

# IODP Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 8-9 July 2004

Hotel Concorde St. Lazare  
Paris, France

## Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee - SPPOC

---

Eric J. Barron	Department of Geosciences, Pennsylvania State University, USA
Michael Bickle*	Department of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Margaret Delaney	Ocean Sciences Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
Yoshio Fukao	Institute for Research on Earth Evolution (IFREE), JAMSTEC, Japan
Susan Humphris	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
Gaku Kimura	Department of Earth & Planetary Science, University of Tokyo, Japan
Hermann Kudrass	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Germany
Roger Larson	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
Julian Pearce <sup>a</sup>	Department of Earth Sciences, Cardiff University, United Kingdom
Xavier Le Pichon	Chaire de Géodynamique, Collège de France, France
Larry Mayer*	Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping, University of New Hampshire, USA
Judith McKenzie	Departement Erdwissenschaften, ETH Zürich, Switzerland
Akira Nishimura	Geological Survey of Japan
Motoyoshi Oda	Department of GeoEnvironmental Sciences, Tohoku University, Japan
Nicklas Pisiias	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, USA
David Rea	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
Neil Opdyke <sup>b</sup>	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Florida, USA
Kenji Shuto	Department of Geology, Niigata University, Japan
Kensaku Tamaki (chair)	Department of Geosystem Engineering, University of Tokyo, Japan
Kaoru Tsujii	Research Institute for Electronic Science, Hokkaido University, Japan

<sup>a</sup>Alternate for Michael Bickle.

<sup>b</sup>Alternate for Larry Mayer.

\*Unable to attend.

## Liaisons and observers

---

Steve Bohlen	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Yuchen Chai	National Natural Science Foundation, China
Mike Coffin (SPC)	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Nobuhisa Eguchi	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
David Falvey	ECORD Science Operator, British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Tom Janecek	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Hans Christian Larsen	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Bruce Malfait	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Catherine Mevel	ECORD Managing Agency, Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, France
Jeff Schuffert	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Asahiko Taira	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Manik Talwani	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Yasuhisa Tanaka	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan

## Guests

---

Rodey Batiza	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Dan Evans	ECORD Science Operator, British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Jeff Fox	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
David Goldberg	JOI Alliance, Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Benoit Ildefonse (SPC)	Laboratoire de Tectonophysique, ISTEEM, Université Montpellier II, France
Yoshihisa Kawamura	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Eiichi Kikawa	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), Japan
Kenji Kimura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Hajimu Kinoshita (IMI BoG)	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), Japan
Tsuyoshi Kogo	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Evgeny Kontar	Shirshov Institute of Oceanology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

John Ludden (ECORD)	Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers, CNRS, France
Yoichiro Otsuka	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Frank Rack	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Shingo Satomura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Takafumi Shimizu	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Kiyoshi Suyehiro (IODP-MI)	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), Japan
Svetlana Zolotikova	ECORD Managing Agency, Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, France

# IODP Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 8-9 July 2004

Hotel Concorde St. Lazare  
Paris, France

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-1:** The SPPOC approves the revised agenda of its second meeting on 8-9 July 2004 in Paris, France.

**SPPOC Motion 0407-2:** The SPPOC approves the minutes of its first meeting on 5-6 December 2003 in San Francisco, California, U.S.A.

*Pisias moved, Larson seconded; 17 in favor.*

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-3:** The SPPOC accepts the modified report of the SPPOC *ad hoc* committee on the conflict-of-interest policy (including Appendix A and excluding Appendices B and C) and adopts it as the conflict-of-interest policy for the IODP Science Advisory Structure.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-4:** The SPPOC acknowledges the ramifications of changing the SPC voting, vote tabulation, and recording processes for ranking proposals and will include that topic on the agenda for the December 2004 SPPOC meeting.

**SPPOC Motion 0407-5:** The SPPOC approves the IODP Program Plan for FY2005.

*Pisias moved; Larson seconded; 17 in favor.*

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-6:** To conduct an assessment of progress towards the goals and objectives of the IODP Initial Science Plan and to assist in long-term planning, the SPPOC requests for its December 2004 meeting that the SPC chair present an overview of the current status of submitted proposals and their distribution with respect to the designated themes and initiatives of the IODP Initial Science Plan.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-7:** The SPPOC receives SPC Consensus 0406-26 regarding a revised IODP Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy and thanks the Science Advisory Structure for its work on combining and revising the previous Sample and Data Policy and Obligations Policy. The SPPOC forwards this policy to IODP-MI and asks them to review it with the implementing organizations and revisit it with the SAS as necessary before seeking final approval by the SPPOC in December 2004.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-8:** The SPPOC receives SPC Consensus 0403-18 regarding an IODP Publications Policy and looks forward to learning at its December 2004 meeting the results of the review being conducted by IODP-MI and the implementing organizations on implementing the policy.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-9:** The SPPOC accepts SPC Motion 0406-03 and approves the proposed changes to three clauses of the SPC terms of reference.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-10:** The SPPOC appreciates the efforts of the SPC working group in reviewing the IODP Science Advisory Structure. The SPPOC *ad hoc* committee on the Science Advisory Structure looks forward to continued interactions and discussions with this group as the *ad hoc* committee completes its review by early December 2004.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-11:** The SPPOC approves the proposed changes, with minor modifications, to the terms of reference of the IODP Science Steering and Evaluation Panels (SSEPs), Site Survey Panel (SSP), Scientific Measurements Panel (SciMP), Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP), Technology Advice Panel (TAP), and Industry Liaison Panel (ILP).

The SPPOC also approves the addition of observatory science to the SciMP terms of reference as follows:

1. General Purpose: The Scientific Measurements Panel (SciMP) will contribute information and advice to the IODP community through the SPC with regard to the handling of IODP data and information, methods and techniques of IODP measurements (including factors that impact measurements, such as sample handling, curation, etc.), laboratory design, portable laboratory needs, ~~and~~ downhole measurements and experiments, and observatories.

2. Mandate: ... Specific responsibilities for the panel are publications, databases, sampling handling, curation, computers, shipboard equipment usage and needs, measurement calibrations and standards (including intercalibration between platforms and shorebased laboratories), as well as borehole and observatory measurements, equipment, usage, and needs.

5. Membership: Members should have expertise representing the ~~three~~ four core areas of the panel mandate covering information handling, downhole measurements, ~~and~~ scientific measurements, and observatories.

The SPPOC notes that the ongoing review of the Science Advisory Structure may result in further changes to the terms of reference of some panels.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-12:** The SPPOC thanks Catherine Mevel for hosting this meeting in such a pleasant and hospitable environment. We also thank Svetlana Zolotikova for her superb efforts in organizing all of the necessary arrangements.

# IODP Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 8-9 July 2004

Hotel Concorde St. Lazare  
Paris, France

## FINAL MINUTES

Thursday

8 July

08:30-18:00

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Opening remarks and introduction of participants

Tamaki convened the meeting at 08:30 and reviewed several news items since the previous SPPOC meeting. The participants introduced themselves.

#### 1.2 Welcome and meeting logistics

Catherine Mevel welcomed everyone to Paris and outlined the meeting logistics.

#### 1.3 Approve meeting agenda

Tamaki asked for approval of the agenda for this meeting. Delaney requested to add an item under other business for discussing IODP at a paleoceanography conference. The committee offered no other comments or objections.

<b>SPPOC Consensus 0407-1:</b> The SPPOC approves the revised agenda of its second meeting on 8-9 July 2004 in Paris, France.
---

#### 1.4 Approve last meeting minutes

Tamaki asked for approval of the minutes from the previous SPPOC meeting. The committee offered no comments or objections.

<b>SPPOC Motion 0407-2:</b> The SPPOC approves the minutes of its first meeting on 5-6 December 2003 in San Francisco, California, U.S.A.
---

*Pisias moved, Larson seconded; 17 in favor.*

#### 1.5 Review committee terms of reference

Tamaki briefly reviewed the SPPOC terms of reference. He highlighted several points and noted that nothing had changed since the last meeting.

#### 1.6 Items approved since December 2003 SPPOC meeting

Tamaki reported that since the December 2003 SPPOC meeting, the committee had voted by e-mail to approve SPC alternate members for the March 2004 SPC meeting, to approve Keir Becker as the new SPC vice-chair, to amend the interim conflict-of-interest policy, and to change the name of the Pollution Prevention and Safety Panel to the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel. He noted that the committee also voted on, but did not approve, the sample and data policy, preferring instead to discuss it more thoroughly at this meeting (see Agendum 9.1.1 below).

### 2. Agency reports

#### 2.1 NSF

Bruce Malfait stated that the first IODP expedition had already begun. He expressed strong confidence on extending operations with the *JOIDES Resolution* through at least the end of FY2005 and possibly into FY2006 and said that he hoped to know for sure by the end of this August. Malfait reported that the FY2005 budget to the U.S. Congress included money allocated for converting a non-riser vessel for scientific ocean drilling. He anticipated an

8-9% increase in funds in the FY2005 budget, as part of the ramp up of funding for full operations of the IODP. Malfait announced that Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI) had won the competitive award for managing the U.S. Science Support Program (USSSP). He referred to site surveys and mentioned that the U.S. planned to replace the *Maurice Ewing* and the *Alvin* in the near future.

## **2.2 MEXT**

Yasuhisa Tanaka showed the organizational structure of the Ocean and Earth Division of MEXT, headed by Hiroshi Sato. He outlined the IODP framework for establishing the agreements with ECORD as a contributing member and China as an associate member. Tanaka reported that MEXT established a national committee on ocean drilling to discuss domestic issues such as facilitating science research, education, and outreach. He mentioned that a March 2004 symposium in Yokohama on creating new IODP science in Asian waters attracted more than seventy participants, including ten from overseas. Tanaka announced an IODP promotional campaign in Japanese universities and museums.

## **2.3 EMA**

Catherine Mevel reported that ECORD officially formed on 12 December 2003 with twelve countries. Several new members have since joined, including Spain, Canada, and an Italian institute, and Austria will join in FY2005. Mevel noted that ECORD officially joined the IODP in March 2004. She reported that ECORD representatives attended the EurOCEAN 2004 meeting in Galway, Ireland, organized by the European Commission, and that CNRS would coordinate the ECORD-Net with EC funding of 2.32 million Euros over four years. Mevel reported that the EC 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Program would place greater emphasis on basic research and participation in international programs, thus improving the chances of gaining additional European support for the IODP. She also referred to ongoing discussions with the European Science Foundation. Mevel described the MSP operational plans for FY2004 and FY2005 and mentioned the very successful U.K. IODP launch meeting for the Arctic Coring Expedition (ACEX) on 3 June 2004 in London. She reported that the EC regarded the PROMESS-1 project now underway as a test case for using MSPs. Mevel also identified the European institutional members of the IODP-MI.

Humphris asked about the responsibilities of organizations that join the IODP-MI. Talwani explained that the membership fee of \$5000 gives an organization the possibility of having an elected representative on the board of governors and a chance to help shape program policy. He added that it also provides incentive for the faculty of institutions to participate in the program.

## **2.4 MOST - China**

Yuchen Chai of the Natural Science Foundation of China reported that China had signed a memorandum for participating in the IODP on 26 April 2004 in Tokyo. He said that IODP-China inherited the national organization created for the ODP, established a new IODP office at Tongji University in Shanghai, and launched a Web site ([www.iodp-china.org](http://www.iodp-china.org)) as of late December 2003, with an English language version under construction. They also published a Chinese version of the IODP Initial Science Plan, and the *Chinese Science Bulletin* recently published a special issue with twenty-five papers on ocean drilling results from the South China Sea. Chai reported that the newly established national science committee met in late February 2004 to discuss the national IODP science plan. He maintained that IODP and other related projects such as IMAGES, InterRidge, and InterMARGINS have a high priority in China. Chai mentioned a short course on geomicrobiology organized at Shanghai and stated

that China stands ready to host various international IODP activities such as SAS panel and committee meetings.

### **3. Operation reports for FY2004**

#### **3.1 JOI Alliance**

Frank Rack outlined the JOI Alliance management structure and identified JOI as the prime contractor with subcontracts to TAMU and the LDEO. He reviewed recent staffing changes, cited the various integrated management teams, and noted the current opening for director of the non-riser vessel conversion project. Rack summarized the JOI response to the PEC-VI report and stated that JOI would submit a formal report to the NSF. He noted progress on addressing the ODP recommendations on monitoring legacy images, close-up core photos, public relations, and outreach material, and indicated that JOI provided the report to the IODP-MI to address recommendations on the IODP.

Rack briefly reviewed JOI Alliance activities for Phase I, including approval of the vessel indemnification request and submission of an environmental assessment to the NSF for evaluation. He noted several changes to the current operations schedule following the OPCOM meeting. These included dropping the dry-dock requirement, inserting three days for Proposal 641-APL Costa Rica CORK-II, adding days for weather contingency to North Atlantic Paleoclimate Expeditions 303 and 306, testing the advanced diamond core barrel (ADCB) on Atlantis Oceanic Core Complex Expedition 304, and drilling a new hole for installing the CORK on Expedition 306 instead of using an existing hole as originally proposed. Rack outlined the new plan for vessel security. He noted the appointment of co-chiefs for all scheduled expeditions and referred to other expedition staffing in progress, including sailing a teacher on Juan de Fuca Hydrogeology Expedition 301. Rack mentioned instituting a high-latitude marine contingency plan for Expedition 303 off Greenland and submitting the program plan for FY2005 to the IODP-MI for approval. He also showed a planning timeline for the non-riser vessel conversion project.

Larson asked what activities the *JOIDES Resolution* had undertaken between September 2003 and June 2004. Rack referred to a contract with the Japan National Oil Corporation for gas hydrate drilling off Japan. Delaney asked about the timing for current operations of the *JOIDES Resolution*. Rack replied that the program plan currently called for demobilizing the ship in May 2005, but that could change depending on forthcoming fiscal guidance from the NSF. He added that JOI would have to inform the subcontractor by December 2004 to exercise a contingency to extend the current contract. Piasias asked whether the option for using the *JOIDES Resolution* had any limit. Fox expected the subcontractor would cooperate with the program to extend the contract into FY2006 if desired.

#### **3.2 CDEX**

Asahiko Taira briefly outlined the new CDEX organizational structure and reported on CDEX activities for FY2004 and FY2005. He described the status of the *Chikyu*, now slated for delivery to JAMSTEC in April 2005 followed by two years of training, and he showed photos of the recently installed drilling equipment. Taira cited the location of the training cruise off Shimokita Peninsula of Northeast Japan and reported that the EPSP had previewed the related engineering site survey in June 2004. He also showed a five-year planning timeline, outlined the engineering development needs for the NanTroSEIZE project, and mentioned several publication and outreach activities.

#### **3.3 ESO**

Dan Evans reported on the progress for planning the Tahiti Sea Level Expedition in FY2005. He stated that ECORD had committed to providing the POCs for the required vessel with

dynamic positioning capability, and tendering activities should begin soon. Evans also reported on the Arctic Coring Expedition (ACEX), with all contracts now in place except for logging. He explained that the original logging contractor backed out after a company takeover. Evans listed the specifications for the Russian nuclear icebreaker *Sovetskiy Soyuz* and showed the progress on outfitting the *Vidar Viking* for drilling. He outlined the plans for education and outreach, saying that the press had already shown considerable interest and that artists and teachers would participate at sea. Evans described the operational phase for mobilizing and conducting the expedition, with up to thirty-five days available in the ice, including ten days of transit, though factors such as the price of oil or a medical emergency could influence the final total. He said that the expedition would conclude on 16 September in Tromsø, Norway, where the science party would disembark and the two-stage demobilization of the drill ship would begin. Evans added that the cores would go to the Bremen repository, and the onshore science party would meet there starting on 1 November.

Le Pichon inquired about the total ACEX budget. Evans said \$12.5 million. Humphris asked about the contingency plan for the drilling system and about the use of the teacher on board given that it would occur during summer vacation. Evans answered that they could vary the nature of the core barrels depending on the conditions encountered. He added that the value of the teacher onboard might depend on the character of the individual selected, and they certainly would not have any capability for real-time or interactive reports. Larsen asked about the power of the drill ship. Evans described the ship as classified for operating solo in the Baltic Sea and possessing a good dynamic positioning system, but it needed support in the Arctic. Larson asked about the plans for using the helicopters. Evans said that they only planned for one long-range helicopter trip, principally for the press, and any other use would only involve emergencies. Pias asked if MSP expeditions normally would not split cores onboard the platform. Evans said that it would depend on the individual project; the Arctic drill ship, for example, simply did not have enough room for splitting cores.

#### **4. IODP-MI, Inc. management update**

Manik Talwani reported on the establishment of the IODP-MI offices in Washington, D.C. and Sapporo, Japan, noting that the Sapporo office operates through a subcontract to the Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (AESTO). He explained that the IODP-MI intends to remain a lean organization. He showed organizational diagrams of the two offices, indicating filled and unfilled positions, and listed the responsibilities of the president and two vice-presidents. Talwani cited several science planning activities from April to June 2004, such as developing a draft program plan for FY2005, establishing an education and outreach task force, and holding an OPCOM meeting. He identified many of the necessary tasks for establishing a working corporation and showed a preview of the new IODP Web site slated to go online in the next week.

Larson asked about the role of AESTO. Larsen described it as a non-profit organization that supports the staff and infrastructure of the Sapporo office, as well as supporting the national program in Japan through J-DESC.

Pias wondered if the SPPOC should do anything with the PEC-VI report since the IODP-MI had received it and since it contained many recommendations concerning the IODP. Talwani replied that the IODP-MI hoped to create a structure for evaluating the program continuously rather than on a three-year basis. Tamaki suggested discussing this issue under Agendum 7.1. Delaney believed that the SPPOC needed guidance on how the SAS should interact with the IODP-MI. Talwani said that guidance now comes from the proposal submitted to the funding agencies and that he recommended to the Board of Governors that the SPPOC should work



on a higher plane and have guidance over the entire program without getting caught up in the details. He noted that many of the issues considered at the last SPPOC meeting went back to the SPC and SAS panels, whereas others went straight to the IODP-MI, suggesting that many of those issues need not have gone to the SPPOC in the first place. Tamaki asked when JOI passed the PEC-VI report to the IODP-MI. Bohlen said in late May 2004. Tamaki thought the PEC-VI report could prove very useful for the *ad hoc* committees to consider in their deliberations. He suggested distributing it to the SPPOC members as soon as possible. Piasias wanted to hear a report of the recommendations later in the meeting. Delaney asked if the funding agencies expected a response from the IODP-MI. Malfait saw no reason not to consider it, though none was required. Talwani said that he had not had time to study the report thoroughly and did not realize that it might involve the need for a response. Le Pichon called any further discussion premature since the committee had not seen the report.

## **5. Presentation of FY2005 Program Plan**

### **5.1 Introduction**

Manik Talwani outlined the costs of the FY2005 Program Plan, as distributed between SOCs and POCs. He showed the requested and proposed costs in various categories and noted that all categories received less than requested, though education, outreach, and publications fared better than others.

### **5.2 Science Plan**

Mike Coffin reported on the science plan that resulted from the SPC ranking and scheduling exercises conducted in September 2003 and June 2004. He showed the areas of operations in the North Atlantic and off Tahiti. Coffin summarized the scientific objectives of the North Atlantic Paleoclimate I and II Expeditions, including the Norwegian Margin Bottom Water component, and the Atlantis Oceanic Core Complex I and II Expeditions. Coffin reported that the SPC decided to split the South Pacific Sea Level proposal (519-Full2) into two parts for Tahiti and the Great Barrier Reef and conduct the Tahiti part as soon as possible. He presented the scientific objectives of the Tahiti portion and a related ancillary project letter (650-APL). Coffin said that the SPC regarded the APL favorably and believed it should interest industry, but it depended on receiving additional external funding. He expected the SPC would make a final recommendation on the APL in October 2004. Coffin characterized the highly ranked proposals currently residing with OPCOM for potential scheduling in late FY2005 and FY2006 as spread among the themes of the Initial Science Plan and geographically located primarily in the Pacific.

### **5.3 Operation Plan**

Tom Janecek reported that the flow of SOCs would change in FY2005 and go through the IODP-MI instead of directly from the funding agencies to the IOs. He described the proposed operations for the companion North Atlantic Paleoclimate Expeditions 303 and 306 and noted the environmental and safety risks. He also described the operations for the companion Atlantis Oceanic Core Complex Expeditions 304 and 305 and noted that these would comprise a single science party. Janecek added that Expedition 304 would include a short test of the ADCB coring system at the base of the hole as a limited trial for improving hard rock drilling capabilities. He described the operations of the South Pacific Sea Level Expedition off Tahiti and cited the very flexible weather window and the necessity of environmental awareness. Janecek summarized the budget for all of the expeditions.

### **5.4 Deliverables**

Hans Christian Larsen reported on science deliverables for FY2004-FY2005 relating to data, publications, and core distribution. He reviewed past SPPOC Recommendations 0312-11 on

the sample and data policy, 0312-15 on publications, and 0312-18 on several working group reports. Larsen referred to the urgent matter of issuing a request for proposals (RFP) for a new site-survey data bank, noting that the current contract runs through September 2004, with funding secured through the end of January 2005. He identified the goal of creating an entirely digital, Web-based data bank that would allow for closer integration of drilling proposals with the corresponding site-survey data. Larsen said that the data bank must encompass the resources to receive, archive, recover, and display data in service to proponents and the SAS. He announced that the Sapporo office would assemble a task force to assess proposals received in response to the RFP in October 2004 and would coordinate future IODP-MI involvement with the new data bank. Larsen explained that the IODP-MI would not have any funding available in FY2005 for data management and publications, but they planned to take on new staff in late FY2005 for initiating these activities in FY2006. He cited the exception of starting a new program journal, possibly with involvement of the International Continental Scientific Drilling Program (ICDP). Larsen mentioned that the IODP-MI proposed a geographically based system for distributing cores among the three core repositories, and the SPC recommended the plan in principle in June 2004 (see Agendum 9.1.6 below), though it could involve a major redistribution of existing cores.

Pisias inquired about the average number of sample requests from the SIO and LDEO core repositories. Fox said about fifty per year. Pisias thought it made sense then to do it in the most cost effective way possible because it should not matter where the samples reside in an integrated program. Malfait clarified that no agreed plans existed at the moment.

Malfait inquired about the process for releasing the databank RFP and the anticipated response time. Larsen expected to issue the RFP in early September with a deadline in late October, giving at least six weeks to respond. Malfait suggested including the EPSP and operators in the decision process.

## **6. Discussion of FY2004 and FY2005 Program Plans**

Tamaki opened the discussion of the program plans. Shuto asked if the POC budget for FY2005 included the costs of the non-riser vessel conversion project. Talwani replied that the funding agencies basically defined the division of POCs and SOC for FY2005. Pearce inquired whether the budget adjustments resulted in the loss of any scientific items. Talwani said it had no effect on science. Pisias questioned why the budget included funds for undetermined engineering developments yet did not provide for establishing data management oversight within the program management, especially with the first expedition already underway and collecting data. Larsen responded that he had advertised the data management positions and identified good candidates who could fill those positions in FY2005 pending budget approval. Talwani added that the IODP-MI had to wait for clear budget guidance from the funding agencies. Malfait responded that the lead agencies thought the IODP-MI needed to put immediate emphasis on other priorities of starting up a new business involved with managing \$400 million.

Kudrass mentioned the past change in the publications policy and wondered if anything indicated a cause for concern about the policy. Pisias said that the available data indicated that the change had no effect on the number of publications appearing in the open literature. Kudrass suggested promoting the publishing of thematic volumes in the open literature. Le Pichon wanted to avoid giving the impression of retreating back to the gray literature of in-house publications. Tamaki referred to the SPC work on the publications policy and deferred discussing it further until the next day (see Agendum 9.1.2).

Oda thought the program plan did not present a clear policy for coordinating education and outreach efforts. Otsuka replied that the task force had discussed certain general guidelines and agreed that the IODP-MI should support international program events such as AGU, and the IOs should support platform-specific activities. He expected the task force to develop more detailed guidelines in the near future. Pearce perceived a lack of good publicity to promote the FY2005 schedule and wondered if the IODP would undertake efforts similar to those done in the U.K. for ACEX. Otsuka believed the task force would take the example of ACEX into account in developing policies and guidelines for press releases. Talwani agreed and expected those efforts to increase in the future as the IODP becomes more fully established.

Kimura asked if the core repositories all had the same quality of conditions for storing cores. He suggested that some cores might have to go to a certain repository regardless of geographic origin. Larsen wanted certainly to keep the policy flexible enough to handle special cases, and he emphasized the difference between the forward-looking policy for IODP and how to redistribute ODP cores. Fukao wondered why the Bremen repository appeared as a separate entity in the budget outline, whereas the Kochi and Gulf Coast repositories folded into the operator budgets. Janecek described the Bremen repository as a separate contracting entity receiving funds for supporting ODP and IODP core storage. Evans added that the support for the repository overall and for core curation related to ACEX involved completely separate contracts. Humphris did not understand why the normal Bremen budget did not include curation of the ACEX cores. Evans noted that most analyses of the ACEX cores would not occur until the shore-based party.

Pisias hoped to see the budget presented in a more uniform fashion. Talwani said that he would insist on a having uniform breakdown of the budgeting for FY2006. He expected everyone would see a clearer picture in the future, but the short lead-time of establishing the IODP-MI simply precluded making fundamental changes in the existing accounting procedures for this program plan. Tsujii noted the lack of details for the Sapporo office portion of the IODP-MI budget. Larsen answered that the appendix contained greater details. Talwani reiterated the difficulty of giving consistent details for all parts of the main program plan in such a short timeframe. Janecek sought comments on how to present the program plan better in the future. Rack suggested that the program plan did not need to indicate the JOI Alliance subcontracts since they had presented a unified proposal to the IODP-MI. He noted that the old model included all core repositories under a single category, but things have changed. Delaney called it confusing that the structural diagrams did not show the Bremen repository receiving funds directly from the IODP-MI. Talwani suggested that perhaps the program plan could include the Bremen contract as part of outsourcing under the IODP-MI line item.

Coffin asked how the budget reduction to the SAS would affect SAS operations. Talwani said that it had delayed hiring decisions until later in FY2005 and reduced the travel budgets across the board for the Washington and Sapporo offices. Tamaki noted the new budget expense for supporting SAS panel chairs. Talwani said that the Board of Governors favored the idea but had not approved it yet. Larson viewed it as a very good deal. Kimura noted the inconsistent way of handling travel funds across the program, as SOCs in Europe, as POCs in Japan, and mixed in the U.S. Talwani recognized the inconsistency and promised to work toward making it more consistent in the future. Kimura also asked about accounting for demobilizing the *JOIDES Resolution* as a POC. Malfait stated that the memoranda excluded mobilization costs from POCs but did not mention demobilization costs, and the IODP Council would discuss that issue at their meeting two days from now. Pisias asked if it

represented a problem that the proposed budget still exceeded the target from the lead agencies by \$1.7 million. Tanaka replied that although the lead agencies provided the target figure, they would still seek funds to support the proposed amount.

Tamaki shifted the discussion to the science and operations plan and asked Larson to report as the liaison to the Arctic scoping group. Larson gave a brief update on ACEX planning. He characterized the mobilization schedule as very tight, with plenty of opportunity for things to go wrong, but great if everything worked right. He reported that the ESO had decided not to take the DOSECC system as a backup piston corer because they regarded it as not robust enough for the expected conditions. Larson suggested that the IODP-MI vice-president for operations should handle similar liaison activity in the future. Janecek agreed on the tight schedule but described the operators as experienced and quite capable of doing it. Humphris wondered if the Arctic scoping group would remain active to conduct an assessment of the project. Janecek noted that the group had already disbanded. Falvey assured the committee that ISO 9000 standards compelled the BGS to evaluate the project thoroughly in the aftermath. Delaney asked about oversight of the scientific measurements performed by the shore-based party. Janecek replied that the SciMP had begun examining the shipboard and shore-based measurements plan for ACEX in conjunction with the ESO, whereas a more generalized long-term approach remained under development. Piasias asserted that the process should ensure SAS assessment of the prospectus as indicated in the IODP-MI proposal.

Coffin remembered to mention that OPCOM inserted the ancillary project for Costa Rica CORK-II (641-APL) into the operations schedule, as approved by the SPC in March. Tsujii expressed disappointed at still not seeing any direct reference to microbiology in the program plan for FY2005 or among the top-ranked proposals available for FY2006. He urged making a stronger effort to promote microbiology research in the program. Coffin clarified that the SPC had reviewed one microbiology proposal with a deep biosphere focus and ranked it in the second group. He also hoped that with microbiology now comprising part of the routine measurements, new scientists would contribute proposals in the near future. Tamaki asked Piasias to prepare a recommendation for approving the program plan the next day (see Agendum 8 below).

## **7. *Ad hoc* committee reports**

### **7.1 Science Advisory Structure**

Judy McKenzie presented an interim report from the *ad hoc* committee for reviewing the science advisory structure (SAS). She said that the *ad hoc* committee proposed forming a new panel to handle scientific outreach and assessment, and they proposed transforming the TAP and the ILP into task forces under the IODP-MI. The committee struggled with the question of how to maintain appropriate expertise on the panels, and they identified a current gender imbalance on SAS panels and committees. The committee wondered about the appropriate chair system for various panels and the procedure for selecting chairs. McKenzie proposed requesting further comments from J-DESC, ESSAC, and USSAC, and she suggested that the *ad hoc* committee should meet once more after the SPC finalizes its report in October 2004.

Janecek asked about the definition of task forces, whether they would belong to the SAS or the IODP-MI, and who would pay for the participants if the latter. Talwani stated that the IODP-MI would not have the funds to pay for task forces. Piasias supported exploring new ways of organizing the advisory structure in the new program. He suggested that perhaps certain advisory panels or task forces could work more closely with the IODP-MI than with the SPC, yet still get funding from the same source as other SAS panels. Delaney emphasized

that the interim report represented just a matter of discussion for now and not a final recommendation to the IODP-MI.

Le Pichon questioned the function of the SPPOC in terms of discussing important matters such as changing the entire advisory structure versus spending so much time on other inconsequential details. Delaney replied that the *ad hoc* committee did not talk about the SPPOC function in particular, but she advised that the SPPOC should focus on policies, programmatic decisions, and budgetary matters. She sensed some confusion, however, about how to translate the SPPOC mandate into an agenda and how the SPPOC would interact with the IODP-MI and the rest of the SAS. Tamaki noted that the SPPOC clearly has to approve the program plan, and the terms of reference put the SPPOC at the top of the SAS, but the communication pathway between the SAS and the IODP-MI sometimes seems to bypass the SPPOC.

Larsen wondered about the necessity of forming a new panel and suggested that at least it should not participate in reviewing proposals. Le Pichon questioned the idea of forming a new panel to do what the SPPOC should do itself. Opdyke also wondered if the SPPOC could perhaps subsume the tasks of the proposed new panel. Pearce favored placing greater emphasis on education and outreach efforts, noting that past efforts paled in comparison with other organizations, such as NASA. Piasias suggested identifying the list of tasks that need doing and then deciding how to handle those within the SAS.

The committee resumed discussing the SAS on Friday morning, with Humphris presenting the recommendations from the PEC-VI report. The recommendations focused on maintaining strong international participation and interaction with other international research organizations, and they advocated longer term advance planning and rigorous evaluation and assessment of the ongoing program. The recommendations also raised concerns about legacy preservation, paleontological databases, publications, developing a clear policy for third-party tools, ensuring good presentation of proposals, preventing budgets from creeping upward, and making sure that the TAP and the ILP focus on long-term issues.

Tamaki recalled that the PEC-VI had an overall favorable impression of the SAS. Malfait referred to the previous overhaul of the panel structure under JOIDES and the greater emphasis placed on the proposal driven nature of the program. He cited the current lack of microbiology proposals and the observatory issue and wondered if the program might have lost some control over its own direction. Delaney agreed that the previous change from four thematic panels to the two SSEPs yielded various effects and may have resulted in some proposals arriving at the top that are not ready for scheduling. Le Pichon stressed the importance of publicizing the opportunity for proposals in certain areas. He saw danger in ranking just the best proposals technically and then not ending up with the best science. Pearce did not view the lack of a dedicated microbiology expedition as necessarily a shortcoming given the established routine of integrating microbiology with geological and geochemical studies. McKenzie advocated microbiology as a field of study and not just a methodology. Piasias wanted to ensure proper evaluation of add-on experiments in fields such as microbiology.

McKenzie presented a revised SAS diagram for discussion. Piasias wanted to see the SPPOC assume responsibility for long-range planning and assessment. Tamaki suggested letting the *ad hoc* committee continue working and return at the next meeting for further discussion of the SPPOC role in the advisory structure. Talwani preferred receiving advice and recommendations from the SAS because the IODP-MI could not take on the planning role itself. Delaney hoped to get substantive input from the IODP-MI in the process. Talwani

replied that IODP-MI personnel would gladly provide input to the discussions, but not as members of the committee. Kudrass suggested also getting input from the SPC and the SSEPs for added insight. Tamaki proposed that the SAS *ad hoc* committee should have a two-day meeting before the December 2004 SPPOC meeting to prepare the final report for the SPPOC. He also recommended that McKenzie attend the October 2004 SPC meeting to meet with the SPC working group, and he suggested that the two IODP-MI vice presidents and the SPC chair participate as liaisons with the SAS *ad hoc* committee. McKenzie welcomed input from all SPPOC members. Piasias offered to attend the October SPC meeting at his institution and advise on the SAS. Larsen asked about the definition of liaison. Talwani said that a liaison should serve for information purposes only without influencing decisions.

Humphris suggested first defining the SPPOC functions, particularly in terms of program assessment, because other parts of the SAS might not need to undertake those efforts. Barron agreed and suggested identifying the agenda items for the next meeting before the end of this one. He hoped to see the SPPOC ask a completely different set of questions concerning the program plan, for example on whether it adequately addresses the long-range plan. Tamaki encouraged the committee to offer suggestions later in the afternoon for the next agenda (see Agendum 11 below). Janecek noted that SPPOC comments could enter sooner into the planning process now that the SPC would rank proposals six months earlier than before. Tanaka stated that the SPPOC could approve only the scientific operations schedule this December and not the FY2006 program plan because the lead agencies could not provide budget guidance by then. Talwani clarified that the IODP-MI would submit a supplement to the FY2005 program plan for approval in December. Larson asked if the committee could assume that future approval of program plans would normally occur at a meeting about this time of year. Tanaka expected so, though the Council would discuss it the next day.

## **7.2 Conflict-of-Interest Policy**

Yoshio Fukao reported on behalf of the *ad hoc* committee for developing a conflict-of-interest policy. He noted that the committee met in late April 2004 in Tokyo and early July 2004 in Paris. Fukao presented a draft report that included a general introductory statement, a definition of conflict of interest, basic principles, and specific policy statements. The report also included three appendices concerning a) a SAS conflict of interest statement, b) SPC voting procedures for global scientific ranking of proposals, and c) an overview of the implementing organizations.

Larson thought the policy seemed very similar to the JOIDES policy for the ODP. Humphris noted that the policy allowed sending two representatives to a meeting for one position and having the alternate vote only in the event of a conflict and the regular member vote otherwise. She added that the policy also seemed to allow IODP-MI or IO personnel to serve as proponents of proposals. Talwani assured the committee that no IODP-MI employees would serve as proponents of proposals. Coffin noted the existence of one proposal with a lead proponent from an implementing organization and many other proposals with staff scientists as proponents. Humphris worried that excluding proponents from voting on long-term platform plans could pose serious problems. Delaney thought that the advisory structure had followed that principle since it reorganized in 1997. Rea suggested amending the policy to refer only to proposals available for the long-range schedule. Opdyke asked about the procedure for choosing alternates. Coffin explained that the national or consortium programs name all SAS members and alternates, sometimes with input from committee or panel chairs.

Pearce asked if the SPC voting results remained on the public record. Coffin said no, the SPC ranks proposals by closed ballot and does not want the ballots of individual committee

members revealed to the public. Le Pichon argued in favor of transparency in the voting procedures and making the results a matter of public record. Pearce agreed that someone voting honestly did not need to worry about the voting record. Opdyke remarked that he would not review any proposals if he could not remain anonymous. Falvey cautioned that anyone could file for judicial review of the program in any of the member countries. Piasias questioned the sense of ranking thirty proposals when everyone knows the best five and the worst five and just guesses at everything in between. He suggested that compiling a list of only the top five or ten from every member would yield the same results.

Kudrass wondered about the definition of funding agencies because all of the participating German institutions now contribute to the IODP membership fee. Delaney recommended focusing on making Appendices A and B clear and agreeable. Le Pichon agreed on the goal of approving only Appendix A. Barron noted several differences between the policy section and Appendix A. He also wondered if the SPPOC really wanted to receive regular detailed reports on these matters or just entrust them to the IODP-MI and only come to the SPPOC if a problem arises. McKenzie thought that other issues might arise in discussing the SAS system, and she proposed creating a statement of ethical practices. Rea summarized the points of how the *ad hoc* committee could modify the policy before the next day.

Coffin suggested adopting this as an interim policy and finalizing it at the next meeting after reviewing the SAS working group report. Humphris preferred modifying and shortening the policy first before approving it. She thought it seemed like an extra step to approve another interim policy after already having an interim policy in place. Coffin agreed in principle but noted that the existing policy covered only the SPC and the SSEPs and not any of the other panels or management entities.

Fukao asked if the policy needed considerable shortening or only minor changes. Larson preferred using the entire report for the benefit of the outside community. Barron wanted to focus on Appendix A but still shorten it and simplify it considerably. Tamaki favored using the longer document and believed that the committee could settle for minor changes of the existing version. The committee agreed to table the issue until the next day and adjourned the meeting for the day at 18:00.

**Friday**

**9 July**

**8:30-16:30**

### **7.2 Conflict-of-Interest Policy (continued)**

The committee resumed discussing the conflict-of-interest policy on Friday morning. Fukao presented a revised policy statement and characterized Appendix A as the most important part for internal use within the SAS, though the full report could help inform the broader community. Rea explained the detailed revisions made to the policy since the previous day and asked for further substantive comments.

Barron stated that everyone has a bias of some sort and the key lies in identifying it. He recommended that the policy should require revealing those biases to the whole panel instead of just informing the chair. Rea agreed. Humphris expressed concern about handling institutional conflicts uniformly across all panels. Coffin explained that the SPC asks everyone to declare institutional conflicts and then decides on a case-by-case basis what represents a true conflict. Rea understood the concern and welcomed more input from the committee. Coffin added that the question of institutional conflicts must account for certain cultural differences.

Pearce reasserted that having a transparent voting system would eliminate most of the concerns about conflicts of interest. Le Pichon agreed that transparent voting would solve the

problem and limit the number of exclusions necessary. Piasias suggested looking at the past data first to see if a problem exists. Opdyke proposed adopting the conflict-of-interest policy now and addressing the transparency issue separately at a later meeting. Barron stressed that the policy did not exclude anyone because of having an institutional conflict; it only required them to declare such conflicts.

After a brief recess, Rea presented the minor modifications on making a public declaration of conflicts of interest and not regarding institutional conflicts as cause for exclusion. Le Pichon objected to including institutional conflicts as too complex. Kimura also objected to declaring institutional conflicts and instead favored transparent voting. Tamaki still preferred declaring institutional conflicts. Piasias supported having a transparent voting process. Barron wanted to preserve the idea of announcing institutional conflicts. He suggested allowing transparency of voting within the panel but not to the outside community. Larsen doubted the possibility of maintaining partial transparency.

Rea proposed discussing this issue as a separate agenda item at the next meeting. He argued that the committee could not vote on it at this meeting because it did not appear on the agenda. Le Pichon disagreed, saying that it very much comprised part of the COI discussion. Tamaki proposed deferring a decision until the next meeting. Coffin reiterated that the existing policy applied only to the SPC and the SSEPs. Piasias suggested approving Appendix A now and waiting until next time for Appendix B. Le Pichon wanted to resolve the question of institutional conflicts. Piasias agreed with removing the institutional reference. Barron still argued for declaring potential institutional conflicts, noting that it would only pose a true conflict at a certain level.

Fukao presented a revised COI policy later in the afternoon. Rea indicated the details of the minor changes that eliminated specifying the types of interest that might cause a conflict and instead referring simply to direct interest. Le Pichon felt satisfied with the change, as long as the committee would address the issue of SPC voting procedures at the next meeting. Rea volunteered to draft separate consensus statements concerning the two issues.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-3:** The SPPOC accepts the modified report of the SPPOC *ad hoc* committee on the conflict-of-interest policy (including Appendix A and excluding Appendices B and C) and adopts it as the conflict-of-interest policy for the IODP Science Advisory Structure.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-4:** The SPPOC acknowledges the ramifications of changing the SPC voting, vote tabulation, and recording processes for ranking proposals and will include that topic on the agenda for the December 2004 SPPOC meeting.

### 7.3 SOCs and POCs

Nick Piasias reported that the *ad hoc* committee worked from the memorandum that defined science operating costs (SOCs) and platform operating costs (POCs) for the FY2005 program plan, primarily for non-riser operations. The committee discussed various issues concerning mobilization and demobilization, observatory science, outreach, site surveys for engineering and safety, management and administration distribution, and engineering development. Piasias noted that mobilization and demobilization have the biggest impact on MSPs and a secondary impact for demobilizing the *JOIDES Resolution* and bringing the new non-riser vessel on line. Other issues include transits, tool development, and standard science equipment. In FY2005 for example, POCs include CORK bodies and casing but not instruments. Piasias reported that since observatory science plays such an important role in the IODP, the committee suggested forming a new SAS panel for borehole observatories, with a mandate to build partnerships



with other programs, define technical requirements, and identify development timelines. The committee recognized that the IODP-MI must define the responsibilities of the IOs with respect to program wide and culturally specific outreach activities. The program must also resolve the questions of when an engineering site survey becomes a POC and what priority it takes versus other POCs. Piasias noted that new environmental permitting issues would require added survey needs, and the SSP and the EPSP needed expanded guidelines to cover those issues. He said the committee found that a 100% or 50-50% distribution of management and administrative personnel among SOC's or POC's should work well for budgeting. They also identified three classes of tools under engineering development; stable tools involving steady improvement represent POC's, whereas those undergoing active development or new tool developments represent SOC's. Piasias suggested that the SAS should provide engineering priorities for short- and long-term scientific needs.

Larson wondered what would happen to the POC line item budget after reclassifying SOC activities as POC's. Piasias said that it would work differently for each operator, and the answers might change as the program evolves. Talwani noted for example that the IODP-MI asked JOI to reclassify its management and administration budget as half POC's and half SOC's instead of all SOC's. Tanaka stated that the lead agencies share the total program costs equally. Malfait remarked that the lead agencies consider the estimated POC's in giving the IODP-MI a target budget.

Humphris wondered when the SOC-POC *ad hoc* committee would produce a final report and whether it should appear on the agenda for the next meeting. Tamaki recognized the somewhat unclear outcome but said that the committee could not do much to change POC's and SOC's as defined in the program memoranda. Humphris asked if that meant that the *ad hoc* committee had finished its work. Piasias offered to translate his presentation into a report but agreed that it could not really change anything. Humphris recommended disbanding the *ad hoc* committee. Tamaki concluded that since the committee achieved its task by giving a report at this meeting, he regarded it as essentially disbanded.

### **8. Consider FY2004 and FY2005 Program Plans**

Tamaki asked for any further comments on the program plan before seeking its approval. Piasias suggested that the SPPOC should decide exactly what it wants to see from now on in program plans. He recognized the short time available for preparing this plan but hoped that the next plan would come forward with a longer lead-time and more uniformly presented budget. Le Pichon suggested noting the lack of microbiological objectives and a clear plan for the first project for riser drilling. Talwani noted that the program must work with the projects available.

<b>SPPOC Motion 0407-5:</b> The SPPOC approves the IODP Program Plan for FY2005.
--

*Piasias moved; Larson seconded; 17 in favor.*

Piasias sought to build a consensus on some of the other issues on presenting program plans and recommended making this a key topic for the next meeting agenda. Le Pichon reiterated his concern about not addressing satisfactorily the objectives of the Initial Science Plan. Coffin explained that most of the proposals now up for scheduling originated during the ODP, and it would still take a bit more time until more of the proposals developed specifically for the IODP reach maturity. He added that microbiology did not constitute the only initiative with a lack of proposal pressure. Humphris proposed asking for a report from the SPC on how the existing proposals fulfill the initiatives of the Initial Science Plan. Delaney thought that the SPPOC needed more information and time on the agenda to evaluate proposal pressure with respect to the Initial Science Plan. She inquired about the timing of program

plan development and how it passes through the advisory structure. Talwani suggested that the SPPOC should see the prioritized list of proposals from the SPC before it goes to the IODP-MI for incorporation in the program plan. Tamaki proposed discussing these issues again at the next meeting.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-6:** To conduct an assessment of progress towards the goals and objectives of the IODP Initial Science Plan and to assist in long-term planning, the SPPOC requests for its December 2004 meeting that the SPC chair present an overview of the current status of submitted proposals and their distribution with respect to the designated themes and initiatives of the IODP Initial Science Plan.

## **9. Science Planning Committee report and recommendations**

### **9.1 SPC report**

Coffin diagrammed the SAS and identified the current chairs of each committee and panel. He reviewed the schedule of SPC meetings. Piasis identified the largest missing element as the lack of a co-chair for the SPPOC.

#### **9.1.1 IODP sample, data, and obligations policy**

Coffin reviewed the history of developing the sample, data, and obligations policy and noted that it had now reached the SPPOC for debate for the third time. He gave an overview of the policy and cited some of its specific goals and detailed points. Coffin asked for approval of the policy by the SPPOC.

**SPC Consensus 0406-26:** The SPC accepts the revised IODP Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy and forwards it to the SPPOC for consideration.

Janecek noted that the policy does not contain a true obligation for publications because it allows just submitting a progress report. Pearce asked whether everyone would have access to samples after the moratorium or only program members. Delaney asked how the moratorium would apply to split expeditions such as North Atlantic Paleoclimate I and II. Coffin acknowledged that issue as problematic depending on the length of time between the two expeditions. He believed that the wording of the policy allowed enough flexibility to interpret those special cases. Taira supposed that a similar complexity would apply to riser drilling projects.

Larsen recalled that the initial consensus called for the IODP-MI to get input from the IOs and return to the SPPOC with a revised policy. Coffin thought that the SciMP discussions involved the IOs and the IODP-MI. Delaney did not see clearly where the process stood. Talwani hoped to receive clear advice of what to do and a chance to do it. Tamaki proposed accepting the policy as an interim policy at this meeting. Humphris said that it seemed premature to accept a policy that still needed more negotiating. Piasis asserted that the SPPOC could only repeat the previous recommendation asking the IODP-MI to take the draft policy and determine how to implement it before coming back to the SPPOC for approval. Tamaki asked Humphris to prepare a consensus statement.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-7:** The SPPOC receives SPC Consensus 0406-26 regarding a revised IODP Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy and thanks the Science Advisory Structure for its work on combining and revising the previous Sample and Data Policy and Obligations Policy. The SPPOC forwards this policy to IODP-MI and asks them to review it with the implementing organizations and revisit it with the SAS as necessary before seeking final approval by the SPPOC in December 2004.

### 9.1.2 IODP publications policy

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0403-18 and Consensus 0406-4 on the IODP publications policy.

SPC Consensus 0403-18: The SPC in consultation with the SciMP recommends to the IODP-MI that:

- 1) The Web version of the expedition report (analogous to the ODP Initial Reports) be designated as the permanent archive.
- 2) There be an electronic scientific results volume that includes but is not limited to: an expedition science summary coordinated by the co-chief scientists, a continually updated bibliography of all publications related to the expedition, and data reports and technical notes.
- 3) Within the RFP for publications, provisions be made for permanent (>100 years) archiving, which may be electronic.
- 4) The IODP-MI request as part of the RFP various options for paper production that include less-than-archival quality, on-demand copies or subscriptions because a portion of the community requests paper versions of the Expedition Reports.
- 5) Each implementing organization be responsible for providing scientific content for its platforms, but that one contractual organization be a central point for technical editing, layout, and production, thus ensuring uniformity of style.

SPC Consensus 0406-4: The SPC recognizes that because of fiscal constraints, a request for proposals (RFP) for publications cannot be issued in time to provide publication support of the first IODP expeditions. In view of SPC Consensus 0403-18, the committee reaffirms that “Each implementing organization be responsible for providing scientific content for its platforms, but that one contractual organization be a central point for technical editing, layout, and production, thus ensuring uniformity of style.” The committee recognizes that the current situation is unusual and encourages the IODP-MI: 1) to have the implementing organizations of expeditions not covered under the RFP prepare the content of the expedition reports, and 2) to contract with one organization for technical editing, layout, and production of the reports. The committee also encourages the IODP-MI to issue an RFP for publications as soon as possible and to inform the SPC of any changes in publication strategy.

Larsen reiterated that the IODP-MI had no funding available in the FY2005 budget to issue an RFP for publications. Talwani said that the IODP-MI could only examine the feasibility of the recommendation and report back to the SAS at some point. Larsen added that management needed to discuss the issue with the IOs. Coffin assured that the SAS realized that financial realities might limit some of the possibilities. Piasias viewed the recommended policy as too specific on how to implement it, rather than just specifying the desires of what to publish. Humphris doubted that the SPPOC could reach a consensus on this issue without understanding how it related to activities undertaken by the IODP-MI. Talwani believed that the SPPOC could not do anything at the moment with this request.

Pearce asked if the IODP had assumed responsibility for archiving the ODP data and publications. Malfait identified the objective of placing those products in a national archive, and he also expected to pass them on to the IODP. Coffin explained that he presented the draft policy because the SPPOC had not yet endorsed any policy on publications, though he understood the concerns of the IODP-MI. Humphris proposed receiving the policy and looking forward to a further report from the IODP-MI. Tamaki asked Piasias and Humphris to draft a consensus statement.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-8:** The SPPOC receives SPC Consensus 0403-18 regarding an IODP Publications Policy and looks forward to learning at its December 2004 meeting the results of the review being conducted by IODP-MI and the implementing organizations on implementing the policy.

### 9.1.3 Consider revised terms of reference for SPC

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0403-4 on not requiring SPPOC approval of SPC members or alternates. He noted that five SPC members rotated off the committee after the last meeting, and he would work with J-DESC and USSAC to name replacements with suitable expertise.

SPC Consensus 04-03-4: With regard to SPPOC Consensus 03-12-12, the SPC notes that the nomination of highly qualified, non-conflicted scientists to SAS committees and panels is in the interest of IODP national and consortium committees and the SAS. Conflicts of interest and disciplinary balance are identified by the SPC chair and the IODP-MI Sapporo office and communicated to the IODP national and consortium committees for nomination of members and alternates. We conclude that this oversight is sufficient to address disciplinary balance and deal with conflicts of interest for proposal evaluation. Therefore, we recommend that SPPOC approval not be required for SPC members or alternates.

Coffin also presented SPC Motion 0406-3 on revising the SPC terms of reference to incorporate the recommended change consistent with SPC Consensus 0403-4.

SPC Motion 0406-3: The SPC recommends revising three clauses of its terms of reference as follows:

1.2 Mandate. The SPC encourages the international community to develop and submit drilling proposals for the IODP. The SPC can initiate and terminate temporary SAS groups as needed. The SPC ~~recommends~~ reviews SAS membership ~~to the SPPOC, particularly~~ with respect to disciplinary balance. The SPC recommends SAS meeting frequency...

1.5 Membership. The SPC will consist of seven members from Japan, seven members from the U.S., ~~and~~ four members (three voting and one non-voting) from the ECORD, and one member (non-voting) from China. All appointees to the SPC shall satisfy the fundamental criteria of having the ability and commitment to provide mature and expert scientific direction to IODP planning. Each member should have a designated alternate to serve in his or her absence. The term of membership will be three years and at least one third of the members shall rotate off the committee annually, so that the SPC membership is replaced every three years. Re-appointment shall be made only in exceptional circumstances. ~~Any changes in the SPC member representation (i.e., naming of alternates for members for meetings without prior approval of the alternates by the SPPOC) must be reviewed by the SPPOC for approval.~~ The fields of specialization on the SPC shall be kept balanced as far as possible by requests to national and consortia program committees. If an SPC member misses two meetings in succession, the SPC chair or vice-chair will discuss the problem of SAS representation with the appropriate ~~country~~ national or consortia representative(s) on the SPPOC.

1.6 Liaison. The Vice-President of Science Planning at the IODP-MI, the directors of the implementing organizations, or nominees thereof, and representatives of the lead agencies are permanent, non-voting liaisons. The SPC chair is the liaison to the SPPOC, and the SPC assigns other liaisons to the SSEPs, ~~PPSP~~ EPSP, and other SAS panels and groups.

The committee accepted the revised SPC terms of reference without debate.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-9:** The SPPOC accepts SPC Motion 0406-03 and approves the proposed changes to three clauses of the SPC terms of reference.

#### **9.1.4 SAS review (mid-term)**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0406-5 on the mid-term report of the SPC working group for reviewing the SAS. He noted that the group would finish its report for the October 2004 SPC meeting and make it available after that for the SPPOC *ad hoc* committee.

SPC Consensus 0406-5: The SPC receives the mid-term report from its own SAS Review working group (Duncan, Ildefonse, Tatsumi), commends the efforts of the group to date, and looks forward to receiving a final report at the October 2004 SPC meeting.

Delaney suggested defining the role and responsibilities of liaisons. Coffin agreed to assign that task to the working group. Tamaki noted that the chair of the SPPOC *ad hoc* committee could invite the SPC working group members to participate at the December meeting. He also proposed inviting the IODP-MI vice-presidents to participate as liaisons or observers. Tamaki asked Humphris to draft a consensus statement.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-10:** The SPPOC appreciates the efforts of the SPC working group in reviewing the IODP Science Advisory Structure. The SPPOC *ad hoc* committee on the Science Advisory Structure looks forward to continued interactions and discussions with this group as the *ad hoc* committee completes its review by early December 2004.

#### **9.1.5 IODP expedition and site designation**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0403-19 on an expedition and site designation scheme. Humphris worried that the names assigned to expeditions would not inform the public very well, especially if used as the primary designator. Janecek promised that expeditions henceforth would have better names than those currently assigned by default on short notice. Larsen suggested working with the co-chiefs to get better names based on the prospectus. Ildefonse emphasized the purpose of communicating within and outside the IODP community. Humphris asked if the SPPOC needed to decide anything on this. Coffin clarified that he just presented it for information.

#### **9.1.6 DSDP, ODP, and IODP core distribution**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0406-24 on the IODP core distribution policy. The committee offered no additional comments (see Agendum 5.4 above) and took no action.

#### **9.1.7 SPC annual ranking/scheduling and OPCOM interactions**

Coffin explained the entire SPC procedure of reviewing and ranking proposals, including what information other panels contribute to the process. He listed all of the information that proponents receive and emphasized that only the external reviews and the SPC voting results remain anonymous.

Coffin presented a series of recommendations on specific drilling proposals (SPC Consensus 0403-13, 15, 16, 21, 22, and 23) from the March 2004 SPC meeting, primarily for information purposes. The committee offered no comments and took no action.

Coffin reviewed the results of the June 2004 SPC ranking exercise and presented SPC Consensus 0406-15 on the proposals forwarded to OPCOM. He noted that the SPC would consider FY2005-06 scheduling options received from OPCOM in October 2004 and conduct another ranking exercise in March 2005. For further information, Coffin also presented a series of recommendations on specific drilling proposals (SPC Consensus 0406-8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, and 19) and a recommendation on interactions with OPCOM (SPC Consensus 0406-22) from the June 2004 SPC meeting. The committee offered no comments and took no action.

Coffin reviewed the characteristics of complex drilling projects (CDPs) and presented SPC Consensus 0403-16 on designating the Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP) proposal (537-CDP3) and the Nankai Trough Seismogenic Zone (NanTroSEIZE) proposal (603-CDP3) as CDPs. He referred to the beginning of scoping activities for the NanTroSEIZE project and noted SPC Consensus 0403-17 on the deferral of such activities for CRISP and for the Indus Fan and Murray Ridge proposal (595-Full3). The committee offered no comments and took no action.

### **9.1.8 Observatories and the IODP**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0403-6 on integrating observatories within the IODP and Consensus 0406-14 on the Monterey Bay Observatories proposal (621-Full). He noted that the SPC would submit a report to the SPPOC in December on observatories.

### **9.1.9 SAS travel and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0406-7 on voluntarily offsetting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The committee offered no comments and took no action.

## **9.2 SAS panel reports**

Coffin presented SPC Consensus 0403-11 and 0406-6 on panel mandates. He explained that he sought a blanket approval of the revised terms of reference and noted that this represented a short-term solution pending possible changes to the advisory structure that the SPPOC might recommend.

SPC Consensus 04-03-11: The SPC establishes a working group to evaluate, make consistent, and otherwise modify the revised terms of reference for each SAS panel as presented at the March 2004 SPC meeting. The working group of Kenter, Mori, and Prell should provide a final report at the June 2004 SPC meeting.

SPC Consensus 0406-6: The SPC receives the revised terms of reference for the SAS panels from its own SAS Terms of Reference working group (Kenter, Mori, Prell), requests minor modifications, and forwards the revised terms of reference with modifications to the SPPOC for consideration.

Delaney suggested inserting responsibility for observatories into the SciMP mandate. Coffin agreed and indicated that he might still make other minor changes to the SAS terms of reference for clarity and consistency.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-11:** The SPPOC approves the proposed changes, with minor modifications, to the terms of reference of the IODP Science Steering and Evaluation Panels (SSEPs), Site Survey Panel (SSP), Scientific Measurements Panel (SciMP), Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP), Technology Advice Panel (TAP), and Industry Liaison Panel (ILP).

The SPPOC also approves the addition of observatory science to the SciMP terms of reference as follows:

1. General Purpose: The Scientific Measurements Panel (SciMP) will contribute information and advice to the IODP community through the SPC with regard to the handling of IODP data and information, methods and techniques of IODP measurements (including factors that impact measurements, such as sample handling, curation, etc.), laboratory design, portable laboratory needs, and downhole measurements and experiments, and observatories.
2. Mandate: ... Specific responsibilities for the panel are publications, databases, sampling handling, curation, computers, shipboard equipment usage and needs, measurement

calibrations and standards (including intercalibration between platforms and shorebased laboratories), as well as borehole and observatory measurements, equipment, usage, and needs.

5. Membership: Members should have expertise representing the ~~three~~ four core areas of the panel mandate covering information handling, downhole measurements, ~~and~~ scientific measurements, and observatories.

The SPPOC notes that the ongoing review of the Science Advisory Structure may result in further changes to the terms of reference of some panels.

#### **10. Identify liaisons to the SAS**

Coffin noted that the IOs provided lists of their liaisons for all SAS committees and panels, as previously requested. Delaney asked about the procedure for approving SAS meetings and attendees. Coffin explained the two-step procedure of getting approval from the SPC chair and the IODP-MI vice-president in the Sapporo office.

#### **11. Review of motions and consensus items**

The committee reviewed the final wording of the conflict-of-interest policy and several consensus statements as presented by Fukao, Rea, and Humphries. Piasis summarized the concerns related to presenting the budget for the program plan in a uniform way, determining what should appear in future program plans, whether the program plan meets the objectives of the Initial Science Plan, and whether the meeting schedule accords with the timing required for developing the program plan. Talwani regarded the first concern as easily addressed but viewed the second point as too vague. Barron suggested that these points should appear on the agenda for the next meeting. Piasis agreed.

Tamaki reviewed the items for the next meeting agenda including amending the FY2005 program plan, how to present future program plans, the role of the SPPOC, the SAS review, COI transparency, and a report from the SPC chair on proposal pressure. He said that SPPOC members could still make additional suggestions when the draft agenda circulates before the meeting. Barron suggested adding a riser drilling report and interaction with other international programs. Humphris suggested visiting long-term program planning on an annual basis. Piasis suggested adding an item on implementing the long-range plan. Larsen wanted to ensure distributing a draft agenda well in advance of the meeting to provide a chance for adding items like this, and not just taking this discussion as sufficient. He recommended releasing a draft agenda more than one month in advance to allow for preparing and distributing the agenda book by one month in advance. Tamaki hoped to send out a draft agenda two months in advance.

#### **12. Any other business**

Peggy Delaney cited an opportunity for promoting the IODP at the 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Paleoceanography on 5-10 September 2004 in Biaritz, France. She reported that the meeting organizers offered to have an IODP display booth, and she welcomed input from committee members for her keynote talk on the program.

**SPPOC Consensus 0407-12:** The SPPOC thanks Catherine Mevel for hosting this meeting in such a pleasant and hospitable environment. We also thank Svetlana Zolotikova for her superb efforts in organizing all of the necessary arrangements.

### **13. Future meetings**

#### **13.1 Third SPPOC meeting, 11-12 December 2004, San Francisco**

Tamaki proposed holding the next SPPOC meeting on 11-12 December 2004 in San Francisco, California. He suggested that IODP-MI could host the meeting. He also noted that the IODP Council would not meet at that time.

Larsen agreed with the proposed meeting dates and location and advised against changing the dates later because of the inconvenience to participants who must plan busy schedules far in advance. Le Pichon reiterated his earlier concern about not hearing any plans for the first riser drilling expedition. Coffin offered to present a more coherent overview of riser drilling plans at the next SPPOC meeting. Barron suggested making it a habit at the end of each meeting to ask for proposed agenda items for the next meeting.

#### **13.2 Fourth SPPOC meeting, June 2005, Japan**

Tamaki offered to provide an opportunity for SPPOC members to visit the *Chikyu*, together with the IODP Council. Taira indicated that the meeting could occur in conjunction with the first open house ceremony for the *Chikyu* in early June 2005, attended by the royal family.

Humphris wondered if the SPPOC should continue following a December-June meeting schedule or else adjust it as appropriate for making decisions on the program plan. Talwani suggested that it might suffice just to deliver the program plan somewhat earlier to the committee. He added that the lead agencies had asked for a plan by August this year, so June should work well for next year.

The committee adjourned the meeting at 16:30.