



PRESIDENT: Dr. Sinjae Yoo  
SECRETARY: Prof. Paul G. Myers  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Dr. Patricia Miloslavich

Secretariat:  
College of Earth, Ocean, and Environment  
Robinson Hall  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716 USA

**19 May 2021**

**To:** National Committees for SCOR, Nominated Members of SCOR, SCOR Executive Committee, Chairs of SCOR Subsidiary Bodies, Affiliated Organizations, Corresponding Organizations, Interested International Organizations

**From:** Patricia Miloslavich, Executive Director

## **2021 SCOR ANNUAL MEETING**

### **REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF WORKING GROUP PROPOSALS**

Five working group proposals were submitted to the SCOR Secretariat for consideration at the 2021 SCOR Annual Meeting and are available on the SCOR Web site at <https://scor-int.org/events/scor-annual-meeting-2021/>. The SCOR Executive Committee will be very grateful for comments from SCOR National Committees, individuals, and interested organizations to assist in the review of these proposals. This is, in fact, one of the most important ways in which SCOR's National Committees and cooperating organizations can provide input to SCOR on scientific priorities for ocean science. Instructions and a template for the review are given on the following pages.

Additional membership nominations to the Working Groups are welcome from SCOR National Committees, as they provide funding for WGs. However, due to financial limitations, working groups may not have more than 10 Full Members, including the chair(s), so not everyone who is nominated can be selected as a Full Member. Any additional nomination to the membership will also need to be approved by the chairs of the WGs that are funded. Some individuals may be invited to serve on working groups as Associate Members, but their travel funds must come from sources other than SCOR. The primary consideration for selection as a member of a SCOR working group is the scientific expertise of the individual. An important criterion is SCOR's aim to ensure an appropriate international and gender balance in all its groups. All proposed working groups should also be expected to include at least one Early Career Scientist among the suggested members.

It is helpful for national SCOR committees to provide arguments to justify the ratings they give to each proposal (rather than just answering "yes" or "no"). When multiple national committee members have commented on a specific proposal, the chair of the national SCOR committee should synthesize the committee members' responses. The review should be based on the science related to the topic, and whether the proposal is fundable or not in its present form, assigning a recommendation of "must fund", "may fund, or "do not fund" to each of the proposals. Each reviewer (national committee, organization, or individual) should recommend no more than three proposals in the "must fund" category following the criteria described in the following page.

**Please send your comments on these proposals to me, by e-mail if possible, before 31st August 2021.**

All comments for each of the proposals will be compiled and one member of the SCOR Executive Committee will be responsible for leading the discussion of each proposal. Finally, please consider whether financial support might be arranged from your country or organization for any of these groups. SCOR funding for working group activities is limited, so we depend on external funding to increase the number of working groups and the variety of topics covered. Even if external funding is certain, proposals will be evaluated based on scientific merit, relevance to SCOR, and appropriateness of the proposed terms of reference and membership.

Thank you in advance for your assistance!

### **Instructions for Reviewing SCOR Working Group Proposals**

Please answer the following questions as you review the proposals for new SCOR working groups:

- Is the proposal timely?
- Is the topic a priority for ocean science and for SCOR?
- Is a SCOR Working Group a good mechanism to advance this topic?
- Are the terms of reference appropriate?
- Are the membership suggestions appropriate? (Please note that individuals listed as potential members may not have been contacted yet and that membership is not final until approval by the SCOR Executive Committee.)
- Do you have any other comments to improve the proposal?
- How would you rank the priority of SCOR funding for these proposals? In recent years, discussions of proposals at SCOR annual meetings have focused on categorizing proposals as those that should be or might be funded versus those that should not be funded. Each reviewer (national committee, organization, or individual) should recommend no more than **three** proposals in the “must fund” category. Proposals in this category should be those that substantially meet the above criteria, although may need minor adjustments to their terms of reference and/or membership.

The SCOR 2021 meeting will provide an opportunity for national SCOR committee representatives and other meeting participants to provide comments on each proposal. Once all the reviews are received, SCOR will rank the proposals according to their recommendations of “must fund”, “may fund” or “do not fund”. In the first phase of discussions, the proposals with the highest ranks will be shortlisted. A second round of discussions will reduce this list to the proposals that SCOR will fund beginning in 2021. In addition to identifying the proposals to fund (usually up to two, depending on quality of the proposal and funding availability), the discussions generate comments that will be summarized and provided to proponents whose proposals were not approved in case that they wish to re-submit their proposal in a later year.

**Comments from [country name] SCOR Committee**

[Name of proposal]

Please give reasons for your ranking, rather than only answering “yes” or “no”. This information is helpful in the discussions and responses to those who submitted proposals.

Timeliness	
High priority for ocean science and for SCOR?	
Is a SCOR Working Group a good mechanism here?	
Are the terms of reference appropriate?	
Are the membership suggestions appropriate?	
Any other comments or suggestions for improvement of proposal	
Rating: <i>must fund, may fund, do not fund.</i>	