IODP-MI / IO Meeting #3

Corvallis, Oregon,
October 28-30th, 20004

List of Attendees

Peter Blum	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Mike Coffin	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Ronald Conze	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), GFZ Potsdam, ICDP, Germany
Dan Evans	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geol Survey, UK
David Fackler	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
John Firth	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Jeff Fox	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Dave Goldberg	Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Colin Graham	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geol Survey, UK
Thomas Janecek	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Yoshi Kawamura	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Kenji Kimura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Tech., Japan
Ann Klaus	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Shinishi Kuramoto	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Hans Christian Larsen	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Shigemi Matsuda	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Rakesh Mithal	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Daniel Quoidbach	Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Frank Rack	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc., USA
Ursula Roehl	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), University of Bremen, Ger
Sanny Saito	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Takao Saito	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Alister Skinner	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geol Survey, UK
Emanuel Soeding	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Kyoma Takahashi	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Hans-J. Wallrabe-Adams	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), University of Bremen, Ger

Summary Agenda

October 28th

08:30 –12:30
> **IO- only meeting** (CH2M Hill Alumni Center –Rm 111a/b))
>> Chaired by Frank Rack

13:30-17:30
> **Data Management:** (CH2M Hill Alumni Ctr –Rm 111a/b)
>> All attendees
>>> Chaired by Hans Christian Larsen

October 29th

08:30-17:30
> Two concurrent sessions:
>
> **1) Main IO Meeting Session** (CH2M Hill Alumni Ctr- Rm 111a/b)
>> Chaired by Tom Janecek
> **2) Data Management break-out Session** (CH2M Hill Alumni Ctr -Rm 114a/b))
>> Chaired by Emanuel Soeding

October 30th

08:30-15:00 (perhaps 12:00)
> Two concurrent sessions:
>
> **1) Main IO Meeting Session** ((CH2M Hill Alumni Ctr Rm 111a/b)
>> Chaired by Tom Janecek
> **2) Data Management break-out Session** CH2M Hill Alumni Ctr- Room 114a/b)
>> Chaired by Emanuel Soeding

<div align="center">**Report Summaries/Action Items:**</div>

A. IO-only Session:

Contact Frank Rack (frack@joiscience.org) for information about the IO-only session

B. Data Management Sessions:

1) Data Management: October 28th
> All attendees
> Chaired by Hans Christian Larsen

Topics:
- Welcome, agenda and introduction of participants (Larsen)
- CDEX Overview Report (Kuramoto)
- USIO Overview Report (Klaus)
- ESO Overview Report (Graham)
- Vision for the future ISC (Soeding)

<u>Welcome agenda and introduction</u>
Hans Christian Larsen welcomed everybody to the meeting. The participants introduced themselves stating their affiliation and position with the respective IOs. Larsen explained the new structure within the IODP-MI Sapporo office, which changed due to several new hires. Bernard Miville is filling the position as Data Management Specialist and will work full time on program data management. Emanuel Soeding is filling the position as Publications, Sample and Data Integration Manager. Both positions reports directly to the VP Science Planning. Saneatsu Saito is filling a new position as Executive Program Associate and will be part time involved with data management in addition to a number of other support and administrative functions. This position replaces a position as Program and Administrative Associate. See also www.iodp-mi-sapporo.org for overview of office structure. Sanny Saito was member of the iSciMP Database Working Group.

<u>CDEX Report</u>
Shin'ichi Kuramoto presented an overview of the current status of data management at CDEX including a brief overview of staffing and budget issues. Kuramoto introduced the new data management system called "SIO_7". The "SIO_7" is composed of J-CORES (JAMSTEC CORE SYSTEMATICS) and DEXIS. A detailed explanation of new features and capabilities was provided during the data management session on day two. Within the discussion Jamie Allen commented on security issues pointing out, that many NSF projects IT structures are not yet as secure as they should be. Special security measures should be undertaken to ensure, that valuable program data can not be compromised.

<u>USIO Report</u>
Ann Klaus presented an overview of the current status of data management at USIO (Texas A&M Univ. and Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory). Klaus explained the organization structure and personnel in USIO. Current system and future projects of JANUS and logging database were explained. Klaus also introduced legacy data issues. A detailed explanation was provided during the breakout session on the second day.

<u>ESO Report</u>
Colin Graham presented present an overview of the current status of data management at ESO including a brief overview of staffing and budget issues. Graham explained the current organization, personnel, and data management structure of the WDC MARE/Pangaea system and the ICDP DIS (Drilling Information System). A more detailed presentation was provided during the breakout session on the second day.

<u>Vision for the future ISC</u>
Emanuel Soeding presented a brief overview of the Information Service Center on the basis of SciMP Working Group report. Although the general concept of the ISC is well conveyed in this report, it is too generic for implementation. A comment was made from the NSF representative that realistic budget scenarios might differ from those anticipated by the working group.

All issues above were re-addressed in greater details the following days. PP slides presented are available fro IODP-MI on request (Soeding, with copy to Saito-san).

2) Data management breakout sessions: October 29th – 30th, 2004

Participants
Peter Blum	Texas A&M University, USIO
Ronald Conze	Geoforschungszentrum Potsdam, ICDP/ESO
David Fackler	Texas A&M University, USIO
John Firth	Texas A&M University, USIO
Colin Graham	British Geological Survey, ESO
Ann Klaus	Texas A&M University, USIO
Shin'ishi Kuramoto	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center, CDEX
Shigemi Matsuda	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center, CDEX
Rakesh Mithal	Texas A&M University, USIO
Daniel Quoidbach	Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USIO
Ursula Roehl	University of Bremen, ESO
Sanny Saito	IODP-MI
Emanuel Soeding	IODP-MI
Kyoma Takahashi	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center, CDEX
Hans-Joachim Wallrabe-Adams	University of Bremen, ESO
(Hans Christian Larsen)	IODP-MI (rotating between sessions)

Agenda Topics:
- Status report (capabilities/staffing/budget issues/outsourcing/software)
- Application development
- Database integration and data sharing
- Digital imaging implementation strategies

- Implementation of DOIs
- Curation issues
- Legacy issues
- Communication issues

29 October 2004

The goal of this meeting was to share information on the current status of the different IO's status in data management, as well as to develop integration and implementation strategies towards a future IODP Information Service Center (ISC). Detailed presentation of the database systems applied by the three IOs were given. Each IO in detail addressed the database management and evolution of capabilities including staffing and budget issues, degree of outsourcing, and which software was used. It was discussed, which issues need to be resolved to allow for database integration and data sharing to proceed. Digital imaging implementation strategies as well as legacy issues were brought up.

PP slides form the following presentations are available from IODP-MI on request (Soeding, with copy to Saito-san).

ESO

Colin Graham presented the organization and management structure of the European Consortium for Ocean Drilling (ECORD). The two main parts are located with respectively the British Geological Survey, who does the coordination, scientific, operational and offshore data management and the University of Bremen (Germany), where the curation and laboratory facilities, on-shore science parties, the core repository and the onshore data management services are located. Graham explained the current status of the ESO Data Management, based on the data flow and organization throughout the MSP expedition ACEX (Arctic Coring Expedition).

The data during the ACEX cruise was acquired on-site using a specifically designed Drilling Information System (DIS). Ronald Conze introduced into the methods and capabilities of the DIS. This system is in use with various ICDP projects, being individually adapted to the special needs of these drilling projects. There are many analogies to the concept of the MSPs, where different platforms and targets require different kinds of instruments and data to be used. For the IODP-missions it was taken care of, that the acquired data types within the DIS are of the same type as their analogues in the JANUS database, to prepare for a possible data integration. The DIS is based on a SQL-Server database using MS-Access clients. Common scientific commercial programs are used as visualization tools(i.e. Strater by GoldenSoftware for plotting of downhole data (lithologies, logging data etc.)). ACEX had two data management persons onboard the operating vessels.

The data onshore is stored in the Pangaea World Data Center (WDC) database as was demonstrated by Hans-Joachim Wallrabe-Adams. Pangaea uses a Sybase database engine with 4D clients. Visualization tools include several in-house developed standalone programs, mainly for MS Windows environments. As part of its quality control concept, only trained data managers may enter data into the system. These persons check and verify every data set before it is added to the database. Within Pangaea data is closely linked to publications. Consequently

Pangaea makes extensive use of digital links to connect the datasets to publications called Digital Object Identifiers (DOI). Pangaea takes responsibility for the legacy of the MSP program. All data is stored there – it is supposed to receive long term EU funding for this legacy responsibility.

USIO
The JANUS database is the shipboard and on-shore database of the riserless vessel, operated by the USIO. Rakesh Mithal first gave a short overview of LDEO's logging database, which contains the ODP logging data, and is managed by the LDEO Bore Hole Research Group. This database mainly contains logging data and metadata from the JR onboard Schlumberger downhole logging system. The data is stored in flat file format on a Unix system, to stay consistent with the NGDC data standards to simplify integration of DSDP, ODP and IODP data. Logging data are not accessible through JANUS, however, both the logging and the core data are accessible from the USIO website (www.iodp-usio.org). Rakesh then reviewed the history, data acquisition, analysis, access and application development, data migration between on-shore and off-shore as well as the database management and quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) of the JANUS database maintained and operated at Texas A&M University. JANUS uses ORACLE as the database engine using two redundant SUN server systems mirroring each other. Four people (= 3 FTE) are involved in data management activities at TAMU: Database Administrator (100%), Senior Data Analyst (100%), Data Librarian (80%) and Supervisor of Databases & Archives (20%).

Based on ODP experience with running JANUS, TAMU staff commented significantly on issues where the transition from a one-ship program towards a three platform program might become difficult and which points need attention and coordination between the three IOs. Many of the action items listed in chapter c. result from this discussion, in particular the depth calculation, database documentation and migration schemes and the issue of database-internal site numbering.

Peter Blum introduced the ongoing data application developments at TAMU. These enhancements covered data capturing of digital images, core logging, visual core descriptions (VCD), QA/QC protocols, Depth mapping, age modelers and stratigraphic correlation programs. Current resources do not allow TAMU to address all of the topics immediately. However, there are plans to hire additional application developers which might provide enough manpower to work on more of these applications at the same time. The schedule is still very tight, if these should be finished within the next two years. Peter then recommended, that especially in application development, coordination between the different IOs is a must, as the tasks become more complicated, and the timeline is tighter.

CDEX
Shinichi Kuramoto, Shigemi Matsuda and Kyoma Takahashi presented the new management structure as well as the latest developments of the J-CORES database. For the first time CDEX announced and presented their development of a new overarching data management and visualization program called SIO_7 (Science Information from the 7 Oceans). SIO_7 includes the
- JCORES database, for all Chikyu onboard data, and the
- DEXIS database, for all other data collected, like site survey, seismic, logging data etc.

J-CORES itself is ready to be tested onboard the Chikyu and in the Kochi Core Center. The tests are planned to July 2006 and February 2005, respectively. J-CORES uses an Oracle database system as well as Janus. However, the data model of J-CORES has been developed to match the Chikyu's sciences, without any compatibilities with that of Janus. Several new tools were developed for J-CORES in Java and demonstrated by Kyoma Takahashi. They are, a visual core description (VCD) tool, a stratigraphy/geochronology tool including age-modeling, and data visualization tool (Composite Log Viewer). The whole system, entity relationship diagrams (ERD) of the data model and Java programs, will be published.

DEXIS, the other wing of SIO_7, is aimed to store seismic and logging data, as well as other electronic documents associated with the operations of the Chikyu. DEXIS is equipped with a GIS tool, to search for data. It does use GeoFrame to visualize logging and 2D and 3D seismic data. The DEXIS online processing capabilities were demonstrated by Kyoma Takahashi as well and showed, that the development standard for these kind of tools has already progressed very far, and the tools are about ready for integration. While the GeoFrame software is a commercial tool, the architecture developed by CDEX can be made available, so the same functionalities can be implemented to other GeoFrame installations within the program. DEXIS was set up by 2 advisors and a database engineer.

SIO_7 is the data management and visualization system overarching J-CORES and DEXIS. Data in J-CORES and DEXIS are available in SIO_7 human interfaces by employing XML technologies.

Several issues came up discussing the different capabilities of Chikyu and the JR, among them how to treat cuttings and implement consistent depth estimations.

Curation Issues
John Firth outlined how Cross IO-Distributions of Cores, Cuttings and other Materials have implications for database and analytical services. Material dealt with includes cores of different diameters, well cuttings, sidewall cores, downhole fluid samples and downhole data. This material is drilled with one of the drilling platforms, analyzed with the onboard facilities, and then (probably) sent to the core repositories, depending on the region where the core was taken. These core repositories do again have different analytical capabilities. An issue that needs to be addressed is, how the material and data flow from the different labs, can be organized, so measurements and data treatment stays comparable throughout the program. These issues will be reported to the IODP Curatorial Advisory Board (CAB) headed by IDOP-MI VP for science planning. Once a core distribution policy is determined, the specific data management issues will be dealt with by the data management coordination group (see section 7. Coordination issues and program data management policies)

October 30th

Digital Imaging
The implementation plans of the USIO for digital imaging were presented by Peter Blum.
Imaging is done to

- Collect spatially registered information that is viewed as a 2-D or 3-D image
- Collect and archive core images to preserve the appearance of the cores soon after they were drilled - core images are by far the most requested data type
- Collect digital images because they allow more rapid distribution and access, and better quantitative QC, compared to film photographs
- Collect the highest quality possible color images
- Collect images that reveal what the naked eye does not: microscopic, infrared, x-ray
- Reduce image data to obtain derivative information, such as spectral characteristics and material properties

While classical photography was used through DSDP and most of ODP, demand for digital imaging began in the mid nineties, when the technical development yielded satisfying affordable results. Since then digital imaging has slowly replaced the classical photographic images.
As a minimum coordination effort the   IOs must share…
- ….protocols for meta data collection;
- ….standards for QA/QC:
- ….processes and technology for image archiving

To do this, the major challenges are:
- Definition of identifiers and other meta data, and consistent capture of the meta data
- QA/QC - each image may require different parameter values
- Large data volume - process, computing resources and archiving

Application Development
Covered within the IO presentations, no separate discussion.

Coordination issues and overarching data management policies
To handle long- and short term coordination issues between the IOs, a Data Management Coordination Group was established, with two contact persons from each IO. IODP-MI will chair the group (initially by Soeding) and establish a list server to facilitate discussions and recovery of information exchanged A requested for IOs to report to this group on all new initiatives was endorsed. The group will coordinate all short term data management issues between the IOs and act as forum for discussions and planning of future meetings.

The coordination group initially consists of the following persons, but can be amended on a case by case basis with additional expertise as necessary. Membership is:

Peter Blum	TAMU, USIO
Colin Graham	BGS, ESO
Shinishi Kuramoto	JAMSTEC, CDEX
Shigemi Matsuda	JAMSTEC, CDEX
Rakesh Mithal	TAMU, USIO
Bernard Miville	IODP-MI
Sanny Saito	IODP-MI
Emanuel Soeding	IODP-MI (chair)
Hans-Joachim Wallrabe-Adams	University Bremen, ESO

The coordination group intentionally is kept small in order to keep input and discussion manageable. It is expected that group members:

- raise discussion issues that need coordination among the IOs
- outline at least one solution on how to handle an issue raised
- discuss topics with their respective IO-experts internally and then share these discussions with the other IOs through this group
- give feedback on every issue brought up, even if "no opinion" is the respsonse

A mailing-list has been set up by IODP-MI at dm_coordination@iodp-mi-sapporo.org (note underscore after dm!) start the discussions. The group will begin communication from December 1st.

Data Management Action Items
The discussion held during the meeting resulted in a number of action items listed in the following.

Action Item 1 Terminologies: Despite the "ODP" terminology generally is used, it appeared that between IOs, the data management terminology may not be entirely uniform and consistent. e.g., the terms "site", "event", "cruise", "expedition" should be defined to be consistently used throughout the program. For this purpose a central website (i.e.,Wiki) should be established. TAMU is requested to supply their current list of terms to the coordination group.

Action Item 2 Site numbering: The new numbering system for expedition sites causes internal database problems with JANUS. As the "site"-field is defined as an *int* and many tables refer to this number as a key value, the new naming scheme (Platform Key – site number, starting at 1 for each individual platform, i.e. M1, M2, M3...for MSP, C1, C2, C3...for Chikyu, J1, J2, J3...for JR) can only be introduced by applying a database Internal workaround. This would be a second table mapping the new site naming scheme onto the old one. This, however, leads to a different site numbering within the database than to the outside. The data management coordination group must resolve this issue as sson as possible and no later that end January. The three IOs are requested to report to IODP-MI how they will handle this issue by January 17th.

Action Item 3 Uniform naming of Lithologies: A uniform naming scheme for lithologies is needed for the visual core descriptions on all platforms. CDEX and ESO are requested to

comment on the current TAMU policy by January 17th in preparation for the next coordination group meeting (likely early February). A special lithology sub-group, and possibly SAS advise, might be necessary to define this list.

Action Item 4 Addressing the Depth problem: The determination of the depth determined while drilling and later referred to as "mbsf" is consistent between USIO and CDEX. It is however not consistent with the MSP so far, as the DIS, coming from ICDP with a usually stable drilling platform didn't have this problem to the same extent as IODP with a platform, subjected to heave etc. The ESO group will discuss a solution with assistance from USIO and CDEX as necessary and report a solution during the next coordination group meeting. A general 'one fit all' solution might not exist as platform specifics change between different missions.

Action Item 5 Database Documentation: To allow in depth discussions on the database structures each IO will have their database structure (ERD) for the off-shore and on-shore database available on the web by the next IO meeting. This information will be published among the IOs as soon as it is available. It is anticipated that the diagrams will be updated as changes are introduced. However, all changes are coordinated with the coordination group for comments before implementation.

Action Item 6 Naming of Cuttings and Samples: The existence of a program-wide identification and labeling scheme for cuttings and samples was not cear to the participants. This will involve input from the IODP curators to the coordination group. VP SP chairing the Curatorial Advisory Board (CAB) will initiate action.

Action Item 7 Scheme for Cross IO-Distributions of Cores and Samples: A Policy for the distribution of Cores, Samples, Cuttings and other material is currently being developed by IODP-MI in consultation with the CAB and the lead agencies. The policy eventually decided will need the attention of the coordination group for possible consequences in terms of data management, particularly for cores drilled by one IO and curated by another IO.

Action Item 8 Digital Images: A policy about how and which digital images need to be stored will be established. Discussions on this subject will begin during the on-site visit of IODP-MI data management personnel in January to TAMU and CDEX. The coordination group will then outline a scheme during their next meeting (February 2005 ?) and willpresent a proposal before April 2005.

Other:
Shin'ichi Kuramoto has kindly offered to host a second data management meeting at JAMSTEC / Yokohama, possibly in late January or early February 2005.

C. IODP-MI /IO Session

Attendees

Jack Baldauf	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Mike Coffin	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Dan Evans	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geol Survey, UK
John Firth	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Jeff Fox	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Thomas Janecek	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Yoshihisa Kawamura	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Ann Klaus	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Shinichi Kuramoto	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Hans Christian Larsen	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Frank Rack	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc., USA
Ursula Roehl	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), Univ of Bremen, Germany
Takao Saito	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Alister Skinner	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geol Survey, UK

Agenda / Major Discussion Topics during this session
1) Repositories, Curation and Sample Policies
2) Publications
3) Communications
4) Expedition Assessment and Evaluation
5) Minimum Measurements
6) Safety
7) Engineering Development
8) Other-

Summary of Discussion Topics, Action Items and Timelines

1) Repositories, Curation, and Sample Policies

IODP /ODP/DSDP Core Distribution

Two models for core distribution were proposed:
Model 1:
- IODP cores distributed via geographic distribution
- DSDP/ODP Cores consolidated:
  - West Coast Repository cores to Gulf Coast Repository (GCR)
  - East Coast Repository to Bremen Core Repository (BCR)
    - (w/ Caribbean/GOM to Gulf Coast Repository)

Model 2:
- IODP/DSDP/ODP cores distributed via geographic distribution
    -Arctic- BCR
    -Atlantic- BCR
    -Caribbean and GOM-GCR
    -Southern Ocean-GCR
    -Pacific-GCR
    -Marginal Seas and Indian Ocean- Kochi

A working group was established to determine the budgetary and logistical details of each model and then forward this information to NSF. The working group consist of J. Firth, Y. Kawamura, U. Roehl, T. Janecek

Action Item: Develop details for Conceptual Core Distribution Models and send to NSF/MEXT for comment.

Time line: Send to NSF/MEXT by mid-late November for comment. Present model(s) at December SPPOC

Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy
The interim Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy needs revisions for readability and content. Significant content input needed on the Curation Procedures (e.g., how to submit a sample request, creation of permanent archive, when can archive be sampled?, etc) and Definitions (e.g., who is the IODP curator, what is the moratorium period, etc).

Action Item: Working group of A Klaus, S. Kuramoto, T Janecek to meet at IODP-MI headquarters to begin work on finalizing document. T. Janecek will develop full draft based upon this initial meeting. Hans Christian Larsen will work with Publications Task Force to finalize document

Time Line: Initial meeting of working group on Oct 1. T Janecek to prepare full draft ASAP. Hans Christian Larsen to present document to SPPOC in December.

Database usage between repositories
In IODP, the multiple repositories will be used by multiple platforms resulting in numerous database use and integration issues including:
- Which database will be used by curators for collections retrieved by different platforms?
- Will all repositories need to have full access and knowledge of DIS, JCORE and Janus?
- How will data management be coordinated?
- Will a coordinated sample request numbering system be instituted in IODP?

Action Item: Data Management Task Force to address these issues
Timeline: Unknown

Roles and responsibilities of Curators

In IODP, what are the roles and responsibilities of the curators at each of the repositories. In particular:

- What guidelines will be established regarding roles and responsibilities of the curators related to DSDP/ODP cores? Does the BCR Curator have responsibility for administering sample requests from DSDP/ODP core that resides in this facility? Or does the USIO Curator maintain responsibility for administering these requests?
- What guidelines will be established regarding roles and responsibilities of the curators related to IODP cores? Will the Curator affiliated with an IO be responsible for administering sample requests for IODP core that was collected on that IO's drilling platform or that resides at that repository? How will sample request across multiple repositories be handled? Will scientists need to submit a single request or multiple separate requests related to samples at each repository? Will requests be approved as separate parts related to different repositories or as one integrated study by all affiliated Curators and/or by one Curator?
- What guidelines will be established regarding roles and responsibilities of the curators related to the CAB? .

Action Item: Tom Janecek (working with curators at BCR, GCR, and Kochi) to develop a draft document addressing roles and responsibilities of IODP curators.
Timeline: Draft document by Jan 1, 2006.

2) Publications Issues:

The majority of the items in this section were tabled for this section pending the outcome of the upcoming Publications Task Force.   The main discussion topic in this section was the need to standardize the Prospectus and Preliminary reports between the IOs with particular attention paid to Roles, Content and Production responsibilities.

Action Item : Define Roles/Content/Production responsibilities for Prospectus and Preliminary Report Generation. H.C. Larsen (with A. Klaus, Dan Evan, S. Kuramoto) to use Publications Task force to work toward resolution of this action item.
Time Line: ASAP after discussion during November Publications Task Force meeting.

3) Communications

Contacts
Lines of communication between IODP-MI and the IOs (and between the IOs themselves) are not well-defined. It is not often clear who is the contact point for each area of responsibility at IODP-MI and the IOs and what are the lines of responsibility and reporting for each contact.

Action Item: T.Janecek to send IOs a list of areas (e.g., Publications, Data Management, Operations, etc) for which contact points are needed.   IOs to send list of IO contacts, areas of responsibility, and reporting lines to T.Janecek who will then compile the information and return it to the IOs with a list of IODP-MI contacts .

Time Line: January 1, 2005

Daily/Weekly Reports and Site Summaries
The distribution of the summary reports coming from the (e.g., daily, weekly, site summaries) are not consistent between the IOs. Discussion revolved around who should be on the distribution lists for each type of report. Some of the content of the daily report is sensitive/confidential in nature and cannot be distributed beyond directors/key personnel at the IOs, IODP-MI and the funding agencies. The weekly reports and site summaries generally have this sensitive information removed and can be posted to a wider distribution.

Action Item: IOs to supply each other with names of personnel to receive the full unedited Daily Reports. Others can be added by an IO on expedition-by-expedition basis if there is a specific need. The content of these Daily Reports should follow the current JOIDES Resolution model.

Time line: January 1, 2005

There is a lot of interest in the community to see the science portion of the daily reports There isn't any sensitive/confidential information in these science reports so they could be extracted from the Daily Report and place on the web.

Action Item: The Science portion of Daily Report should be extracted and placed on IO website on a daily basis (or when there is science to report).   The complete Weekly Reports and Site Summaries should also be placed on the IO website when sent from the ship.

Time line: January 1, 2005

SPC/SPPOC Presentations
Discussion centered on the need to develop short but informative written reports for SPC/SPPOC and other SAS meetings, to minimize overlap of oral presentations, and to improve access to reports and ppt presentations used at meetings.

Action Item: Han Christian Larsen to define content of IO and IODP-MI written reports for SPC and other meetings. Consensus is that these should be short (1-2 page) report –not simply printed copies of ppt presentations.

Timeline: ASAP.

A lot of effort goes into presentations used at SPC/SPPOC and other SAS meetings. The full contents of these presentations are not consistently entered into minutes (especially for meetings where there are not any official reporters (e.g., most technical panel meetings).

Action Item: SAS group in IODP-MI Sapporo office to develop mechanism to link vetted powerpoint presentation to minutes.

Time line: ASAP

Meeting Agenda Notification
The numerous SAS and management meetings require long-lead time planning for the IOs to ensure that the correct personnel can be available for the meeting and that the proper information is prepared for the meeting. Meetings should avoid known port-calls or other conflicting times for the IOs.   The development of a Master Calendar on the IODP-MI website that incorporates SAS meetings, Task force meetings, OPCOM, REVCOM, port calls, etc, would help IOs with meeting planning and preparation.

Action Item: IODP-MI to develop Master Calendar on the IODP-MI website to assist the community with meeting planning.

Time line: ASAP

Protocols for Calls for applications
The protocols and procedures for issuing and posting the "Call for Application" needs to be better defined so that all the IOs and IODP-MI issue consistent information.. It is generally agreed that IODP-MI should issue the initial announcement/

Action Item: Hans Christian Larsen to issue guidelines for the "Call for Applications" process.

Time line: ASAP

---

4) Expedition Technical Assessment

Specific details about the new expedition technical assessment committee (REVCOM) were presented. Discussion centered on the roles of IODP-MI and the IOs, the frequency of meetings, confidentiality of reports, standards for review and the process/procedures utilized for each REVCOM.

A consensus formed on having a biannual review process at least for JOIDES Resolution reviews. MSP reviews will normally be once per year (or after each MSP operation. The frequency of Chikyu reviews is not known at this time.

The IOs agreed that an representative from each IO should be present at each review and that there is no need for a national office presence. The group also agreed that a pool of industry representatives with various backgrounds and expertise (separate from TAP) should be established for these reviews. This would provide for a more consistent review process for the IOs.

The IOs requested that IODP-MI consider science party input very carefully as their perceptions throughout the expedition and as time passes after an expedition.

The IOs requested that a process/procedures for the reviews as well as the standards/expectations upon which the reviews are based be codified by IODP-MI.

Action Item: IODP-MI (T. Janecek) to develop written expectations/standards, process, formats, guidelines for IOs

Time line: ASAP

---

5) Safety

The status of the overarching Health, Safety, and Environmental (HSE) document was discussed. The IOs have provided their comments and revisions but it is not clear where this document stands with respect to SPPOC approval.

Action Item: T. Janecek to determine status at of HSE document on the agenda for December SPPOC meeting.

Time line: Before December SPPOC meeting.

---

6) Minimum Measurements

The IOs addressed this topic during their meeting session and over the past year have developed a draft of Minimum Measuremements document in conjunction with the SciMP. IODP-MI can

assist with the development of this document by helping to establish priorities for measurements on the different platforms and repositories and developing a more integrated document.

> **Action Item:** IODP-MI to review Minimum Measurements document and address outstanding issues in current document.
>
> **Time line:** ASAP

7) Engineering Development

The definition of Engineering Development for the FY05 and beyond Program Plans was briefly discussed. More information was needed by the Lead Agencies regarding the exact definition and further discussion was delayed until this information was received.

> **Action Item**: T, Janecek to verify Engineering Development definitions for IOs for FY06 Program Plan and also to verify how replacement costs for large items are defined.
>
> **Time line:** ASAP

8) Other

Co-Chief Monitoring
The protocols for monitoring the national balance for Co-Chief scientists are unclear. Are Co-Chiefs considered to be part of the science party or are they to be considered separately.

> **Action Item:** T.Janecek to verify with NSF/MEXT how co-chiefs are to be counted in terms of national balance (i.e., as part of the science party or independently). \
>
> **Time line:** ASAP