

**4<sup>th</sup> Interim Site Survey Panel Meeting  
28-30 July 2003  
Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory  
Columbia University NY**

**Minutes**

**Day 1: 28 July 2003 (9:20-17:00)**

**1 Welcome and Introduction**

- 1.1 Co-chair's welcome (Okino)
- 1.2 Round table introduction of participants
- 1.3 Meeting logistics (Quoidbach)

**2 Reports**

**2.1 iSAS office (Eguchi)**

- iSAS office received 8 new proposal by the latest deadline, and the total 101 proposals are active. Proposals ranked, ready to be ranked, and the remainders were summarized. Half of the old ODP proposals have been reactivated in to IODP.
- The office may become TSAS (Transition SAS) and should remain in operation from October to next January.

**2.2 iPC (Ito)**

- IODP and the related new panels will start October, 2003. SPC (not co-chair, chair and a vice chair) and OPCOM will have their first meeting in Sapporo, September. Under new IODP system, SPC rank the proposals, SPOC makes decision, and IMI makes contracts to IOs. The mandate will be very complicated because of the three different platforms.
- A flow chart of review process concept was shown.

**2.3 iISSEP/iESSEP (Okino)**

- The panels reviewed 25 proposals at Niigata meeting, three proposals are sent to iPC for ranking, two are ready for external review. One CDP proposal (1 CDP umbrella + 2 full proposals) is waiting for external review, because the umbrella and one full proposal are ready for external review, but another one is required to revise.
- New guideline for proposal submission in IODP was shown.
- The SSEP structures and the effective review process are open to discussion and debate. All panel members are expected to join debate equally, however the current size of joint panel meeting (32 members), the speed and manner of discussion makes non-English speakers feel handicapped. The same situation applies to other panels; co-chairs should pay attention and encourage non-English members to express their opinions.

**2.4 iPPSP (Watkins/Shipp)**

- Two holes of leg 204 (off Oregon) had been cut off due to hydrocarbon flow, gas thought to have used an ash layer to accumulate giving unacceptable c1/c2 ratios and H<sub>2</sub>S. The safety issues of gas hydrates have come up and Shipp mentioned the concern that logging should be done prior to coring (following methodology of industry in an effort to remain as safe as possible). The safety issues about gas hydrate should be dealt with MWD – Monitoring While Drilling – within the iPPSP. The iPPSP will bring this issue to iPC.

- Proposal 553 (Arctic) was formally reviewed and approved. Proposal 564 (new Jersey Margin) is not ready at the moment but the issues are not major. The panel discussed the e-mail reviews for low risk proposals.
- Guidelines on near surface operations need to be revised and need input from operators once they are chosen and finalized. Communication among iPPSP and iSSP watchdogs is important and useful.

## **2.5 iSciMP (Divins)**

- The mandate and structure of the ISC (IODP Information Service Center) – results of a working group report – were presented. It is an internet service that functions as a clearinghouse and coordination center, and serve as a portal to site survey data, logging data, and data curation - Publication DataBanks, IO's data and ODP legacy data. Databanks will be decentralized but users can access (link) from ISC web. No decisions on who or where, until RFP is made.
- The security and access controls will be treated in each databank separately.

## **2.6 ODPDB (Quiodbach)**

- The current ODPDB will close Sept 30, 2004.
- New data for proposals 512, 519, 533, 537A, 545, 552, 564, 572, 595, 603A were submitted.
- ODPDB (at LDEO) wrote proposal for non-riser databank as part of ODP/TAMU response to US non-riser RFP.
- A test model of MATRIX web site is under construction.
- Enachescu proposed that all forms (proposals, data submission etc.) have dates on them, so that panel members will know what is revised and what has not been modified. *ACTION ITEM: attempt to date all future data submission including version of data, including figures and other illustrations in the new revised documents, directly on the data items if possible.*

## **2.7 OD21/CDEX (Hashimoto)**

- CHIKYU sea trial will be June-August, 2004 (responsibility of the operator), and equipment test from September 2004 to 2005.
- The ship will ready for international operation in October 2006.

## **2.8 J-DESC (Ito)**

- Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium, which is equivalent of USSAC or ECORD, was established. The tasks of J-DESC are nominations of SAS and IMI members, promotion of drilling activities in Japan scientific community, and assisting in getting funds for drilling activities. J-DESC also supports databanks, core center, SAS office, reference and logging center and public relations.

# **3 Presentation –CDEX's site survey for shake down cruise results (Hashimoto)**

- Results of seismic surveys in Sanriku-Oki were presented. The surveys were conducted for two sites whose bathymetry is 1000m and 2000m. The surveys consist of 2D exploration (EX2D) high-resolution 2D seismic (HR2D), which were conducted in 2002 and 2003, respectively.
- EX2D survey: dominant frequency is 50Hz at seabottom and 20-30Hz at the acoustic basement. Cable length and receiver interval are 5100m and 12.5m, respectively. Total 3500ci air gun is used. Suggestion of gas and hazardous events in a few places.
- HR2D survey: Dominant frequency is 100Hz in top 1000m. Line spacing is 100m for east survey area and 75m for west (shallower) area. Cable length and depth are 1500m and 4m, respectively. Cable length is important parameter, good velocity focusing was observed with cable length ranging in 1100-1500m. Cable depth of 3-

4m maximized the data quality. Hazardous events in shallower part become more visible than on EX2D, so this type of survey is valuable for predicting drilling hazard in top 1000m.

- Survey with side-scan, current profiling, and single channel seismic for the both are
- Diebold's suggestion: make streamers and source at the same depth AND add compass to streamers if possible especially if there are currents.
- Enachescu's suggestion: take a piece of 3D deep penetration data, process shallow resolution, and compare upper 1 sec.

#### **4 Discussion on MATRIX**

- Naar reviewed concept and progress of committee on behalf of Shipp and Droxler and Katz and others at the Norway meeting. A list of data sets required from iSSP and iPPSP (for different given conditions) was shown.
- Quoidbach reviewed progress of creating an algorithm using the results of the Norway meeting.
- Eguchi reviewed new web page design for proposal submission that will provide input information for Quoidbach's algorithm – thus reducing redundant input from the proponents and streamlining the web submission process.
- The site characterization requirements listed in matrix are a starting point to help the proponents. After the iSSP meeting, then refinements to the site characterization list may take place related to specifics of each hole and review of any existing data.
- Although iPPSP does not review pre-proposals, the proponents will have an idea of what the typical safety requirements will be for the proposed drill holes much earlier on in the proposal process.
- It was suggested that the pre-proposal website inquire if the drill hole investigates paleomag or magnetic anomalies (which in turn would be used in the MATRIX algorithm in defining site characterization requirements).
- Panel realized that the list of site characterization requirements was not to replace the panel function, but rather to reach out and help the proponents and serve as a starting point for both the proponents and the iSSP and iPPSP panel members.
- A WG report should be submitted to iPC by the end of interim period, though the WG discussion will continue. Present plans include direct interaction between Quoidbach (LDEO) and Eguchi (iSAS) to identify funding to complete programming tasks, to continue collaboration, and eventually to provide a test version for panel members to test hopefully sometime in the Fall of 2003.

#### **5 Individual review of proposal datasets available at Data Bank**

**Day 2: 29 July 2003 (8:30-17:00)**

**(Continue individual review of proposal datasets available at Data Bank for 45 minutes)**

#### **6 Proposal reviews**

Panel reviewed 24 proposals, three top ranked MSP proposals, 2 proposals forwarded to iPC, 2 CDP /9 full/3 pre-proposals reviewed in last iSSEP meeting, and 2 full proposals which were not reviewed at the last iSSEP meeting but new data were submitted. The list of proposals, watchdogs, and iSSP readiness classification is shown in attachment.

**Day 3: 30 July 2003 (9:00-10:30)**

**7 Date selection for next panel meeting**

- Next panel meeting will be held in the University of Tokyo, Japan. Local hosts are Dr. Kimihiro Mochizuki (Univ. Tokyo) and AESTO.
- The date selected is tentatively 11-13 February 2004, with a data submission deadline moved up to January 15, 2004.

**8 Selection for liaisons and other SAS meetings**

- iPC/SPC: September, 2003 at Sapporo, Japan: Droxler, Okino
- SSEP: 13-16 or 20-23 November at Boulder, USA: Droxler, Naar (not fixed)
- PPSP: 15-17 December at Nagasaki, Japan: Okino

**9 Final Discussion**

**9.1 Modification of readiness classification**

Panel agreed a part of definition of readiness classification should be rephrased to clarify its meaning. The modified classifications are as follows;

1A: All required data are in the Data Bank *and have been reviewed by SSP*.

1B: A few required items are missing from the Data Bank, *or have not been reviewed by SSP*, -but data are believed to exist and to be readily available.

3B: No data are in Data Bank.

**9.2 Mandate update for IODP phase**

- Communication between watchdogs of SSP and PPSP should be written in new mandate.
- One of the important tasks of the SSP is to help proponents and nurture proposals. A clear system of contact with proponents is needed.
- Any comments on mandate update should be sent to co-chairs by next iPC/SPC meeting in September.

**9.3 Others**

- The possibility of inviting funding agency members to the panel was discussed.
- Short reports on site-survey capability in academia (ship, instruments, 3D survey ability etc.) from each country in next panel meeting will help the panel discussion.

**10 Presentation of R/V Ewing replacement**

- New seismic survey ship: 3D survey, multi streamer
- High-resolution swath bathymetry and swath sub-bottom profiling

Adjournment of the panel meeting and writing of watchdog reviews.

**List of participants:****iSSP panel members:**

Caress, David  
Droxler, Andre (co-chair)  
Enachescu, Michael  
Gutscher, Marc-Andre  
Hoyanagi, Koichi  
Korja, Annakaisa  
Naar, David  
Nogi, Yoshifumi  
Okino, Kyoko (co-chair)  
Qiu, Xuelin  
Reves-Sohn, Rob  
Tsumura, Noriko  
Tsuru, Tetsuro

**Liaisons and guests:**

Ito, Hisao (iPC)  
Divins, David (iSciMP)  
Eguchi, Nobuhisa (iSAS office)  
Hashimoto, Tsukuru (CDEX)  
Quoidback, Daniel (ODP DataBank)  
Shipp, Craig (iPPSP)  
Watkins, Joel (iPPSP)