

**JRFB Working Group on
Science Framework Proposal Requirements and Assessments
March 12, 2021 – Virtual Meeting**

Roster

Ken Miller	Chair	Rutgers University
Cara Burberry*	Member	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Gail Christeson	Member	SEP Co-Chair
Sean Gulick	Member	University of Texas at Austin
Susan Humphris	Member	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Lisa McNeill	Member	SEP Co-Chair
Dick Norris	Member	Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Brandi Reese	Member	Dauphin Island Sea Lab
Jamie Allan	Ex Officio	National Science Foundation
Donna Blackman	Ex Officio	<i>Chikyu</i> IODP Board
Brad Clement*	Ex Officio	<i>JOIDES Resolution</i> Science Operator
Dick Kroon	Ex Officio	IODP Forum
Mitch Malone ⁺	Ex Officio	<i>JOIDES Resolution</i> Science Operator
Charna Meth	Ex Officio	IODP Science Support Office
Clive Neal	Ex Officio	<i>JOIDES Resolution</i> Facility Board
Sasha Turchyn	Ex Officio	ECORD Facility Board

**not present/+alternate*

Consensus Statements

Consensus Statement 1: The WG-SFP agreed that the following elements (in any order) should be required in each Flagship Initiative workshop report:

- primary science objectives, goals, and hypotheses
- scientific milestones
- operational scenarios
- risks to obtaining objectives and potential mitigating strategies with operator input
- critical steps in obtaining science goals (milestones) and minimum success criteria
- data, samples, and models needed to achieve objectives
- tools and drilling technology needed to obtain the data and samples
- science communication opportunities and broader impacts
- workshop participant list (with the guidelines encouraging diversity, a range of career stages, and broad participation)

- leadership team plan (the leadership team should consist of co-chairs, with one co-chair being an early mid-career researcher; the guidelines should encourage three to five year terms, staggered rotations, and succession planning)

The WG-SFP welcomes feedback from the upcoming PMO and IODP Forum Meetings on the requirements for Flagship Initiative workshop reports and the consensus statements from the WG-SFP's prior meetings. PMOs should also discuss how this information could be provided to those organizing Flagship Initiative workshops.

Consensus Statement 2: In addition to the Science Communication Plain Language Summary, the WG-SFP agreed to recommend that the following questions be added to the requirements. These questions would not be part of the proposal's word count.

- Does this proposal build on previous scientific ocean drilling legs/expeditions from which a wider communications narrative could be built? If so, please provide the leg/expedition number(s).
- Do articles or media about this research already exist in the popular press or general interest literature? If so, please provide references (with links, if available).

Consensus Statement 3: The WG-SFP recommends that a future scientific ocean drilling program develop an overarching science communications plan. Proponents would then work with communication experts at the relevant facility PMO(s) to determine how their research plugs into that central strategy. The WG-SFP strongly encourages the PMOs to collaboratively develop of an overarching science communication plan.

Consensus Statement 4: The current Proposal Database System (PDB) asks proponents (1) which specific challenges of the Science Plan their proposal addresses (through a list of checkboxes) and (2) to state in the proposal text how their scientific objectives relate to, or advance beyond, the Science Plan. The WG-SFP agreed that a similar approach of checkboxes and proposal text could be used for proposals addressing the Strategic Objectives, Flagship Initiatives, and Enabling Elements of the Science Framework.

Consensus Statement 5: The WG-SFP recommends that proponents be required to interact with the ship operator in developing operational scenarios for their proposals. Each proposal submission deadline would have a preceding deadline for contacting the ship operator. Based on discussions with the proponent, the ship operator would provide the proponent with a cost category for two scenarios representing a range of success criteria and risk. The proposal submission forms would ask proponents for these two cost categories when submitting full proposals.