



INSTITUTE OF ATMOSPHERIC PHYSICS
CAS
Bocni II 1401, 141 00 Prague 4
Czech Republic

Praha, June 30, 2021

Statement on the final evaluation report

I. We have no objections against the course of the evaluation. The evaluation proceeded in accord with the Evaluation Methodology.

II. We have the following comment on the amended version of the final report (Final Report Reassessment from June 21 and Comments to the Reassessment from June 23):

We appreciate that items (a), (f) and (g) of the previous statement on the evaluation report were responded to by the evaluation commission to our satisfaction.

Although the “Comments to the Reassessment” state that the commission has taken items (b), (c), (d), and (e) into account and the text has been modified accordingly, the report has not actually been modified in these points at all. **The text has remained unchanged** in the new version despite our request to modify it and **despite the commission’s claim that it has been modified**.

The items in question are repeated below for clarification:

b) There is a disproportion in the evaluation of the quality of selected outputs (H1.1) among departments: Whereas a rather detailed list is provided for some departments, text is rather cursory for other departments. We ask for the evaluation to be comparable among departments.

c) The same comment applies to item “Most valuable discoveries...” (H1.4).

d) Strengths of the Dept. of Ionosphere and Aeronomy, p. 12: Whereas the statement “Several “in house” data series of comparatively long term, enabling studies of long-term trends to be made” is true, in fact it is no real strength as these data are available at a variety of places. We suggest to replace this sentence with “Leading role in studies of long-term trends in the upper atmosphere and mesosphere,” which we believe is a real and unique strength of the Department, among others because of the contribution by Jan Laštovička as a founder and long-term leader of e.g. the respective IAGA working group.

e) Weaknesses of the Dept. of Ionosphere and Aeronomy, p. 13: Statement “Lack of a course on climate science and climate change...” is irrelevant to the department since its work is unrelated to these topics; people working on ionosphere and aeronomy are highly qualified, but not for giving lectures on climate science and climate change.

Otherwise, we have no other comments to the evaluation reports and fully concur with it.

doc. RNDr. Radan Huth, DrSc.,
director, Institute of Atmospheric Physics CAS