



Statement from the director of the institute on the final report of the Commission No. 5

We thank the members of the commission for their effort and time devoted to the evaluation process. We accept the Final Report, however, we have decided to comment a few points:

A. Evaluation of the Institute as a whole (p. 2)

a) Position of the Dept. of Tectonics and Geodynamics (DTGD)

We believe that the statement about the Department as focussing on research similar to that of the Institute of Geology does not reflect the situation accurately (and is in fact in contradiction to statement on p. 10. line 4). Our preferred wording would be, for instance:

The department has focused on interdisciplinary approaches to a range of geoscience topics, combining in particular geological and geophysical approaches, field data combined with numerical and analogue modelling.

There seems to be a misunderstanding in the statement at the bottom of p. 2 (the Department ... was historically largely isolated ...). The Department was founded (2004) with the aim to introduce multidisciplinary approaches into the research of the institute. Logically, this has been a gradual process. The publications, which were submitted into the evaluation, show clearly that within the Institute there has been collaboration with colleagues from departments of geothermics, geomagnetism and seismology.

b) The report mentions that the location „far from university facilities“ is a problem in collaboration with universities. We believe that the travel time between about 30 and 40 minutes by public transport to various university departments in Prague is not really a problem. The main problem is generally low number of geoscience students at both Faculty of Mathematics and Physics and the Faculty of Science.

c). Outreach (p.3, Structure of the Institute)

The text mentions only the Geopark as an outreach activity. However, the Institute is much more active in this sense, e.g., initiated the Earth Day, which is organized annually in cooperation with the Academy of Sciences. Outreach activities of the Institute were recognized by the Academy's Outreach Award granted to A. Špičák.

B. Department of Seismology

Point 3: The statistics is correct; however, the numbers, which look fatally, need a clarification. The reason of the gap of the staff between 30 and 50 has been mentioned by the Director and is to a great deal beyond our control. A positive feature for the future of the Department is a fairly high number of young people below 30 – this group is among the most numerous from all the departments in the Institute. They represent a good prospect for the future. It is right that they are not experienced enough yet, but the senior researchers in the Department are ready to share their experience with them. Many from the age group of 50+ are already close to or in the age of retirement, but they are ready and eager to transfer their experience to the young colleagues, either when continuing their full-time jobs, or acting as part-time consultants.

Point 4, bullet 2: In my opinion, Department of Seismology is visible for the public. Members of the Department make the public acquainted with notable earthquakes and other important seismological issues through numerous announcements and interviews in mass media. Moreover, the activity in earthquake hazard related to nuclear power plants, waste repositories and important civil engineering objects is appreciated by the society.

Point 5e: The sentence "There is a danger..." is speculative. We have never discouraged young colleagues from applying for post-doctoral fellowships abroad, just vice versa. In recent years we had three PhD students graduated in the Department. One of them left for the commerce within seismology, one is on the leave abroad (however with a small chance of return), and the last one refused to apply for a fellowship abroad from family reasons, though being encouraged repeatedly.

RNDr. Pavel Hejda, CSc.

Director

Institute of Geophysics of the CAS, v. v. i.

Prague, January 21, 2016