



PRESIDENT: Dr. Sinjae Yoo
SECRETARY: Prof. Peter Croot
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Dr. Patricia Miloslavich

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

22 May 2023

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

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF 2023 WORKING GROUP PROPOSALS

Twelve working group proposals were submitted to the SCOR Secretariat for consideration at the 2023 SCOR Annual Meeting and are available on the SCOR Web site at <https://scor-int.org/events/scor-2023-annual-meeting/>. 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 (either as full or as associate member) will also need to be approved by the chairs of the WGs that are funded. 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 full members and additional early career scientists among the suggested associate members.

The review should be based on scientific merits, and whether the proposal is fundable or not in its present form, **assigning the proposals a rank from 1 (most desired) to 12 (least desired) along with the recommendation of "must fund", "may fund, or "do not fund" to each of the proposals following the criteria described in the following pages.** Each reviewer (national committee, organization, or individual) should recommend **no more than three proposals in the "must fund" category.** Proposals ranked as "must fund" should be those that substantially meet the criteria, although may need minor adjustments to their terms of reference and/or membership. 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.

Once all the reviews are received, SCOR will rank the proposals according to the national committee member recommendations of “must fund”, “may fund” or “do not fund”. The SCOR 2023 meeting will provide an opportunity for national SCOR committee representatives and other meeting participants to provide additional comments on each proposal. At the SCOR Annual Meeting, the proposals with the highest ranks will be shortlisted. A following round of discussions will reduce this list to the proposals that SCOR will fund to begin in 2024. The number of approved new working groups will depend on the quality of the proposals and funding availability. Comments generated during the discussions 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.

Please send your comments on these proposals to the SCOR Secretariat (secretariat@scor-int.org) before 31st August 2023.

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 also on external funding to increase the number of funded working groups and the variety of topics covered. Even if external funding is guaranteed for a given proposal, proposals will be evaluated based on the established criteria.

Thank you in advance for your assistance!

Instructions / criteria for reviewing SCOR Working Group proposals

SCOR Committee: [name of country / association]

Proposal: [acronym of proposed WG]

Please answer the following questions as you review the proposals for new SCOR working groups. Give reasons for your ranking, rather than only answering “yes” or “no”. This information is helpful in the discussions and to provide feedback to those who submitted proposals.

Timeliness <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is this an urgent topic?• Are there enough previous studies to guide this activity?• Are there enough accumulated data upon which new compilation of data and/or analysis can be built?
High priority for ocean science and for SCOR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is this a topic that will advance oceanographic understanding?• Does the WG tackle important methodological or conceptual issues hindering advancements?• Does the topic represent novel science or scientific activities?• Does this have further impact on other areas?
Is a SCOR Working Group a good mechanism to develop this topic <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is this of interdisciplinary nature?• Does it require a global compilation, inter-comparison, or synthesis?• If successful, will it have impacts globally as well as regionally?
Appropriateness of the Terms of Reference (ToRs) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the ToRs clearly and logically described?• Can the ToRs be achieved in the time frame?• Do the work plans include all the necessary steps to achieve the goals?• Is there a timeline of activities and for deliverables?• Are the deliverables appropriate and clearly derived from each of the ToRs?• Is capacity development well planned?
Appropriateness of membership <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the membership balanced and inclusive in terms of: gender, geographic distribution, expertise, early career scientists involved, and emerging countries?
Other comments or suggestions for improvement of proposal
Rating <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please select only one: must fund, may fund, do not fund• Assign this proposal a rank from 1 (most desired) to 12 (least desired) (this rank must be different for each of the proposals that you review):

