

JOIDES Resolution
Facility Board Meeting Notes
March 18-20, 2013
NSF, Arlington, VA

The first *JOIDES Resolution* Facility Board (FB) meeting was held March 18-20, 2013. The agenda is appended to these Minutes.

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began with introductions around the room of all members, liaisons, and observers.

2. Approval of Agenda

The meeting agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Architecture of the new IODP

The National Science Foundation (NSF) began discussion of the new IODP architecture by providing a PowerPoint presentation detailing the Program's structure, reviewing the JRFB and detailing the Framework document for the Program. Discussion following the presentation concluded that the Terms of Reference for the international advisory panels are dedicated to the needs of the JOIDES Resolution (JR) management and facilities, but the advisory panels are available for other FBs to use for their respective programs. The advisory panel activities will be funded through the Support Office budget by the *JOIDES Resolution* consortium. NSF also noted that a panel was convened to make recommendations for the next operator of the JR and the Science Support Office, but NSF has not yet made a selection for either award.

Action Item:

G. Camoin and T. Janecek will create a structural diagram to detail flow of information within the new IODP.

4. JRFB Terms of Reference

The FB discussed its draft Terms of Reference and made the following revisions and changes:

Mandate: Text will be added under item #1 to state, "Monitor progress relative to the Science Plan". The JRFB will also implement a mechanism to maintain communications with, and receive feedback from, other FBs regarding the effectiveness of the panels in meeting their needs (item #4).

Membership: The JRFB agreed that the scientist nomination/application process will be run by the U.S. Science Support Program (USSSP), and that the JRFB would then have final approval of new members. In addition, because of the importance of continuity in its operation and the value of corporate memory, the Chair will not be selected based on a call for a new Chair, but rather the JRFB will appoint its own Chair from those scientists who are members. The service panel chairs will be added as liaisons.

Meetings: The desirability of more than one meeting a year was discussed, and all agreed that in its first year of operation, a second meeting will be required to approve the Annual Program Plans for the facility and the support office, and address remaining issues with facility and program policies and procedures. This second FY'13 meeting will be held in July-August depending on the availability of the Annual Program Plans and the scheduling of the Chikyu Facility Board meeting. If two meetings are needed in future years, they will likely be held in February and August. The February meeting would be held primarily to schedule JR operations, while the August meeting would be

held to approve the Annual Program Plans, if this could not be accomplished electronically because of the complexity of issues.

Action Item:

S. Humphris will revise the Terms of Reference as discussed and circulate for comment, with approval planned at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

5. Advisory Panels

The FB reviewed the Terms of Reference for the three advisory panels that had been red-lined prior to the meeting.

PEP: The JRFB agreed that the current Terms of Reference include too much implementation rather than policy. In particular, the text detailing the workings of PEP through sub-panels will be stricken in order to allow the Panel to be flexible in its operations according to the needs at each meeting. In terms of membership, PEP must strive for a balance of expertise across all areas of the Science Plan.

There was discussion about the Chair selection process, which is currently done by an independent search committee. The JRFB felt that, because of the importance of continuity in its operation and the value of corporate memory, the Chair should be nominated by members of the PEP, and that nomination forwarded to JRFB for approval.

EPSP: It was noted that the EPSP does not follow the conflict of interest policy referred to as common to all advisory panels because it requires the proponents to participate in the discussion of their proposal. Hence, the COI policy needs to be revised. In addition, the EPSP does not hold electronic meetings, but rather electronic reviews. The Chair of the JRFB will provide guidance when appropriate to EPSP as to which proposals need review.

SCP: Revisions as red-lined.

SCP-PEP Interactions: With the recommendations for proposals reading for scheduling moving directly from PEP to JRFB, the status of site survey data will need to be considered during the PEP decision process. This requires close coordination between SCP and PEP to avoid proposals reaching the JRFB that cannot be drilled due to the status of the site survey requirements. There has been discussion of merging the two panels and, in June, the two panels will meet in the same geographic location with a day's overlap for a joint meeting. While there are questions relating to required expertise on each panel, and the workload change for a merged panel, the Chairs of PEP and SCP will review the consequences of such a merger after the June meeting, and recommend either a merger or a joint meeting plan at the next JRFB meeting.

Based on general agreement that site survey data would be required before proposals are advanced to the JRFB for consideration, and the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP) must review the information prior to scheduling. The JRFB recommended that preliminary proposals include a section on the status of site survey data.

Action Items:

S. Humphris and Dick Kroon will revise the PEP Terms of Reference for review and approval at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

D. Mallinson will review and recommend revisions to the SCP Terms of Reference for review and approval at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

B. Katz will review and recommend revisions to the EPSP Terms of Reference, including updating the flow chart.

D. Kroon and D. Mallinson will review the PEP-SCP interactions after their June meeting and recommend either merger of the two panels or a plan for joint meetings. This will be an agenda item at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

Recommendation to the Science Support Office:

The JRFB recommends that the requirement for a brief discussion of the status of site survey data and how it will be sufficient to address the scientific objectives be added to Preliminary Proposals. The page limit can be extended to include this section.

6. Conflict of Interest for JRFB and Advisory Panels

The JRFB reviewed a red-line version of the Conflict of Interest policy and agreed it needs to be simplified and the Appendix removed. In addition, the paragraph concerning SAS activities needs to be deleted. The policy also needs to be revised to enable **EPSP** to involve discussion with proponents of their proposals, which is currently not permissible under the current policy.

Action Item:

S. Humphris will revise and simplify the Conflict of Interest policy, circulate for comment, and then revise for approval at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

7. Procedures and Guidelines for JR Expeditions

Staffing Procedures:

- Staffing of the JR will continue with the current process of nominations from Program Management Offices (PMO) for scientist to participate in each expedition.
- Co-Chief Scientist nominations will be provided by PEP initially to IODP-MI (until September 2013) and thereafter to the JR Operator. Nominations from the PMOs for Co-Chief Scientists will be requested by IODP-MI (until September 2013) and thereafter directly by the JR Operator.
- An effort will be made to balance international representation within each scientific party. However, co-chief scientists are not included in the quotes and will be selected based on programmatic or project needs.

Standard Measurements: The JRFB discussed the possibility of developing a set of standard measurements across drilling platforms based on needs for post-cruise sampling, risk of loss of ephemeral data, cruise comparison, downhole measurements and the potential audiences for the data from such standard measurement. A subgroup (M. Malone, R. Murray, H. Palike, C. Yeats) was created to develop a set of basic measurements and options for discussion at the next JRFB meeting. This will be shared with the other FBs to try to standardize across platforms within the resources available to the operators.

Third Party Tool Guidelines: The JRFB believes that the current policy has been effective. It is particularly beneficial because it places the onus upon the tool developer to incorporate the technology and make the most effective use of it. The section of the policy that needs revision is that concerning the adoption of the tool by IODP. Although this should be kept as an option, it needs to be de-emphasized. A subgroup (Murray, Palike, Yeats, Malone) was created to revise the document for approval at the next JRFB meeting.

EPSP Safety Review Guidelines: The JRFB agreed to update the EPSP safety review guidelines that refer to “paper copies” and “Expedition Safety package distribution” to reflect that information is distributed electronically. In addition, the flow chart needs revision to reflect additional sites that may be added while a cruise is underway. The FB had significant discussion on cruise plan contingencies and the benefits inherent in targeting Sites of Opportunity when initial drilling plans fail. The FB considered having proponents develop well-defined secondary plans in their Full Proposals, with special consideration of promoting nearby sites with alternative.

Action Items

M. Malone will revise the staffing procedures document for review at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

M. Malone (lead), R. Murray, H. Pälike, C. Yeats will revisit the list of standard measurements and revise the Standard Measurements document to reflect what should be basic measurement and what should be optional for the JR. This needs to be completed by early July 2013 to be shared with the *Chikyu* FB.

R. Murray (lead), H. Pälike, C. Yeats, M. Malone will revise the Third Party Tools document to de-emphasize adoption of tools by IODP for review and approval at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

S, Humphris and B. Katz will revise the EPSP Safety Review guidelines for review and approval at the August 2013 JRFB meeting.

8. Core Curation

The JRFB needs advice from the core curators regarding curatorial procedures. It was generally agreed that a standard procedure for requests for samples taken with all platforms is desirable. The JRFB determined that the best approach would be for all three Facility Boards to request a from the core curators a proposed plan for standardizing curatorial procedures. The proposal created by the core curators must include budgetary information and prioritized activities.

Action Item

S. Humphris will bring up this curatorial issue to the CIB when it meets in July. After that meeting, the FBs can jointly request the core curators to propose standard procedures for core curation.

9. Data Management and Publishing Criteria

The JRFB agreed that Data Management and Publishing Criteria would be discussed in the summer when the JR Operator is known.

10. Overview of Proposals Ready for Scheduling

The PEP Chair gave a presentation of the science objectives of the JR proposals that have been brought forward to the JRFB for scheduling, as well as their site survey status. This included:

Proposal 505: Mariana Convergent Margin

Proposal 552: Bengal Fan

Proposal 567: Paleogene South Pacific Transect

APL 693: South Chamorra Seamount

Proposal 732: Sediment Drifts off the Antarctic Peninsula

Proposal 770: Kanto Asperity Project

Proposal 778: Tanzania Offshore Paleoclimate

Proposal 781: Hikurangi Subduction Zone, New Zealand
Proposal 793 CPP: Arabian Sea
Proposal 795: Indian Monsoon Rainfall
Proposal 800: Nature of the Lower Crust and Moho
Proposal 807: Indonesian Throughflow

Two others were also mentioned as important to longer term planning:
Proposal 702: Agulhas Current (needs reconsideration of site locations and review by SCP)
Proposal 704: Sumatra Subduction Zone (proposal needs further revision).

11. Overview of JR Operations and Costs

D. Divins provided a history of JR operations and costs. On an annual basis since 2004, time spent on site has varied between 72 and 190 days, with transit time ranging from 34 to 93 days.

For FY'13, the total USIO budget is \$70.97M with 85% of that being used to support technical, engineering and science support.

The average cost to add an expedition is ~\$2.5M, although costs vary widely depending on the complexity of the cruise. The average cost to add a multi-level, multi-component CORK is ~\$1M.

The FY'13 average operating day rate is \$86K, which results in an annual day rate cost of \$30.9M. In FY'14 some savings on the day rate (~\$14K) will be realized as the day rate decreases due to completion of payments to the ship owner for the JR upgrade. This will provide an annual savings of ~\$5.25M and a total annual day rate costs of ~\$25.7M.

12. Budgetary Guidance from NSF

NSF provided details on its budgetary constraints and discussed current Foundation priorities, including Science, Engineering and Education for Sustainability (SEES) and Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI) operations and maintenance as well as the sequester cuts. NSF does not have final figures for budgets for FY 2013 or 2014. The JRFB was told to assume four expeditions for the FY'15 planning.

Renewal of *JOIDES Resolution* operations beyond FY'14 will require National Science Board (NSB) approval this year, with the NSB providing final guidance on financial request amounts should they approve renewal of facility operations.

13 & 14. Options for, and Development of, an FY'15 Schedule

M. Malone provided several options for an FY'15 schedule. The ship will end FY'14 at IBM in the western Pacific. Three options were presented for consideration, all of which included Indian Monsoon (795), Bengal Fan (552) and Arabian Sea (793) and only varied in the fourth cruise.

The JRFB discussed the options, taking into account the status of the site survey data available, the feasibility of proposals that included observatories, weather windows, transit times, and the positioning of the ship for FY'16. Based on this information, the JRFB recommended that Indonesian Flowthrough (807) be the fourth project. It was also agreed that lead proponents of all proposals considered by the JRFB should receive a letter from the JRFB Chair updating them on the status of the schedule and providing any addition instructions to the proponents on how to proceed to resolve any outstanding issues.

Action Item:

S. Humphris and D. Kroon will prepare letters to lead proponents of all proposals under JRFB consideration informing them on the status of scheduling and how to proceed. These will be sent through IODP-MI this time, but eventually through the Science Support Office.

15. Overview of JR Proposals at PEP

The JRFB reviewed current and anticipated proposal pressure to determine likely geographic locations of operation a few years from now, and discussed the need to generate proposals in preparation for work in those areas.

Consensus

Taking into consideration current and anticipated proposal pressure, the JRFB considers that the JOIDES Resolution is likely to remain in the eastern Indian and western and south western Pacific oceans through 2016 and 2017, followed by a likely track across the southern Pacific Ocean, with an opportunity for drilling in the southern and central Atlantic Ocean in 2018 and 2019.

The JRFB noted there are three projects in the western Indian Ocean waiting for scheduling (Tanzania – 778, Atlantis Bank – 800, and Agulhas Current – 704), although one of them (Tanzania – 778) is in a piracy area that has seen some improvement. Hence, a detour into the western Indian Ocean is likely when the ship is in the southern Atlantic. While providing general guidance to the community, this anticipated long-term ship track will be reviewed every year to ensure efficient scheduling of projects ready for drilling and achievement of the challenges laid out in the Science Plan.

The JRFB agreed to encourage the community to begin planning workshops to develop drilling proposals for the Atlantic.

16. Operational/Scientific Expedition Reviews by the JRFB

The JRFB considered the merit of continuing scientific and operational reviews of each expedition. Under a Cooperative Agreement, NSF has an increased role in reviewing the performance of the operations and management of the JR Operator. Multiple reviews are unnecessary and cost inefficient. Given NSF's mandatory operational review process, and the scientific review conducted by the IODP Forum, the JRFB discussed what additional information it would like a review to provide that could be incorporated into the NSF review. The JRFB agreed that for expedition year 2014, reports from the operator and the Co-Chiefs summarizing the expedition experience would be sufficient. For expedition year 2015 and beyond, the JRFB would assist NSF in writing the charge to the review panel, and one member of the JRFB would be a member of the NSF review panel.

17. Long-Term Planning

The JRFB discussed implementation of the recommendations that came out of the US Strategies Workshop concerning operational planning for the JR. The JRFB recommends that the APL process be implemented to take advantage of sites of opportunity along transits.

18. Other JR Issues

Expedition Length: There was discussion of the traditional two-month duration of an expedition. The two-month duration appears to represent a balance between crew rotation requirements and fiscal/time constraints of transit in and out of port. The scientific community has become accustomed to tailoring proposals to fit the available time. However, there are projects whose

scientific objectives could be met with shorter drilling times. The JRFB agreed to allow proponents to propose projects of flexible time lengths. Shorter projects will fit well within the new regional scheduling model of the *JOIDES Resolution* and allow the ship operator to create an efficient expedition schedule by packaging two of three smaller projects into a two-month expedition time slot. This change will require that proponents develop a drilling strategy that justifies the requested length of the project. This change will be advertised and written into the proposal submission guidelines.

Weekly vs. Site Reporting: The weekly and site reporting requirements during JR expeditions are burdensome and repetitive particularly when new sites are being drilled in rapid succession. The JRFB agreed to require weekly site reports for expeditions only when the site occupancy was two weeks or longer. Site reports are to continue to be required for all sites.

Expedition and Site Number Designations: The JRFB agreed to continue the current method of designating expedition and site numbers with the operators coordination assignment of expedition numbers.

Recommendation for the Science Support Office

Change the Proposal Submission Guidelines to allow for projects with less than 2-month drilling requirements.

19. Proposal Submission Guidelines

The JRFB agreed to maintain proposal submission dates in April and October.

The JRFB reviewed the revised version of the Proposal Submission Guidelines. There was some discussion about the need to include the level of detail found in the document but the JRFB members ultimately agreed that the detail is necessary for newcomers to the proposal process. However, the JRFB members noted that the number of documents on the IODP website that relate to proposal submission can be confusing to a newcomer. There needs to be simple explanatory materials to explain the relationship between all the documents. Examples of this explanatory material include a flow chart detailing how proposals move through the system and links to recent examples of successful proposals. JRFB created a working group (G. Filippelli, D. Kroon, G. Camoin) to address this need.

The JRFB reviewed the status of Complementary Project Proposals (CPP) and considered benefits including day-rate relief, new opportunities for partnerships, and active outreach groups seeking new CPP possibilities. After considerable discussion, the JRFB agreed that the 70% level would be maintained for the JR.

Action Item

G. Filippelli, D. Kroon and G. Camoin will improve the accessibility of documents relating to proposal submission by providing explanatory text and visuals.

Recommendation to the Support Office

The following recommendations will be made to the new Support Office:

- (1) Update the proposal submission guidelines and the website flow chart of how proposals move through the system based upon material provided by the JRFB working group.
- (2) Provide links to recent examples of successful proposals.
- (3) Keep the Google Earth overlay of completed and proposed sites up to date.

20. Publications

Expedition Prospectus: The JRFB agreed that a pre-cruise prospectus is required for all scheduled projects. All efforts should be made to make this available prior to the scientist application process. The prospectus should include a short summary for the general public. The JRFB also noted that the emphasis for the prospectus should be on timely publication rather than production aspects (e.g. layout, undue graphical editing, etc.).

Preliminary Reports: The JRFB needs to consider what information the Preliminary Report needs to impart and who is the audience in order to determine specific content requirements. This is best done is a discussion with the JR Operator.

Post-Cruise Reporting Requirements: The JRFB established the following with respect to post-cruise reporting requirements:

Immediate post-cruise reporting needs to target several audiences. For the funding agencies, there needs to be a summary of achieved objectives and operations, and results of drilling. Scientists need a similar summary, data on core recovery, and some summary figures of the major findings. For the general public, there should be press releases and media kits. For research clearance requirements, there needs to be summary maps and a project abstracts. One year post-cruise the shipboard party will be required to have published a report in Scientific Drilling.

One year after the sampling party, the scientific party will have produced an Initial Reports volume similar in content and quality to the current publication, with a summary overview chapter and an expedition bibliography.

It was agreed that the Expedition Bibliography will be maintained in the new IODP.

Liaisons from other JRFBs agreed to maintain the same format of publications across their programs.

21. JR Facility Policies

Action Items

S. Humphris will revise the proposal confidentiality policy for approval at the JRFB August 2013 meeting.

D. Mallinson and the SCB will review the site survey confidentiality policy and then update it for JRFB review and approval at the August 2013 meeting.

U. Rohl, W. Azuma, J. Allan, N. Eguchi and D. Divins will begin review of the Sample, Data and Obligations Policy. The curators will be requested to provide an implementation process. It was noted that data are not dealt with appropriately in the policy.

S. Humphris will rewrite the Environmental Principles policy and send to the FBs for each platform.

23. Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting depends on 1) the schedule for production of the Annual Program Plan, and 2) on the date of the *Chikyu* FB meeting. It will be sometime in July or August, and will be held in Washington, DC.