

STANS AWARD 2017 (awarded 19 January 2018)

Dear Colleagues and Friends ,

On behalf of the two-headed jury – my distinguished roommate Koos Biesmeijer and yours truly – a very warm welcome.

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, 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 prizes: one for the best scientific paper and more recently one for the best outreach. The STANS prize was first awarded in **1986** so today we celebrate our 33th Anniversary.

Sadly enough Constance Eikelenboom passed away on March 12 of last year at the age of 95. Her two notorious walking aids were put on her grave. The prize named after her is a lasting tribute to this remarkable woman.

We are grateful to Stephan Slingerland, who donated last year to the Prize to honour Stans.

So now you all know why we are here.

I can tell you folks, Koos and I had to make tough choices. We received four really good nominations in the category best scientific publication, reflecting the quality and productivity of our staff. We got many candidates and nominations for the Outreach Award, all absolutely up to the mark. And for the Stans Award we were really surprised to not only receive a full-fledged – 120 pages - student report but also a published paper and another piece of work that could easily make it to a journal.

Let us now continue with the award for the **best publication**. Here, as I said, we got four nominations. (**slide 3**)

Paul Behrens and his coauthors came up with a simple but very original idea: to assess the links between recommended diet and environmental impact. Food production is mostly associated with negative impacts on the environment, but the paper shows that at least in our part of the world we can improve the environment if we follow dietary recommendations, or approach it from the other side: we will improve our diet if environmental concerns determine our food choice. For sure a catchy topic.

Jeroen Guinée and his CML inmates took up the challenge to cooperate between the two departments on a really high level. They managed to tie two important scientific methods (risk assessment and LCA) by sketching four schools of thought for combining and integrating both methods, specifically for the emerging field of nanomaterials. The stage is set and hopefully future debates will be played out on this stage.

Laura Scherer and colleagues wrote a decent and very provocative paper: The paper adds a new perspective, that of animal welfare, to Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment by taking a utilitarian approach. Maximizing welfare for as many individual animals. The paper ignited a debate within CML, which has become unusual but absolutely to be praised. There were doubts whether the moral value of a honeybee hive (20,000 bees) simply the accumulative value is of the 20,000 individuals though

Ellen Cieraad contributed to an already well cited Nature paper. Global warming is often viewed to have straightforward effects on biodiversity. However this paper shows that alpine plant communities may be disturbed as a result of future temperature rise. A combination of direct and indirect effects differentially rule the above- and belowground reorganization of tree-line ecosystems and its functioning. The strength of the paper is that it addressed the same question using data from very different parts of the world

Four papers - in high ranking journals - All different authors; None of them managed to multiply his or her chances to become prize-winners.

We are not awarding Journals, we are awarding specific papers and are allowed to add our own criteria to the selection process: the Importance of the topic from a broader perspective; the originality in content or methods; clear, concise and coherent writing; convincing or pertinent results. Finding new ways to further CML

research count as a plus. According to the Jury the majority of the authors or the first author must have a CML affiliation.

Taking all these criteria into consideration one paper stood out, so the award for the best Scientific paper published in 2017 goes to:

(Slide 4)

The best Outreach

I hope you are all convinced that in the end society is best served by good science. But even good science needs some outreach. Scientists need to be heard on their findings and insights, scientist need to tell the story, to build trust, to participate and give science a voice in the societal debate where it's due. We even tolerate modest self-exposure. If the results of your research is very appealing or even sexy and able to create publicity on its own: great! And if you manage to enter in the address books of science-journalist's as renowned experts, even better The Jury is delighted to see this important message taking root at CML.

We collected many and got also nominations **(Slide 5 and 6)**

Paul Behrens performance stood out in a particular way. His and his co-authors' double edged sword (original paper and worldwide media coverage) is exceptional.

According to the Jury two other nominations deserved special attention.

1. First our CML / Science contribution to the Night of Art & Science. The enthusiasm with which Joris (and others) have taken up this challenge is remarkable: virtual reality at the night of art and science as an attractor for attention of the Multiply project and CML as a whole!
2. Kevin and his brother Marvin are ardent advocates of Urban Biodiversity. Their unflagging enthusiasm attracted media attention and now they are offered a regular program. Being yourself on TV is not easy, but Kevin has achieved this and given nature and environment a new podium on national tv.

The best Outreach award 2018 goes to **(Slide 7)**

Marvin Groen

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

Here got three really outstanding nominations:

(Slide 8)

Stijn Vaessen BSc (!) thesis excellent ecological analysis of distribution of mycorrhizal forms across the world. Using an impressively large dataset of plants and their associations with fungi. It would be interesting to discuss the implications of his findings a bit further, both in the light of global warming and in the light of future agriculture.

With his Master thesis Davide De Mauro has produced a solid, more classical, analysis of a complex topic addressing whether available scenarios will meet the demand for mitigation of environmental pressures of the Dutch dairy industry. The topic remains very pertinent and given the difficulty to really get the dairy industry in a sustainable direction, Davide work is deemed very important.

Margreet Beenakker proved herself and us to be a real researcher: her thesis is a nice piece of work and combination of methods. The finding that adult exposure affects offspring in the brood pouch is important. Fantastic to see that her work made it already into a good publication, mainly written by Nadia Brun.

.

Taking into account the environmental relevance, the scope and the amount of work of all nominees.

The STANS Student award 2018 goes to Davide De Mauro. (**Slide 9**)