

## STANS AWARD 2015 (**First Slide**)

(awarded 12 January 2016)

Dear Colleagues and Friends ,

Last year I had to tell you that my fellow member of the Jury Gjalt Huppes was unable to attend this festive CML event due to serious hip problems. Today I'm finding myself in a similar situation whilst awaiting a hip replacement the day after tomorrow. Being a member of this Jury is beyond doubt risky business. I'm glad that Helias was willing to join me this year. He is a brave man.

For all our new colleagues I would start out with a bit of history (**Slide 2**)

In 1985 the just retired pharmacist Misses **Constance Eikelenboom** (her nickname was Stans) decided to take our CML Course 'Environmental science'. Due to her expertise and outspoken character, she was an unusual critical student. I was told that right from the start she was badgering professors of all sort to make sensible comments, but gradually she came to like the course and at the time she graduated she offered a substantial sum of money to establish an award for the best student's thesis or paper. Her aim was to enhance the quality by introducing some competition.

The board of CML named the price after this remarkable student and later on extended the idea as to serve the staff, by introducing two new prices one for the best scientific paper and one for the best 'societal paper'.

The STANS price was first awarded in **1986** so today we celebrate our 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. Stans herself is 94, and - understandably - a bit picky in what she attends or not. And for today.. she made it!! Please give a warm welcome to the one and only Stans.

So now you all know why we are here.

As was the case last year, it was not an easy task for the Jury to make choices. For the category of scientific papers we received a whopping five good nominations, reflecting the quality and productivity of our staff. We also have two very good student reports. Unfortunately, we didn't see a paper that was explicitly nominated or could qualify for the category of 'societal paper', raising the problem of how to proceed with this award, and challenging the creativity of the Jury.

Let us now continue with the award for the **best scientific paper**.

Here, as I said, we got five nominations. (**slide 3**)

**The Environmental Sustainability of Nations: Benchmarking the Carbon, Water and Land Footprints against Allocated Planetary Boundaries**

Kai Fang, Reinout Heijungs, Zheng Duan and Geert de Snoo. (In: *Sustainability*)

Open access: Impact **0.94**

A really important topic and an interesting comparison between 28 major countries. We were surprised to find Indonesia, without much further explanation, ending up so high at the list. It made us a bit suspicious about the scope of the methodology.

**The relativity of eco-innovation: environmental rebound effects from past transport innovations in Europe**

David Font Vivanco, Rene Kemp and Ester van der Voet (In: *J of Cleaner Production*). Impact **1.58**

Another very good paper of David and his supporting staff, addressing the rebound effects of industrial innovations. A perfect sequel to his rewarded paper of last year; or did we see a kind of rebound effect?

**A pseudo-statistical approach to treat choice uncertainty: the example of partitioning allocation methods**

Angelica Mendoza Beltran, Reinout Heijungs, Jeroen Guinée & Arnold Tukker (In: *Int J of Life Cycle Assessment*) Impact **3.99**

A skilful and original paper on an important topic, a bit specialised and at times a tough read.

**Product Carbon Footprints and Their Uncertainties in Comparative Decision Contexts**

Patrik J. G. Henriksson, Reinout Heijungs Hai M. Dao, Lam T. Phan, Geert R. de Snoo and Jeroen B. Guinée (In: *PloS ONE*) Impact **3.23**

A carefully crafted paper delineating when and how to apply a well-known methodology while illustrating the theory with the case of fish hatchery

**Toxicity and Accumulation of Cu and ZnO Nanoparticles in Daphnia magna**

Yinlong Xiao, Martina G. Vijver, Guangchao Chen, and Willie J. G. M. Peijnenburg (In: *Environmental Science and Technology*) Impact **5.33**

A textbook example of modern day science and for sure an important topic, those scary nanoparticles.

Five papers with in total 21 authors; 16 different as 3 authors managed to multiply their chances to become price-winners.

Despite this high number of nominations we somehow got the feeling that the procedure of nomination was not as careful as it should have been, so I went over the whole list of CML-publications 2015 and after consultation we concluded that the short list should be complemented with:

**Autosomal and mtDNA Markers Affirm the Distinctiveness of Lions in West and Central Africa**

Laura Bertola, L. Tensen. P. van Hooft, P.A. White, C.A. Discoll, P. Henschel, A. Caragiulo, I. Dias-Freedman, E.A. Sogbohossou, P.M. Tumenta, T.H. Jirmo, G.R. de Snoo, H.H. de Iongh & K. Vrieling. (In *PLoS ONE*) Impact **3.23**

A straightforward paper, applying new methods to solve a long lasting dispute in conservation biology. Crystal clear: Title, summary and conclusion, all in one sentence.

Bringing the total number of authors up to 35; of which **29** different as G.R. de Snoo slipped in again.

You might have noticed that we included the impact factor of the Journal and by using that figure we could easily decide who to award the price by ranking the papers accordingly, making our work as a Jury redundant. But we are not awarding Journals, we are awarding specific papers and are allowed to add our own criteria to the selection process (Importance of the topic from a broader perspective; originality; clear, concise and coherent writing; convincing or pertinent results)

Taking all these criteria into consideration two papers stood out. We were not able to rank these two in a sensible way, so the Stans award for the best Scientific papers goes to:

**(Slide 4)**

Patrik Henriksson et al AND Laura Bertola et al

In doing so we have indirectly rewarded about 2/3 of our scientific staff. May be in 2016 you could write a really good integrative paper authored by some 30 people and get it published in Nature. It would guarantee us a more relaxed Christmas holiday.

**The best Societal “paper”**

Last year we got two nominations in this category and according to our report (I quote) “we were very pleased to see that by the same token these publications

could be good candidates in the scientific category. Somehow proving our conviction that in the end society is best served by good science”.

We still have that conviction. But even good science needs some outreach and scientists need to be heard on their findings and insights. They also need to participate and influence the societal debate where it's due. And if they manage to enter the address books of science-journalist's as renowned experts, even better. We therefor propose to designate this award for the best scientific publicity and outreach of any kind.

Following up our own advise we compiled the following shortlist (**Slide 5**)

We nominated **Ester** for producing the first CML-Moocs and for her continuing effort as a member of UNEP's International Resource Panel.

**Martina** for keeping the people and politicians up to date about the bees and the flowers, nano-particles as well as advancing equal rights in academia.

**René** for his noteworthy appearances in the media.

And **Merlijn** to honour that he was presented the Parker / Gentry award of the Field Museum in Chicago

Ester's work, although less visible for the public at large, fully deserves to be mentioned here, as it brings her and the departments expertise into the realm of international environmental policy.

Martina had to be praised for her unflagging efforts to convince the outside world not to jump to conclusions but to stick to the evidence and remain careful on the effects of Imidacloprid. But may be Jeroen van der Sluijs' intuition was proven right.

Merlijn got a prestigious award for his enduring efforts to save the Philippine crocodile and its habitat, and rightly so. It seems a bit sad and cynical to see work being recognised and honoured internationally that was deemed less important for our University.

René showed up a couple of times in the media, e.g. the 'NOS Journaal (8 O'clock news) Brandpunt and Labyrinth, being recognized as an environmental expert on the global metabolism of metals and materials of all sort. His views were deemed valuable even if not directly related to a recently published paper. His performances made an impression. Assuming this will continue he could improve some details like 'How to give your message a clear and positive twist if you got only two minutes'.

The Stans societal award 2015 goes to René Kleijn (**slide 6**)

Last but not least the real **STANS Award**

Here our work as Jury was made really easy as we got the following nomination:

**“ Best student for the Stans award is without doubt Marco Villares. He finished his IE study Cum Laude with a judicium of 8,79!! ” (Slide 7)**

Assuming that it was ‘with distinction’ and with a grade of 8.79 (The English don’t speak Latin), we have to admit that this grade is really stunning, we have never seen such an accurate assessment of our students qualities.

But that was all; apparently no need to provide a title or hand in a report.

Luckily, we were curious and found out there was a report behind the figure. In fact a decent thorough research report, over 100 pages long and single authored!!.

**(Slide 8)**

The contesting nomination came with a title so that we were able to ask for the draft article that came out of the work, and finally start reading. This study dealt with the spatial requirements to secure the biodiversity of bees, which in turn is pivotal for our agricultural productivity.

Again we had to judge very different studies, dealing with important and modern day environmental problems and both proving a high quality level of graduate student research. Both could be winners.

Based on a slightly better writing and the promising article that was written along the way the STANS award 2015 goes to Kevin Groen. **(Slide 9)**