C20) requested that IUPAP consider having a Commission on Medical Physics. Since the International Organization of Medical Physicists (IOMP) already exists, it was important that IUPAP should cooperate with them. Accordingly, a committee was established to consider this proposal, with 3 members from IUPAP and 3 from IOMP, with Ormos as chair.

The formation of an Affiliated Commission was supported by the members from IOMP and two out of the three from IUPAP.

Azam Niroomand-Rad reported for the IOMP. Although medical physics is applied physics the affiliation has been with bioengineering side, rather than with physics. An association of IOMP with IUPAP would improve links with scientists. She traced the history of the IOMP and described its links with the International Federation for Medical and Biological Engineering, The International Union for Physical and Engineering Sciences in Medicine, and with ICSU.

Franz commented that the situation of the IOMP was very parallel to that of the ICO / AC1 and that the IOMP should be established as an affiliated commission.

Action: It was agreed that a recommendation be made to the General Assembly that the IOMP become an affiliated commission of IUPAP.

4:00 Following the coffee break talks on physics in India were given:

Professor Ajay Sood, Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore, spoke on "Nanoscience in India" and Professor Deepak Mathur, Tata Institute for Fundamental Research, spoke on "Matter in very strong fields".

6:15 The meeting recessed

Saturday, October 16, 2004 The meeting reconvened at 8:30 am.

11. Visas issues

There was general concern over the restrictive measures that have been implemented in the USA under the aegis of the Office of Homeland Security. While the primary concern for IUPAP is centred around the holding of conferences, the general issue of the free circulation of scientists is also a concern. There is considerable difficulty for foreign scientists participating in experiments in the USA.

Franz pointed out that international conferences can now be registered with the US Academy of Sciences. They have connections with the State Department and get reports of how visas are progressing. Letters have been written pressing for improved handling of visas. She reported that, for two conferences, only 2 visas had been denied out of ~1000 participants and that others from those countries had been admitted

Trimble commented that they have lost people who were unwilling to give up their passports for the long periods that were now common for the USA. Further other countries are retaliating. Petroff knew of a case where, after two and a half months the person was asked to furnish additional extensive documentation. For many the process had become far too much trouble. Nagamiya noted that the situation had improved, but was still a matter of great concern to C12. Luth observed that organizers of conferences frequently did not know, six weeks before a conference, whether a speaker would actually be able to attend. Astbury knew of a case where a British citizen, working in the USA, was worried about getting back into the USA.

Petroff thought that it was not a good idea to boycott the US, but we must continue actions already

started. In the long term, this is very bad for science and for the US. He proposed that we involve other unions such as IUPAC. He proposed that a joint letter be written and signed by as many as possible.

Franz pointed out that physics is affected more than most other disciplines because we have large collaborations, which have been hit quite hard. The possibility of multi-entry visas that were valid for an extended time was suggested.

Action: Petroff agreed to prepare a letter and press the case further.

12. Conferences

12.1 Conference Fee Limit

The conference fee was reviewed earlier in 2004 and set at 410 i. It was decided that it should not be changed for 2005.

12.2 Policies on Early Approval of Conferences

The approval in October of conferences that will be held in the following year provides too short a lead time in many cases. Especially major conferences are planned much earlier than this. It would be desirable to have IUPAP sponsorship known at an early stage, particularly for the major Type A conferences.

The following policies were proposed and **approved**:

12.2.1 Approval of Type A conferences

Type A conferences will be eligible for approval at least two years in advance. For example, conferences to be held in the summer of 2008 would be eligible for approval at the Council meeting in October of 2005, 2006, or 2007.

12.2.2 Approval of Type B conferences

Type B conferences will be eligible for approval at least one year in advance. For example, conferences to be held in the summer of 2007 would be eligible for approval at the Council meeting in October of 2005 or 2006.

Note

In both cases, the approval given would be provisional; if the requirements are not met when first approved, evidence that they have been met must be given in subsequent years for sponsorship to be maintained. In particular, the conference registration fee must be within the IUPAP limit. The exchange rates would be applied as of May 1 of the year before the one in which the conference is held.

12.3 Grants for Type C conferences.

The usefulness of IUPAP sponsorship of Type C conferences, where no financial support is provided, has been questioned. Therefore the following policy was proposed and **approved**:

Type C conferences will be eligible for travel grants, particularly for those held in developing countries. Approval of Type C conferences will continue to be exceptional. All of the usual conditions for IUPAP sponsorship will be required.

12.4 Schedule for availability of grants.

As a matter of procedure within the secretariat, the grants will be made available at least 4 months before the conference is held.

12.5 Reports on Conferences that have been held

Currently conference organizers are requested to submit reports on the conferences. This is a somewhat unfocused request and needs to be improved.

As a matter of procedure, the secretariat will develop a web form for reporting information on a given conference. Information that is of interest would be matters such as:

- \$ number of attendees
- \$ number of women participating, number giving invited papers
- \$ number of countries participating
- \$ number of participants from outside the host country.
- \$ number of scientists from developing/disadvantaged countries whose travel has been assisted and the amount spent.
- \$ total funds used to support travel of scientists to attend.
- \$ an optional one page (maximum) description of new and important work that has been presented at the conference.
- \$ comments on IUPAP sponsorship from the viewpoint of the organizer (e.g. problems that arose, timing of the availability of funds, communication with the secretariat, etc.)

12.6 Approval of conferences for IUPAP sponsorship in 2005

Barber presented the list of conferences proposed for sponsorship for discussion. The list of approved conferences has been circulated as a separated document to the Executive Council and Chairs of Commissions.

13. Report from the Working Group on High Magnetic Fields

Gérard Martinez represented the Working Group whose report was circulated with the agenda. They considered Ultrahigh magnetic fields to be those above 20T. He reviewed the science and the trends toward attracting scientists from other disciplines.

Petroff commented that this is an important developing scientific community. For example, exceptional results have been achieved with high field NMR. It is not understood what is going on is some phase transitions. It is desirable to link high field facilities with neutron facilities. The report should be revised and edited in some places so that it is understandable for non-experts.

Franz noted that this working group had brought together the various interests for first time. Inasmuch as large facilities are involved, the working group recommended that an International Committee on High Magnetic Field Science and Technology be established under the auspices of an international scientific organization.

Action: No action was taken on this.

14. Reports from other working groups

14.1 Working Group on Women in Physics (WGWiP)

The report was circulated with the agenda. Judy Franz commented on the report, noting that demonstrable progress is being made following the 1st International Conference on Women in Physics. A web site is operating. The Working Group is using funds from UNESCO and L'Oreal to support

participation by women in developing countries and in the Former Soviet Union through travel grants for international conferences. The number of applicants for these grants is increasing rapidly, with 200 applicants in the recent competition for 20 grants. New sources of funding are being sought.

They are currently working to develop a network of women in physics in Africa. The design of this is currently being developed.

Another conference on Women in Physics is planned for Rio de Janeiro, 23-25 May, 2005, hosted by Elisa Baggio-Saitovitch, former president of the Brazilian Physical Society. (See <http://www.cbpf.br/women-physics>)

Fukuyama drew attention to the report on the Japanese situation for women in physics that was circulated with the agenda.

14.2 *International Committee on Ultrahigh Intensity Lasers (ICUIL)*

The report was circulated with the agenda. Deepak Mathur (secretary) reported for the working group. The first conference organized under the aegis of ICUIL was held at Tahoe City, USA, October 3-7, 2004 emphasizing the technology of ultrahigh intensity lasers. A web site has been established at <http://www.icuil.org>

14.3 *International Committee on Future Accelerators (ICFA)*

The report from Roy Rubinstein (secretary) was circulated with the agenda. Vera Luth presented a brief synopsis of the mission, personnel, and recent work of ICFA. The committee meets twice a year. She commented on the status of the 500 GeV linear collider, which ICFA has been guiding since the early 90's. The design team is the International Linear collider Steering Committee. Recently the International Technical Review Panel has made the decision to use superconducting cavities. Petroff commented that it was remarkable that there should be unanimous agreement on the matter.

15. ICSU matters

Discussion centred on the draft statement by ICSU on the Value of Basic Scientific Research. Franz criticised it as making little reference to basic science. Petroff commented that it refers to nanotechnology, rather than nanoscience. He said there is not a single word about basic science and that he had been told that developing countries are not interested in nanoscience.

IUPAP had asked them to include a statement on basic science and Peter Kalmus had drafted a lengthy statement on the importance of basic science in physics. ICSU finally had a meeting in January 2004, but had completely ignored the Kalmus statement.

The unsatisfactory nature of the statement was regarded as important because ICSU's papers are read by many governments.

It was noted that the last ICSU World Conference on Science had not been well organized; it had not been well advertised and only a small number attended. The next such conference is to take place late in 2004, but as yet no one knows when or where. However, ICSU has links with governments and cannot be ignored.

Franz observed that we are now getting a great deal of material from ICSU because it has become more active. However, the staff comes mostly with biological backgrounds and when they write a report, they

do so from that viewpoint. Petroff commented on the fact that in ICSU there are many small biological unions. However, the staff is now attempting to put ICSU on a sound basis. The latest meeting was much better organized. Physics representatives are Burt Richter, Roger Elliott and Anna Maria Cetto.

Action: IUPAP makes known its viewpoint that not all science is applied science.

There was a brief discussion of the ICSU grants. These now should involve another international union and be interdisciplinary in nature. They favour short-term projects and are now limited to US k\$50. Unions can apply. The deadline is March 1, 2005. Franz suggested that we consider applications that might be successful.

16. Plans for 2005 General Assembly

The General Assembly will be held in Cape Town, South Africa, October 26-29, 2005. It will be preceded by the meeting of the Council and Commission Chairs, October 24-25, 2005.

General details about the meeting were circulated with the agenda.

The major input for the agenda from the commissions will be recommendations for membership in the commissions. Similarly, the liaison committees will be making nominations for membership in the commissions and on the Council. Commissions are urged to work with the liaison committees. Further it was noted that the commissions should include alternates and people from developing countries.

The secretariat will open the web site, Jan 1, 2005, to receive nominations over the web. The liaison committees have until May 1, 2005 to submit nominations, while the commissions have until September 1, 2005. The Secretariat will remind the chairs to check on the list of nominations for their commission on May 1, 2005.

It is anticipated that important topics for discussion at the General Assembly will likely be Energy, Ethics, World Year of Physics, Free Circulation of Scientists.

17. Reports from Inter-Union Commissions

17.1 Committee on Space Research COSPAR

The report was distributed with the agenda and presented by Peter Wenzel (IUPAP liaison to COSPAR).

18. Nanoscience

Petroff commented that this was an important area., but two of the main players were not here. He suggested that there needs to be more interaction between atomic physics, condensed matter and studies on cold atoms. Van Wijngaarden thought that something should be done. Petroff suggested that we need three or four people in several areas to make recommendations of the best way to work together. There have already been some conferences on nanoscience.

It was agreed that Van Wijngaarden should draft a proposed mandate and chair a committee to consider what IUPAP should do. Possible commissions to participate were C3, C5, C6, C8, C9, C10, C15, C17, C20.

19. New business

19.1 Proposal by C10 regarding Synchrotron Radiation and Neutron sources: past experience and

future opportunities.

This is a proposal for another working group. No decision was taken.

19.2 Proposal for a virtual library.

A proposal had been made that IUPAP set up a virtual library over the internet. While there was some appreciation of the idea, it was realised that it would be very expensive to set up such a library with general access. There are major copyright issues, as well as competing commercial interest in electronic journals. ICTP in Trieste already has a program for making scientific literature available to developing countries. Franz said that we must work with ICTP and that we already contribute ~ \$ 5,000 to provide journal access.

The proposal was not supported.

20. Adjournment at 1:00 pm