

# **IODP Interim Industry Liaison Panel**

**Final minutes of first meeting, 20 – 22 February 2003**

**Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam**

---

## **Present:**

### **iILP:**

**Hiroyuki Arato, Philippe de Clarens, Harry Doust\*, Ryosuke Fudou, George Grabowski, Masao Hayashi, John Hogg\*, Garry Karner, Hiroto Kanno, Isabelle Moretti, Heiko Moller, Martin Perlmutter, Carlos Pirmez, Weilin Zhu.**

### **Guests (some part-time)**

**Jamie Allen, Nobu Eguchi, Michael Enachescu, Jimmy Kinoshita, Ted Moore, Kate Moran, Jeff Schuffert, Brian Taylor,**

### **Absent (with apologies):**

**Alan Hoffman, David Roberts.**

### **\*iILP co-chairs**

---

## **AGENDA:**

### **1. Welcome and introduction of iILP members to each other.**

- Areas of individual expertise and ODP experience were noted
- Panel members are overwhelmingly energy industry-related, with relatively little representation from academia or the microbiology sector. There are no representatives from the mining or insurance industries. Expansion of the panel to redress this imbalance may be required in due course

### **2. Presentation on opportunities for industry-academic cooperation in IODP by Harry Doust, prepared for lecture to the Geological Society, London, in April 2003.**

- Harry will update this presentation and make it available to all iILP members as soon as possible, for their use in publicising iILP activities.

### **3. Presentation by Jeroen Kenter on status of European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling (ECORD)**

- ECORD will forge the way to European membership of IODP. There are 4 members, UK, France, Germany and a consortium of 12 countries (including The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Spain, etc.)

- ECORD aims to fund Mission Specific Platform (MSP) operations such as the planned Arctic Lomonosov Ridge drilling in 2004 (but may not be the only sponsor of MSP's)
- A full report on ECORD status will be made at the iPC meeting in Austin, Texas (March 2003)

**4. Presentation by Harry Doust on the history and current status of iILP, past initiatives in identifying areas of potential industry interest in relation to the IODP Initial Science Plan (ISP), reports on recent iPC and iSSEPs meetings, and some important and urgent issues/concerns for panel consideration**

**5. Brainstorming of some of the main issues to be addressed by iILP in the next couple of years. The following are in no ranked order:**

1. The average 5 year period between proposal submission and programme execution has been a discouragement to industry participation in ODP, as has been the relatively low acceptance rate of proposals.
2. How can the iILP provide effective support to industry proponents, such that the evaluation procedure can be streamlined?

**In the discussion and breakout sessions that followed, the following points were made or raised**

3. The 5 years from Proposal to Drilling may be excessive (Leg 147, 182, drilling has been done in less than three years), and is perhaps no longer than some industry projects. ODP normally commits to a leg 2 years ahead of execution. It would be prudent to plan on a minimum of 3 years. Wherever possible industry should seek to piggy-back on existing proposals or aim to submit proposals at operationally favourable times. W.r.t. MSP's there is in principle no scheduling issue – if a budget exists the programme can be carried out.
4. iILP needs to establish clear links with the other IODP planning panels and understand their precise mandates and methods of working. Strong and active championship of industry-parented proposals will be needed.
5. In order to streamline the process, academic help will be needed with preparation and writing of proposals, especially multi-disciplinary ones. The minimum time for approval is 1.5 years, each revision adds about 0.5yr. Typical reasons for revision requests are that the scientific argument has not been fully articulated or formulated properly. So far only one fully industry-sourced research hole has been drilled (DSDP 96) so industry experience is small.
6. Industry objectives will have to be translated effectively into strong scientific objectives. It is anticipated that manner of presentation will be crucial, so close links to SSEPs panels must be established and maintained. The potential advantages of industry participation must be made clear to the academic community (possibly through some case-histories).

7. Cooperation between industry and academic IODP scientists will be essential in order to identify mutual areas of benefit and deliver the science plan. In the beginning, industry could consider small experimental add-on projects to already-planned legs
8. IILP must advertise its role to industry, for example in AAPG, AGU, GSA, EAGE, SEG, OGJ through presentations, publications and posters.
9. Industry can potentially contribute its experience in risk-assessment to IODP (both planning and operational).
10. The industry-dominated nature of iILP is beneficial to the urgent need to raise the profile of IODP science in industry, but in the longer-term the panel must avoid being seen as a pressure group.
11. Industry access to high quality 2D and 3D seismic data should be used to enhance IODP scientific objectives, but liaison with the site-survey panel will be crucial to separate scientific and safety aspects. Ideally, industry panel representatives should be in a position to decide whether their companies can release data or not. This will likely be on a case-by-case basis, whereby iILP will assume a liaison role. Scope is seen for involving geophysical service companies/vendors in the iILP (owners of much seismic data).
12. Industry could profitably consider convening (a)workshop(s) to identify the most urgent themes, objectives or key fundamental questions to answer in order to get maximum involvement, for instance in the context of Source-to-sink (S2S) proposals. Essential here is that such workshops are not funded by IODP (could be NSF, JOI, companies, national committees, etc).
13. Some concerns were expressed that IODP may seek funding from industry. While not encouraged, in special cases industry priorities may be addressed through such financial support.
14. The iILP panel composition is overwhelmingly oil/gas industry, with one from microbiology and none from mining/insurance. The mining industry should be approached, initially via academia.
15. iILP should make a recommendation to IODP on the scope for repackaging of ODP thematic data, assuming industry interest.
16. If set up, an ODP data base group would benefit from iILP participation. iILP might assist IODP in the creation of a meta-database of seismic/well data if requested – a recommendation should go forward to SSP to initiate such a meta-db.

**6. Establishment of contacts. IILP needs to establish the manner of contacts with the industry groups. First thoughts are as follows:**

- Energy / Microbiology. Where relevant objectives are seen in proposals that justify contact with these groups, iILP members will ensure that appropriate staff are informed

- iILP will develop a coordinated outreach plan to encourage participation of the above industries
- Energy service companies, as owners of considerable data sets, will be approached on a case-by-case basis for release of seismic to specific proposals as appropriate
- Contacts with insurance companies are likely to be in the areas of hazards and climate change (eg if sea-level research is involved). Exploratory contacts to be made in due course, as the extent of proposals covering these themes becomes clearer
- Mining – a possible champion may be identified in Canada. In addition, the AGI (to be contacted) has identified mining people involved in education
- Other parties – governments etc. are to be contacted as required (eg for permission to release data)

#### **7. Facilitation of academic/industry cooperation. Among iILP responsibilities will be**

- Advice to other IODP panels (scientific, technological, organizational) on industry staff, funding, testing industry equipment, etc.
- Facilitation of industry data identification and availability, advice on confidentiality issues, and help with access. In general it is expected that locating appropriate data, establishing legal constraints to release and allocating/charging time to handling data transfer may represent the main challenges for iILP
- Help IODP with advice on complex operations and logistics (probably via DPG's).
- Working on scientific objectives together with IODP academics will require considerable mutual commitment. Perhaps a high-level IODP industry policy is needed to get this going? iILP will identify which projects could be enhanced through accessible industry seismic data and propose where the objectives could be enhanced
- Training plans. The widespread shortage of earth-science students makes attracting new staff imperative to industry. IODP may represent an opportunity for young staff to obtain training? This possibility will be explored. Further action will be contemplated later. Staffing of 3 platforms is likely to be a challenge, so there may be mutual value here. The programme offers of opportunities and greater flexibility time-wise than previously, so advertise!

#### **8. Promotional material: requirements and preparation**

- iILP panel members will commit to oral presentations at conferences – These should be identified and a tentative roster prepared. Preferably, a single story should be prepared, though flexibility will be needed to account for variations in place, emphasis and time of presentation. Perhaps need two talks, one for industry, one for academia
- Press releases, trade journals/newsletters
- iILP panel members should volunteer to chair dedicated IODP sessions at AAPG conferences – this could be an opportunity to present proposals of possible industry interest? Another option would be a booth at AGI, GSA (this is often a better means to bring the message over)

#### **9. Examination of the current list of active IODP proposals**

See <http://www.isas-office.jp/active.html>. Summary sheets of the 97 active proposals were examined and categorized as below. 28 were not seen, and those not mentioned were considered to be of no interest to industry.

- **S** = Clear interest to industry. **A/B** = no direct industry interest, but industry may be able to enhance proposal with data or experience. **C/D** = potential industry interest if industry objectives could be incorporated. **E** = general interest to industry scientists, but unlikely to attract direct industry participation
- **S**: 533 (Arctic), 547 (Biosphere), 552 (Bengal Fan), 554 (GOM hydrate), 564 (N.Jersey Shelf), 589 (GOM Overpr.), 595 (Indus), 600 (New Zealand), 601 (Microbiology), 606 (Somalia), 607 (N.Jersey slope) (total 11)
- **A/B**: 455, 477, 549, 593, 596, 602, 608, 617, 618 (total 9)
- **C/D**: 505, 515, 519, 537, 553, 570, 573, 581, 584, 591 (total 10, includes some of potential mining/microbiology industry interest)
- **E**: 489, 555, 557, 564, 576, 578, 603, 604, 605, 609 (total 10)

It was agreed that proponents of S-category proposals would be requested to allow iILP to examine them for possible industry collaboration. After iILP panel members have read them, one or two will be nominated “active readers” to make recommendations on action at the next iILP meeting.

## 10. Discussion of the draft iILP Mandate and proposed modifications

See attached sheet

## 11. Joint meeting with iTAP: Discussion of respective areas of responsibility

Both iTAP and iILP provide links from IODP to industry. SSPPs may recommend to all proponents of proposals that they consult one or both panels.

- **iILP** will concern itself with promoting IODP in industry and providing advice on industry participation. It will also have in an advice liaison function to identify appropriate data, staff, etc. to provide advice on specific elements of the programme. It will primarily concern itself with scientific and data issues.
- **iTAP** will provide advice to IODP on the technical challenges that will need to be met in order to realize the medium to long-term scientific programme. This may involve R & D programmes and establishment of engineering teams, collaborative projects or commercial contacts. Technical challenges are likely to include deep water/penetration well design, HPT wells, gas-hydrate penetration and deep biosphere sampling.

**Presentations** were made by iTAP and iILP co-chairs, and on NanTroSEIZE (Harold Tobin – see full proposal at [ees.nmt.edu/nantroseize](http://ees.nmt.edu/nantroseize)) and CRISP (Roland von Huene).

**Operations planning advice:** For Chikyu operations, planning needs to commence in 2003, although there is as yet no defined programme in place. Two detailed planning groups (DPGs) are needed:

- A Drilling Operations Group, to carry out well planning (define hole design and experimental programme, etc.)
- A Complex Drilling Programme Group, to provide practical scheduling, logistic and planning advice

Both iTAP and iILP are requested urgently to identify industry staff potentially able and willing to serve as advisers to operators on these groups, and to provide nominations

prior to the mid-March iPC meeting in Austin. In discussion it was suggested that participation in IODP planning could be in one of two ways:

- through membership of these DPGs, implying a longer-term commitment by individuals to specialist provision of advice. The manner of working and the likely time commitment need to be urgently addressed before industry staff could be approached
- through participation in peer reviews at critical phases in the project planning cycle. This would imply less time commitment by individuals and may, for many companies, be a more acceptable alternative

iTAP and iILP will prepare a project planning road-map, similar to those used in industry, for consideration by IODP.

**ITAP/iILP liaison:** From the above it is clear that iTAP and iILP need to keep close links with each other. This could be achieved either by

- regular joint meetings, as on this occasion. This would be beneficial but would be logistically difficult to maintain, especially when one or other panel may need to jointly meet with other iSAS panels
- ensuring that at all iTAP and iILP meetings, at least one, and preferably two members of the other panel are present. This option was preferred, being considered adequate and cost effective.

## **12. Plan for coming year and action items**

The focus in coming year is likely to be on the following elements of the mandate:

- reviewing existing proposals for potential industry participation
- update of list of industry “burning questions”
- promotion of IODP in industry
- identification of barriers to industry participation and possible solutions

## **13. NEXT MEETING.**

At the meeting, it was proposed to hold the next meeting on the occasion of the AAPG International Conference/Exhibition in **Barcelona, Spain, 21-24 September 2003**. The iILP meeting would then probably take place on Saturday and/or Sunday 21 September. Panel members will investigate a possible venue (AAPG, university, CSIC, hotel).

**Subsequently, it appeared that the timing is difficult to accommodate with that of the September iPC. IILP co-chairs are investigating alternatives (eg October 9-11, London PESGB, October 25-26, Dallas SEG, November 1-3, Seattle GSA),**

---

**Please note that proposals for additions or modifications are welcome.  
They will be discussed at the second iILP meeting.**

---

**Interim Industrial Liaison Panel (iILP)  
– Draft mandate –  
Version following first meeting (February 2003)**

**9.1 General purpose:** As in the final draft document. No change proposed.

*Possible addition for the future (after, say, 5-10yr): Identification of major scientific objectives to contribute to IODP. This would follow the identification, in the first few years, of specific projects of industry interest.*

*Italics are additions to original mandate*

**9.2 Mandate:** The iILP will:

1. Develop effective links between academic and industry scientists with mutual research and technical/engineering interests.
2. Identify barriers to industry participation in IODP and recommend solutions for overcoming these barriers.
3. Develop mechanisms for sharing industry data/expertise/resources between IODP and industry scientists *and provide advice to IODP scientists where appropriate.*
4. Act as the liaison group for IODP to industry and selected industry associations, and promote IODP educational and outreach activities within selected industry professional organizations.
5. Assist with the identification of scientists and engineers from industry to serve on panels, committees and working groups of IODP as needed. These might include Detailed Planning Groups for complex multiple-platform, multiple-leg drilling programmes and/or interim Programme Planning Groups.
6. Define industrial priority research within the IODP context and facilitate communication and cooperative scientific and technical development activities between IODP and industry.

*(Note: item 7 has been incorporated in item 5)*

**9.3 Meetings:** The iILP should meet twice per year, separately or in conjunction with other iSAS panels or professional societies as appropriate. *Representatives from iILP will attend all iTAP meetings.*

**9.4 Membership:** The iILP comprises 16 members, representing a broad range of IWG member nations, with a balance of expertise and research interests. It has an ideal goal of about two thirds of the members from industry, one third from academia. ...Remainder as in the final draft

**9.5 Liaisons:** as in final draft

**9.6 Chair:** as in final draft

#### **9.10 Housekeeping:**

**Contacts:** Through twice yearly meetings and e-mail. Documents will be stored under the iSAS web-site. Action: request iSAS office to open a protected document environment.

**Communication of decisions and nominations:** Co-chairs will contact panel members as appropriate.

**Individual responsibilities:** Liaisons for proposal review will be nominated when the proposals are in – they will then be distributed.

**Work plan:** An iILP work-plan will be prepared and circulated.

**Common story-line,** material and plans for update: HD will update the existing story and circulate to members. Following comments from all, a common story will be prepared by end March. This should be updated each 6 months.

**Conference representation:** iILLP to be represented at AGU (December), preferably in a booth (also AAPG, GSA, EAGE, JAPT, etc).

#### **9.11 GOALS OF IILP**

- Achieve 5 industry-linked proposals or proposals with significant industry input in IODP, either with highly-ranked status or in a schedule phase within 5 years.
- Maintain a short list of the most relevant proposals for industry, and proactively offer advice in improving them/adding industry-related objectives.
- An as yet to be defined number of new project proponents come to iILP for advice per year.
- Maintain an evergreen list of industry scientific objectives, including longer-term (10yrs+) areas of interest.
- Achieve placement of industry representatives on all iSAS advice panels, including SSEPs.



- Achieve increased industry support for IODP, for instance including representatives on DPG's, through active promotion.
- Aim to get at least one industry representative as co chief-scientist on an IODP leg within 7 years.

## **CURRENT iILP ACTION PLAN**

### **Review proposals submitted to IODP for interest to industry and:**

- 1. identify data, analyses, etc that could apply**
- 2. suggest enhancements and advice for proposals**
- 3. meet with proponent(s) when and where requested**

### **Identify areas of interest for joint industry/academic studies and coordination**

- 1. identify topics on list of industry interests**
- 2. identify workers in industry and academia that share these interests**
- 3. conduct workshops for planning of new proposals**
- 4. make new proposals**

### **Promote IODP and its benefits to industry**

- 1. develop advertisement materials**
- 2. present to companies, meetings**

### **Liaise between industry and academia on IODP issues**

- 1. make connections where requested**
  - 2. nominate for committees and panels**
-