

## Submitting a Proposal for a SCOR Working Group

SCOR approves new working groups each year at its annual meeting. The number of proposals funded each year depends on both the results of the proposal review process and the availability of funding. In recent years, 1-3 proposals have been funded in any given year. SCOR is an organization that promotes science that comes from the “bottom up” from the ocean science community and working groups are an important vehicle to bring attention to the important ocean science issues identified by the global community of ocean scientists.

### **Proposal Review Cycle**

The timing of the proposal process depends on the timing of the annual meeting, so it is best to check the SCOR Web site and announcements from the SCOR Secretariat about the schedule in any given year.

### **Call for Proposals**

The call for working group proposals is usually made in late January or early February each year. The call is distributed through the SCOR email list and the *SCOR Newsletter*. Anyone in the global ocean science community is eligible to submit a proposal and there is no limitation to individuals from nations that pay dues to SCOR. The deadline for proposals is set 2-3 months after the call for proposals is distributed. We strongly recommend that individuals interested in submitting a proposal contact the SCOR Secretariat or a SCOR Executive Committee member early and often in the process for feedback about the working group idea and how it might fit with other past and current activities of SCOR and the activities of other organizations, and to avoid common mistakes that will make it difficult for national SCOR committees to rank the proposal highly (see below). Proposals submitted without previous review by the SCOR Secretariat are seldom successful in the review process, although pre-review feedback from SCOR does not guarantee success.

### **Review by National SCOR Committees and Others**

A few days following the deadline for proposals, the set of proposals is posted on the Web site for the upcoming annual SCOR meeting and the review period is opened for several months. SCOR welcomes review comments from national SCOR committees, partner organizations, and anyone in the global ocean science community who wishes to comment. The decision to fund proposals is seen as a specific responsibility of national SCOR committees (who provide co-funding for the working groups).

The call for review comments asks national SCOR committees and others to consider the following:

- 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?
- How would you rank the priority of SCOR funding for these proposals?

### **Ideal Proposal**

Many different types of proposals have succeeded over the years, but some guidelines should help proponents of new groups:

- A SCOR WG proposal can be in ANY field of ocean science. Matching funding and support (e.g. hosting meeting costs) is a positive aspect of proposals. This should be stated in the text, not in separate letters of support.
- The topic should be global in scope. Some past working groups have focused on regional topics but, when they do, the regional topic has global consequences. An example is WG 136 on Climatic Importance of the Greater Agulhas System.
- The topic should represent novel science or scientific activities that are unlikely to be supported through national sources.
- The proposed activity should be urgent as a hot topic or an enabling activity to remove barriers to research.
- The proposal should not present activities that could just as easily be submitted as a research proposal to a research funding agency.
- The proposal should summarize the state of science and justify the need for the proposed work.
- The group's membership should include no more than 10 Full Members and 10 Associate Members, with no more than two from a single country and no more than one from a single institution. SCOR pays specific attention to gender balance and inclusion of members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition (e.g., Commonwealth of Independent States and Eastern Europe). The proposal should specify how it will involve early-career scientists (up to 10 years post-Ph.D. and under 40 years of age).
- The proposal should state terms of reference that include explicit deliverables beyond 'hold a workshop', 'publish a paper', etc. Each term of reference should be written as a single short sentence described one overarching goal of the group. A timeline for activities should be presented. The terms of reference should be achievable in a 3- to 4-year period within the budget provided for SCOR working groups. SCOR expects at least some kind of product coming from each Working Group, aimed to lead to long-term advancement of the field of study and enhancement of international cooperation, beyond the term of SCOR support.
- The group will be asked each year about their progress in achieving terms of reference and funding for future meetings will depend on the group making progress toward meeting their terms of reference and a reasonable path for achievement for the ones that remain.
- The proposal should be written with minimum jargon so it can be understood by non-specialists; that is, the SCOR national committees that review the proposal are composed of a wide range of specialists.
- Finally, the proposal must present a well thought out plan for capacity building. The SCOR Secretariat can be contacted to get ideas of resources available and what other groups have done in terms of capacity building.

**Discussion at Annual SCOR Meeting**

Before the annual SCOR meeting, a member of the SCOR Executive Committee is assigned to each proposal, to present the proposal and to summarize comments from national SCOR committees at the meeting. To be fair to proponents who cannot send someone to the meeting, any proponent or proposed member of a working group is asked to leave the room before discussion of their proposal. Each proposal is discussed individually and ranked in terms of the desirability for the SCOR funding available that year.

## SCOR Working Group Proposal Template

(max. 5000 words, excluding Appendix)

**Title:**

**Acronym:**

**Summary/Abstract (max. 250 words)**

**Scientific Background and Rationale (max 1250 words)**

**Terms of Reference (max. 250 words)**

**Working plan (logical sequence of steps to fulfil terms of reference, with timeline. Max. 1000 words)**

**Deliverables (state clearly what products the WG will generate. Should relate to the terms of reference. Max 250 words). A workshop is not a deliverable. Please note that SCOR prefers that publications be in open-access journals.**

**Capacity Building (How will this WG build long-lasting capacity for practicing and understanding this area of marine science globally. Max 500 words)**

**Working Group composition (as table). Divide by Full Members (10 people) and Associate Members, taking note of scientific discipline spread, geographical spread, and gender balance. (max. 500 words)**

Full Members (no more than 10, please identify chair(s))

Name	Gender	Place of work	Expertise relevant to proposal
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

Associate Member (no more than 10)

Name	Gender	Place of work	Expertise relevant to proposal
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

**Working Group contributions (max. 500 words)**

Detail for each Full Member (max. 2 sentences per member) why she/he is being proposed as a Full Member of the Working Group, what is her/his unique contribution?

**Relationship to other international programs and SCOR Working groups (max. 500 words)**

**Key References (max. 500 words)**

**Appendix**

For each Full Member, indicate 5 key publications related to the proposal.