

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Meeting:
17-18 May 2016
Arlington, VA USA**

Summary of Consensus Statements and Action Items

Consensus Statements

Consensus 1

The JRFB approves the Agenda with the caveat that Jamie Allan and Beth Christensen will present the Item 4 topics originally assigned to Tom Janecek.

Consensus 2

The JRFB approves the May 2015 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.

Consensus 3

The JRFB agrees to institute a Standing JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines, with the following members: Anthony Koppers (JRFB Chair), Holly Given (ex-officio representing SSO), and two other members of the JRFB (Christina Ravelo and Mike Coffin).

The mandate of this subcommittee is: (1) to consult with SEP, EPSP, SSO, JRFB, and the IODP Facility Boards to improve IODP policies, guidelines, and terms of reference documents, (2) to present those in a common IODP format, (3) to report every year at the JRFB meeting any substantial changes for discussion and seek approval of the board where necessary, and (4) to survey the wider IODP community about the effectiveness of these policies and guidelines.

Consensus 4

The JRFB approves the revised and reformatted IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines (28 April 2016).

Consensus 5

The JRFB approves the revised and reformatted IODP Site Characterization Guidelines (28 April 2016).

Consensus 6

The JRFB approves the revised ADP Guidelines (3 May 2016).

Consensus 7

The JRFB approves the three proposed revisions to the JRFB Advisory Panels Terms of Reference (September 2013)

Consensus 8

The JRFB encourages all Program Member Offices to keep providing strong nominations for new SEP and EPSP members with nominal 3-year rotations, while striving to increase diversity, including early- to mid-career scientists.

Consensus 9

The JRFB agrees with the deactivation of in total 15 dormant SEP proposals (as per JRFB 1505 Consensus Statement 4) and affirms it will continue monitoring and deactivating inactive (>5 years) proposals as necessary.

Consensus 10

The JRFB approves the plan to contact proponents (via e-mail) of inactive (>5 years) proposals at JRFB to update their proposal (via an Addendum or PRL). The JRFB may ask SEP to comment on any updated science objectives, if necessary.

Consensus 11

The JRFB recommends Full Proposal 832 (Tasman Frontier Subduction) for scheduling in FY17 before Expedition 369 (SW Australia Margin Cretaceous Climate). Furthermore, the JRFB recommends the scheduling of a one-month combined logging-while-drilling (LWD) expedition based on APL Proposal 841 (Creeping Gas Hydrate Slides) and Full Proposal 781A (Hikurangi Observatory), followed by Full Proposals 751 (West Antarctic Ice Sheet Climate), completion of 781A (corks and coring) and 818 (Brothers Arc Flux) in FY18. The JRFB recommends Proposals 567 (South Pacific Paleogene) and 839 (Amundsen Sea Ice Sheet History) for scheduling in the beginning of FY19. The expectation of the JRFB is that there will be 10 months of operations in FY19.

Consensus 12

The JRFB affirms that, based on current and anticipated proposal pressure, the JOIDES Resolution will follow a path from the southwestern Pacific Ocean, through the Southern Ocean, and into the Gulf of Mexico and the Equatorial and South Atlantic, for opportunities for drilling there in FY19 and continuing into FY20. The JRFB expects that the JR will then continue to operate in the general area of the Atlantic and adjacent seas in FY21.

Consensus 13

The JRFB is very pleased with the results and recommendations presented in the FY15 Co-chief Scientists Report and the FY15 JRSO NSF Site Review Report (January 2016). Both reports underscore the outstanding operation and very capable management of the JOIDES Resolution facility by the JRSO. In addition, the JRFB fully supports the conclusions and recommendations by the NSF in their response to the FY15 reports, in particular to add personnel in support of 10-11 months/year IODP operations.

Consensus 14

The JOIDES Resolution Science Operator (JRSO) Annual Program Plan (APP) FY17 is

recommended for approval in principle. A final plan adding Tasman Frontier Subduction (P832) in APP FY17 and XRF scanning in an Addendum to APP FY16 will be considered for approval.

(Postscript: The JRSO APP FY17 and the Addendum to APP FY16 were approved (via email) on 22 July 2016.)

Consensus 15

The JRFB supports the implementation of XRF scanning as a new IODP Standard Onshore Measurement as will be proposed by the JRSO in an Addendum to the Annual Program Plan of FY16.

Consensus 16

The Science Support Office Annual Program Plan (APP) FY17 is recommended for approval in principle. A final plan will be considered for approval.

(Postscript: The SSO APP FY17 was approved (via email) on 25 July 2016.)

Consensus 17

The JRFB supports NSF's plans for the shallow JR100 coring program to be implemented during non-IODP periods, when the JRFB schedule for the JOIDES Resolution permits.

Consensus 18

The JRFB is impressed with the new, simplified implementation of the IODP.org website and agrees that it should be put online by June 2016.

Consensus 19

The JRFB sincerely thanks both Andrew Roberts and Ryo Anma for their excellent service on the JRFB as science members. Over the past three years the JRFB has vastly enjoyed their very enthusiastic and knowledgeable input in all JRFB matters, scheduling of proposals foremost.

Consensus 20

The JRFB thanks both Noritoshi Suzuki and Clive Neal for their excellent service on the CAB as member and as Chair.

Consensus 21

The JRFB sincerely thanks Dave Mallinson, co-chair of SEP for the last 4 years and member of SCP for another 3 years before that. His outstanding leadership and high-energy approach in nurturing proposals, during numerous SEP meetings, but most impressively offline, while working with many, many proponent teams, have been a tremendous service to the overall IODP program and success.

Action Items

Action Item 1

The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will add example data packages into the overall IODP Site Characterization Data Guidelines.

Action Item 2

The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will update and merge the Guidelines for Joint IODP-ICDP “Amphibious” ADP Proposals into the IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines. The JRFB Chair will forward the updated guidelines to the ICDP Program Office.

Action Item 3

The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will work on an updated ADP Implementation Policy in support of the Joint IODP-ICDP “Amphibious” ADP Projects. The updated policy will be circulated amongst all IODP Facility Boards before June 2016 for approval and then shared with ICDP by the JRFB Chair.

Action Item 4

The JRFB Chair will e-mail proponents who have proposals at JRFB that have been inactive for 5 years or more and request them to provide the JRFB with an update via an Addendum or PRL.

Action Item 5

The JRFB Chair will request that USSSP solicit applications for the JRFB science member replacements of Andrew Roberts and Ryo Anma. Recommendations from this process will be circulated to the JRFB (by e-mail) for approval.

(Postscript: New JRFB science members Wolfgang Bach and Liping Zhou were selected (via email) on 29 August 2016.)

Action Item 6

The JRFB Chair will request that the EFB and CIB Chairs solicit applications for CAB member replacements of Noritoshi Suzuki and Clive Neal. Recommendations from this process will be circulated to the JRFB for approval. The CAB Chair will be appointed by the JRFB after the new slate of CAB members is known.

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Meeting Roster: 17–18 May 2016 Arlington, VA USA

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board – JRFB

James Allan	National Science Foundation, USA
Brijesh Bansal	Ministry of Earth Science, India
Gilbert Camoin	ECORD Management Agency, CEREGE, France
Se Won Chang ¹	Korea Inst. of Geoscience and Mineral Res. (KIGAM), Republic of Korea
Brad Clement	JR Science Operator (JRSO), Texas A&M University, USA
Mike Coffin	University of Tasmania, Australia
Alvaro Crósta	Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel (CAPES), Brazil
Qing Sun	Administrative Centre for China's Agenda 21, China
Ryo Anma	University of Tsukuba, Japan
Anthony Koppers, Chair	Oregon State University, USA
Clive Neal	University of Notre Dame, USA
Christina Ravelo	University of California Santa Cruz, USA
Andrew Roberts	Australian National University, Australia
Paul Wilson	University of Southampton, UK

Liaisons

Jamie Austin	IODP Forum Chair, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Sarah Davies	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), University of Leicester, UK
Holly Given	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Barry Katz	EPSP Chair, Chevron Corporation, Houston, TX, USA
Shin'ichi Kuramoto	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Dave Mallinson	SEP Co-Chair, East Carolina University, USA
Ken Miller	SEP Chair, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, USA
Yoshiyuki Tatsumi	CIB Chair, University of Tokyo, Japan
Dominique Weis	ECORD Facility Board Vice-Chair, University of British Columbia, CA

Observers

Rita Bauer	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Jan Behrmann	ESSAC Chair, Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel (GEOMAR), Germany
Carl Brenner	USSSP, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA
Beth Christensen	US Advisory Committee for USSSP Chair, Adelphi University, USA
Nobu Eguchi	CDEX, JAMSTEC, Japan
Dave Goldberg	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Nadine Hallman	ECORD Management Agency, CERGE, France
Bob Houtman	National Science Foundation, USA
Thomas Janecek	National Science Foundation, USA
Mitch Malone	JRSO, Texas A&M University, USA
Rick Murray	National Science Foundation, USA
Hiroshi Nishi	IODP Section Chair, J-DESC, Tohoku University, Japan
Rachel Orange	National Science Foundation, USA
Allison Reed	U.S. State Department, USA
Eisho Sato	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Angela Slagle	USSSP, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA
Shouting Tuo	IODP-China Office, Tongji University, China
Michiko Yamamoto	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA

Not in Attendance

¹ Alternate for Gil Young Kim

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board Meeting Notes:
17-18 May 2016 Arlington, VA USA**

Tuesday	17 May 2016	08:30-18:00
----------------	--------------------	--------------------

1. Welcome and Introductions

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Chair, Anthony Koppers, gave an overview of the most significant meeting topics, including:

- Scheduling of the *JOIDES Resolution* expeditions
- First *JOIDES Resolution* Science Operator (JRSO) Review Panel Report for FY15

Tom Janecek then welcomed the group and provided a brief overview of safety and comfort information.

Anthony introduced the new JRFB members, noted which members were absent, moderated self-introductions for all present, and reviewed the rules of engagement, confidentiality policy, and conflict of interest management for this meeting. Specifically, he directed conflicted members to remain in the room during the Science Evaluation Panel (SEP) proposal review presentation, the JRSO's schedule options presentation, and the general discussion session, but asked that those with conflicts not ask questions or provide comments. Anthony stated that any conflicted persons would need to leave the room during the decision session on the morning of May 18.

To wrap up the meeting introduction, Anthony reviewed the ship track, the expeditions since May 2015, and the IODP paper published in *Eos*.

2. Approval of Agenda

Anthony Koppers requested consensus to approve the agenda. He received consensus to approve the agenda with the understanding that Jamie Allan and Beth Christensen will cover the topics assigned to Tom Janecek in Item 4 of the original agenda.

Consensus 1

The JRFB approves the Agenda with the caveat that Jamie Allan and Beth Christensen will present the Item 4 topics originally assigned to Tom Janecek.

3. Approval of May 2015 JRFB Meeting Minutes

Anthony Koppers asked if the members recommended changes to the 2015 Meeting Minutes. Clive Neal noted that while the Nagoya Protocol was discussed, it produced no action items. Anthony replied that no action items will be added to the 2015 Meeting Minutes because each country is developing their unique response to the Protocol and action items will be generated on a case-by-case basis. With no other questions or issues raised, Anthony requested consensus to approve the 2015 Meeting Minutes, and the JRFB gave their approval.

Consensus 2

The JRFB approves the May 2015 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.

4. National Science Foundation (NSF) Report

4A. Update by the OCE Division Director

NSF Ocean Sciences (OCE) Director, Rick Murray, provided a high-level view of NSF funding for core science and infrastructure. He stated that the IODP continued to produce high-profile, first-class science, and that IODP's strong financial state was due to the hard work of IODP funding and hosting institutions. He expressed NSF's appreciation for the hard work done by all participating countries and he stressed that the scientific, cost cutting, and other financial actions and accomplishments of IODP give him several strong talking points when he is promoting IODP.

Rick reminded the group that the Sea Change Report encouraged and advised NSF to transfer money to the core science programs from the infrastructure programs, and that due to herculean efforts by Bob Houtman's group (including IODP) they transferred \$10M to the core science programs, and will continue this realignment process.

Clive Neal and Jamie Austin asked if the transfer of funds translated to more site survey opportunities funded through core science programs. Rick confirmed that funding of stand-alone proposals with seafloor seismic components continues to be strong. He stated that there is also an advantage to doing wrap-up surveys after coring, and the link between surveying and scientific drilling is strong.

Anthony Koppers asked 1) if additional fund transfers would be requested, and 2) where can IODP do better? In response to question 1: The process will be iterative and future requests are possible. In response to question 2: High-profile science is the goal and IODP's number one objective should be getting the word out regarding our science. While NSF is focused on getting the word out in Washington, DC and with IODP member nation governments, IODP participants can focus on making the scientific community, and the general population, more aware of IODP science.

4B. NSF Budget and Forecast

Jamie Allan stated his opinion that the IODP program is currently enjoying a high degree of success and recognition. In support of Rick Murray's call to get the word out, Jamie highlighted that IODP MSP Expedition 364 (Chicxulub K-Pg Impact Crater) is getting wide airplay, and IODP *Chikyu* Expedition 365 (Exploring the Fault Trace – NanTroSEIZE) videos are emphasizing the benefit of the international program and partner platform providers to the U.S. Community.

Jamie gave a brief presentation highlighting IODP financial, operational, and administrative progress, including:

- IODP's Positive Financial Situation
- NSF's Request to JRFB to
 - Operate for 10 months in FY17 (if possible)

- Increase US Science Party Members from 8 to 10 (including the Onboard Outreach scientist), with associated increases to US Science Support Program (USSSP) and the Science Support Office (SSO)
- JR Facility Review Progress and Schedule going forward
- NSF's Support of IODP-related Core Science Proposals through MGG

Jamie pointed out that the JR's reduced costs offered a lot of opportunities, helped to restore the balance recommended by the Sea Change report, and made it possible to increase annual operations from 8 to 10 months.

Jamie clarified that, while increasing the US Science Party headcount, the inclusion of the Onboard Outreach Program scientist (Education Officer) into the US Science Party placed their leadership clearly within the Science Party, and gave the Education Officer the same publishing responsibility as other Science Party members. He confirmed that Education Officers, will be included as part of the Science Party in future Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with member nations.

4C. Renewal Process for JRSO Cooperative Agreement in 2019 and Associated US Activities

Beth Christensen presented the goals, plans, and schedule of US Advisory Committee (USAC) for Scientific Ocean Drilling in their support of NSF's mid-point renewal/review of the *JOIDES Resolution* Facility. USAC plans to gather data through a survey and a small workshop similar to their 2012 meeting in Denver. Mirroring NSF's needs for the National Science Board presentation in 2018, USAC will work to:

- A. Affirm or (re)prioritize the science plan as it relates to US needs
- B. Assess the role of the JR to date in accomplishing the science plan
- C. Project the JR's role in the completion of the remainder of the science plan
- D. Highlight the regional operational approach, including planning and science syntheses workshops and products

USAC's approach will include a steering committee to develop the survey and approximately 40 workshop participants (US community and a subset of pre-selected report writers). The strategy for the survey is to focus on the ability of the JR to support the science plan (rather than focusing on the science plan itself) by:

- Collecting demographic data
- Tying the success of the 14 challenges to the facility
 - Understand how the JR helped (or did not help) to address the challenges
 - Consider treating the facility as units (e.g. drilling technology, equipment, and upgrades)
- Linking to the regional approach (Monsoon results and Antarctic workshops)
 - Highlight the benefit of fuel costs to the regional focus on science

Beth provided the timelines for implementation of the survey/workshop and the facility renewal process; with the survey at AGU in December and the process ending with a report made available to NSF for use in their NSB presentation in 2018.

Several attendees questioned the plan to limit the workshop attendance to 40. Beth stated that the number was based on feasibility (how many can attend and still produce a concrete report) and she stated that the survey would serve as the larger US community input behind any decisions made. Other JRFB meeting attendees supported the ideas that:

- A larger group would better represent the community
- The other platform providers should be permitted to send liaisons
- A smaller executive writing group could effectively prepare the report

Beth stated that USAC and NSF wanted to keep the survey focused on the US request, but that the workshop could extend outside the US community. Jamie Allan made the comment that this workshop is intended to provide input from the U.S. Science Community to the NSF National Science Board, and that should remain its focus.

Mike Coffin encouraged the JRFB to share these community-based processes and the information generated from them with the member partners because they are useful to the other platform providers as they too are starting the process of petitioning to renew IODP funding.

Jamie Austin stated that it is important to let the Forum know so they can fold this information into what the other platform providers are doing. This will give some coherence to the renewal requests. He would like to see something in writing (e.g. a white paper) before the September Forum meeting. He also advised that the community should avoid requesting revisions to the Science Plan, but rather look at the positives in the science plan, and emphasize the regional aspect.

5. Science Support Office Report

Holly Given, SSO Executive Director presented an update of activities and accomplishments at the SSO since May 2015. Her summary included:

- SSO Funding and Task Areas
- Proposal Call Language and Submission History
- Data File Submission History (Site Survey Data Base - SSDB)
- Proposals Received in April 2016
- Outcome of two proposal cycles
- Guidance Documents (Document origins and need to revise/update)
- Post-SEP Small Group Meeting Issues and Outcomes (January 2016)
- Special Data Review of 877-CPP (January 2016)
- FY2016 Tech Developments
 - New Proposal Data Base (PDB): Experience / Feedback
 - New Website
 - Introducing new features (sortable tables, pie charts posted)
 - Time to move to the new site? Two week comments for approval
- Breakdown of Active Proposal Distribution by Status, Ocean, Challenges, Review Stage, Proponent, Platform, and Category.

Dave Mallinson, SEP Co-Chair thanked the SSO for their hard work and professional updates to the online tools. Jamie Austin urged the SSO to continue work on the call for proposals, as he's spoken with oil industry people who are interested in the JR being in the Gulf, and making the ship-track known in their circles will be important.

6. IODP Forum Report

Jamie Austin, Forum Chair updated the JRFB regarding IODP Forum-related activities. His highlights included:

- The IODP Forum's general purpose, participation, and meeting schedule
- IODP's progress toward Science Plan fulfillment (Expeditions tabulated by Science Plan theme / challenge)
- IODP Forum 2015 consensus statements, including
 - Review of Education and Outreach coordination
 - Linkage between seismic surveys (imaging) and IODP drilling
 - Proposed workshops that generate documents in service of renewal

Jamie, on behalf of the IODP Forum, asked for support (financial and staffing) from all IODP funded institutions and IODP funding agencies to assure that appropriate papers / documents are generated to support the upcoming IODP renewal efforts.

Beth Christensen stated that USAC has and will continue to discuss a regional Monsoon Workshop, and Tom Janecek agreed that NSF needs to provide appropriate funding toward a yet to be determined activity. Others agreed, that if IODP scientists are to be the initiators for public documents, they should be selected based on their ability to relate science to the public, and not on their association with the science. An alternative approach would be to ask an educational program or professional editor to partner with the IODP scientists to keep the science correct, but also keep it at a public level. Ken Miller noted that one-page documents are needed, as these are helpful with the public, and can serve to get larger documents started.

7. Policies and Guidelines Updates

7A. Standing Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines

Anthony Koppers provided a history of policy and guideline document updates. Holly Given stated that one of the main reasons these documents will continue to need updates is to keep them consistent with the online SSDB and PDB systems.

Anthony recommended the JRFB set up a standing subcommittee on policies and guidelines. He reminded the group that the documents revised by this subcommittee must be reviewed and approved by the JRFB, the ECORD Facility Board (EFB), and the Chikyu IODP Board (CIB), and that this subcommittee would be tasked with revising *only* JRFB documents. Each Facility Board is responsible for maintaining the policy documents specific to their platform, and while the JRFB expects to be informed about revisions to the policy documents specific to the other platforms, it will not be the task of the JRFB subcommittee to implement those revisions.

The JRFB agrees to the following consensus statement (with mandates):

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 3: The JRFB agrees to institute a Standing JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines, with the following members: Anthony Koppers (JRFB Chair), Holly Given (ex-officio representing SSO), and two other members of the JRFB (Christina Ravelo and Mike Coffin).

The mandate of this subcommittee is: (1) to consult with SEP, EPSP, SSO, JRFB, and the IODP Facility Boards (JRFB, EFB, and CIB) to improve IODP policies, guidelines, and terms-of-reference documents, (2) to present those in a common IODP format, (3) to report every year at the JRFB meeting any substantial changes for discussion and seek approval of the board where necessary, and (4) to survey the wider IODP community about the effectiveness of these policies and guidelines.

7B. IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines

Anthony Koppers summarized the changes made to resolve the issues identified in this document as:

7B1. Maximum Number of Lead Proponents and Total Proponents

Anthony proposed that the JRFB approve the following change to the Proposal Submission Guidelines:

All proposals will now require a “list of proponents (maximum 20), specifying the name, affiliation, email, and expertise of each proponent. Up to 10 lead proponents may be specified. The Principal Lead Proponent and Data Lead (i.e. the lead proponent for site survey data) also need to be identified.”

Gilbert Camoin asked how we settled on the number 20? Anthony stated that it was a bit random – 10 was not enough, 30 was too many.

7B2. Email Verification of Proponents During Proposal Submittal

After discussion of and revision to the originally proposed text, Anthony proposed that the JRFB approve the following change to the Proposal Submission Guidelines document:

“Upon acceptance of the proposal by the Science Support Office, individuals listed in the proponent table will receive an automatic email notification to confirm that they have agreed to this role.”

Holly Given clarified that if the named proponent declined to accept proponent status on a proposal, the SSO would remove them from the proponent list after emailing appropriate individuals. The SSO will try email notification for a few rounds, and will continue to refine the process details, with advice from the JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines.

Clive Neal noted that, as currently written, the Proposal Submission Guidelines imply a 5-year limit on revisions to Full proposals, but provide no information as to how that limit is enforced. Clive requested that text be added to state that proponents will be contacted if their proposal is inactive for 5 years, and if they are not responsive, the proposal will be deactivated. Clive agreed to draft the appropriate language and send it to Anthony.

The JRFB agreed to approve these suggested changes.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 4: The JRFB approves the revised and reformatted IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines (28 April 2016).

7C. IODP Site Characterization Guidelines

Anthony Koppers summarized the updates made to the Site Characterization Guidelines document as:

- Posting of the revised Data Guidelines to iodp.org in September 2015
- Removal of redundant online documentation
- Adding Cover Page and Table of Contents and improving format

The JRFB agreed to approve this document as updated.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 5: The JRFB approves the revised and reformatted IODP Site Characterization Guidelines (28 April 2016).

ACTION ITEM 1: The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will add example data packages into the overall IODP Site Characterization Data Guidelines.

7D. Amphibious Drilling Proposal (ADP) Guidelines

Anthony Koppers reviewed the history of this item and the previous agreements / consensus statements of the Facility Boards related to this document.

7D1. Improved Pre-proposal Stage and Workshop Funding Guidelines

Anthony pointed out that two issues remain unresolved:

- 1) The nature and requirements of IODP pre-proposals were not addressed
- 2) IODP does not have a program-wide workshop budget

Anthony addressed these issues with an updated flow chart showing the process of coordinated review for an ICDP workshop proposal and an IODP pre-proposal.

Angela Slagle and Clive Neal asked what mechanism SEP and SAG will use to discuss proposal review results, how that would be coordinated by the National Program Offices, and how will any budgetary implications be addressed? Anthony suggested this would involve enhanced communication between the SEP and SAG Chairs, while Jamie Austin recommended that each panel have a liaison from the other panel attend their meetings. Holly Given pointed out that each IODP Program Member Office (PMO) is also asked to send a liaison to the SEP meetings, and their presence at these meetings gives them the opportunity to hear and respond to SEP decisions regarding ADPs. In addition, the onus is on the proponents to work with the IODP PMOs regarding workshop funding.

Jamie Austin suggested that the SSO retain institutional knowledge by keeping a record of each ADP-related decision. Holly stated that following these new flow charts will also help SEP track down and pursue ADPs.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 6: The JRFB approves the revised ADP Guidelines (3 May 2016).

ACTION ITEM 2: The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will merge the Guidelines for Joint Review of Amphibious Drilling Proposals (ADP) into the overall IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines. The JRFB Chair will forward the updated guidelines to the ICDP Program Office.

7D2. New ADP Implementation Guidelines (by Forum Workgroup)

Anthony highlighted and summarized the Implementation Guidelines major points:

- Project Structure, Operational Management, Administration, and Responsibilities
- Joint Staffing Sampling, Data, and Publications
- Timelines
- Scientific Management
- Finances, Funding, Infrastructure, and Support

Anthony recommended that the document be updated to better deal with the following issues:

- IODP and ICDP policies on scientific measurements, sample handling, curation and publications **cannot** be reconciled into a single (and variable) ADP-specific policy on a case-by-case basis by the joint IODP-ICDP operator. Standard IODP policies must be followed for all IODP expeditions.
- Although IODP Facility Boards and ICDP could potentially discuss for each ADP how to minimize costs and maximize outcome by effectively sharing resources, the new IODP structure in the US has been developed to circumvent co-mingling of funding resources.

Several panel members emphasized that the point is to **coordinate** efforts to address a single and unique scientific issue, because the data and funding cannot be merged. Eventually, the data might be merged (NSF agreed to fund the handling and distribution of data) of the IODP moratorium period. Historically, though, it was IODP and Rutgers that agreed to fund the handling and preservation of the samples collected by Ken Miller in his previous joint ICDP and IODP Expeditions.

Jamie Austin advised that we identify a test case, and the people who will lead the charge.

ACTION ITEM 3: The JRFB Subcommittee on Policies and Guidelines will work on an updated ADP Implementation Policy in support of the Joint IODP-ICDP “Amphibious” ADP Projects. The updated policy will be circulated amongst all IODP Facility Boards for approval and then shared with ICDP by the JRFB Chair.

7E. SEP Advisory Panels Terms of Reference (TOR)

7E1. Chair and Co-Chair Selection and Appointment Process

Anthony Koppers reviewed the current Advisory Panels TOR selection and appointment process for chair and co-chair and he proposed that it be modified such that SEP select and send a list of at least two candidates to the JRFB for JRFB's review and final selection. The JRFB will consider the credentials (IODP science portfolio, technical capability) and the leadership capabilities of the candidates; followed by the PMO quotas and gender balance.

Holly Given noted that the Advisory Panels TOR currently refers to chair and co-chair for the SEP (and one chair for EPSP), and she asked the JRFB if they would like to take this opportunity to change the SEP references to co-chairs only. Ken Miller stated that he feels strongly that as the SEP is now one panel, the use of co-chairs is best.

Anthony then recommended the following text modifications:

"The SEP co-chairs will be nominated by members of the SEP. For each position, at least two highly qualified candidates will be forwarded to the JRFB for consideration. The SEP co-chairs will be approved by the JRFB for a term of three years."

and

"The EPSP chair will be nominated by members of the EPSP. At least two highly qualified candidates will be forwarded to the JRFB for consideration. The EPSP chair will be approved by the JRFB for a term of three years."

Gilbert Camoin asked if the candidates are limited to a certain amount of time served? Barry Katz noted that the 3-year terms for the EPSP (chair and members) were always renewable:

- For members at the discretion of the EPSP chair, the JRFB, and the relevant national/consortia program
- For the chair at the discretion of the JRFB

Anthony added that this statement of renewability remains in the Advisory Panel TOR. Barry added that permitting longer terms keeps the Chair and Panel members relatively stable, which as an operational panel, retains history and makes more sense.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 7: The JRFB approves the three proposed revisions to the JRFB Advisory Panels TOR (Sept 2013).

7E2. Rotation Scheme and Gender Equity

Anthony provided a quick review of statistics regarding

- Member distribution between science and site tasks

- Member attendance rates 2014 through 2016
- Gender and PMO distribution of SEP and EPSP members
- Expertise distribution of SEP and EPSP members

And as summarized on the following slides:

7. Policies and Guidelines Updates

7E Updates on Science Evaluation Panel (SEP) Terms of Reference (TOR)

7E2 Rotation Scheme and Gender Equity

- **SEP/EPSP have memberships of 56/17**
 - 36 Science (includes 1 chair) on SEP
 - 20 Site (includes 1 co-chair) on SEP
- **Members not attending SEP meetings (Jan/Jun) or EPSP meetings (Sept)**

Year	January Science	January Site	June Science	June Site	September EPSP
2016	9 (25%)	3 (15%)	7 (19%)	6 (30%)	Not Convened Yet
2015	4 (11%)	3 (15%)	8 (22%)	7 (35%)	6 (35%)
2014	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	11 (31%)	7 (35%)	--

7. Policies and Guidelines Updates

7E2 Continues ...

- **SEP member rotation is nominally every 3 years**
 - Occasionally some members are on this panel for more than 6 years
- **EPSP member rotation also is nominally every 3 years**
 - Three-year terms are renewable at the discretion of the EPSP chair, JRFB, and relevant national program
 - Some members have been on the EPSP panel for quite a long time

7. Policies and Guidelines Updates

7E2 Continues ...

➤ **Gender and PMO Distribution**

SEP Science	SEP Site	EPSP
9 Female (25%)	5 Female (25%)	1 Female (6%)
25 Male (69%)	14 Male (70%)	14 Male (88%)
1 Vacant	0 Vacant	0 Vacant

SEP Science	SEP Site	EPSP
14 US (includes 1 co-chair)	7 US (includes 1 co-chair)	7 US (includes 1 chair)
9 ECORD	5 ECORD	4 ECORD
6 Japan	1 Japan	1 Japan
1 Brazil	1 Brazil	--
2 China	2 China	2 China
1 ANZIC	1 ANZIC	1 ANZIC
1 India	1 India	--
1 Korea	1 Korea	--

7. Policies and Guidelines Updates

7E2 Continues ...

➤ **General Areas of Expertise**

SEP Science	SEP Site
8 Geochemistry/Petrology (19%)	15 Geophysics/Tectonics/Seismology (75%)
7 Geophysics/Tectonics/Seismology (17%)	5 Submarine Hazards/Geohazards (25%)
14 Paleoceanography/Paleoclimatology (33%)	
8 Sedimentology/Stratigraphy (19%)	
5 Microbiology/Geomicrobiology (12%)	
EPSP	
5 Geotechnical Engineering/Petroleum Engineering/Petroleum Geomechanics (29%)	
4 Marine Geophysics/Geophysics/Geophysical Exploration (24%)	
3 Petroleum Geology/Petroleum Geochemistry (18%)	
2 Gas Hydrates/Geohazards (12%)	
1 Deepwater Riser Drilling (6%)	
2 Hydrogeology/Marine Ecology/Biodiversity (12%)	

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 8: The JRFB encourages all Program Member Offices to keep providing strong nominations for new SEP and EPSP members with nominal 3-year rotations, while striving to increase diversity, including the involvement of early- to mid-career scientists.

7F. ECORD and Chikyu Facility Board Policies

Anthony Koppers reminded the JRFB members that ECORD and CIB approval of the moratorium statement drafted in 2015 was still pending, and he will implement this process via by e-mail. Neither JRFB members, nor liaisons from the CIB or the EFB, had other policy issues to discuss.

8. Shallow Coring with the JR During Non-IODP Periods

Tom Janecek asked that this item be delayed until tomorrow. The JRFB members agree.

9. SEP Overview of Proposals for FY18-19 Expedition Scheduling

9A. Statistics of JR Proposals at JRFB, in SEP Holding Bin and with SEP

Michiko Yamamoto summarized the status and distribution of proposals available for JRFB review.

9B. Science Evaluation Overview of Proposals Ready for Scheduling and Relevant Proposals in the SEP Holding Bin

Ken Miller and Dave Mallinson reviewed SEP summaries for the proposals to be considered by the JRFB.

10. Updates on Scheduled Expeditions and Proposals at JRFB

10A. Update on South China Sea Expeditions 367 and 368

Anthony Koppers provided a summary of the issues and concerns related to these expeditions, as well as an update regarding items addressed by the proponent.

10B. Update on Holding Bin Proposals 846APL2 and 832FULL2 and JRFB Proposal 732

Anthony Koppers, Ken Miller, and Dave Mallinson provided updates on these proposals as they have recent changes or added information.

10C. Update on Retiring of Inactive Proposals

Anthony Koppers reviewed the results from Susan Humphris' efforts to resolve the status of these 15 proposals. Four agreed to immediate deactivation, six did not take action within the timeframe given, and five did not respond. Anthony proposed deactivate for all 15, and if the proponents choose to, they can return to the SEP with their drilling ideas by submitting a new proposal and re-starting the process.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 9: The JRFB agrees with the deactivation of in total 15 dormant SEP proposals (as per JRFB 1505 Consensus Statement 4) and affirms it will continue monitoring and deactivating inactive (>5 years) proposals as necessary.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 10: The JRFB approves the plan to contact proponents (via e-mail) of inactive (>5 years) proposals at JRFB to update their proposal (via an Addendum or PRL). The JRFB may ask SEP to comment on any updated science objectives, if necessary.

ACTION ITEM 4: The JRFB Chair e-mails proponents who have proposals at JRFB that have been inactive for 5 years or more and request them to provide the JRFB with an update via an Addendum or PRL.

11. Options for a FY18-19 JR Expedition Schedules

11A. Update on ICDP-Oman Core Description Project

Nobu Eguchi stated that the ICDP recently received permission to do this project, and Brad Clement stated that funds that were allotted last year were carried forward to perform the core description work, if they are able to schedule it.

Jamie Austin reminded the group that the currently proposed JR schedule has only one month of maintenance, but the core description work could be done in two months (maintenance with transit). Nobu stated that the permitting process in Oman is moving forward.

11B. Update on Status of Potential Industry Work

Anthony Koppers stated that if oil prices stay low, finding industry work for the JR is not likely. Jamie Allan noted that though the language within the Cooperative Agreement

(CA) encourages the JRSO to seek industry work when the JR is not being used for IODP, NSF has recently informed the JRSO that there is no expectation nor encouragement to seek commercial work in today's economic climate. Jamie further noted that having 10-11 months of JR operation realistically precludes commercial opportunities in any event.

11C. Update on Hole U1437A Remediation for SloMo Project

The SloMo co-chiefs sent a proposal to the Facility Board to clean out Hole U1437A, and the Facility Board agreed to schedule this while the JR transits from Cape Town to Colombo. Carl Brenner noted that a School of Rock is scheduled during this tie-up.

11D. Report from Antarctic Workshop

Anthony Koppers summarized a report provided by the workshop conveners, and asked the conveners to provide priority for the proposals, which they assigned as high priority for all three. The conveners had noted that the 2020 IPCC report might need input from these expeditions. Complications to these expeditions are the difficulty scheduling ice breakers, and a mandatory inspection for the JR, which could last 4 to 6 weeks. Finding a yard in which we can do the inspection could impact where the ship is and how it could be scheduled.

11E. Various Options for Expedition Schedules

Mitch Malone presented the details and rationale for several possible FY18-19 schedules.

12. Discussion of the FY18-19 Expedition Scheduling Options

Mitch Malone provided answers to JRFB member questions regarding the scheduling options provided.

Wednesday

18 May 2016

8:30 – 16:00

13. Development of the FY18-19 Schedule

Anthony Koppers asked those with conflicts to leave the room. Hiroshi Nishi left and Mitch Malone provided options if Ross Sea were cancelled because an icebreaker was not available. Anthony then led the Board in a discussion of potential schedules, their scientific importance and impact, as well as cost implications. He asked the JRFB members to state which schedule they would like to implement in FY18-19 to achieve the best science in a cost-effective way. The following list had strong consensus:

- 832 Tasman Frontier
- 369 SW Australia
- 841 APL with the LWD portion of 781 Hikurangi
- 751 Ross Sea
- 781 Hikurangi (remaining CORKs and coring portion)
- 818 Brothers
- 567 South Pacific Paleogene

The board decides to additionally schedule another expedition for winter 2019. The consensus is with 839 Amundsen Sea.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 11: The JRFB recommends Full Proposal 832 (Tasman Frontier Subduction) for scheduling in FY17 before Expedition 369 (SW Australia Margin Cretaceous Climate). Furthermore, the JRFB recommends the scheduling of a one-month combined logging-while-drilling (LWD) expedition based on APL Proposal 841 (Creeping Gas Hydrate Slides) and Full Proposal 781A (Hikurangi Observatory), followed by Full Proposals 751 (West Antarctic Ice Sheet Climate), completion of 781A (corks and coring) and 818 (Brothers Arc Flux) in FY18. The JRFB recommends Proposals 567 (South Pacific Paleogene) and 839 (Amundsen Sea Ice Sheet History) for scheduling in the beginning of FY19. The expectation of the JRFB is that there will be 10 months of operations in FY19.

14. Long-Term Cruise Track of the *JOIDES Resolution*

14A. Proposal Pressure in the South Atlantic

Anthony Koppers projected the map of proposals at SEP and JRFB and how the schedule for those proposals still in the SEP could delay work in the South Atlantic next year. Based on the typical SEP review schedule, it's unlikely that any of those proposals will be ready for scheduling next year. Anthony asked the JRFB to consider an alternate long-term track. Several members contributed to a discussion of the possibility of fast-tracking proposals (in SEP and/or EPSP), but even fast-tracking proposals would require significant changes to the schedule and likely wouldn't help much in the end.

14B. Alternative Long-Term Cruise Tracks

Jamie Allan noted that routing through the Panama Canal will permit work in the Gulf prior to returning to the original South Atlantic track. Brad Clement noted that the time limit on the DOE funding for 887-CPP aligns with a ship track through the Gulf. Holly Given asked if this scenario ignored the Antarctic proposals? Anthony Koppers stated that it doesn't.

Jamie Austin suggested we notify the community of this revised ship track through an Eos article. Barry Katz recommended that the July EPSP meeting add 887-CPP to their schedule, because this could put the JR is in the Gulf early in 2019 (to avoid the hurricane window). Holly will work with the 887 proponents to sort out complications regarding confidentiality requirements.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 12: The JRFB affirms that, based on current and anticipated proposal pressure, the *JOIDES Resolution* will follow a path from the southwestern Pacific Ocean, through the Southern Ocean, and into the Gulf of Mexico and the Equatorial and South Atlantic, for opportunities for drilling there in FY19 and continuing into FY20. The JRFB expects that the JR will then continue to operate in the general area of the Atlantic and adjacent seas in FY21.

15. Executive Session to Discuss FY15 JRSO Site Review and Co-Chief Scientists' Evaluation Reports

Closed session – no notes taken.

16. Discussion of NSF's Response to FY15 JRSO Site Review

Jamie Allan presented NSF's response to the JR Facility Review Panel Report by highlighting the guidance NSF presented to JRSO.

16A. Improving Issues with Clearance Requests for JR Operations in EEZ Waters and Extended Continental Shelves

NSF asked the JRSO to propose additional staffing to ensure prompt responses to unexpected complications in obtaining clearance.

16B. Increasing JRSO Personal Support of Planned Increased FY18-19 Seagoing Operations

NSF also asked the JRSO to propose additional staffing to:

- Ensure that staff numbers are adequate to provide backup (and not compromise the facility) should JRSO lose an employee or manager
- Ensure that staff numbers are sufficient to meet the needs of 10 months of operation per year

The JRSO will also review staff additions to:

- Provide assistance in the Science Operations Department with the episodic requirements of research clearance and environmental assessments
- Potentially provide ship tours during port calls and tie-up periods
- Other areas as needed

16C. Increased Shipboard Instrumentation

NSF asked the JRSO to increase the visibility of and community participation in the Lab Working Groups (LWGs) and to send two LWG members to visit the JR during port calls in FY17 to assess the laboratories, protocols, and documentation. The JRSO will also convene a Color Reflectance Workshop in the late summer or early fall of 2016.

16D. Increasing Shipboard Internet Bandwidth for Science Parties

NSF asked the JRSO to propose increased satellite communication bandwidth aboard the JR (downlink bandwidth increase from 1 Mbps to 2 Mbps).

16E. Reinstatement of Annual PMO Meetings

No details documented. (*Postscript: the first PMO meeting was proposed and organized by Carl Brenner from USSSP for the day after the IODP Forum meeting in Buzios, Brazil, on 23 September 2016*).

Jamie then gave a summary of the makeup of the JR Facility Review Panel and how the review was conducted. He noted that the process was changed to a 2-day co-chief review that fed into the three-day full panel review, and that this worked very well. Jamie noted that the report is confidential, but is being shared with the financial member partners and the JRFB. And while the JR Facility Review Panel Report is confidential, NSF's Response is public and stated:

“The JOIDES Resolution Science Operator Site Visit Panel concludes that the facility is being managed exceptionally well by the JRSO, and that it is also being overseen effectively by the *JOIDES Resolution* Facility Board and the National Science Foundation to meet the IODP Science Plan.

Anthony Koppers asked if there are any questions or anything to add? None were voiced.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 13: The JRFB is very pleased with the results and recommendations presented in the FY15 Co-chief Scientists Report and the FY15 JRSO NSF Site Review Report (January 2016). Both reports underscore the outstanding operation and very capable management of the JOIDES Resolution facility by the JRSO. In addition, the JRFB fully supports the conclusions and recommendations by the NSF in their response to the FY15 reports, in particular to add personnel in support of 10-11 months/year IODP operations.

17. The JR Science Operator Draft FY’17 Annual Program Plan

Brad Clement gave a brief operational review to bring the board up to date on the science accomplished in the most recent expeditions:

- Expedition 356: Indonesian Throughflow
- Expedition 359: Maldives Monsoon and Sea Level
- Expedition 360: SW Indian Ridge Lower Crust and Moho
- Expedition 361: South African Climates (SAFARI)

Mike Coffin asked if the medical evacuation procedures are the same? Brad stated that they are, but we’ve seen the PMOs take this more seriously lately. Dave Goldberg noted that the JRSO down-hole measurements programs are superb, and Jamie Austin stated that this was an exceptional set of IODP basin-based expeditions, and is a great opportunity for a good scientific writing team.

Brad then presented his Annual Program Plan with the caveat that an additional expedition was added, so a new version will be produced. He also noted that:

- New US labor laws regarding overtime will result in increased costs
- Fuel costs continue to fluctuate
- The JR day rate increased, but contracting for two years resulted in some savings
- While industry work makes the ship owner happier (they see an increase in income), low fuel costs and more IODP expeditions make industry work unlikely

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 14: The JOIDES Resolution Science Operator (JRSO) Annual Program Plan (APP) FY17 is recommended for approval in principle. A final plan adding Tasman Frontier Subduction (P832) in APP FY17 and XRF scanning in an Addendum to APP FY16 will be considered for approval.

(Postscript: The JRSO APP FY17 and the Addendum to APP FY16 were approved (via email) on 22 July 2016.)

18. XRF Scanning as a New IODP Standard Onshore Measurement

Brad Clement reminded the group that last year the JRFB decided that funding for XRF Scanning would be the responsibility of the proponent. However, he noted that the requests for XRF scanning continue to increase, and the JRSO's limited resources (instruments and staff) result in work backups and increased core storage times, which are a logistical and management issue for JRSO.

While the science parties need the XRF Scans completed promptly after an expedition because the XRF data permit better splicing and more precise sampling plans (to prevent oversampling of the core), the JRSO doesn't manage or store the XRF data, and either because of poor coordination, or distinctly different needs, different members of the science party are asking for separate (multiple) scans of the same cores. Therefore, the JRSO proposes that the IODP make about 6 weeks (1.5 km) of XRF scanning per expedition part of the program resource. This limit makes the XRF a reasonable resource, but also forces each science party to set its priorities or if necessary, find external funding to support additional XRF scanning.

Staff from the Gulf Core Repository (GCR) would operate the XRF unit(s), so if XRF work slowed, this person would do other curatorial work. The data would be part of the GCR LIMS and available (after the appropriate moratorium period).

Brad provided an example schedule and summarized the issues and benefits of making this a standard measurement. He proposed that TAMU upgrade their current XRF instrument and purchase a new instrument. He noted that, while the JRSO realizes that it would be ideal to have an XRF unit on the ship, at present, they are too slow to be useful during an expedition.

Several participants in recent expeditions shared their comments or concerns regarding:

- Delayed scanning - previous expeditions scan requests were running long
- Questions regarding instrument settings
- The qualifications of those operating the instrument
- Successful use of XRF data
- Benefits of eliminating multiple scanning of the same core
- CT scanning - available at University of Texas at Austin, TAMU pre-clinical trails group, and Johnson Space Center
- Scheduling and supporting XRF scanning for core going to the Bremen Core Repository

Jamie Austin noted that the XRF scanning service would be an added value to the GCR and TAMU could recover costs associated with additional scans. Anthony Koppers agreed that XRF scanning would keep the program state of the art.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 15: The JRFB supports the implementation of XRF scanning as a new IODP Standard Onshore Measurement as will be proposed by the JRSO in an Addendum to Annual Program Plan of FY16.

19. The Science Support Office Draft FY'17 Annual Program Plan

Holly Given presented the first draft of the SSO Annual Program Plan. She reviewed the planned:

- Budget
 - Increased by less than 2%, with some funds coming from carry forward
- Staffing
 - Requested provisional approval for a marine science post doc to assist with data management
- Task work
 - Continue PDB improvements including
 - Implement proponent email notification
 - Implement file size restrictions
 - Implement pdf links from Site Table to Site Forms
 - Continue SSDB improvements
 - Update QC procedures and data submission policies and practices to improve the proponent and reviewer experience
 - Add capability to correct/delete data
 - Create a data submission package
 - Develop a proposal archive tool to manage proposal review and archive
 - Release the new web site and continue its management, maintenance, and improvements
 - Consider archival of IODP-old material

Finally, Holly presented a forecast into Year 5 of the Cooperative Agreement and the next 5 years by noting that proponents are, or will be looking for more dynamic systems, which could include:

- A new SSDB. Holly recommended that, prior to establishing a plan for modernizing, we leverage existing user comments and charge a to-be-selected group of experts with determining the design basis and look for a new SSDB.
- An update to the proposal format. Holly noted that the proposal format should reflect current processes and new technologies, but we are using a format designed in 2001.

Holly asked the JRFB for preliminary approval of this plan, so she can look forward to making the hire.

Jamie Austin suggested an area of the new web site be dedicated keeping the community updated on progress toward renewal for all organizations – US, ECORD, JAMSTEC and ANZIC. Holly said that this is possible.

A few JRFB members expressed concern that a post doc position, as described, would not benefit the professional development of the person hired, and suggested other titles. Holly agreed to look into alternative titles, reminding the members that this is a limited appointment and the person hired would benefit by learning about the IODP process and what makes a good IODP proposal. While she plans to look to institutions with active IODP participation for the best candidates, her options for title are limited by the rules of UCSC's Human Resources system, the salary proposed, and the limited term of the appointment.

Anthony Koppers asked how the SSO plans to address the negative feedback received on recent changes to the PDB. Holly stated that she'll continue to gather wider input from: proponents who have used the system recently, review panelists, and the science operators.

Anthony asked what SSO plans to do with the IODP.org legacy articles and other information? Holly would like it to become something like *odplegacy.org*, which is designed such that it cannot be confused for an active site. Similar to the ODP site, IODP.org has a lot of information that could be preserved, but more that doesn't need to be preserved.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 16: The Science Support Office Annual Program Plan (APP) FY17 is recommended for approval in principle. A final plan will be considered for approval.

(Postscript: The SSO APP FY17 was approved (via email) on 25 July 2016.)

8. Shallow Coring with the JR During Non-IODP Periods

Delayed from Tuesday 17 May 2016

Tom Janecek presented the JRFB with the rationale behind NSF's proposal to use the *JOIDES Resolution* (JR) in a non-IODP mode to collect high-resolution Advanced Piston Corer (APC) cores from 0-100 mbsf (henceforth called JR100). This included the scientific need for these cores, the removal of the R/V *Knorr* from the UNOLS fleet (and the NSF decision to not redeploy the WHOI Long Coring System on another UNOLS vessel), and the potential availability of the JR to perform this work for at least one month/year.

The May 2015 Marine Sediment Coring Workshop and the Sea Change Report identified the need for reliable piston coring, as well as the priorities for this coring. The JR is being considered for this type of coring because it is available for at least one month/year, has the technical capabilities to retrieve relatively undisturbed cores to 100 mbsf, and has a significant portion of its day-rate already covered. With the NSF decision to not modify another UNOLS vessel to accommodate the WHOI Long Coring System, this proposal may provide the US community with cost-effective mechanism for partially addressing the deeper (piston) coring penetration needs. Additional costs above and beyond the day-rate (e.g. fuel, insurance, etc.) would be covered by NSF's ship operations program, and NSF science programs would provide funding for items normally included in a UNOLS-based coring proposal (e.g. PI Salaries, travel, post-cruise science funding, etc.).

Tom then outlined the basic framework on how this coring would be implemented. Once the JR schedule is set for a given year by the JRFB, the NSF would send out a Dear Colleague Letter to the US community calling for JR100 proposals to be implemented during a 2-4 week period in a geographic region near where the JR would be during its two-month tie-up period. The NSF core science programs would review these proposals. If recommended for funding by the NSF science programs, the JRSO would then work with the PIs to prepare for the cruise (pre-cruise meetings, staffing, safety reviews, medicals, etc.). The extent of core processing (multi-sensor track analyses, core description, chemical analyses, etc.) would depend on scientific needs and available funding. Data/sample management and core storage would follow the NSF OCE Sample and Data Policy. During the first few years of the program, preference would be given toward proposals that did not require site characterization, but once experience is gained additional site characterization (e.g. multi-core capability) could be added.

Gilbert Camoin requested that Tom present this information to the ECORD Facility Board (EFB) as he sees this as something the EFB could consider in the future for the MEBO. Mike Coffin suggested looking into international ship trades as an alternative. NSF representatives indicated that while NSF has a barter system with other countries, they do not see this as an alternative to JR100 program, which is meant to utilize the JR during part of its tie-up period, and as partial replacement for its lost long-coring capability.

Clive Neal expressed his concern that NSF's funding of this program could take funding from IODP-related site survey proposals. Neither Candice Major nor Jamie Allan from NSF agreed with this concern because:

- Economies on the facilities side have boosted core research budgets
- NSF supports competitive proposals (site survey proposals in support of IODP are doing well)
- JR100 opportunities provide a mechanism to leverage NSF-ODP funds and utilize a US facility more fully.

Jamie Allan noted that if the JRFB schedules enough expeditions such that there is no tie up, then NSF would not call for JR100 proposals that year.

Dave Mallinson and Hiroshi Nishi support the idea, but ask if this wouldn't or shouldn't be an IODP proposal – particularly in light of the need for EPSP approval? NSF replied that this is a way to utilize the JR (with non-IODP funds) during its tie up period when it would not be conducting IODP operations. JR100 will not need EPSP approval but will be reviewed by the Texas A/M University Safety Panel. JR100 proposals will be reviewed via the normal NSF MG&G proposal calls (February 15 and August 15 deadlines).

Anthony Koppers noted general support from the Board and while they have many questions, they look forward to seeing a Dear Colleague Letter describing this opportunity.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 17: The JRFB supports NSF's plans for the shallow JR100 coring program to be implemented during non-IODP periods, when the Facility Board's schedule for the *JOIDES Resolution* permits.

20. Update on Database Development and IODP Data Management

Brad Clement provided an update of the ongoing effort to deal with post-moratorium data. While the IODP was a leader in the management of open access data, new journal data management requirements (persistent archives with a DOI) had us looking for a new data management solution.

After looking at several options, the JRSO collaborated with CSDCO (Continental Scientific Drilling Coordination Office), IEDA (Interdisciplinary Earth Data Alliance), COL (Consortium for Ocean Leadership), and NSF on a proposal (IEDA lead) that was awarded and will start in June. We agreed to collaborate by putting JR's post-moratorium data into their Open Core Data (OCD) infrastructure, making it semantically discoverable, persistent, citable (DOI) and approachable. The basic query would be all data by hole. How to deal with images is yet to be worked out. There are plans for a community workshop and it is an open system, so they welcome the community adding to the tool kit.

There is also work at University of Colorado to bring our historic data to a more permanent archive (deep archive). We used the funds remaining from the previous program, and an agreement with MEXT to store and publish the data.

Jamie Austin asked how our international partners are managing their data? Brad stated that this is a development project and if it proves useful it would accept data from anyone. Other attendees expressed their concern that going with OCD could fracture IODP results from traditional paleoceanographic databases, like the NOAA paleoclimate database or PANGEA. Brad stated that the end goal of the OCD system is to link to these other systems (PANGEA, etc.), and because OCD is developmental, it may not be the last solution. However, because the federal government requires open data access but provides no infrastructure for it, we will start with OCD, and anchor our data with the deep archive.

21. Update on New IODP.org Website

Holly Given gave a brief introduction to the new IODP.org website, highlighting the content and features currently in place, and asking the attendees to look through the web site and let her know of comments or recommendations regarding content or design. She asked if the JRFB approved the switch to the new site in June to resolve current security / stability issues.

Jamie Austin suggested that the site should be the place where people rediscover the program as a program based on internationally driven science. He offered to talk to the Forum and gather suggestions from the community to make this the program portal.

Other meeting participants provided the following comments / suggestions:

- Provide a clear clickable list of participating nations
- Present current expeditions front and center on the home page
- Check the resolution on the logo as it appears blurry or fuzzy
- Add more photos on each page
- Provide an archive of historic photos
- Assure that the site is always compatible with smartphone viewing
- Add a prominent link to *Scientific Drilling*

Holly said that the SSO would look into each of these requests and address them as appropriate.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 18: The JRFB is impressed with the new, simplified implementation of the IODP.org website and agrees that it should be put online by June 2016.

22. Improved Public Relations (PR) for IODP and JR Expeditions

Carl Brenner provided meeting attendees with print copies of the Spring 2016 issue of *Ocean Discovery*, the USSSP's IODP newsletter, and welcomed feedback. Carl stated that, while the community called for a print version, it's also downloadable from usoceandiscovery.org, and community members will be pointed to the downloadable version via the community update email. Because creating this newsletter is labor intensive, and the USSSP doesn't have a dedicated Education and Outreach (E&O) person, the USSSP will publish this only semi-annually.

Holly Given asked what degree of engagement meeting attendees had with the publication *Scientific Drilling*? Several attendees indicated that they continued to receive and read *Scientific Drilling* and thought it, along with *Ocean Discovery*, were useful outreach tools. Other PR suggestions were:

- Continued use of the IODP.org flash box on the home page
- Articles and/or ads in *Eos*, *GSA Today*, and *AAPG Explorer* for broader audiences
- Send an email blast with what is in the news and where to find it
- A TED talk on IODP (general overview)
- The Taira International Prize – promote its purpose and winners
- Promote existing YouTube channels and videos
- Promote expedition-related press and interviews
- Participate in SubReddit AMA (Ask Me Anything)

Several members noted that as an organization, we must carefully select the topics and presenters, as not everything is interesting, and not everyone is an enthusiastic and dynamic presenter. Anthony Koppers will take these suggestions and talk to the editor of *Eos* to see if he can get a timelier article to discuss the expedition schedule and the long-term vision of the ship track, perhaps something under project updates. Anthony also asked Jamie Austin to ask about E&O in the upcoming IODP Forum meeting.

24. Membership of the JRFB and CAB

Anthony Koppers noted that the JRFB terms of Ryo Anma and Andrew Roberts and the Curatorial Advisory Board (CAB) terms of Noritoshi Suzuki and Clive Neal end on September 30, 2016, and he thanked them for their service. Anthony also noted that Dave Mallinson will be rotating out of his SEP co-chair role on September 30, 2016 and he thanked Dave for his service and dedication to the IODP.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 19: The JRFB sincerely thanks both Andrew Roberts and Ryo Anma for their excellent service on the JRFB as science members. Over the past three years the JRFB has vastly enjoyed their very enthusiastic and knowledgeable input in all JRFB matters, scheduling of proposals foremost.

ACTION ITEM 5: The JRFB Chair will request that USSSP solicit applications for the JRFB science member replacements of Andrew Roberts and Ryo Anma. Recommendations from this process will be circulated to the JRFB (by e-mail) for approval.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 20: The JRFB thanks both Noritoshi Suzuki and Clive Neal for their excellent service on the CAB as member and as Chair.

ACTION ITEM 6: The JRFB Chair will request that the EFB and CIB Chairs solicit applications for CAB member replacements of Noritoshi Suzuki and Clive Neal. Recommendations from this process will be circulated to the JRFB for approval. The Chair will be appointed by the JRFB after the new slate of CAB members is known.

CONSENSUS STATEMENT 21: The JRFB sincerely thanks Dave Mallinson, co-chair of SEP for the last 4 years and member of SCP for another 3 years before that. His outstanding leadership and high-energy approach in nurturing proposals, during numerous SEP meetings, but most impressively offline, while working with many-many proponent teams, have been a tremendous service to the overall IODP program and success.

25. Review of Consensus Statements and Action Items

Anthony Koppers led the review of consensus statements and accepted appropriate changes. The final statements are presented in this document.

26. Other Business and Next JRFB Meeting

The JRFB discussed 2017 schedules for the following meetings:

- EFB is scheduled for June 15-16, 2016.
- JRFB agreed to meet May 16-17, 2017.

Anthony thanked NSF for hosting the meeting, the SSO for their hard work in supporting the meeting, and for all participants for their active participation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.