

Program Member Office (PMO) Meeting Minutes

Búzios, Brazil
23 September, 2016

Meeting Attendees

Jamie Allan	NSF
Richard Arculus	ANZIC
Jamie Austin	IODP Forum
Nathan Bangs	UT Austin (US)
Brijesh Bansal	Ministry of Earth Sciences, India
Keir Becker	University of Miami (US)
Jan Behrmann	ESSAC
Carl Brenner	USSSP, Meeting Chair
Janaina de Cássia Carvalho	CAPES
Beth Christensen	USAC
Brad Clement	JRSO
Nobu Eguchi	CDEX
Magnus Friberg	ECORD Council
Robert Gatliff	ESO
Cleverson Guizan-Silva	UFF
Luigi Jovane	CAPES-IODP
Gil Young Kim	KIGAM
Gaku Kimora	J-DESC
Adam Klaus	JRSO
Anthony Koppers	JRFB
Anthony Morris	University of Plymouth (UK)
Hiroshi Nishi	J-DESC
Eisho Sato	MEXT
Shouting Tuo	IODP-China
Helenice Vital	CAPES-IODP

Agenda

Friday

23 September 2016

0900 - ?

- I. (Re-)introductions and agenda approval

- II. Presentations by each PMO of their activities and practices
 - A. Office personnel
 - B. Shipboard staffing & interactions with platform operators
 - 1. Application design and staffing criteria
 - 2. Webinar planning
 - 3. Format for presenting nominations to platform operators
 - 4. Increasing early career scientist participation
 - C. Post-cruise research funding (if applicable)
 - D. Workshop and short course communication and support (if applicable)
 - E. Pre-drilling activities (if applicable)
 - F. Panel nominations and travel support
 - 1. Facility boards
 - 2. SEP, EPSP
 - G. Advisory bodies to PMOs
 - H. Education & outreach – overview of activities

- III. Policies for migration of scientists among PMOs

- IV. Collaborations on E&O activities
 - A. Collaboration among PMOs
 - B. Collaboration with other programs (e.g., ICDP)

- V. Other business

I. (Re-)introductions and agenda approval

C. Brenner called the meeting to order, thanking the hosts from Brazil and all the attendees. He noted a change in agenda and asked A. Klaus of the JRSO to make the initial presentation because the JR staffing statistics would provide context for the meeting.

A. Klaus introduced his role in charge of staffing for *JOIDES Resolution* expeditions. He presented a summary of scientific participants in JR Expeditions 349-368 (16 expeditions total). He noted first that each IODP entity has its own way of counting participation, that the list includes 4 CPPs, and that he generally counts co-chief scientists but not staff scientists. The tally for the 16 expeditions included: 993 applicants, 475 scientists sailed (452 individuals because 23 sailed twice), 24 member countries represented, 100 graduate students (21%), 141 women (30%), 35 women grad students, 230 institutions. Allan noted that the proportion of women was somewhat higher in the first IODP. Austin noted that the percentage of graduate students has been about 20% since the beginning of ODP.

Klaus showed lists of the PMOs and countries represented, and then the quotas among PMOs, noting a change in 2015 (US up by 2, Japan down by 1, Brazil down by 1). He then presented a chart showing numbers of applicants, quotas, and actual participants by PMO, noting that the actual participants have been close to the quotas. He showed application success rate by PMO, which tends to be lower in the bigger members (US and ESSAC) and higher in the smaller members. Allan noted that in the past the smaller members tended to nominate only their quota number with little range in expertise, complicating the process of staffing a well-rounded scientific party. He recommended that each PMO nominate a greater number of scientists than its normal quota. Klaus agreed and noted the smaller PMOs could further prioritize their nominations. He presented charts illustrating numbers and percentages of graduate students by PMO. Although the number of graduate students from IODP-China number appeared low, Klaus noted IODP-China is sailing many early career post-PhD scientists.

He then presented a plot of total number of scientists per expedition, which ranged from 26-32, and explained that this can vary for a range of reasons. For context, the average was about 25 in ODP. Arculus commented that there is flexibility to accommodate factors like the 2015 expansion of the US participation without affecting allocations for other member countries. Klaus noted that there can be many reasons that additional berths are needed. Allan noted some debate as to whether the total size of the scientific party is too large and should be reduced in the future phase of IODP, but now he is less concerned because Klaus had noted little change in scientific party functionality between ODP and the current phase of IODP.

Koppers noted some issues in certain expeditions with focused priorities and a greater proportion of scientific party with similar expertise. Morris noted some potential issues if the party includes only 1-2 scientists in a given lab because of co-chief scientist pressures to mold the overall balance, but Klaus indicated he generally pushes for a greater number to avoid any problems in each lab. Klaus then showed plots of participants by country and co-chief scientists by PMO. Allan noted that the memoranda for the next phase of IODP will include co-chief scientists as members of scientific party in the quotas negotiated with each PMO, as opposed to the current memoranda that counts co-chief scientists separately. Clement noted that the PMOs should realize that the increase in number of annual JR expeditions from 4 to 5 will entail additional

financial commitments from each PMO in terms of supporting more participants annually. Allan emphasized the intent to including co-chief scientists among the scientific party quotas to be negotiated for the next phase of IODP. In response to a question from Eguchi, he noted this would not affect the berth exchange agreement between Japan and US.

Brenner suggested one actionable item from the discussion: that the smaller PMOs nominate more than their quota of scientists for each expedition and prioritize their selections.

Consensus 1609-1: Each IODP PMO should work to nominate a greater number of participants for each IODP expedition than just their quota as defined in IODP memoranda.

II. Presentations by each PMO of their activities and practices

R. Arculus presented for ANZIC, showing first the PMO leadership in both Australia and New Zealand. He noted there is a governing council headed by Dr. Geoff Garrett through 2016, with the new chair to be Prof. Ian Poiner. In response to a question from Brenner, Arculus noted the governing council includes about ten people. He then described the functions of the ANZIC Science Committee, which assists in proposal development, conducts workshops, selects nominees for scientific parties, reviews post-expedition science proposals, and conducts special educational activities related to IODP. He noted that ANZIC post-expedition funding is typically < \$30K (US) per participant and closed by noting that Agenda Item III is significant to ANZIC.

J. de Cássia Carvalho and L Jovane presented for Brazil. Carvalho described the history of CAPES since it was created in 1951 with a goal of fostering graduate education in Brazil across all disciplines. She described the six main tasks of the Directory of Programs and Scholarships (DPS) and reviewed the history and rationale for Brazil to join IODP by becoming a JR partner in 2013 with CAPES as signatory of the memorandum with NSF. There are two official IODP committees: a scientific committee (comprising four researchers) and an executive committee (comprising two civil servants from CAPES and two researchers). Both committees define the criteria for the selection of candidates for expeditions and function as advisory bodies to Brazilian PMO. She reviewed statistics related to Brazilian participation in IODP expeditions (17 so far) and financial support for these participants.

L. Jovane presented Brazilian interest in seven specific IODP proposals: Amazon Fan, Brazilian Equatorial Margin tectonics (T-BEM), paleoceanography BEM (P-BEM), Pernambuco Cretaceous Atlantic opening, Neogene BEM (N-BEM), Sao Paola Plateau, and Rio Grande Rise. He summarized their objectives and status within the IODP proposal evaluation process. He also summarized status of the associated site survey data, some of which are confidential industry/navy data, including 3-D seismic at certain sites. He described the plans for a 2017 graduate student summer school co-funded by CAPES, ECORD, and NSF to define additional site survey activities including multibeam mapping. Jovane then briefly summarized Brazilian oceanographic ship capabilities and funding mechanisms.

Brenner asked if the Brazilian IODP PMO could provide a list of contacts and specific responsibilities. *[Update: Brazil is currently in the process of issuing a call for proposals to establish an IODP Office.]*

M. Friberg and J. Behrmann presented for ECORD and ESSAC. Friberg started by summarizing

the overall structure of the European participation in IODP, including the ECORD Council, ECORD Management Agency (EMA), ESSAC, and ECORD Science Operator (ESO). Behrmann then described how ESSAC makes staffing nominations. The process within ECORD is complicated because of internal quotas among the ~17 ECORD partner countries that defined by their levels of contribution to ECORD. He noted that some ECORD countries are over their participation quotas and others under their quotas for specific reasons. He also pointed out that there are 17 different national IODP structures within ECORD, and they handle aspects like site survey funding, salary support for shipboard scientists, and post-expedition funding in individual ways. Behrmann described the process within Germany, and A. Morris described the process within UK.

Allan asked whether shipboard participants from any IODP country ever sail without salary support. Behrmann noted that salaries are paid by the scientists' institutions but the ESSAC teacher at sea program does not provide salary support.

S. Tuo summarized Chinese participation in the 2014-2017 IODP expeditions. Applications typically range from 3 to 12 for typical JR expedition, with 1-3 actual Chinese participants. For the three Chinese CPP expeditions, applications are much higher and actual Chinese participants average about 10. A total of 73 Chinese scientists from 24 institutions have sailed in IODP-2 expeditions, contrasting with 36 shipboard participants in all of IODP-1. Tuo described the criteria used by IODP-China in evaluating Chinese applicants. He noted that IODP-China has no specific budget for salaries of shipboard scientists or post-expedition science. Salary support is provided by each participant's institution and participants must seek other funding for post-expedition research.

B. Bansal showed the structure and personnel associated with IODP-India, which involves 10 institutions within India associated with three different ministries. He showed flowcharts for shipboard staffing coordinated by the IODP-India office in Goa and the proposal-driven process for post-expedition research funding. He noted that post-expedition research grants typically range from \$US30–100K. He summarized the roles of IODP-India as PMO, and the structure of advisory bodies that oversee the office. He quickly reviewed statistics related to the 38 Indian participants from 7 different types of institutions in IODP-1 and IODP-2 to date. He closed by noting he feels that IODP activities are broadly supported within India, and that one goal is to increase graduate student participation. In response to a question, he confirmed that an Indian scientist from any institution could apply to participate. Arculus noted that this contrasted with the situation in Australia, which limits participation only to scientists from institutions that are financial contributors to the Australian IODP membership.

H. Nishi presented the organizational structure of Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC) which involves 53 institutions or companies and includes an IODP section and an ICDP section. He presented the structure of JAMSTEC and CDEX, and then explained the relationship between J-DESC (as PMO) and JAMSTEC research divisions, and how financial support is provided for seven different aspects of participation by Japanese scientists in IODP. He presented the names of the J-DESC PMO staff, and described the application process for Japanese scientists to participate in IODP. He noted that nominations of potential Japanese participants are prioritized when provided to the platform operators. He reviewed statistics of Japanese applicants, highlighting a strong record in engaging Master's and PhD students, and described modest opportunities for post-cruise funding support for younger participants.

Nishi noted that the PMO has no travel support for workshops currently, except limited support for proposal planning activities. He described how travel support is provided for panel members. He noted there are no specific advisory bodies for J-DESC but JAMSTEC has one. In response to a question from H. Given, he noted that scientists from any Japanese institution can participate in IODP.

G.Y. Kim described the organization and structure of the Korea-IODP office hosted at KIGAM. He noted that Korean IODP participation is open to all Korean scientists; to date there have been 15 from KIGAM, 20 from other institutions. He noted that K-IODP supports post-expedition research at levels up to \$US 35K.

For USSSP, C. Brenner presented the names and functions of the staff members and described the range of USSSP activities. He showed the distribution of the USSSP budget, noting that the largest percentage goes to expedition science support, including salary support for US shipboard scientists, post-expedition research awards and scientist travel costs. He then described the USSSP staffing nomination procedures, which involve the use of a web portal for applications. He asked if there should be application uniformity across PMO, and the responses from A. Klaus and R. Gatliff indicated there is sufficient convergence from the perspective of platform operators. He described the role of the USSAC staffing subcommittee and noted that nominations are forwarded to operators with three levels of priority. He described the level of salary support provided to US shipboard participants (1.5 x time at sea, typically a total of 3 months) and co-chief scientists (8 months total over 3 years).

Brenner also reviewed staffing by career level, noting a recent increase in % of graduate students but a decrease at assistant/associate professor level. He described USSSP PEA awards up to \$15K and the application and review process. Austin noted that this type of award at the beginning of ODP was typically around \$30K. Allan noted that part of the rationale for lowering the typical award amount came from past external programmatic review that criticized the awards as less competitive than other funding mechanisms. Clement suggested that the perceptions about PEAs could be countered by making the review process much more competitive by declining some; however, Brenner pointed out that these awards often provide support for working up data that support the entire science party, so such a “punishment” can have wide-ranging impact. Austin suggested that evaluation of the PEA proposals could be folded into the application process, but Brenner stated that this is actually the case in that the pre-cruise “participation plan” is essentially a PEA proposal that has not yet been modified by the vagaries of actual data acquisition on the expedition. In addition, Allan reiterated that the scope is really to ensure collection of essential post-expedition data. Christensen reviewed recent USAC debate about PEAs, confirming the intent to collect essential post-expedition data of use to all participants. In that case, Clement suggested folding support of that kind of activity in commingled program funding.

Brenner then described USSSP support of drilling workshops and the process for application and review of workshop proposals. He then described USSSP opportunities for US scientists to propose modest support for pre-drilling activities. In response to a question from Austin, Brenner noted two recent examples at an average of ~\$30k. Austin questioned whether the same concerns about post-expedition awards noted earlier should apply to the pre-drilling proposals. Allan noted that the intent was to provide an avenue for modest activities at a level that would be considered too low to justify the internal NSF administrative effort. Koppers noted that the

scope is not really considered scientific research, but instead is more directly tied to providing essential background data for upcoming drilling.

Brenner then described the process for selecting US members of panels. He quickly reviewed USSSP E & O activities, suggesting that they had been discussed in sufficient detail at the Forum, and closed by showing the pie chart of distribution of USSSP funding among tasks.

H. Given asked whether there are any formal efforts to mentor first-time shipboard participants on IODP platforms. A. Klaus noted that some mentoring does occur within lab groups on JR, but it hasn't been formalized to date. In response to a question from Bansal, Allan and Brenner confirmed that both NSF and USSSP can consider proposals for US scientists to participate in international workshops to develop IODP pre-proposals.

Brenner asked whether PMOs should work to bring their new panel membership rotations into better alignment. Brenner and Eguchi confirmed that the US and Japanese rotation schedules are already aligned on an October 1 rotation date. There was agreement that other PMOs should be asked to work toward the same goal.

Consensus 1609-2: IODP PMOs should work to align panel member rotation dates to be aligned on October 1 of every year.

III. Policies for migration of scientists among PMOs

Citing a couple of recent examples, Brenner asked about responsibilities for financial support when an IODP scientist changes country (e.g., either between staffing and sailing, or shortly after an expedition but before all that person's expedition-related activities are completed). Brenner noted that from his perspective the recent examples had been satisfactorily handled on an ad hoc basis. Arculus suggested that could work in most cases. Klaus noted that given the wide range in how various IODP member countries support post-expedition research, handling cases on an ad hoc basis might be the only possible solution. Clement noted that one reason this issue is being raised is the question whether it somehow affects the evaluation of applications to participate in IODP. Brenner noted USAC does like to see post-expedition affiliation plans in evaluating certain participation applications. Allan asked if there is any data related to potential impact on early career scientists. Arculus reiterated support for continuing to deal with the situation in the current mode, but also indicated that the initial financial supporters of participants who move would like to see credit for their support. Koppers and Klaus suggested that this is sometimes done by listing both original and subsequent affiliations of participants in the IODP reports. Friberg noted that, with the wide range of approaches by PMOs in providing support for IODP participants, it would not be sensible for the PMO meeting to suggest a specific policy.

Consensus 1609-3: The PMOs will continue to deal with cases of IODP participants who change country in an informed, ad hoc basis, but will stress the importance of those scientists citing both sources of their support for IODP research.

IV. Collaborations on E&O activities

Brenner noted that since the PMO staff who handle E & O on a daily basis are not actually at the

PMO meeting, there was little to discuss in the way of specifics. However, he noted that progress toward program-wide integration is already being made at the meetings of the ECORD E & O Task Force, to which the E & O personnel from other PMOs are invited, and informal meetings such as those that have occurred recently at the Fall AGU. Christensen asked if there has ever been a program-wide E & O workshop. Brenner said not recently, but collaborative Schools of Rock have been discussed and the 2016 SOR in Cape Town included local South African teachers. A collaborative E&O workshop is a possibility in the future.

V. Other business

Brenner raised the question whether PMO meetings should occur regularly in conjunction with Forum meetings. Austin suggested it would be a good idea. Eguchi and others suggested the chairmanship of the PMO meeting should rotate among PMO chairs. Given asked about overlap of agenda materials between Forum and PMO meetings, suggesting that minimizing the overlap could free up time for discussion of special issues at the Forum. Austin thought that including the material in both meetings was actually useful. Allan suggested that Brenner should chair the PMO meeting one more time. Brenner expressed willingness, citing ease of communication with the US-based IODP Forum Chair. Austin asked for a formal consensus statement indicating the next PMO meeting would be in Shanghai. Koppers noted that the annual JR co-chief reviews include feedback about PMO-related issues, and he suggested that feedback should form input for future PMO meetings. Friburg agreed and said that ECORD can also provide comparable feedback from reviews of MSP expeditions.

Consensus 1609-4: The IODP PMO meeting will be scheduled in September 2017 in Shanghai, for an additional day in conjunction with the next meeting of the IODP Forum. The 2017 PMO meeting will be chaired again by Carl Brenner.

The participants thanked the hosts for the PMO meeting, and Brenner closed the meeting.

[Note: The presentations for the PMO meeting can be found at: <http://bit.ly/2iASlqI>]

PMO Points of Contact

(Note: This list is restricted to Program Member Office personnel only)

ANZIC:

Program Scientist: Neville Exon (Neville.Exon@anu.edu.au)
Administrator: Cath Beasley (iodp.administrator@anu.edu.au)

BRAZIL:

General contact: iodp@capes.gov.br
Coordinator, Innovation Programs: Priscila Lelis Cagni Postigo (priscila.cagni@capes.gov.br)
[copy on all correspondence]

CHINA:

General contact: iodp_china@tongji.edu.cn
Director, IODP-China: Tian Jun (tianjun@tongji.edu.cn)
Science Coordinator: Shouting Tuo (iodp_china@tongji.edu.cn)

ESSAC:

General contact: essac@geomar.de
Chair: Jan Behrmann (jbehrmann@geomar.de)
Science Coordinator: Hanno Kinkel (hkinkel@geomar.de)

INDIA:

Program Officer: Dhananjai Pandey (pandey@ncaor.gov.in)

JAPAN:

General contact: info@j-desc.org
Chair, IODP Section, J-DESC: Hiroshi Nishi (hnishi@m.tohoku.ac.jp)
Secretary, IODP Section: Masafumi Murayama (murayama@kochi-u.ac.jp)

KOREA:

Project Manager: Gil Young Kim (gykim@kigam.re.kr)
Se Won Chang (swchang@kigam.re.kr)
Young-Joo Lee (yjl@kigam.re.kr)

USSSP:

General contact: usssp@LDEO.columbia.edu
Director: Carl Brenner (cbrenner@LDEO.columbia.edu)
Science Program Officer: Angela Slagle (aslagle@LDEO.columbia.edu)