

IODP Proposal Evaluation Panel
1st Meeting, 1-3 December 2012
San Francisco, USA

Proposal Evaluation Panel – PEP

Richard Arculus	Australian National University
Jennifer Biddle	University of Delaware
Tim Bralower	Pennsylvania State University
Julie Carlut	CNRS (Centre national de la recherche scientifique)
Antonio Cattaneo ^a	IFREMER
Gail Christeson ^b	University of Texas Institute for Geophysics
Tim Ferdelman	Max-Planck-Institut für marine Mikrobiologie
Ian Hall ^c	Cardiff University
David Hodell	University of Cambridge
Matthew Hornbach	University of Texas at Austin
Barbara John	University of Wyoming
Juergen Koepke	Institut für Mineralogie, Leibniz Universität Hannover
Dick Kroon*	The University of Edinburgh
Kyung Eun Lee	Korea Maritime University
John MacLennan	University of Cambridge
Cecilia McHugh	Queens College, CUNY
Katsuyoshi Michibayashi	Shizuoka University
Tomoaki Morishita	Kanazawa University
Maryline Moulin	Instituto Dom Luiz
Masafumi Murayama	Kochi University
Clive Neal	University of Notre Dame
Hiroshi Nishi	Tohoku University
Koichiro Obana	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC)
Amelia Shevenell	University of South Florida
Ashok Singhvi	Physical Research Laboratory
Aleksey Smirnov	Michigan Technological University
David Smith	University of Rhode Island
Michael Strasser	ETH Zurich
Nabil Sultan	IFREMER
Yohey Suzuki	The University of Tokyo
Yoshinori Takano	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC)
Eiichi Takazawa	Niigata University
Jun Tian	Tongji University
Jody Webster	Sydney University
Yasuhiro Yamada	Kyoto University
Yusuke Yokoyama	The University of Tokyo
James Zachos	University of California, Santa Cruz

Unable to attend.

a –Alternate for Sultan

b –Alternate for Hornback

c –Alternate for Hodell

Liaisons, Guests, and Observers

Jamie Allan	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Rodey Batiza	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Peter Blum	Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, USA
Sarah Davies	University of Leicester, UK
David Divins	Ocean Drilling, The Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Nobuhisa Eguchi	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Julie Farver	Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Holly Given	Consultant to IODP-MI, USA
Tom Janecek	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Yoshi Kawamura	IODP Management International, Inc., Japan
Yusuke Kubo	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Shin'ichi Kuramoto	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Hans Christian Larsen	IODP Management International, Inc., Japan
Young-Joo Lee	Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources (KIGAM), Korea
Gilles Lericolais	IFREMER, France
Alberto Malinverno	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, USA
Mitch Malone	Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, USA
Charna Meth	U.S. Science Support Program, Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Catherine Mével	ECORD Managing Agency, Paris Geophysical Institute, France
Kiyoka Miki	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Dhananjai Pandey	National Centre for Antarctic and Ocean Research, India
Terry Quinn	University of Texas at Austin, USA
Sanny Saito	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Japan
Jeff Schuffert	U.S. Science Support Program, Consortium for Ocean Leadership, USA
Shingo Shitaba	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Craig Shipp	Shell International E&P
Angela Slagle	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Sean Toczko	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Shouting Tuo	Tongji University, China
Keita Umetsu	Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC), Japan
Michiko Yamamoto	IODP Management International, Inc., Japan

**IODP Proposal Evaluation Panel
1st Meeting, 1-3 December 2012
San Francisco, USA**

DRAFT minutes (Ver. 2)

Thursday	1 December 2012	08:30-17:30
-----------------	------------------------	--------------------

1. Introduction

1.1. Call to order and self-introductions

PEP chair Dick Kroon called the meeting to order at 8:30. All meeting participants introduced themselves.

1.2. Welcome and meeting logistics

Local host Jeff Schuffert welcomed the meeting participants and outlined the logistics for the meeting.

1.3. PEP and new SAS

1.3.1. Role of PEP in SAS (terms of reference)

Kroon went over PEP's terms of reference and noted the following roles of PEP.

1. PEP evaluates all proposals in the context of the themes of the new science plan
2. PEP selects the best proposals and forwards them to SIPCOM and OTF
3. PEP stimulates proposal pressure in certain scientific areas in case needed

Kroon reminded the panel members of the following review procedure.

1. PEP evaluates Pre-proposals, identifies those ready for development into a full proposal (one revision!), nursing stage, MDP, etc.
2. PEP evaluates full proposals, identifies those ready for external review (note, only one revision possible if not ready for external review!).
3. PEP rates full proposals, taking into account reviewers comments and reply letter, the 'good and excellent ones' will move forward to OTF and SIPCOM (note, in the post 2013 system directly to Platform providers)

1.3.2. Approval of 4 vice chairs

Kroon introduced 4 vice chairs.

Tim Bralower - Climate and Ocean Change

Yoshinori Takano - Biosphere Frontiers

Richard Arculus - Earth Connections

Michi Strasser - Earth in Motion

Kroon asked the sub-chairs to lead the discussion in the thematic sub-panels and present the discussion summary in the agenda item 7.

1.4. Approve PEP meeting agenda

Kroon summarized the major agenda items for the meeting. He asked if there needed to be any changes to the agenda. No changes were suggested.

1.5. PEP Review Process

1.5.1 Rules and Policies

Kroon explained the following rules and policies applied to the PEP meeting.

[Voting]

1. When PEP makes a motion or consensus statement, chair assigns the sub-chair, or other who moves, to write down the statement on which we vote.
2. The sub-chair counts the votes
3. The information of who moved, who seconded, and who voted what is needed for agenda item 10 (Review of motions and consensus items"). The sub-chair sends information to Yamamoto (MI) and chair.

[Conflict of Interest]

The members who fit the following conditions are considered to have a conflict of interest and need to declare to chair beforehand.

- PEP members who are co-proponent of proposal leave the room during discussions
- PEP members who have a colleague as co-proponent don't comment during the discussions and abstain from voting

1.5.2. Design of discussions

Kroon explained the roles of watchdogs, chair and sub-chairs in PEP discussions.

- Watchdog 1 presents proposal (plenary or in break-out groups), comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal
- Watchdog 2 writes comments to proponents
- Watchdog 3 adds to the discussion
- Chair or vice-chair asks for additional comments from audience, discussion follows. Chair or vice-chair makes a proposition for the fate of the proposal. If there is no consensus, the panel members vote.

Kroon reminded that watchdogs must not ask the proponents for presentation slides.

1.5.3. Rating system and criteria

[Evaluation criteria]

- Are the scientific questions/hypotheses being addressed exciting and of sufficiently wide interest to justify the requested resources?
- Will the proposal significantly advance one or more goals of the Science Plan?
- Would the proposal engage new communities or other science programs into the drilling program?
- To what degree does the integrated experimental design of site characterization, drilling, sampling, measurements, and downhole experiments constitute a compelling and feasible scientific proposal?

[Rating]

(See the full set of rating parameters in appendix.)

Larsen commented that proposals which lack a partial site survey data set or EPSP related information could be forwarded into the holding bin.

1.5.4. Key points for feedback to proponents.

Kroon explained that the feedback to the proponents should describe how the proponents could clear the evaluation criteria above.

Larsen informed that PEP can recommend proponents, who have submitted a Pre-proposal,

to have a workshop, which is a new option from this meeting.

2. Question-and-answers to Agency reports

Agency reports have been previously tabled. Clive Neal asked for some insight from the NSF representative with respect to the future of the IODP, and clarification why the situation of the future platform implementation by separate agencies had developed during the past year. Rodey Batiza replied that the fundamental issues were budgetary, and it should be solved in a clear optimization of available funding for maximal scientific return for the largest community.

Catherine Mével informed that ECORD, NSF and MEXT had a meeting in August, and came to an agreement, which has been already partly published, but the details will be finalized at the next Goa meeting in January. The basic idea of the common international SAS structure as the only one entry will be kept for future.

Kroon stressed that PEP helps the bottom-up system driven by proposal pressure, which is very important for this program. Larsen added that PEP is the most important panel as it is the only panel to evaluate science.

3. IODP Management International, Inc. (IODP-MI) report

Michiko Yamamoto reported the statistics of IODP active proposals.

[Proposal statistic]

Total number of active proposal: 87

Breakdown by science plan theme

Theme	Number of proposal
Climate and Ocean	40
Biosphere Frontier	15
Earth Connections	20
Earth in Motion	12

Breakdown by ocean

Ocean	Number of proposal
Arctic	6
Atlantic	23
Indian	14

Pacific	37
Southern	4

Breakdown by SAS evaluation stage

SAS Stage	Number of proposal
PEP(New)	5
PEP(SSEP)	38
PEP(SPC)	6
OTF	37
Holding Bin	1

() = Old SAS stage the proposals were transferred from.

Breakdown by lead proponent

Country of PI	Number of proposal
US	39
Japan	12
ECORD	29
China	1
Korea	1
ANZIC	4
India	1

Breakdown by platform

Platform	Number of proposal
Non-Riser	59
Riser	8
MSP	11
Multiple	6

[Approved IODP workshop list]

Title	Lead_proponents	Country	Proposed date
Continental transform boundaries: Tectonic evolution and Geohazards	McHugh	USA	2011
Workshop to develop a conceptual framework for ocean drilling to unlock thesecrets of slow slip events	Wallace	ANZIC:NZ	June 2011
Indian Ocean Drilling	Pandey	India	Oct-Nov. 2011
Coordinated Scientific Drilling in the Canadian Beaufort Sea: Addressing Past, Present and Future Changes in Arctic Terrestrial and Marine Systems.	Matt O'Regan	UK	Jan-Feb. 2012
Unlocking the opening processes of the South China Sea	Chun-Feng Li	China	Jan, 2012

[Schedule of SAS meeting]

19-Jan-12	SIPCOM	GOA, India
April 1st		Proposal deadline
19-Mar-12	STP	Kochi, Japan
28-Mar-12	EPSP	College Station, USA
May, 2012	PEP	TBD

[IODP-MI news]

- New IODP web site will be open in Spring 2012
- IODP-MI has received additional funding (up to 600K USD) to fund necessary instrumentation to pursue J-FAST as planned.
- New proposal submission system is under development.
- Change in staff: Hans Christian Larsen and Kevin Johnson leave IODP-MI at end of January.

Larsen informed that only 5 proposals have been submitted for the last October 1st deadline,

which is the lowest submission number since the start of IODP.

Kroon noted that keeping proposal pressure is very important. Mével informed that a letter was sent out to the Ocean Drilling community emphasizing the continuous need of submitting the best ideas as proposals to the system.

4. Implementing Organization (IO) reports

4.1. CDEX

Yusuke Kubo provided CDEX report.

Chikyu's activity over the last 12 months

Expedition #	Title	Time window
Exp 332	NanTroSEIZE Riserless Observatory 2	25 Oct to 12 Dec
Exp 333	NanTroSEIZE Inputs Coring 2 and Heat Flow	12 Dec to 10 Jan
Non-IODP		10 Jan to 7 Mar
Exp 337	Deep Coalbed Biosphere off Shimokita	Postponed
Exp 338	NanTroSEIZE Plate Boundary Deep Riser - 2	Postponed

[Exp 332: NanTroSEIZE Riserless Observatory 2]

- Installed a permanent riserless long-term borehole observatory at Site C0002
- Recovered the temporary SmartPlug and replaced it with a newly designed GeniusPlug at Site C0010
- The data collected from the recovered SmartPlug proved to be complete time series data over >15 months

[Exp 333: NanTroSEIZE Inputs Coring 2 and Heat Flow]

- Coring and in situ heat flow measurements at C0011 and C0012
- Basement coring at Site C0012
- Coring mass transport deposits associated with major splay fault at C0018

Chikyu activity over the coming 12 months

Expedition #	Title	Time window
Non-IODP	At Sri Lanka	~ late Jan
Non-IODP	At Nankai Trough	Feb-Mar

Exp 343	Japan Trench Fast Drilling Project	1 Apr to 25 May
Annual inspection (and installation of a new thruster) in dry dock		
Exp 337	Coalbed biosphere off Shimokita	6 Jul to 16 Sep
Exp 338	NanTroSEIZE Plate Boundary Deep Riser - 2	19 Sep to 31 Jan, 2013

[Exp 343: Japan Trench Fast Drilling Project (1 Apr - 25 May, 2012)]

- LWD, temperature measurement, and coring across co-seismic slip will provide dynamic coefficient of friction and stress conditions

[Exp 337: Deep Coalbed Biosphere off Shimokita (15 Mar to 21 May, 2012)]

- Riser drilling with spot cores to 2200 mbsf
- Large diameter cores across the critical formations
- Formation fluid sampling by wireline tools
- Mud gas monitoring by newly installed lab

[Expedition 338: Plate Boundary Deep Riser – 2 (10 Aug, 2012 to 10 Jan, 2013)]

- Deepen the Hole C0002F to 3300 mbsf.
- The riser hole is intended to access the plate boundary faults at an ultimate depth of 7000 meters.
- Spot coring within the inner wedge accretionary complex
- LWD and wireline logging, downhole stress, pore pressure and permeability tests,
- A zero-offset and/or walkaway VSP

David Smith asked the status of the 6th thruster. Kubo replied that reinstallation is planned to May/June 2012

4.2. USIO

David Divins provided USIO report.

[Tie-Up Period – UPDATE]

JOIDES Resolution in Curacao: June 8 – September 13, 2011

Two major projects:

- LIMS Reports and DESClogik Application enhancement
- Completed and deployed September 2011

JOIDES Resolution transited to Bridgetown, Barbados to begin IODP Expedition 336: Mid-Atlantic Microbiology.

[LIMS Reports Scope Highlights]

- LIMS Reports provides scientists with a simple, intuitive, web interface to extract data and generate reports for scientific analysis.
- Project encompassed the development of 30 tabular-data reports.
- Each report includes a description, definitions, and examples to guide scientists not familiar with the data.
- Each report displays the primary data relevant for that system.
- Project includes overview tables (drill down capability).
- The reports do not encompass descriptive data, which will be addressed in a separate project.

[FY12 JR OPERATIONS Schedule]

EXPEDITION	EXP #	DATES	TOTAL DAYS (port/at sea)	CO-CHIEF
Mid-Atlantic Mbio	336	16 Sep–17 Nov '11	62 (2/60)	K. Edwards W. Bach
Mediterranean Outflow	339	17 Nov '11–17 Jan '12	61 (5/56)	J. Hernandez-Molina D. Stow
Atlantis Massif	340T	17 Jan–6 Feb. '12	20 (5/15)	D. Blackman
Lesser Antilles	340	6 Feb–18 March '12	41 (1/40)	A. Le Friant O. Ishizuka
Tie-Up		18 March–18 Jun '12		
Newfoundland Sediment Drifts	342	18 June–17 August '12	60 (4/56)	R. Norris P. Wilson
Tie-Up		17 August–17 Oct. '12		

[FY13 JR OPERATIONS schedule]

EXPEDITION	EXP #	DATES	TOTAL DAYS (port/at sea)	CO-CHIEF
Tie-Up		17 Aug–22 Oct '12		
Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project 2 (CRISP)	334	22Oct–17 Dec '12	56 (3/53)	R. Harris TBD
Hess Deep Plutonic Crust	345	17 Dec–16 Feb. 13	61 (5/56)	TBD
Tie-Up		16 Feb–27 May '13		
Southern Alaska Margin Tectonics, Climate & Sedimentation	341	27 May–27 July '13	61 (3/58)	J. Jaeger, S. Gulick
Transit	346T	27 July–18 Aug '13	22 (5/17)	
Asian Monsoon	346	18 Aug–26 Sep '13	39 (1/38)	TBD

[Education & Outreach Activities]

School of Rock, 1-3 August 2011

- Onboard the JOIDES Resolution while in port in Curacao.

Port Call Events

- Ponta Delgada, Azores, 18-19 November 2011

Ship tours of the JOIDES Resolution:

200 High School Students on the 18th

70 adults including Secretary for Science and Technology for the Azores on the 19th

-Teacher from Portugal to sail as Educator at Sea during Expedition 339: Mediterranean Outflow.

- Lisbon, Portugal, 18-19 January 2012 in partnership with ECORD Managing Agency.

- Press conference to be held during January port call; European VIPs to attend.

Jamie Allan commented that practicality issues would be put forward in the break-out sessions. Larsen commented PEP should concern mostly about science.

4.3. ESO

Sarah Davies provided the ESO report

MSPs at OTF

=====

Proposal	Short title	Panel	Comments
672	Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment	OTF	SPC preferred option for 2013: Tender for all boreholes
548	Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater	OTF	SPC preferred option for 2014: Hazard survey in 2013
758	Atlantis Massif Seafloor Processes	OTF	SPC preferred mission for first sea floor drilling expedition
716	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	OTF	Forwarded March 2009
581	Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks	OTF	Forwarded March 2010
637	New England Shelf Hydrogeology	OTF	Forwarded March 2009: work required on water sampling

[Proposal 672 : Project Management Team Meeting (June 2011)]

Examined requirements for: Drilling / Microbiology sampling & analysis/ Downhole logging

Developments:Co-chiefs appointed (Thomas Andrén & Bo Baker Jörgensen) / Expedition scheduled for 2013 / Tender for platform in 2012

[Proposal 758: Project Management Team Meeting (June 2011)]

Examined requirements for: Drilling / Logging / Microbiology sampling/ Science party

Developments:

- ESO assessing sea bed data for sea floor drill operation
- Number of organizations, including the British Geological Survey is developing logging tools for use from sea bed rock drills
- Site Survey Panel has approved information – ready to implement

[Proposal 548]

Developments post Project Management Team Meeting October 2010:

- Quotes requested for hazard survey
- Submitted letter of project approval to the directors of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the National Council on Science and Technology
- Permit application will be submitted through UNAM

Expeditions

=====

[Exp. 325: Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes (2010 Feb.-Apr.)]

- July 2011 Operations Review Task Force
- Expedition moratorium ended in July 2011
- Logging data ready for placement on database
- Great Barrier Reef cores now at Kochi Core Centre
- Second post-cruise is planned for July 2012

Data Management & QA/QC for Mission Specific Platform expeditions

=====

- Bremen leading with IODP-MI
- Metadata for all Mission Specific Platform expeditions entered into IODP database
- Link metadata to analytical data
- QA/QC procedures for specific analytical equipment & data requests
- Developing online tutorials for offshore and onshore phases

Outreach

=====

- ECORD/ESO videos finalised with input from IODP-MI
- ESO Outreach Officer, Alan Stevenson, was interviewed about Chicxulub for a Norwegian daily newspaper
- August 2011 IODP booth at the Goldschmidt Conference (Prague)
- September 2011 IODP booth at the AAPG Polar Petroleum Potential Arctic Conference

(Halifax, Nova Scotia)

Holly Given asked ESO's perspective on the collaboration between IODP and Petroleum industry in Arctic. Mével replied that industry is interested in gaining general knowledge including geodynamics of the area. It is a sensitive issue but there is room for scientific proposals from them.

5. Borehole into Earth's Mantle (BEAM) Report

Holly Given, Manager of the BEAM Scoping Group, reported on the aims of this conceptual project which is supported with a \$US500K grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The Project is to accelerate science planning for the first borehole through the entire ocean crust into Earth's mantle. The Project has been scientifically underpinned by a series of community workshops from 2006 to 2010, and has been identified as a priority scientific goal in both current and future scientific plans for IODP.

BEAM will test the design limits of IODP drilling platforms and require new partnerships between research, engineering, and industry. The Scoping Group will be formed from selected experts with a wide range of expertise to develop a roadmap with prioritized scientific goals and engineering approaches; define a conceptual international scheme of science and engineering management; inform the public and policy makers of the Project's goals; develop and refine relationships with the Deep Carbon Observatory, a multidisciplinary international initiative dedicated to understanding Earth's deep carbon cycle also funded by the Sloan Foundation; and define the management of risk for the Project.

The rough order of magnitude costs of BEAM are \$US500 million for a drilling commencement possibly in 2018. Relationships with the IODP and its scientific advisory structure will be explored in the future.

	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
	program year 6	program yr 7	pgm yr 8	pgm yr 9	pgm yr 10	IODP yr 1	pgm yr 2	pgm yr 3
IODP	Site characterization: crust/mantle scale				Site decision	Detailed site surveys		
	Community-wide international workshop on scientific drilling in 2013-23	INVEST Report; International Workshop MoHole, Japan	Project Scoping Group		Project Management Team			
			Initial feasibility study	Conceptual Design	Detailed Design	Project Management		
Sloan Foundation- IODP- DCO	Mantle Frontier International Workshop	Initiate Project Scoping Office; prepare for conceptual design	Project Scoping Office		Project Management Office			
Project execution	Domestic efforts for hyper-deep water deep drilling technology development				Formal start	Platform operators' preparations	Operation planning, procurements	
	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024
Project execution	Operation planning, procurements, outfitting	Crust-MohoMantle Campaign		Preparations	Observatory		Long-term research continues	
		Step-by-step results		First scientific results; Sample distributions		Scientific Report		

Tim Bralower commented that the scoping group should figure out the technical feasibility very quickly. Given agreed with Bralower, and recommended reading a commentary on the initial feasibility plan, in which many optimistic comments are introduced. Yoshi Kawamura commented that the commentary is based on much assumption, but it doesn't say "not achievable" at least. Given added that the balance on how much they can spend and scientific gain should be articulated.

Richard Arculus asked if the scoping group expected PEP to approve the BEAM proposal

when it will be submitted. Given commented that she did not know the details of the proposal. Allan commented that MI received the funding from Sloan Foundation independently, and NSF did not approve it prior to when it happened. He stressed that MI should step away from the proposal. Larsen agreed with Allan and noted that no one from MI can be a proponent of the mantle proposal.

6. Proposal review

6.1 Proposal review process

This agenda item was merged with the agenda item 1.5.3 and is not discussion here.

6.2. Proposal review

The first watchdog listed below presented their assigned proposal. They explained the scientific objectives, alignment with New Science Plan and site assessment. This was followed by the second and third watchdog's comments, and then the floor was opened for comments from everyone. After the panel reached a conclusion, the second watchdog writes the PEP recommendation.

6.2.1. (Plenary) 6 SPC proposals

Proposal#	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
567	Full4	South Pacific Paleogene	Zachos	Bralower
589	Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	Obana	John
659	Full	Newfoundland Rifted Margin	Arculus	Takazawa
698	Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust	Neal	MacLennan
703	Full	Costa Rica SeisCORK	Moulin	Cattaneo
772	APL2	North Atlantic Crustal Architecture	John	Obana

6.2.2. (Plenary) 2 SSEP proposals with External reviews and PRLs

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
696	Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Deep Forearc Crust	Neal	Takazawa	Morishita

747	Full	North Atlantic Paleogene Climate	Zachos	Bralower	Singhvi
-----	------	----------------------------------	--------	----------	---------

Friday	2 December 2012	08:30-17:30
---------------	------------------------	--------------------

6.2.3. (Plenary) 1 CDP and daughter proposal with PRL

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
770	Full2	Kanto Asperity Project: Observatories	Strasser	John	Cattaneo
707	Full	Kanto Asperity CDP	Strasser	Moulin	Michibayashi

6.2.4. (Plenary) 1 MDP and daughter proposal pair

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
781	MDP	Hikurangi subduction margin	MacLennan	Yamada	Moulin
781A	Full	Hikurangi: observatory	Moulin	Cattaneo	John

6.2.5. (Plenary) 1 New and 1 revised APLs

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
791	APL	Continental Margin Methane Cycling	Biddle	Suzuki	Takano
777	APL2	Okinawa Trough Quaternary Paleoceanography	Murayama	Shevenell	McHugh

6.2.6. (Breakout) 18 existing SSEP proposals without external reviews

The panel members were thematically divided into four breakout groups to review and

discuss on the proposals that have not reached the stage of external review.

Breakout group1 (chaired by Hall)

Theme: Climate and Ocean Change

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
625	Full	Pleistocene Pacific Southern Ocean	Lee	Hall	
751	Full	West Antarctic Ice Sheet Climate	Hall		
771	Full	Iberian Margin Paleoclimate 2	Lee	Shevenell	
784	Full	Amundsen Sea Ice Sheet history	Hall	Cattaneo	Ferdelman
615	Full2	NW Pacific Coral Reefs	Hall	Webster	

Breakout group2 (chaired by Bralower)

Theme: Climate and Ocean Change

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
667	Full	NW Australian Shelf Eustasy	McHugh	Tian
680	Full	Bering Strait Climate Change	Yokoyama	Shevenell
702	Full	Southern African Climates	Zachos	Tian
776	Full	Arabian Sea Paleoclimate	Bralower	Tian
658	Full2	North Atlantic Volcanism and Paleoclimate	Nishi	Bralower
778	Full2	Tanzania Margin Paleoclimate Transect	Zachos	Nishi

Breakout group3 (chaired by Strasser and Takano)

Theme: Earth in Motion and Biosphere Frontiers

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
735	CPP	South China Sea Tectonic Evolution	Christeson	Smirnov

704	Full2	Sumatra Seismogenic Zone	Smirnov	Obana
635	Full3	Hydrate Ridge Observatory	Biddle	MacLennan

Breakout group4 (chaired by Arculus)

Theme: Earth Connections

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
640	Full	Godzilla Mullion	Carlut	Koepke
692	Full	Flemish Cap Rifted Margin	Koepke	Takazawa
740	Full	Galicia Margin Rift History	Carlut	Yokoyama
754	Full2	Norwegian Sea Silica Diagenesis	Koepke	Lee
778	Full2	Tanzania Margin Paleoclimate Transect	Zachos	Nishi

Saturday	3 December 2012	08:30-17:30
-----------------	------------------------	--------------------

6.2.7. (Breakout) 16 preliminary proposal

The panel members were thematically divided into four breakout groups to review and discuss on the preliminary proposals.

Breakout group1 (chaired by Bralower)

Theme: Climate and Ocean Change

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
750	Pre	Beringia Sea Level History	Yokoyama	McHugh
756	Pre	Arctic Ocean Exit Gateway	Murayama	Hall
760	Pre	SW Australia Margin Cretaceous Climate	Takano	Bralower

Breakout group2 (chaired by Shevenell)

Theme: Climate and Ocean Change

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
708	Pre2	Central Arctic Paleoceanography	Lee	Shevenell
730	Pre2	Sabine Bank Sea Level	Shevenell	Murayama
753	Pre2	Beaufort Sea Paleoceanography	Shevenell	Webster
790	Pre	Indian Ocean Neogene monsoon	Webster	Yokoyama

Breakout group3 (chaired by Arculus and Strasser)

Theme: Earth Connections and Earth in Motion

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2	WD3
729	Pre	Western Lord Howe Rise Extension	Morishita	Nishi	
731	Pre	Papua New Guinea Orogenic Lifecycle	Nishi	Morishita	
782	Pre	Kanto Asperity Project: Plate Boundary Deformation	Michibayashi	Neal	
788	Pre	Shiva Impact Structure	Arculus	Tian	Obana
789	Pre	Arctic Slope Stability	Cattaneo	Yamada	Christeson

Breakout group4 (chaired by Takano)

Theme: Biosphere Frontiers

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	WD1	WD2
749	Pre	Gulf of California Rifting & Microbiology	Suzuki	Smith
759	Pre	EPR Fast-Spread Crust	Michibayashi	Biddle
761	Pre	South Atlantic Bight Hydrogeology	Ferdelman	Christeson
780	Pre	Rodriguez Triple Junction Microbiology	Smith	Suzuki

7. Reports from breakout sessions

Sub-chairs presented the summary of the breakout discussions. The course of action regarding each of the 49 PEP proposals reviewed during the 1st PEP meeting was achieved by consensus of the full panel. The specific dispositions for each proposal were as follows:

Proposal #	Version	Short Title	Disposition
567	Full4	South Pacific Paleogene	Forward to OTF
589	Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	Submit revised full
615	Full2	NW Pacific Coral Reefs	Deactivate
625	Full	Pleistocene Pacific Southern Ocean	Deactivate
635	Full3	Hydrate Ridge Observatory	Submit revised full
640	Full	Godzilla Mullion	Deactivate
658	Full2	North Atlantic Volcanism and Paleoclimate	Submit revised full
659	Full	Newfoundland Rifted Margin	Submit revised full
667	Full	NW Australian Shelf Eustasy	Submit revised full
680	Full	Bering Strait Climate Change	Submit revised full
692	Full	Flemish Cap Rifted Margin	Submit revised full
696	Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Deep Forearc Crust	Submit revised full
698	Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust	Forward to OTF
702	Full	Southern African Climates	Submit revised full
703	Full	Costa Rica SeisCORK	Submit revised full
704	Full2	Sumatra Seismogenic Zone	Submit revised full
707	Full	Kanto Asperity CDP	Submit revised full
708	Pre2	Central Arctic Paleoceanography	Submit full
729	Pre	Western Lord Howe Rise Extension	Deactivate
730	Pre2	Sabine Bank Sea Level	Submit full
731	Pre	Papua New Guinea Orogenic Lifecycle	Deactivate
735	CPP	South China Sea Tectonic Evolution	Submit revised full
740	Full	Galicia Margin Rift History	Submit revised full
747	Full	North Atlantic Paleogene Climate	Submit revised full
749	Pre	Gulf of California Rifting & Microbiology	Submit full
750	Pre	Beringia Sea Level History	Submit full
751	Full	West Antarctic Ice Sheet Climate	Submit revised full
753	Pre2	Beaufort Sea Paleoceanography	Submit full
754	Full2	Norwegian Sea Silica Diagenesis	Submit revised full
756	Pre	Arctic Ocean Exit Gateway	Submit full
759	Pre	EPR Fast-Spread Crust	Deactivate

760	Pre	SW Australia Margin Cretaceous Climate	Submit full
761	Pre	South Atlantic Bight Hydrogeology	Submit full
770	Full2	Kanto Asperity Project: Observatories	Submit revised full
771	Full	Iberian Margin Paleoclimate 2	Submit revised full
772	APL2	North Atlantic Crustal Architecture	Submit revised full
776	Full	Arabian Sea Paleoclimate	Deactivate
777	APL2	Okinawa Trough Quaternary Paleooceanography	Submit revised APL
778	Full2	Tanzania Margin Paleoclimate Transect	Send to external review
780	Pre	Rodriguez Triple Junction Microbiology	Deactivate
781	MDP	Hikurangi subduction margin	Send to External review
781A	Full	Hikurangi: observatory	Send to External review
782	Pre	Kanto Asperity Project: Plate Boundary Deformation	Submit full
784	Full	Amundsen Sea Ice Sheet history	Submit revised full
788	Pre	Shiva Impact Structure	Deactivate
789	Pre	Arctic Slope Stability	Deactivate
790	Pre	Indian Ocean Neogene monsoon	Deactivate
791	APL	Continental Margin Methane Cycling	Submit revised APL

8. Future PEP meeting

Dick Kroon emphasizes that the relationship with SCP is very important. PEP needs specific advice from SCP for evaluating whether or not there are scientific concerns arising from site survey data. Considering the time proponents need to prepare site survey data between PEP and SPC meetings, alternating meetings of PEP and SCP are considered the most effective. Gilles Lericolais (SCP chair) seconded this statement. He noted that it is important to avoid proposals going back and forward between OTF and PEP.

Sanny Saito provided the STP report. He introduced STP's role in SAS and recent STP activities.

[STP mandates]

STP develops guidelines and provides advice on a wide range of IODP functions such as

shipboard measurements, downhole measurements/observatories, data management, publications and Curation.

- STP reviews QA/QC of data collection procedures on IODP platforms and expedition measurement plans to ensure consistent high quality data across the program.
- STP recommendations shall be sent to CMO, SIPCom, PEP, and IOs.

[Recent STP activities]

Routine tasks

- Review of expedition QA/QC report from the IOs
- Approval of measurement plans (non-standard measurements) for scheduled expeditions
- Evaluation of shipboard/on shore science system

Shorter-term issues: examples

- Cuttings sampling, measurements, archiving, and curation
- Routine microbiology sampling
- IODP Depth Scale implementation
- New publication format, etc.

Longer-term issues

-Development of Scientific Technology Roadmap. Current version 1.1 includes 56 items with periodization and availability.

Saito noted that the PEP-STP relationship is very important for proposal evaluation when it needs technical advice. He offered STP's help on assessment of technical issues by reporting back to PEP from STP watchdogs.

Kroon noted that PEP would identify proposals that need technical advice, which can be forwarded to STP for advice. Yasuhiro Yamada commented that PEP cannot wait for a next STP meeting for their advice. Saito replied that STP can discuss through emails between their meetings, and he estimated one month as maximum time for STP to answer.

9. Other business

No other business was discussed.

Dick Kroon praised Hans Christan Larsen and Kevin Johnson for their outstanding service to IODP over a long period.

10 Review of motions and consensus items

There was no motion or consensus to review.

11. Future meetings

Tom Janecek asked how the proponents receive the feedback from IOs. Larsen replied that IOs are given the opportunity to make comments during the PEP meeting. PEP will include IO's comments in their review. Janecek suggested that IOs would see the PEP reviews and add their comments before sending them out to the proponents. Allan agreed with Janecek and commented IO's reviews would benefit proponents very much. Larsen agreed on Janecek's suggestion but only for this meeting.

11.1 Liaisons to other panels and programs

Kroon attends SIPCOM. Kroon and sub-chairs attend OTF

11.2. 2nd PEP meeting

Host: Dick Kroon

Place: Edinburgh

Date: 14-15 May 2012

Kroon adjourned the meeting at 17:30.

[Appendix - PEP Rating System]

This rating system will be applied to all proposals that have passed through the full PEP review cycle, including external, anonymous peer-review. The rating is applied by PEP based on the proposal version reviewed by the external reviewers, and augmented with the proponent response letter (PRL). It is a three level rating system:

- Excellent (10 - 20 percent of proposals)
- Good (40 – 60 percent of proposals)
- Fair (20 – 30 percent of proposals)

Because proposals that have not been found of high enough quality by PEP to undergo external review, truly insufficient or unfeasible proposals are not expected to reach the stage of PEP rating (to be rejected if there is not meeting PEP approval for external review after the maximum one revision).

The rating value applies specifically to the science quality of the proposal. The technical feasibility and/or other logistical parameters are to be discussed in accompanying comments, but should not be used as a rating criterion by PEP, whose charge is to evaluate the scientific quality and merit of the proposal. This is in order to maintain simple and clear scientific evaluation criteria. These comments on technical drilling feasibility can be utilized by the experts that liaise with PEP, but are not PEP members with the responsibilities this implies. Technical drilling feasibility will therefore be commented on separately by relevant experts (typically Implementing Organization (IO) representatives). However, an experiment design can also have scientific risks (e.g., suggested measurements are at experimental, unproven stage, entire success depends entirely of one specific sampling target, imaging/presence of target is a concern etc.). PEP, assisted by SCP, STP, and other SAS expertise will comment on such kinds of 'science risk'.

The general evaluation criteria for IODP proposals are (as per PEP ToR):

- Are the scientific questions/hypotheses being addressed exciting and of sufficiently wide interest to justify the requested resources?
- Will the proposal significantly advance one or more goals of the Science Plan?
- Would the proposal engage new communities or other science programs into the drilling program?
- To what degree does the integrated experimental design of site characterization, drilling, sampling, measurements, and downhole experiments constitute a compelling and feasible scientific proposal?

Together with these general criteria, the 3 rating categories are defined as follows:

Excellent proposal:

Proposal is exciting, addresses new scientific problems, or will take novel approaches to existing problems that remain unresolved/controversial and considered of wide importance. May challenge existing paradigms, has strong potential for true discoveries and breakthroughs and most likely will open up new avenues of research in the field(s) pursued or even beyond. Should be drilled if at all possible:

-The science plan proposed is innovative, cutting edge, aims at, or extends beyond, the vision of the new science plan

-Excellent, succinct and carefully planned scientific drilling and research plan

-In all probability, the expedition(s) will be regarded as a major achievement of scientific ocean drilling

-In all probability, the scientific and technical achievements will have important societal impact in one way or another (e.g., application of results, outreach, or public education).

Good proposal

This second category of proposals also has potential for producing exciting science, and will apply compelling research strategies. Compared to 'Excellent' proposals, 'Good' proposals address more mature scientific problems with less potential for major new discoveries or paradigm changes. They are still highly likely to produce important datasets that can support long-term building of data archives, help resolve long-standing controversies in established fields of research, and thereby advance such fields of research in a significant way, possibly including new avenues of research within the fields pursued. Should be seriously considered for drilling if fitting into long-term efforts/planning and platform schedules:

-Objectives are consistent with one or more themes of the new science plan

-In all probability, the expedition(s) will result in important refinements of existing scientific concepts and advance the science plan. Data are very useful to test the hypotheses as formulated in the proposal.

-Good and succinct drilling plan, feasible, carefully planned

-The science plan is likely to result in successful expedition(s) with a good effort to outcome ratio

-In all probability, the scientific and technical achievements will be important for society in one way or another.

'Fair' proposal

This third category of proposals falls behind in terms of excitement and potential for discovery. The research may still be able to provide important, complementary data sets that can help filling specific niches, but is unlikely to move the field of research significantly forward, or to lead to new avenues of research. Nevertheless, the proposal may contain elements that, if fitting into other proposals or other planned drilling activities (e.g., regional proximity), could provide a solid scientific return for a limited program investment, and therefore might be considered for (partial) implementation at some point:

- Objectives show a fair consistency with thematic priorities in the new science plan
- The science plan is not clear, and deficiencies are identified
- The expedition(s) could possibly result in some non-trivial achievements, but mostly of incremental nature, perhaps a partly relevant data set to test the hypotheses as formulated in the proposal, or the expedition(s) will not be successful.
- Insufficient drilling plan with unfavourable effort to output ratio
- The potential societal impacts from scientific and technical achievements are not high, or are poorly documented.