FELLOWSHIP REPORT ON 2007-2008 APPLICIATIONS

May 31 was the deadline for applications for the SCAR Fellowships for 2007-2008. As last year, the review board comprised the three SSG COs and should have included two members of the Executive Committee as well as the Executive Director. However, as there are many biological candidates and no biologist on the EXCOM, we asked Clive Howard-Williams (member of last year’s fellowship evaluation team) to stay on the team as a past EXCOM Member and biologist.

We had 22 applicants, as last year. To prevent any one of the evaluation team having to take on a large burden, the tasks were divided up as follows:

1. Maurizio Candidi took all 7 SSG-PS proposals;
2. Alessandro Capra took all 7 SSG-GS proposals;
3. Ad Huiskes took all 12 LS proposals;
4. Toni Meloni took the GS and PS proposals;
5. Clive Howard-Williams took all the LS proposals;
6. Colin Summerhayes took all 22 proposals.

This ensured at least 3 reviews for all proposals.

Marks were based on:

(i) High quality;
(ii) Relevance to SCAR’s SRPs;
(iii) The work will help to build the capacity of those who need it most;
(iv) The study is largely self-contained, rather than being part of a bigger project in which the applicant is a collaborator;
(v) The study can be effected in the set time and could lead to a publication;
(vi) The study helps someone from a country that is relatively financially stressed.

Evaluators scored proposals as: "A+" excellent; "A" good; "A-" not bad; or "B" reject.

Evaluators ranked their top 4 choices (1 = top; then 2, 3, 4), and marked as ‘5’ all others for which they were responsible.

The Executive Director converted the alphabetical scores to numerical (A+ = 1, A=2; A- = 3; B=5), then summed the alphabetical and rating scores to give a combined score that was averaged according to the number of evaluators. This gave the scores and rankings in table 1 below. Only the top 8 candidates are shown.

Delegates agreed to allocate up to two of our fellowships to candidates for the 6th Continent Initiative (6CI). Basically this is the same as the SCAR Fellowship, with the addition of having someone spend some time at a base or on a ship in the Antarctic (extra costs paid by IPF). Etable 1 identified those candidates applying for a 6CI SCAR-IFP Fellowship. Evaluators did NOT differentiate between these and the other fellows when evaluating the candidates. The same high standards applied to all.
For general information, half of the candidates were women. The candidates were going from the following countries: Arg (1); Aus (4); Be (3); Chi (1); Chin (1); Fra (1); Ge (1); It (4); NZ (1); Pol (1); Por (1); Ukr (1); US (2). They were proposing to go to the following countries: Aus (3); Be (2); Br (1); Fr (2); Ge (3); It (1); Neth (1); NZ (2); Swi (1); UK (4); US (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SSG</th>
<th>SRP</th>
<th>6CI</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
<th>Cum $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coco</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ICESTAR</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lannuzel</td>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>Aus</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Aus</td>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>EBA/CAML</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verducci</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Aus</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassler</td>
<td>Aus</td>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Neth</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>AGCS</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandoy</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GS/PS</td>
<td>ACE/AGCS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fernandoy is the only one in the top 8 from a developing country. There is something odd about his budget request (asks for costs for 2 persons), which is being checked.

The budget available is $30,000 + $2,000 from South Africa. In addition, the unspent $5,000 set aside for office secondments for young scientists is requested since there have been no takers and there is no sign of any. Thus SCAR could have $37,000 available. This would enable full funding of the top 4 candidates.

We are exploring with IPF the possibility that they may provide additional resources to assist with paying for at least 2 of the 6CI fellowships. If they pay for half of Lannuzel and Kaiser (total $9,000), then the cost to SCAR of the top 4 candidates would be $29000. Given a target of $37000 that would enable us to afford Verducci (29+6=35). If we were then to add Hassler that would raise the total to $42,500. Cutting the top 4 by $1k each would bring that figure down to a more manageable $38,500.

If IPF cannot make any contribution, then by cutting the top 4 by 1k each we could reduce the total to n$34,000, which then makes Verducci look affordable (total $40,000). The additional $3k could be taken from the endowment fund, which has grown significantly.

This would exclude the developing country scientist (Fernandoy), who is seeking a large grant ($10k). Possibly IPF would be willing to cover his costs.