

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board Meeting:  
26-27 August 2013  
Washington, DC USA**

**Summary of Consensus Statements and Action Items**

**Consensus Statements**

1. The JRFB approves the Agenda with the changes discussed.
2. The JRFB approves the March 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.
3. The revised JR Facility Board Terms of Reference are approved with the following changes:
  - The JRFB may go outside of the Facility Board to select a Chair should they deem it appropriate.
  - The U.S. Science Support Program will conduct an open nomination/application process for scientific representatives on the JRFB, and recommend new members to the JRFB for its approval.
4. The JRFB approves the revised EPSP Terms of Reference with no changes.
5. The JRFB approves the merger of the SCP and PEP into a single review team (the Science Evaluation Panel). The SEP will initially keep all existing members and it will meet twice a year.
6. The JRFB approves the SEP Terms of Reference with the changes discussed.
7. The JRFB welcomes the CIB in using JRF Advisory Panels.
8. The JRFB approves the revised JR Facility Conflict of Interest Policy.
9. The JRFB approves the JR Staffing Procedures document.
10. The JRFB approves the EPSP Safety Review Guidelines document with minor revisions.
11. The JRFB accepts the revised IODP Environmental Principles document.
12. Recognizing the fundamental importance of the cryogenic magnetometer to the science of the *JR*, the JRFB recommends that a new instrument be ordered as soon as possible.
13. The JRFB approves the *JR* Facility FY'14 Annual Program Plan with no changes, and hopefully with the inclusion of the South China Sea CPP.
14. The JRFB recommends that the USIO/NSF *not* pursue the potential commercial work opportunity in 2014.
15. The JRFB approves the SSO Annual Program Plan for FY14. The Board recommends the engagement of a user group for feedback on changes to the web site.
16. The JRFB concurred that the three criteria appropriate for the transfer of proposals for riserless operations to the Chikyu are:
  - 1) Those beyond JR capability (e.g., ultra-deep water)
  - 2) Operations in regions where the *JR* will not be for many years
  - 3) Operations when *Chikyu* is *enroute* to or from, from example, industry operations.
17. The JRFB accepts the revised Proposal Submission Guidelines with the revisions discussed.
18. The JRFB approves the following revised documents:
  - IODP Proposal Confidentiality Policy
  - IODP Site Survey Confidentiality Policy

- IODP Science Evaluation Panel: Guidelines and Rationale for Site Characterization Data.
19. The JRFB accepts the recommendations of the USSSP for two new members of the Board for three-year terms starting October 1, 2013. The JRFB thanks Gabe Filippelli and Akira Ishiwitari for their service and contributions to the early days of the JRFB.

## **Action Items**

1. *Tom Janecek will send the diagram around to get input on modifications and/or design. He will work with the Science Support Office and appropriate outside parties to develop illustrations that will show proposal flow, information flow, and money flow in a useful and understandable way.*
2. *The Science Support Office will determine whether links to previous original site survey data can be created, and investigate the best way to obtain permission for release of such data.*
3. *Tom Janecek will communicate with the PMOs what their panel membership allocation is prior to the start of the new program. It will be critical to have more nominations than slots if the panels are to achieve a balanced distribution of expertise.*
4. *Mitch Malone will revise the wording as discussed. The ECORD FB and the CIB will use the document as a basis for development of their own standard measurements policy. The JRFB will review the document every 2-3 years.*
5. *R. Murray (lead), K. Becker, Jamie Allan and Dave Goldberg will revise the Third Party Tools document for review at the next JRFB meeting.*
6. *The Facility Board Chairs will prepare a letter to the core curators requesting the development of a common implementation plan for core curation and sampling.*
7. *David Divins (lead), Nobu Eguchi, Wataru Azuma, Jamie Allan, Keir Becker and Ursula Röhl will revise the Sample, Data and Obligations Policy by mid-October for circulation to the JRFB and other Facility Boards.*
8. *Susan Humphris will follow up with letters providing additional feedback to those proponents who have responded.*
9. *Susan Humphris will work with Nobu Eguchi to build a proposal flow diagram for all platforms from the basis of the Chikyu diagram already developed.*
10. *The Science Support Office will update the Table of Proposal requirements to coordinate with the revised Proposal Submission Guidelines.*
11. *The JRFB Chair will pass the suggestion of a brochure re: the IODP proposal process on to the IODP Forum.*

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Meeting:  
26 – 27 August 2013  
Washington, DC USA**

*JOIDES Resolution Facility Board – JRFB*

---

James Allan	National Science Foundation, USA
Gilbert Camoin	European Management Agency, CEREGE, France
David Divins	US Implementing Organization, Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Neville Exon	Australian IODP Secretariat, The Australian National University, Australia
Gabe Filippelli	Indiana University, Purdue University Indiana, USA
Susan Humphris, Chair	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
Akira Ishiwatari	Tohoku University, Japan
Gil Young Kim	Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources (KIGAM), Republic of Korea
Heiko Palike	University of Bremen, Germany
Terry Quinn	University of Texas, Institute for Geophysics, USA
Marcio da Castro Silva Filho	Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel (CAPES), Brazil

*Liaisons, Guests, and Observers*

---

Dick Kroon	PEP Chair, The University of Edinburgh, UK
Barry Katz	EPSP Chair, Chevron Corporation, Houston, TX, USA
Dave Mallinson	SCP Vice Chair, East Carolina University, USA
Keir Becker	IODP Forum Chair, University of Miami, USA
Karsten Gohl	ECORD Facility Board Chair, AWI-Bremerhaven, Germany
Holly Given	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Rodey Batiza	National Science Foundation, USA
Thomas Janecek	National Science Foundation, USA
Jim Beard	National Science Foundation, USA
Meagan Thompson	National Science Foundation, USA
Idelazil Talhavini	Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel (CAPES), Brazil
Sidney Mello	Universidade Federal Fluminense
Yuzuru Kimura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Brad Clement	US Implementing Organization, Texas A&M University, USA
Mitch Malone	US Implementing Organization, Texas A&M University, USA
Dave Goldberg	US Implementing Organization, Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Nobu Eguchi	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Kiyoshi Suyehiro	IODP Management International, Inc., Japan
Yoshi Kawamura	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Jeff Schuffert	US Science Support Program (USSSP), Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Rita Bauer	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Charna Meth	US Science Support Program (USSSP), Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Shouting Tuo	IODP-China Office, Tongji University, China
Matthew Wright	Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Emido Cantidio	Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel (CAPES), Brazil

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board Meeting:  
26-27 August 2013  
Washington, DC USA**

**Monday**

**26 August 2013**

**09:00-18:00**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Chair Susan Humphris welcomed the group and reviewed the needs for this meeting. She then asked for introductions around the room of all Members, Liaisons, and Observers.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Susan Humphris reviewed the agenda. She noted that during consideration of the JR Facility FY14 Annual Program Plan (Item 13 on the Agenda), the JRFB must decide upon ground rules for dealing with commercial work requests. In particular, the group needs to discuss one specific case that will potentially influence the FY14 APP.

Additional items added:

- Discussion of the timing of the IODP forum meetings
- Update by David Conover (NSF's Division of Ocean Sciences Director) on the status of the approval of the new IODP program
- Discussion of one specific commercial work request that could influence the FY14 Annual Program Plan, and development of a plan to deal with these in the future

**Consensus 1**

**The JRFB approves the Agenda with the changes discussed.**

**3. Approval of March 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes**

Susan Humphris asked if the level of detail in the Minutes is sufficient? Consensus is that the minutes read well and included an appropriate level of information.

**Consensus 2**

**The JRFB approves the March 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.**

**4. Architecture of the new IODP**

Tom Janecek displayed and described a diagram that shows the flow of advice/work and the flow of funds. Discussion of how best to depict the inter-relationships included:

- Usefulness of multiple and/or separate diagrams to show proposal flow, information flow, and money flow for use outside of IODP
- Inclusion of an image of the cover of the Science Plan in the vicinity of the Forum to show that they are the custodians of this plan
- An indication that all parties contribute to the Forum
- Illustration of communication flow of EPSP and their reporting relationship.

**Action Item 1**

*Tom Janecek will send the diagram around to get input on modifications and/or design. He will work with the Science Support Office and appropriate outside parties to develop illustrations that will show proposal flow, information flow, and money flow in a useful and understandable way.*

## 5. JR Facility Board Terms of Reference

### **Consensus 3**

The revised JR Facility Board Terms of Reference are approved with the following changes:

- The JRFB may go outside of the Facility Board to select a Chair should they deem it appropriate.
- The U.S. Science Support Program will conduct an open nomination/application process for scientific representatives on the JRFB, and recommend new members to the JRFB for its approval.

The Facility Board Chairs agreed that an appropriate mechanism for Facility Board interactions is to have the Chairs of each Facility Board (or an alternate if necessary) attend all Facility Board meetings.

## 6. Advisory Panels

### **A Terms of Reference: EPSP**

The Board reviewed the revisions to the EPSP Terms of Reference. Humphris noted that the CIB plans to use EPSP for riserless drilling proposals, but that riser drilling proposals would go straight to the *Chikyu* safety panel for evaluation. When EPSP is reviewing a *Chikyu* riserless drilling proposal, a Japanese representative will be sent to the meeting. ECORD plans to use EPSP.

### **Consensus 4**

The JRFB approves the revised EPSP Terms of Reference with no changes.

### **B SCP/PEP Interactions**

- **Reports from Recent PEP & SCP meetings**

#### ***PROPOSAL EVALUATION PANEL (PEP) Meeting Report***

Dick Kroon reviewed the status of each proposal they had reviewed. There was concern that seven of nine pre-proposals were deactivated: either the instructions for pre-proposals are flawed, or expectations of the level of detail are too great. There was also a concern that the panel has transferred the churning of proposals to the pre-proposal stage rather than multiple revisions of full proposals. Dick Kroon stated that while “deactivation” is a poor word, the panel notes if deactivation is “with encouragement” or “without”. In response to a question as to why some pre-proposals continue to be “encouraged” even after multiple deactivations, Kroon responded that some of the watchdogs are still interested in these proposals.

Jamie Allan stated that the panel is training themselves and the community to not use the review system for fleshing out proposals and he noted that this process make take a few cycles to come into effect. He also noted that proposal review needs to be aware of and consider potential environmental issues – the recommendation was made to modify the proposal sheet to ensure that proponents consider whether there is environmental mitigation to plan for.

#### ***SITE CHARACTERIZATION PANEL (SCP) Meeting Report***

Dave Mallinson summarized the site survey status of proposals reviewed at the SCP meeting.

Jamie Allan pointed out the difficulty some proponents were having accessing proprietary data submitted for an earlier expedition to the same location.

The EPSP Chair noted that the number of sites proposed is usually not sufficient. There need to be alternate sites: ideally double the number of sites proposed. The advisory panels need to get that message to proponents.

### **Action Item 2**

*The Science Support Office will determine whether links to previous original site survey data can be created, and investigate the best way to obtain permission for release of such data.*

#### ○ **Recommendation on SCP/PEP Interactions**

Dick Kroon presented the PEP and SCP's arguments supporting their proposal to merge into one Science Evaluation Panel. They believe the key is having watchdogs from PEP and SCP assigned to each proposal, and communicating with one review letter and one set of recommendations to the proponents. The Panels also recommended initially keeping all existing members, but a reduction in membership could be considered once they see how a merged panel will work.

Advantages to the merger are:

- One meeting instead of two relieves the schedules and budgets of those who normally attended both meetings and reduces the planning efforts of the Science Support Office.
- The eventual reduction of panel size (if implemented) might ease increasing financial pressures.
- Proponents will receive one comprehensive and complete list of what they must do in their resubmittals.
- Having Co-chairs for the SEP will permit a "spread" of responsibilities across issues and would better assure one or both can attend other meetings.
- All supporting data will be considered at the same time, producing a more coherent assessment of the proposals, and resulting in better award decisions.
- Panel interaction will improve each sides understanding of how the other side works, which will also result in better decisions.

Disadvantages to the merger are:

- The number of proposals will be large (at first), as the two groups are not in sync.
- The merged panel will have 54 members, which makes reaching consensus difficult and selecting a reasonable meeting time and location critical.
- The merged panel, if reduced in size, could decrease or marginalize the impact of the scientific community.
- Proposal submittal/review and site survey data submittal/review are not in sync and getting them in sync could prove difficult.

Discussion centered around the need to develop a common submission process for proposals *and* supporting data because a full examination of the proposal cannot happen until critical SSD are in the databank. The SSO has funding to implement the development of such a process and the Panels are working toward this with revisions to their guidelines.

### **Consensus 5**

**The JRFB approves the merger of the SCP and PEP into a single review team (the Science Evaluation Panel). The SEP will initially keep all existing members and it will meet twice a year.**

#### ○ **SEP Terms of Reference**

The JRFB reviewed the draft SEP Terms of Reference and recommended that they be revised to reflect that the PMOs appoint or recommend members and the JRFB approves their recommendations. If alternate members are necessary, the JRFB Chair should be notified of the recommended alternate, but JRFB does not need to approve the alternate.

### **Consensus 6**

**The JRFB approves the SEP Terms of Reference with the changes discussed above.**

### **Action Item 3**

*Tom Janecek will communicate with the PMOs what their panel membership allocation is prior to the start of the new program. It will be critical to have more nominations than slots if the panels are to achieve a balanced distribution of expertise.*

### **C Chikyu IODP Board Request**

#### **Consensus 7**

**The JRFB welcomes the CIB in using JRF Advisory Panels.**

## **7. JR Facility Conflict of Interest Policy**

### **Consensus 8**

**The JRFB approves the revised JR Facility Conflict of Interest Policy.**

## **8. Procedures & Guidelines for JR Expeditions**

### **A Staffing Procedures Document**

Mitch Malone summarized the revisions and the general policy for the Board.

#### **Consensus 9**

**The JRFB approves the JR Staffing Procedures document.**

### **B Standard Measurements: Shipboard & Logging**

Mitch Malone provided a quick summary of the changes/simplifications made to this document. He noted that scientists (who are not routinely scheduled for expeditions) perform the microbiological cell counting and contamination testing so these measurements cannot be elevated to “routine” at this time. Heiko Palike recommended that the JRFB review the document every two years. Susan Humphris stated that a group of microbiologist is working to draft procedures for contamination and preservation that could be applied across platforms.

Malone stated that major deviations should be identified in the proposal or prospectus. The Facility Operator could address deviations from the policy (if it is an “at sea” decision) and, for other decisions, the JRFB Chair, the SEP chair, or the co-chief scientists/IO responsible could address the deviations.

Susan Humphris asked if this list of standard measurements was applicable for the other platforms? Karsten Gohl suggested that the ECORD Board will have a separate but similar document, with some modifications and flexibility. Nobu Eguchi stated that the CIB will develop its own based on this document. These documents should have as much commonality as is feasible.

### **Action Item 4**

*Mitch Malone will revise the wording as discussed. The ECORD FB and the CIB will use the document as a basis for development of their own standard measurements policy. The JRFB will review the document every 2-3 years.*

### **C Third Party Tools Guidelines**

This document needs more work. In particular, it needs to address how observatory data and samples will be handled; e.g., what is the moratorium, where are the data archived, are samples from observatories curated by an operator facility? In addition, the document doesn't mention insurance (or lack thereof), which is usually the responsibility of the PI. The document is also silent on whether a "development" tool or instrument is permitted to stay in "development" (indefinitely) or is the natural procedure to develop the instrument for certification.

#### **Action Item 5**

*R. Murray (lead), K. Becker, Jamie Allan and Dave Goldberg will revise the Third Party Tools document for review at the next JRFB meeting.*

Heiko Palike raised the issue of available software for determining borehole depth scales. The Correlator tools are used in nearly every expedition to aid the core recovery process via visualization and interaction, but there are difficulties with update software in getting data into and out of the database. If interpretation is one place where each shipboard party wants to use a different tool, the JRFB could provide hard specifications stating what must be gathered and let the scientists choose what to use. Mitch Malone indicated that he is working on a document that will address this problem and there should be a draft before the next meeting.

#### **D EPSP Safety Review Guidelines**

Barry Katz provided a review of the revised Safety Review Guidelines document. Dave Mallinson asked that the text be changed from "raw (digital data), SEGY *and/or* data image format" to just "*and*". The proponents should know they must have all data formats.

#### **Consensus 10**

**The JRFB approves the EPSP Safety Review Guidelines document with minor revisions.**

### **9. IODP Environmental Principles**

Susan Humphris noted that this is a program-wide document that has been reviewed by both the ECORD Facility Board and the CIB.

#### **Consensus 11**

**The JRFB accepts the revised IODP Environmental Principles document.**

Neville Exon pointed out that the "green" movement is very strong in New Zealand and he asked if IODP might want to generate some PR to show that the program is doing everything possible to not harm the marine environment. The SSO will think about this when working on the website: perhaps a statement for placement with other core values.

### **10. Core Curation**

Brad Clement noted the complexity of curation as the *JR* cores are housed at three repositories, and ideally the curation processes should be consistent at each location, although each repository will no doubt have some differences in procedures (e.g., microbiology samples). Jamie Allan noted that another critical aspect of the policy is who pays for shipping (the users)?

Susan Humphris indicated the plan is for the Facility Board Chairs to request that the curators of the three repositories provide a common implementation plan for core curation and sampling once the sample policy is revised. Jamie Allan requested a draft copy to provide input.



### **Action Item 6**

*The Facility Board Chairs will prepare a letter to the core curators requesting the development of a common implementation plan for core curation and sampling.*

## **11. IODP Sample, Data and Obligations Policy**

David Divins presented his major changes to the document, which included removing the curatorial policy (appendix 4). He suggested that some of the information be presented as an FAQ document because the standard text is too dry. Jamie Allan reiterated that post-expedition data is covered by the data policies of the agencies providing the funding for the work. There is still more work to be done on this document before the curators can be asked to develop an implementation plan.

### **Action Item 7**

*David Divins (lead), Nobu Eguchi, Wataru Azuma, Jamie Allan, Keir Becker and Ursula Röhl will revise the Sample, Data and Obligations Policy by mid-October for circulation to the JRFB and other Facility Boards.*

<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>27 August 2013</b>	<b>8:30 – 18:00</b>
----------------	-----------------------	---------------------

## **12. Update on Renewal of IODP**

David Conover gave a short presentation and indicated that a plan would be presented to the NSB in November.

Heiko Palike asked David Conover to state NSF's view of leveraging. Would leveraging continue to be part of the JR's operations or would commercial use funds be used to cover shortfalls in the program? David Mallinson added that the importance of the contributions of international partners cannot be overemphasized because their support of operations is based on an expectation of expeditions. David Conover stated that NSF will strive to strike the right balance between what is reinvested in the program and what they use to reduce costs. He stressed that IODP's ability to leverage and implementation of leveraging (through both members (contributions and CPPs) and commercial use) will be vital in making the case to the NSB to continue the program.

David Conover stated that he anticipates the concern of the science community (in the decadal survey) regarding the imbalance in NSF's investments in facilities vs. science. He stated that NSF is not prescribing what the ratio ought to be, but will analyze the entire facility portfolio. He stressed that NSF is reviewing all OCE programs, and the OCE's actions to reduce facility costs include no increase in the overall number of research vessels, and forcing the reduction of the OOI's O&M costs to \$55M (from \$70M). With these harsh budget realities, the IODP's ability to leverage is a powerful case to make before the National Science Board.

Marcio da Castro Silva Filho (Brazil), Neville Exon (Australia/New Zealand), Shouting Tuo (China), and Gilbert Camoin (ECORD) expressed their support of ocean drilling and their concerns regarding NSF's budget issues, the potential impact on the cruise schedule, and their countries' willingness to continue funding the program if the number of expeditions is decreased. David Conover stated that NSF's

message to the scientific communities of IODP's international members is that NSF recognizes the value of scientific ocean drilling and the unique role of the *JR*. NSF is looking for solutions to the budget crisis and they will find one that will both please and displease all parties. In the meantime, NSF will continue funding the *JR* (at some level) at least until they get the results of the decadal survey.

Terry Quinn asked if NSF knows their budgetary constraints? David Conover stated that NSF has been told to plan for no additional resources beyond current levels (with corrections for year-to-year inflation). NSF is permitted to suggest new initiatives that would require more money, but their budget must prioritize these initiatives.

David Conover concluded by saying that he wasn't aware of any previous point in history where funding uncertainty was at a higher level than now. This means that every program must be conservative in their planning.

### **13. Overview/Discussion of JR Facility FY'14 Annual Program Plan**

David Divins presented an overview of the USIO (US Implementing Organization) Facility Annual Program Plan, the process for developing the program plan, and some areas of interest in the plan.

Brad Clement provided background and pricing information regarding the potential purchase of a cryogenic magnetometer. Tom Janecek pointed out that FY14 is an extension year, and there is a possibility of no operations and closeout after that, so he would have difficulty justifying the purchase of new equipment. Tom also stated that the standard justifications for new equipment have been safety first, then measurements for operational decisions, and finally to capture ephemeral properties. While the Board may have a natural desire to augment shipboard capabilities, in this time of austerity, he suggested the Board keep to these justifications. Terry Quinn stated that the measurements provided by the magnetometer are fundamental to the science of the *JR*. Jamie Allan stated that, while we may have to cut the 2014 budget, we cannot cut operations (and the cost of the replacement magnetometer was lower than expected) so he supported the purchase. Brad Clement and David Divins also noted that our guidance from NSF has been to plan as if the program will continue.

#### ***Consensus 12***

**Recognizing the fundamental importance of the cryogenic magnetometer to the science of the *JR*, the JRFB recommends that a new instrument be ordered as soon as possible.**

Susan Humphris asked, if the South China Sea (SCS) CPP expedition is added, how would the budget be impacted (a Complimentary Project Proposal (CPP))? Jamie Allan replied that the SCS expedition adds \$2.3 million to the budget. Neville Exon asked whether there would be a shortfall of ~\$4M if the IBM expeditions go and the SCS CPP doesn't? Jamie Allan confirmed that the cashflow to NSF would be reduced by \$4M from its international partners and stated that, in that scenario, NSF would have to contribute more, or cut the current budget.

#### ***Consensus 13***

**The JRFB approves the *JR* Facility FY'14 Annual Program Plan with no changes, and hopefully with the inclusion of the South China Sea CPP.**

*Commercial work opportunity in 2014* – David Divins reminded the Board that the USIO can pursue commercial work if NSF has no need of the vessel. At this point, the 2014 expeditions are staffed, so including the potential commercial work would seriously disrupt schedules. Brad Clement stated that the client will issue an RFP in October and if the USIO submitted a proposal, they would have a lead-time of 9 months or less. The timing for the commercial work couldn't possibly be worse. Jamie Allan agreed

that the typical non-IODP operation 4-month window is the ideal time to contract commercial work. This particular commercial opportunity is really tough because of the short lead-time and the need for schedule changes that would likely not be acceptable to the science community.

Dave Goldberg reminded the Board that last summer's commercial work experienced the uncertainty at the end of the commercial contract, which could/would impact the net benefit in terms of dollars. Jamie Allan asked if the USIO could propose on the commercial work, while keeping the current expedition schedule in place in case the proposal failed? David Divins said that the USIO would want NSF approval to do that. He indicated that the USIO doesn't need to change the schedule today, but they don't want to prepare the RFP if NSF decides to not change the schedule. Jamie Allan acknowledged that this would also impart a state of uncertainty in the budget.

#### **Consensus 14**

**The JRFB recommends that the USIO/NSF *not* pursue the potential commercial work opportunity in 2014.**

*Commercial work guidelines* – Susan Humphris asked for input regarding the general mechanism and guidelines for determining if commercial opportunities are appropriate to pursue. David Divins stressed that the guidelines should permit the USIO/NSF to keep their credibility with industry as well as the science community. After discussion, the following guidelines were established:

- Once the Annual Program Plan is approved and the budget determined, the schedule cannot be disrupted significantly to incorporate commercial work
- There needs to be some flexibility to allow short (1-3 week) commercial opportunities
- Leveraging rather than cost avoidance is critical in accepting commercial work – the science program must benefit.

### **14. Overview/Discussion of Science Support Office Annual Program Plan**

Holly Given presented a summary of the SSO APP. She recommended the development and use of an *ad hoc* web site users group to provide feedback from the community point of view. She recommended that the group include the Forum Chair, a JRFB rep, an Operations rep, and the SEP Chairs.

Jamie Allan stated that NSF normally takes longer to make a new award for a Cooperative Agreement, but that this one was rushed. He thanked Kiyoshi Suyehiro and Holly Given for working hard to seamlessly transition the SSO under difficult circumstances. He expressed his gratitude for the efforts of Kiyoshi, Holly and their staffs.

#### **Consensus 15**

**The JRFB approves the SSO Annual Program Plan for FY14. The Board recommends the engagement of a user group for feedback on changes to the web site.**

### **15. Update on Proposal Action Items**

The JRFB discussed several proposals for which the Board had requested additional information. Such information has been received for proposal 505 and 693-APL (Wheat, Fryer) and proposal 781 (Saffer). These were reviewed in order to provide feedback to the proponents.

#### **Action Item 8**

*Susan Humphris will follow up with letters providing additional feedback to those proponents who have responded.*

### **16. Chikyu Drilling of Riserless Legs**

Susan Humphris informed the JRFB that at the CIB meeting, three criteria were developed in consideration of transferring proposals written for riserless drilling on the JR to riserless drilling on the Chikyu:

- 1) Those beyond JR capability (e.g., ultra-deep water)
- 2) Operations in regions where the JR will not be for many years
- 3) Operations when *Chikyu* is *enroute* to or from, from example, industry operations

Because the platforms are very different (*Chikyu* can be slow with many holes, but faster with one deep hole), each transferred proposal would require fundamental re-examination for the new platform, especially as most proposals are written with a specific platform in mind. Transfer of any proposals should be considered at the SEA and JRFB level when looking at schedules, but this situation is likely to occur only occasionally.

#### **Consensus 16**

**The JRFB concurred that the three criteria appropriate for the transfer of proposals for riserless operations to the Chikyu are:**

- 4) Those beyond JR capability (e.g., ultra-deep water)
- 5) Operations in regions where the JR will not be for many years
- 6) Operations when *Chikyu* is *enroute* to or from, from example, industry operations.

### **17. Proposal Submission Guidelines**

The many documents related to proposal submission have been revised and simplified by a small sub-group, and further revised after the CIB meeting to reflect the *Chikyu* proposal process. Because the Oct. 1 call for proposals is published, the revised document has been posted on the web site for proponent use in this upcoming cycle. Further suggested revisions include:

- Update the FAQ with better questions or remove it
- Extend the statement about encouraging proponents to contact the IO in advance of proposal submission to include all platforms
- Update the Table of Requirements currently posted on the website
- Create a flow diagram of the proposal process and include turnaround times for each stage

#### **Consensus 17**

**The JRFB accepts the revised Proposal Submission Guidelines with the revisions described above.**

#### **Action Item 9**

*Susan Humphris will work with Nobu Eguchi to build a proposal flow diagram for all platforms from the basis of the Chikyu diagram already developed.*

#### **Action Item 10**

*The Science Support Office will update the Table of Proposal requirements to coordinate with the revised Proposal Submission Guidelines.*

Gilbert Camoin requested a summary of this document in a leaflet or handout style for use at meetings and conferences. There is no overarching entity to fund such documents, but it needs to happen through the good will of member organizations. Tom Janecek confirmed that a champion will have to bring a proposal to the Facility Boards and the FBs will have to determine if they want to support such an effort. Holly Given stated that she and her team, because they are not full time as the SSO, would have the time, but funds would need to be found. The IODP Forum could be another potential organization to do this.

### **Action Item 11**

The JRFB Chair will pass the suggestion of a brochure re: the IODP proposal process on to the IODP Forum.

## **18. JOIDES Resolution Facility Policies**

### **Consensus 18**

The JRFB approves the following revised documents:

- IODP Proposal Confidentiality Policy
- IODP Site Survey Confidentiality Policy
- IODP Science Evaluation Panel: Guidelines and Rationale for Site Characterization Data.

## **19. Membership Rotation and Approval of new Members**

Susan Humphris noted that this was the last meeting for Gabe Filippelli and Akira Ishiwatari, and she thanked both for the contributions.

The USSSP ran an application process to provide recommendations for replacements, and recommended Andrew Roberts and Rio Anma. While these recommendations change the international balance of the Board, they re-emphasize the importance of the international partners.

The lack of women on the JRFB was noted, and the JRFB asked to please think of women who could serve on this Board.

### **Consensus 19**

**The JRFB accepts the recommendations of the USSSP for two new members of the Board for three-year terms starting October 1, 2013. The JRFB thanks Gabe Filippelli and Akira Ishiwatari for their service and contributions to the early days of the JRFB.**

## **21. Other Business and Next JRFB Meeting**

The next meeting of the JRFB is schedule for 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of April 2014 in Washington DC.

### *Other business –*

- 1) The issue of approval of the second post cruise meeting now that IODP-MI will no longer exist was brought up. Jamie Allan indicated it is the responsibility of the science party to do that planning and there is no centralized funding for that, although there is funding through individual partners. It is up to the party to meet wherever they want to meet, but a fallback position would be at College Station.
- 2) We need to move ahead on planning the FY'15 expeditions. All the PMOs have requests for nominations of co-Chiefs and staffing needs to begin. It is now necessary to post the schedule on the web and start the process of putting an ad in EOS with the caveat that the expeditions are pending funding.
- 3) Nobu Eguchi will talk with CIB members regarding rescheduling the CIB meeting so that the ECORD Facility Board and the CIB meeting are not in consecutive weeks.