

# IODP Science Planning Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 23-26 March 2004

Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.  
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

## Science Planning Committee - SPC

---

Jamie Austin**	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Keir Becker (vice-chair)	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Hans Brumsack	Institut für Chemie und Biologie des Meeres (ICBM), Universität Oldenburg, Germany
Mike Coffin (chair)	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Bob Duncan	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, USA
Andy Fisher	Earth Sciences Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
Kathryn Gillis <sup>a</sup>	School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Canada
Benoît Ildefonse	Laboratoire de Tectonophysique, ISTEEM, Université Montpellier II, France
Hisao Ito	Geological Survey of Japan, Japan
Kenji Kato	Institute of Geosciences, Shizuoka University, Japan
Hodaka Kawahata	Geological Survey of Japan, Japan
Jeroen Kenter	Faculty of Earth Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, The Netherlands
Chris MacLeod*	Department of Earth Sciences, Cardiff University, United Kingdom
Ken Miller	Department of Geological Sciences, Rutgers University, USA
Ted Moore	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
James Mori	Disaster Prevention Research Institute, Kyoto University, Japan
Warren Prell <sup>b</sup>	Department of Geological Sciences, Brown University, USA
Terry Quinn	College of Marine Science, University of South Florida, USA
Wonn Soh	Deep Sea Research Department, JAMSTEC, Japan
Yoshiyuki Tatsumi	Institute for Frontier Research on Earth Evolution (IFREE), JAMSTEC, Japan

<sup>a</sup>Alternate for Chris MacLeod.

<sup>b</sup>Alternate for Jamie Austin.

\*\*Attending as IMI interim director.

\*Unable to attend.

## Liaisons

---

Jamie Allan	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Tim Byrne (ISSEP)	Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Connecticut, USA
Gilbert Camoin (ESSEP)	CEREGE-CNRS, France
Harry Doust (ILP)	Faculty of Earth Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, The Netherlands
Barry Katz (PPSP)	ChevronTexaco, Energy, Research and Technology Company, USA
Kenji Kimura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Kate Moran (TAP)	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
Rick Murray (SciMP)	Department of Earth Sciences, Boston University, USA
Makoto Okada (SciMP)	Department of Environmental Sciences, Ibaraki University, Japan
Kyoko Okino (SSP)	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan

## Guests

---

Jack Baldauf	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Rodey Batiza	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Steve Bohlen	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Bob Burger	U.S. Science Support Program, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Dan Evans	ECORD Science Operator (ESO), British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Holly Given	U.S. Science Support Program, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
David Goldberg	JOI Alliance, Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Ulrich Harms (ICDP)	GeoForschungsZentrum, Potsdam, Germany
Dave Huey (TAP)	Stress Engineering Services, Inc., USA
Tom Janecek	Antarctic Research Facility, Florida State University, USA
Yoshihisa Kawamura	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Ann Klaus	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA

Kristen Kusek	InterRidge Initiative, USA
Hans Christian Larsen	Danish Lithosphere Center, Denmark
Roger Larson (SPPOC)	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
Catherine Mevel	ECORD Management Agency (EMA), Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, France
David Mosher (Leg 207)	Geological Survey of Canada – Atlantic, Canada
Kiyoshi Otsuka	OD21 Program Department, JAMSTEC, Japan
Frank Rack	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Manik Talwani	IODP Management International, Inc. (IMI), Washington, D.C., USA
James Zachos (Leg 208)	Earth Sciences Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA

**ISAS Office**

---

Nobuhisa Eguchi	Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (AESTO), Japan
Jeff Schuffert	Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (AESTO), Japan



# IODP Science Planning Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 23-26 March 2004

Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.  
Washington, D.C., USA

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**SPC Consensus 04-03-1:** The SPC approves the minutes of its first meeting on 15-19 September 2003 in Sapporo, Japan.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-2:** The SPC approves the revised agenda for its second meeting on 23-26 March 2004 in Washington, D.C.

**SPC Motion 04-03-3:** The SPC recommends revising Section 1.2 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 and timing to the SPPOC. In addition, the SPC may assign special tasks to SAS committees, panels, and planning groups. The SPC approves the chairs of all SAS panels and planning groups. The SPC chair approves the meeting agendas for all SAS committees, panels, and planning groups other than the SPPOC. The SPC sponsors and convenes planning conferences at intervals determined by long-term science plans for IODP. The SPC assigns its own watchdogs to proposals that are forwarded from the SSEPs. The SPC ranks the scientific objectives of the proposals into final priority after they are reviewed by the SSEPs. The SPC approves by at least a two-thirds majority the annual drilling schedule as forwarded from the OPCOM. The SPC nominates chief scientists to the implementing organizations, who make the final selection.

The SPC periodically reviews the IODP SAS in light of developments in science and technology and recommends amendment of the SAS and its terms of reference to the SPPOC. Much of the work of the SPC is carried out by the commissioning of reports from other SAS panels, including both formal and *ad hoc* working groups, *ad hoc* subcommittees of its own membership, and by its chair or vice-chair.

*Prell moved, Becker seconded; 16 in favor, 1 abstained (Soh)*

**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.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-5:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendations 03-12-02 on conducting the standard suite of downhole measurements when the IODP visits legacy holes, 03-12-03 on including a seismic integrator as part of the scientific party for any drilling project where core-log-seismic integration is required, and 03-12-04 on collecting checkshots or zero-offset vertical seismic profiles (VSPs) whenever correlation of logs to seismic is required for any IODP drilling project. The SPC forwards these petrophysics recommendations to the IODP-MI and the implementing organizations.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-6:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendation 03-12-05 on initiation of discussions on integrating observatories within the IODP and forwards it to the SPPOC, the IODP-MI, and the implementing organizations for consideration.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-7:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendation 03-12-06 for a revised IODP Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy and forwards it to the SPPOC for consideration.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-8:** The SPC forwards the matrix working group report to the IODP-MI and recommends implementing it as soon as possible.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-9:** The SPC accepts the project management system report in principle and forwards it to the IODP-MI as a framework for further development of an IODP project management system, in consultation with SAS representatives. The SPC requests a progress report by June 2004.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-10:** The SPC establishes a working group to evaluate the current IODP Science Advisory Structure and recommend modifications in light of the IODP-MI requests issued on and after 2 October 2003. The modified IODP SAS should implement effectively the following functions: program evaluation and assessment, multi-platform and long-term science planning, interaction between the IODP-MI and the SAS, and integration with other international earth science programs. The working group of Duncan, Ildelfonse, and Tatsumi should give a mid-term report at the June 2004 SPC meeting and a final report at the August 2004 SPC meeting. *(Note: the SPC subsequently postponed its August meeting until October 2004)*

**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 04-03-12:** The SPC recommends renaming the Pollution Prevention and Safety Panel (PPSP) to the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP), effective immediately.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-13:** The SPC recommends that the OPCOM split Proposal 519-Full2 South Pacific Sea Level into two MSP expeditions. The Tahiti component should be considered for scheduling in FY2005.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-14:** The SPC establishes a working group to formulate an environmental policy for drilling on reefs. The working group of Quinn, Kenter, and Kato should consult with the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel and the implementing organizations and present a draft policy at the June 2004 SPC meeting.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-15:** The SPC forwards Proposal 641-APL Costa Rica CORK-II to the OPCOM for consideration for scheduling in FY2004 provided that it does not impact any other previously scheduled expeditions.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-16:** The SPC approves the recommendation of the SSEPs to designate Proposal 603-CDP3 Nankai Trough Seismogenic Zone (NanTroSEIZE) and Proposal 537-CDP3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP) as complex drilling projects (CDPs) and forwards them to the OPCOM to determine the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity. We request a report from the OPCOM on scoping activities at the June 2004 SPC meeting. These CDP proposals should also be distributed to the SAS service panels for providing initial technical advice to the SSEPs and the SPC.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-17:** The SPC requests that the OPCOM determine the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity for Proposal 595-Full3 Indus Fan and Murray Ridge.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-18:** 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 04-03-19:** The designations of IODP expeditions are important for communicating the program results to the broad community as well as for use within the program. The SPC recommends that the prime identification of all IODP expeditions be a unique expedition name that describes the location and/or science objectives. Drilling sites should have a unique, sequential, platform- or expedition-based designation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-20:** The SPC commends the contributors to the draft *Guide to the IODP* for their outstanding work so far. We ask the IODP-MI Sapporo office to assume the task of producing a completed version for community wide distribution, and we request an update on their efforts at the June 2004 SPC meeting.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-21:** The SPC recommends to the IODP-MI that participants of the North Atlantic I and II and Core Complex I and II expeditions be considered as single science parties, respectively.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-22:** The SPC recommends making all efforts necessary to collect a complete sedimentary section at each drilling site on the North Atlantic I and II expeditions. We understand that obtaining such complete sections may require drilling three or four holes to cover gaps in the core record and that MST correlations of the cores must be carefully evaluated to identify the gaps during the drilling operations at each site.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-23:** The SPC was briefed about discussions with the JOI Alliance regarding drilling a new hole for achieving the objectives described in Proposal 543-Full2. The proposal indicated that Hole 642E would be suitable, and in many ways ideal, for the proposed experiments. We are concerned that drilling a new hole will require additional time and funds, and we request that the lead proponent prepare a proposal addendum that justifies additional ship time and program costs if these are required to achieve the primary project objectives. The addendum should be submitted in time for consideration at the OPCOM meeting on 15-16 April 2004. Otherwise, the proponent and the JOI Alliance should determine the best approach to accomplish the proposed science within the currently allocated ship time and budgets.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-24:** The SPC acknowledges that proportional representation rights (defined in the memoranda as 7:7:3+1) are important for the SPC and the SSEPs with respect to making decisions on the disposition of proposals. However, we recommend some flexibility of representation in satisfying the disciplinary needs of the service panels (EPSP, SSP, SciMP, TAP, and ILP).

**SPC Consensus 04-03-25:** The memoranda among the funding agencies define the proportional participation in scientific parties by contributing IODP members. We recommend that the IODP-MI should balance the overall participation utilizing a multi-year rolling timeframe and considering the scientific requirements and multi-platform nature of the program.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-26:** The SPC greatly appreciates the efforts of our host, Steve Bohlen and the JOI Alliance in bringing us together in their new office location. The facilities for this meeting have been excellent, and we have wanted for nothing in the way of a comfortable, commodious room, audio-visual equipment, electronic connection, and food and drink. We thank Steve, Frank, Holly, Bob, Bridget, Maureen, Amy, and Jennifer for their warm hospitality.

# IODP Science Planning Committee

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, 23-26 March 2004

Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.  
Washington, D.C., USA

## FINAL MINUTES

Tuesday

23 March 2004

08:30-17:00

### 1.1. Welcome and meeting logistics

Mike Coffin opened the meeting at 08:30. Amy Castner welcomed everyone to JOI on behalf of Steve Bohlen and explained the meeting logistics. The participants introduced themselves.

### 1.2. Opening remarks from MEXT, NSF, and EMA

Kenji Kimura, the MEXT liaison to the NSF, identified himself as a member of the technical evaluation panel for the contract with the IODP-MI. He referred to the united effort of the lead agencies in promoting the IODP, with the lead oversight role shared by Bruce Malfait of the NSF and Yasuhisa Tanaka of MEXT. Kimura announced that ECORD had signed a memorandum with the lead agencies to join the IODP as a contributing member, and China had begun negotiating to join as an associate member. He also noted that the lead agencies had entered the final stages of implementing the contract with the IODP-MI as the central management organization, and they would soon provide the IODP-MI with guidance on the total budget and on distinguishing platform operating costs (POCs) and science operating costs (SOCs) for FY2005.

Jamie Allan reported that the NSF had initiated a 36-month cooperative agreement with the Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI) for managing the U.S. Science Support Program (USSSP). He updated the NSF plan for converting the Phase II non-riser vessel with \$40 million in FY2005 and \$60 million in FY2006 for expected operation by early summer of 2006. Allan added that the *JOIDES Resolution* would go out of service at the end of May 2005, assuming no change in the FY2005 budget.

Rack asked whether scientific packages for completing a hole, such as CORKs, would represent third-party responsibilities. Allan replied that the hardware for CORK housings would constitute a POC, but the instruments would require third-party support.

Catherine Mevel reported on the activities of ECORD, officially created in December 2003 with twelve countries and since increased to thirteen, with one or two more expected to join soon. She stated that each member country has one seat on the ECORD council, and the European Commission provides funding for the organization but not its operating costs. Mevel described the structure of ECORD and its components, the EMA, the ESSAC, and the ESO, and she explained that the EMA, administered by CNRS-INSU in Paris, pools the funds received from all ECORD members, and ESSAC nominates European scientists to the SAS. Mevel added that ECORD expects to run one or two MSP expeditions each year, and eight to ten European institutions and universities plan to join the IODP-MI.

Rack asked if it presented any conflict having the British Geological Survey (BGS) as an implementing organization and a member of the IODP-MI. Mevel regarded it the same as having TAMU and JAMSTEC as IODP-MI members. Austin clarified that those organizations would not have voting rights on the board of governors.

### 1.3. Approve last SPC meeting minutes

Coffin asked for comments on the minutes of the previous SPC meeting. With no comments the committee approved the minutes by consensus.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-1:** The SPC approves the minutes of its first meeting on 15-19 September 2003 in Sapporo, Japan.

### 1.4. Approve SPC meeting agenda

Coffin asked for comments on the meeting agenda. Rack noted that he would give the report for the JOI Alliance instead of Bohlen. With no further comments, the committee approved the agenda by consensus.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-2:** The SPC approves the revised agenda for its second meeting on 23-26 March 2004 in Washington, D.C.

### 1.5. SPC procedures and protocol

#### 1.5.1. Review draft SPC terms of reference

Coffin presented the SPC terms of reference as revised by the SPPOC in December 2003 and shown in the agenda book. He noted the only changes with regard to the OPCOM and European membership. Prell asked about the meaning of SPC recommending SAS membership to the SPPOC. Coffin said that it appears that the SPPOC wants to approve all members of the SAS. Austin noted that it occurred in the past mostly just to assure disciplinary balance but not on a name-by-name basis. Katz suggested changing the word "recommends" to "advises." Kato said that that still implied that SPPOC would have approval. Coffin explained that two layers of vetting already occurred at national and international levels. Kenter asked what the SPPOC expects to do. Coffin explained that the issue arose from concerns about the large number of alternates who served at the first SPC meeting. Prell suggested changing the wording to "the SPC reviews the SAS membership with respect to disciplinary balance."

**SPC Motion 04-03-3:** The SPC recommends revising Section 1.2 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 and timing to the SPPOC. In addition, the SPC may assign special tasks to SAS committees, panels, and planning groups. The SPC approves the chairs of all SAS panels and planning groups. The SPC chair approves the meeting agendas for all SAS committees, panels, and planning groups other than the SPPOC. The SPC sponsors and convenes planning conferences at intervals determined by long-term science plans for IODP. The SPC assigns its own watchdogs to proposals that are forwarded from the SSEPs. The SPC ranks the scientific objectives of the proposals into final priority after they are reviewed by the SSEPs. The SPC approves by at least a two-thirds majority the annual drilling schedule as forwarded from the OPCOM. The SPC nominates chief scientists to the implementing organizations, who make the final selection.



The SPC periodically reviews the IODP SAS in light of developments in science and technology and recommends amendment of the SAS and its terms of reference to the SPPOC. Much of the work of the SPC is carried out by the commissioning of reports from other SAS panels, including both formal and *ad hoc* working groups, *ad hoc* subcommittees of its own membership, and by its chair or vice-chair.

*Prell moved, Becker seconded; 16 in favor, 1 abstained (Soh)*

Coffin presented Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of the SPC terms of reference. Becker asked whether the SPC would continue meeting in March and August if the SPPOC continued meeting in December. Coffin described the schedule as subject to change in the next few months. Miller suggested not referring to specific months. Moore recommended not changing it now if other things would change over the next few months.

Coffin presented Section 1.5 of the SPC terms of reference and explained that the SPPOC changed it to get approval of the SPC alternates. Becker questioned if the SPPOC could do it quickly. Coffin noted that the SPPOC had responded quickly on other issues. Prell stated that the U.S. had identified standing alternates and could send that information to the SPPOC for advance approval. Kenter remarked that ESSAC had followed a similar course. Austin asked who would judge the disciplinary balance of the panels. Moore stressed the importance of having good disciplinary balance for selecting watchdogs. Prell noted that the USSAC would nominate members in July. It suggested having the national committees engage in a dialog on this issue. Coffin encouraged that idea to save time for the SPC. Kenter asked if the reappointment limit applied only to the SPC. Coffin answered yes.

Coffin presented Sections 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 of the SPC terms of reference, and the committee offered no comments.

### **1.5.2. Conflict-of-interest statements**

Coffin referred to the three proposals up for review at this meeting and asked the committee members to declare any potential conflicts of interests. Ildefonse indicated that he might have a conflict with Proposal 584-Add2 because he had applied to sail on the potentially affected expedition. Becker explained that his name appeared on the first version of Proposal 584, but he never had any involvement in it. He also noted that despite his heavy involvement in CORKs he did not have any direct involvement with Proposal 641-APL. Fisher disclosed that his name appeared unexpectedly on the original proposal for the Costa Rica CORK installation related to Proposal 641-APL, but he had no involvement in it. Coffin concluded that neither Becker nor Fisher had any conflict of interests and that he would discuss matters privately with Ildefonse before deciding his status.

### **1.5.3. Robert's Rules of Order**

Coffin briefly summarized several relevant procedural points from Robert's Rules of Order. The committee offered no comments.

## **2. IODP Management International, Inc. (IODP-MI) report**

### **2.1. Overview**

Manik Talwani reported that the IODP-MI now had twenty-two members and eight new members would join soon from Europe. He announced that the IODP-MI submitted a sole-source proposal to the NSF to serve as the central management organization of the IODP, and he expected to see the contract negotiations finalized by 1 April. Talwani acknowledged

various individuals who helped with the proposal and getting IODP-MI started. He described the principle vision and mission statement of the IODP-MI and asserted that it would operate on the principles that the science community represents the main stakeholder and that the IODP comprises a single, integrated international program. He also explained that the IODP-MI would manage the co-mingled funds for science operating costs and ensure an equitable balance of program activities among the U.S., Japan, and ECORD. Talwani noted that the IODP-MI would have offices in Sapporo, Japan and Washington, D.C. He outlined the duties and responsibilities of the president and two vice presidents and anticipated reaching full staffing by FY2005. This included a senior advisor to the president who would serve as a liaison to the funding agencies and promote the program to other international bodies and a director of communications who would supervise the activities for education, outreach, and public affairs. Talwani diagrammed the paths of funding and advice between the various program components for FY2004 and explained that the paths would change in FY2005, with SOCs funneled through the IODP-MI. He outlined the budget requests for FY2005 and FY2006 and explained that other national sources would supplement the outreach budget and the IODP-MI would coordinate outreach activities. Talwani summarized the charge, membership, and procedures of the OPCOM. He showed an optimum timeline for OPCOM planning efforts and insisted that the IODP-MI would have no involvement in prioritizing science plans.

Mevel asked about the mechanism for advertising requests for proposals. Talwani said that he had not yet considered that issue. Tatsumi asked where the responsibilities would rest for education and outreach. Talwani explained that the Washington office would coordinate those functions, but the national programs would have significant responsibilities as well. Prell asked who would coordinate the national balance issues. Talwani stated that Larsen would do it for the SAS and Janecek for shipboard parties. Given asked about expanding the membership of the IODP-MI to other institutions and universities. Talwani replied that he would welcome discussing ways to increase the membership.

## **2.2. Science Planning**

Hans Christian Larsen reported that the IODP-MI Sapporo Office would open on 1 April, and he expected to complete its staffing by October. He described the office as a fully integrated part of the IODP-MI and outlined its main tasks and responsibilities. Larsen cited the activities underway to establish the office, including submission of a proposal for supporting the office through a subcontract to AESTO. He also identified several urgent tasks remaining for this fiscal year, including establishing full functionality for supporting the SAS, revising the Web site, identifying the requirements for a new site-survey data bank, and developing a publications strategy.

Prell asked if the IODP-MI would review the SPPOC terms of reference. Talwani clarified that the board of governors would review it because they appointed the SPPOC members. Rack asked if the Sapporo office should have approval over the expedition prospectus when it comprises a contractual obligation of the IOs. Becker noted the difference between the science prospectus and the drilling prospectus.

Nobuhisa Eguchi reviewed the status of active drilling proposals and their distribution among the three major scientific themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan (ISP). He also briefly outlined the schedule of recent and upcoming SAS meetings. Becker asked if the balance among the scientific themes had changed much since JOIDES. Eguchi said not significantly.

## 2.3 IO meeting report

Jamie Austin reported on the February 2004 meeting of the implementing organizations in Edinburgh, Scotland, with representatives from the IODP-MI and the SAS. He identified the main goal of integrating the operations and output of the various drilling assets and anticipated having more such meetings. Austin said that the participants reviewed the action items from the previous IOs meeting in Bozeman and addressed other mutually agreed upon items of importance such as the functioning of the OPCOM. They also identified new action items for 1) developing a program-wide HSE policy, 2) implementing the sharing and exchange of technical staff among platforms, 3) agreeing upon and implementing a program-wide sample curation and management policy, 4) developing a minimum set of data to collect on expeditions, and 5) collectively educating the ocean drilling community on the commitment of the program to long-range planning. Austin mentioned that the details of how the OPCOM would function remain undecided.

Kato asked for clarification of what health refers to in HSE. Baldauf explained that it refers mostly to protecting the short and long-term health of shipboard personnel, and it overlaps to some extent with safety issues.

## 3. Implementing Organization (IO) reports

### 3.1. CDEX

Yoshi Kawamura reported on the planning efforts of the Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX). He showed the location for crew training exercises with the *Chikyu* and mentioned site-survey activities for FY2004 and FY2005. He outlined the components of the management systems for HSE, information handling, and preventive maintenance and reported that commissioning of the drilling equipment began in February 2004 with onboard testing by outside professionals. Kawamura announced that the crew-training cruise would begin in May 2005 near the Shimokita Peninsula off northeastern Japan and would involve four stages for preparation, basic ship operations, non-riser drilling, and riser drilling. He outlined the data acquisition plan of first drilling a non-riser section to 600 m with a narrow geotechnical hole and LWD for site characterization, then proceeding with the riser section to target depth. Kawamura listed the available wireline logging services, briefly reviewed the laboratory stack layout and equipment, showed images of the derrick installation in September 2003, and noted that the ship should leave the Nagasaki shipyard for further sea trials in September 2004.

Miller asked how CDEX selected the sites for the training cruise because the cores could have scientific value. Kawamura replied that they initially identified eight locations near Japan and selected sites with the simplest geology and the most favorable weather and sea conditions. He added that CDEX could certainly present the cores for research purposes.

### 3.2. JOI Alliance

Frank Rack reported on the activities of the JOI Alliance since the previous SPC meeting. He announced that JOI had signed a contract with the NSF to establish the IODP implementing organization in the U.S. They also prepared an FY2004 program plan, established an organizational structure, established subcontracts with TAMU and LDEO, established other subcontracts with Transocean/ODL and Schlumberger for Phase 1 activities, and initiated an environmental assessment study with outside contractors. Rack said that the alliance would accept the *JOIDES Resolution* in Yokohama on 1 June, mobilize it, and transit to Astoria, Oregon for the port call preceding the first expedition. They had selected the co-chiefs for the

first two expeditions and invited most of the science party for the first expedition, with nominations for the second expedition expected by 31 March. Rack described the operational plans, rationale, and consequences for the Juan de Fuca, North Atlantic, and Core Complex Expeditions and cited the supplies and equipment contributed to the Arctic Expedition.

Rack outlined the draft project execution plan submitted to the NSF for Phase 2 activities and presented the planned timeline for acquiring and converting a non-riser vessel. He said that JOI had issued a market survey to vendors and an invitation to tender to vessel contractors, and they expected to have a vessel ready by late spring or early summer 2006. Rack mentioned future plans for asking the IODP-MI to coordinate SAS input on lab design plans, hiring a director for the vessel acquisition project, and issuing the requests for proposals. He also outlined the elements of the proposed outreach to stakeholders in the project. Rack finished by identifying the JOI Alliance liaisons to SAS panels as requested by the SPPOC.

Moore asked if the JOI Alliance had considered the SPC recommendation for deepening some of the sites on the North Atlantic Expedition. Rack replied that they would discuss that issue at the pre-cruise meeting. Moore also noted that he had predicated his vote last September on Proposal 543-Full2 CORK in Hole 642E on not having to drill a new hole. Austin expressed dismay at the increased costs from the initial estimates, particularly as the original plan had already exceeded the projected budget. Rack detailed the operational issues regarding port-call locations and fuel purchasing that could help to reduce costs. He also reminded the committee of the short timeline after scheduling these legs to develop an operational plan and budget for FY2004 and the resulting uncertainties in the initial estimates for expedition costs. Gillis asked about the availability of specific operational plans for the later expeditions to benefit prospective participants in staffing. She also inquired about the sampling policy for the two split expeditions. Murray said that the co-chiefs and sample allocation board should decide the sampling strategy. Baldauf confirmed that TAMU regarded the split expeditions as integrated for sampling purposes but they could not realistically give a detailed plan for the order of drilling sites on the two North Atlantic Expeditions because it would depend on weather conditions. Kenter suggested that the community still needed to know what to expect. Coffin asked Gillis and Kenter to draft a recommendation for later consideration (see SPC Consensus 04-03-21 and 04-03-22 in Section 20 below).

Given asked whether the limited number of applicants for the first IODP expeditions satisfactorily covered the needed balance of scientific expertise. Rack referred to an ongoing effort to ensure that. Fisher described the first expedition as somewhat anomalous because it involved more engineering than coring, short notice, a long transit at the end, and poor timing with academic schedules that all could discourage applicants. Coffin asked when JOI expected to learn about funding for FY2005. Rack said by July or August and for FY2006 not until the same time as signing the contract for the vessel.

### **3.3. ESO**

Dan Evans identified the institutional components of the ECORD Science Operator (ESO). He noted that planning and preparations continued in full for the Arctic expedition and advanced planning had begun for possible future expeditions to Tahiti, the Great Barrier Reef, and New Jersey. Evans reviewed several operational aspects for drilling off Tahiti and concerns about getting clearance for the Great Barrier Reef before 2005. He proposed doing only the Tahiti portion of Proposal 519-Full2 in 2005 and deferring the Great Barrier Reef portion until 2006. He added that the ESO needed urgent guidance from the SPC on this issue to provide an operational plan and budget estimate for FY2005 by early May.

Evans touched on staffing issues and raised concerns about applying the sample and data policy to the shore-based scientific parties envisioned for many MSP expeditions. He preferred making the policy more explicit in that regard and clarifying the meaning of defining the science party as chosen by the IODP. Murray stated that the science party included all scientists selected by the IODP to participate on an expedition, and they would have priority over those who wanted to get involved after the moratorium. He explained that the SciMP tried to make the policy as general and flexible as possible to apply to all platforms and a wide variety of types of projects. He conceded that they could look at it again, but he expected they would not want to make further changes. Miller suggested that the SPC should define the meaning of the term science party. Murray noted that the policy already included a short but very specific definition of the science party as referring to those who produced initial data and contributed to the expedition report.

Soh asked if suitable facilities existed on Tahiti for the shore-based science party. Evans said that they had not explored that possibility thoroughly yet. Ildefonse supported the idea of having the shore-based party on Tahiti at the same time as drilling because the near-shore proximity of the sites could perhaps enable the science party members to spend at least some time on the platform. Moore asked if the ESO had the necessary supplies and equipment for MSP expeditions. Evans answered that they would provide for at least the minimum required measurements in the field, with complete facilities at the Bremen repository.

#### **4. ODP Leg 208 report**

Jim Zachos reported on the initial results from ODP Leg 208. He reviewed the primary scientific objective of investigating the thermal maximum at the Paleocene-Eocene boundary and the operational objective of recovering Cenozoic sediments from a depth transect of five or six sites. Zachos showed a map of the drilling sites and said that they succeeded in recovering P-E boundary sediments from five of the six sites. They also recovered excellent K/T boundary sediments from the deeper sites, with clear evidence of orbital cycles that would permit fine-scale tuning of the records. Zachos explained that the CCD apparently shoaled from below 4.7 km to shallower than 2.7 km, a finding that correlates with evidence observed on the Shatsky Rise.

#### **5. SAS reports**

##### **5.1. Committee and panel reports**

###### **5.1.1. SPPOC**

Coffin reviewed the recommendations from the first SPPOC meeting in December 2003. He noted that the SPPOC transferred the OPCOM to the IODP-MI, approved the FY2004 program plan, and requested program plans for FY2005 and FY2006. They also appointed Roger Larson to the Arctic scoping group, asked the SciMP to advise on measurements for the Arctic expedition, and formed three *ad hoc* committees for reviewing the SAS, developing a conflict-of-interest (COI) policy, and defining POCs and SOCs. Coffin presented an action item from the SPPOC SAS *ad hoc* committee on evaluating the spread of science in the pool of active proposals versus the Initial Science Plan. He reported that the SPPOC accepted the sample and data policy, the publication policy, and the JOIDES COI policy on an interim basis pending further review and modification. Coffin added that the SPPOC offered a strict interpretation of the COI policy as applied to the SPC and the SSEPs, and they decided to approve alternate members of the SPC.

Becker inquired about the rationale for considering a two-tiered COI policy. Fisher opposed having multiple standards for the COI. Austin asked if the SPPOC still needed to consider how to define POCs and SOC's since the lead agencies had just offered new guidance. Rack clarified that the new guidance only covers FY2005. Prell wondered why the SPPOC should have any role in approving SPC alternates who have already received approval from their national programs. Coffin said that he and the iSAS Office had opposed the decision but it passed anyway. He foresaw difficulty in implementing it for the June ranking meeting when not knowing what proposals would come forward until after the May SSEPs meeting. Austin wanted to ensure that the SPC had enough suitable expertise to conduct its business. Coffin asked for a volunteer to draft a recommendation. Prell presented a recommendation the next day with regard to SPPOC Consensus 03-12-12. The committee agreed by consensus after a brief discussion of whether to forward it to the SPPOC or to the IODP-MI.

**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.

Gillis asked about the rationale for shifting the OPCOM to the IODP-MI. Coffin said it would allow for longer-term memory of operational history on the committee. Becker asked how this would affect the reporting pathways for future scoping groups. Coffin recommended letting the scoping groups report directly to the OPCOM and then come to the SPC if necessary.

### 5.1.2. SSEPs

Gilbert Camoin reported on the November 2003 SSEPs meeting in Boulder, Colorado. He noted that the workshop on cross-cultural differences had succeeded in changing the atmosphere and improving relations among the panel members. Camoin listed the proposals reviewed, showed how they matched the themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan, and summarized the final dispositions. He said that the panels broke into separate working groups to discuss the SSEPs terms of reference, the SSEPs structure, the reviewing process, and communication with the SPC, and he presented revised terms of reference that preserved the current size and structure of the panels. Camoin added that the SSEPs also favored the size and organization of the breakout sessions now held at each meeting, they would continue assigning five watchdogs to each proposal, and they recognized the importance of maintaining as much continuity and consistency as possible in watchdog assignments from meeting to meeting. Camoin announced that the SSEPs had posted a document on best practices for proposal writing and suggested that national programs and committees could help proponents with educational workshops. He presented a plan for streamlining the proposal development and review process over an appropriate time length of 2-3 years by not allowing more than one revision of preliminary proposals, not rejecting full proposals before obtaining external reviews, and not accepting addenda for review at the SSEPs level. Camoin reported that the SSEPs instituted a new five-star rating scale for proposals after external review, with all members voting unless conflicted on a particular proposal. He stated that when forwarding a proposal to the SPC, the SSEPs would strive to provide a more thorough

final review that would not require another response letter from the proponents, and the SSEPs proposed that only the most recent set of external reviews should go to the SPC.

### 5.1.3. SSP

Kyoko Okino summarized the proposal reviews from the February 2004 SSP meeting in Tokyo. She reported that the panel discussed the terminology of its site classification scheme and preferred using the term "site characterization completeness" from now on instead of "site readiness." They concluded that the data "requirement" for the SSP meant required to judge the completeness from a scientific perspective but not necessarily required to rank or schedule a proposal. They also concluded that any reclassifying of sites between meetings required approval by the whole panel, and the terms of reference should include a statement to that effect. Okino presented SSP Consensus 04-02-1 on maintaining the current site-survey data bank until the IODP identifies or establishes a new databank.

SSP Consensus 04-02-1: The contract of the ODP data bank at LDEO is ending in September 30, 2004. This ODP data bank is essential for the current and future SSP, PPSP, and scheduled drilling activities. We are concerned about a potential gap in service and strongly urge IODP to take immediate action to keep the data bank operating until the new IODP data bank is operational.

Larsen noted the recent decision to extend the contract of the current site-survey data bank. Okino informed the SPC that the SSP would not meet again until August 2004 and thus could not provide any new review comments for the June 2004 SPC meeting.

### 5.1.4. PPSP

Barry Katz identified the proposals previewed and reviewed at the December 2003 PPSP meeting in Nagasaki. He said that the panel discussed LWD and whether it would always require drilling a reference hole, and they identified the need for a set of rules for abandoning LWD holes for safety reasons. They also discussed onboard gas monitoring, particularly with respect to MSPs, but could not recommend changing the procedures without adequate information. Katz wondered about environmental policy regarding the effects on biological communities at cold seeps and listed the topics for the next PPSP meeting. He expressed concern about the timeline for planning the first riser expedition and wanted to confirm the status of the CDEX plans to get a PPSP review for the *Chikyu* shakedown cruises in 2006.

Kawamura said that CDEX would seek an initial review by the PPSP in June 2004 and present the drilling plan in December 2004. Austin expressed surprise that the PPSP did not even come close to approving Proposal 553-Full2 Cascadia Margin Hydrates after it ranked so highly with the SPC and came close to getting scheduled. Byrne wondered if the SSP and the PPSP could get involved earlier in the proposal review process. Katz answered that the PPSP did not have enough time to review every proposal. Soh asked about creating guidelines for biodiversity impacts. Katz answered that the PPSP did not constitute a policy-making panel and they would need guidance on the requirements. Miller wondered if camera surveys would suffice. Katz wondered what sort of decision it would prompt if the camera revealed something of interest. Moran emphasized the importance of informing proponents exactly what they need to do in terms of working with the operators. Katz remarked that the operators might need to seek outside help for conducting biodiversity assessments. Austin noted that the SPC would hear a presentation on biodiversity issues at the June meeting. Coffin recommended getting biodiversity presentations for the SSP and the PPSP as well.

### 5.1.5. SciMP

Rick Murray presented the recommendations from the December 2003 SciMP meeting in Nagasaki.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-01: SciMP recognizes that input on technical and data issues on IODP proposals is not adequate at this point. In order to improve the ability to plan for anticipated technical and data needs, SciMP recommends that SciMP be involved in the formal proposal review process. SciMP recommends the following operating procedure:

1. SciMP discontinue sending a liaison to the SSEPs meetings.
2. SciMP will only review those proposals that are passed from the SSEPS to SPC, and SciMP's comments will be restricted to technical and data needs only (that is, SciMP will not review a proposal for its scientific merit).
3. Cover sheets of forwarded proposals be distributed by the SAS Office to SciMP members immediately after SSEPs meetings. SciMP co-chairs can specifically appoint SciMP members to study specific proposals based on expertise if deemed necessary.
4. Proposals will be reviewed and commented upon, if necessary, by SciMP either by email or at SciMP meetings. A summary of these comments, if any, will be forwarded to SPC in time for their (SPC's) next meeting.
5. SciMP encourages that the SSEPs proposal watchdogs consider aspects and issues that may need to be addressed by SciMP in a systematic and consistent manner, and actively solicit input or advice from SciMP wherever necessary.

Miller asked if the SciMP proposed to review proposals by email because of the tight timeline between the SSEPs and SPC meetings. Murray replied that the SciMP did not want to slow down the overall review process. Byrne wanted to avoid throwing up a roadblock just before the ranking. He noted that the SciMP could not use the SSEPs as a gateway for their input if they reviewed proposals after the SSEPs had forwarded them to the SPC. Fisher noted that proponents would also not have a chance to respond to the SciMP comments. Allan doubted that panel members would know everything about the capabilities of every platform, so they would need input from the IOs. Moran suggested that the project management system might solve some of these problems. Austin agreed that technical reviews should not impact the scientific ranking.

Murray presented SciMP Recommendations 03-02-02, 03-02-03, and 03-02-04 on petrophysics issues. None of these recommendations generated any discussion.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-02: SciMP recommends that when visiting legacy holes, the standard suite of downhole measurements be conducted prior to the installation of instrumentation or an observatory. We recommend this policy due to continually improving resolution and accuracy of measurements as well as assessing hole conditions for safety and installation, and monitoring of physical properties.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-03: SciMP recommends a Seismic Integrator be included as part of the scientific party for any drilling project where core-log-seismic integration is required.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-04: SciMP recommends that whenever correlation of logs to seismic is required for any IODP drilling project, either checkshots or zero-offset VSPs (velocity seismic profiles) should be routinely collected.



Murray presented SciMP Recommendation 03-02-05 seeking guidance on integrating observatories within the IODP.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-05: SciMP recommends that discussion be initiated regarding the integration of observatories *within* IODP. Specific issues include, but are not limited to, databasing, further long-term legacy issues, conflicting scientific objectives, and funding.

Allan stated that the lead agencies had given guidance to the IOs on not bearing the costs for the instruments. Fisher noted that a U.S.-sponsored workshop report addressed some of these issues. He also added that VSP requirements had implications for environmental permitting. Baldauf referred to an ongoing assessment of that concern.

Murray presented SciMP Recommendation 03-02-06 on revising the sample and data policy.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-06: SciMP recommends two revisions to the IODP Sample and Data Policy, as described below. The complete revised Sample and Data Policy is provided in Appendix 16 (*see December 2003 SciMP minutes*).

1. The first sentence of Section 2 be deleted (that is, delete the sentence "IODP samples are generally distributed for research projects that can be completed within two to three years.>").
2. Section 7 is revised as follows (additions or moved text in underline and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~). This revision brings into conformity potential issues regarding obligation fulfillment.

#### Section 7. Sample- and Data-Recipient Responsibilities

All scientific party members incur obligations to IODP that they must fulfill by ~~using samples or data from the drilling project to conduct post project research and publishing associated results~~ in agreement with the other terms of this policy, or submitting a progress report to IODP central management prior to the deadline for publication of results. In the event that research is discontinued, samples may have to be returned as per instructions from IODP central management. Manuscripts for publication must be submitted within 20 months post moratorium.

All scientists who receive samples or conduct nondestructive analyses ~~from cores~~ after the moratorium are obligated to publish a paper in a peer-reviewed scientific journal or book that publishes in English, or submit a progress report to ~~the IODP Curator~~ central management outlining the status of the samples and/or the data no later than 36 months after receiving them. In the event that research is discontinued, samples may have to be returned as per instructions from IODP central management.

All publications incorporating IODP data or samples must include "IODP" in the title, abstract, or as a formal keyword. The publication shall explicitly acknowledge IODP and be submitted to the IODP Curator central management along with any applicable data.

Those not meeting the above obligations will be restricted from obtaining future samples and data and may not be allowed to participate in future drilling projects. Obligations incurred during the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) will be carried forward into the IODP.

Prell asked if the progress report differed from a data report. Murray related that question more to the publications policy and preferred keeping it separate from this issue. Janecek worried that a progress report would not amount to much of an obligation. Murray said that the panel believed that career concerns would motivate scientists enough to publish, and they

wanted to leave open the possibility of a good reason existing for not publishing. He emphasized that national programs could still impose their own obligations.

Murray presented SciMP Consensus 03-12-01 through -06 and SciMP Action Items 03-12-01, -02, -03, -07, -08, -11, -12, -19, -20, and -21 for informational purposes only. None of those items generated any discussion or decisions by the committee.

Coffin proposed dealing with the SciMP recommendations as a group. Murray conceded that the first recommendation did not seem to have much support. Coffin asked for any objections to forwarding all except the first recommendation to the SPPOC. Austin suggested that the SPC should say something stronger than just sending them up to the SPPOC, otherwise many of them might get returned. Coffin wanted to try one more time because the SPPOC accepted some of the recommendations the last time. Kenter wondered how to package it. Murray thought that only the sample and data policy and publications recommendation would need to go to the SPPOC. Austin still insisted on packaging the recommendations as a single consensus to go to the SPPOC. Rack thought that many got sent back the last time because of the lack of opportunity for operator input during the interim period. Prell and Kenter volunteered to work with Murray on identifying how to handle the SciMP recommendations. The committee later agreed by consensus on the following statements.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-5:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendations 03-12-02 on conducting the standard suite of downhole measurements when the IODP visits legacy holes, 03-12-03 on including a seismic integrator as part of the scientific party for any drilling project where core-log-seismic integration is required, and 03-12-04 on collecting checkshots or zero-offset vertical seismic profiles (VSPs) whenever correlation of logs to seismic is required for any IODP drilling project. The SPC forwards these petrophysics recommendations to the IODP-MI and the implementing organizations.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-6:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendation 03-12-05 on initiation of discussions on integrating observatories within the IODP and forwards it to the SPPOC, the IODP-MI, and the implementing organizations for consideration.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-7:** The SPC accepts SciMP Recommendation 03-12-06 for a revised IODP Sample, Data, and Obligations Policy and forwards it to the SPPOC for consideration.

#### **5.1.6. TAP**

Kate Moran reported that the TAP had not met since the last SPC meeting. She reviewed the primary purpose of the panel and listed the areas of expertise needed for the membership. She also cited various actions taken to date on drilling proposals, ROVs, cross-platform issues on pipe, coring, and logging, borehole studies, technical challenges and priorities, and project management. Moran noted that the TAP would continue working on a study of ODP and DSDP boreholes to provide a technical explanation of why certain objectives did not get accomplished. She also listed the technical challenges associated with scientific objectives for climate change, gas hydrates, hard rocks, hydrogeology, and riser drilling and summarized past recommendations on project management and project scoping.

#### **5.1.7. ILP**

Harry Doust reported on the February 2004 ILP meeting in Houston, Texas. He noted the small and effective number of meeting participants, with the guests not exceeding the

members, and he outlined the main objectives of meeting senior industry representatives, informing the panel of IODP planning activities and organizational development, revising the panel terms of reference, and defining urgent action items. Doust listed the current panel membership and identified the basic ILP goals for promoting industry involvement and support of the IODP. He also presented several suggestions for establishing interfaces between the ILP and other IODP panels and between the ILP and the petroleum industry. Doust reported that the panel received good feedback from the senior industry representatives on various issues such as accessing seismic data. They also discussed the disappointing reaction and progress of an attempted electronic meeting in the fall of 2003 and the intent to compile a meta-database of regional seismic data for the IODP. Doust outlined the potential for the ILP contributing to active proposals and noted that some proponents had already contacted the ILP for advice. He mentioned that the ILP had received proposals from the Energy & Geoscience Institute (EGI) of Utah for collaborative projects on surface geochemical calibration and on creating an IODP digital database. Doust discussed several ideas for how the ILP could support industry-parented proposals and noted that the panel had formed a subcommittee to develop the concepts.

Allan advised that proposals such as the ones from the EGI should come in through the IODP-MI. Katz explained that the first proposal amounted to a sample request and the second expressed an interest in becoming part of the IODP database efforts. Ito wondered about the meaning of industry-parented proposals and asked for a chance to discuss it later. Coffin agreed. Duncan liked the idea for industry-sponsored fellowships and wondered if companies intended to recruit from that pool. Doust regarded the IODP as a good training ground for industry. Katz noted that industry faced a large turnover of science and engineering personnel in the next five years because of age demographics. Prell asked if the ILP could help identify prospective panel members from industry. Coffin suggested promoting the program at industry gatherings such as AAPG meetings.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 17:50.

**Wednesday**

**24 March 2004**

**8:30-17:00**

## **5.2. Working group reports**

### **5.2.1. Matrix**

Kyoko Okino presented the revised report of the matrix working group, saying that the group met only by email since the previous SPC meeting. She outlined some of the problems with the old matrix system, such as not giving proponents clear information on data requirements at an early stage of proposal development. Okino explained the concept of integrating the site characterization requirements for the SSP and PPSP and making that information available to proponents early. She showed examples of a prototype interactive Web site for use by proponents and said that required financial support to complete the development of the Web tools.

Fisher applauded the matrix efforts as a long-overdue aid to proponents. He favored formalizing the requirements so that proponents know from the beginning what they need to submit. Mori suggested requiring proponents to use the system. Miller noted that some requests for new data evolve naturally. Moore agreed that the matrix represented a good step forward. He noted that half of all proposals address environmental themes and usually have minimal requirements for site-survey data. Katz remarked that the new matrix included many items that the PPSP had never requested in the past because of the limited capabilities of the

old program. Prell asked about the status of the matrix and whether it needed testing by the community. Eguchi noted that the databank had constructed a rough mock-up version but needed financial support to carry it any further.

Coffin cited the possibility of forwarding the matrix to the IODP-MI for testing by the SAS before implementing it. Byrne suggested asking a focused working group to do the testing because not everyone from a whole panel would try it if asked. Moore suggested asking a few proponents to give it a trial run. Austin also preferred identifying a few specific individuals to test it but advised against opening it to the community if it still had hurdles. Kenter inquired about the potential hurdles. Prell asked if anything besides money prevented implementing it now. Okino described the current design as only a prototype for simple scenarios and said that the working group had not tested the whole matrix for all scenarios. Coffin suggested forwarding it to the IODP-MI and recommending full development and testing of the concept by some specific date. Prell agreed to forward it to the IODP-MI and urge them to implement it as quickly as possible. Tatsumi asked if the matrix working group would still have some involvement. Okino said yes, they would like to oversee the testing and implementation process to insure quality control. Larsen noted that the FY2004 budget did not include any funds for data management, but the IODP-MI would try to do it somehow.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-8:** The SPC forwards the matrix working group report to the IODP-MI and recommends implementing it as soon as possible.

### **5.2.2. HSE (Environmental principles)**

Barry Katz presented a draft statement of the IODP environmental principles on the protection of marine life and the environment, the disposal of waste materials and restitution of the environment, the storage and curation of potentially harmful substances and organisms, and keeping the public informed of program activities. He emphasized that the principles should remain general and not too restrictive; otherwise, the program could not do anything.

Baldauf characterized these as overarching principles for the entire program and said that the IOs would each have their own policies and additional guidelines. Austin inquired about the intent of releasing the statement to the public. Katz replied that the program could certainly do that with the final statement. Kato suggested changing the name of the PPSP to the Environmental Health and Safety Panel. Coffin responded that the committee could consider that idea later when discussing the panel terms of reference.

### **5.3. PANCH report**

Rick Murray reported that the SAS panel chairs met the day before this meeting and discussed ways to enhance communications and panel efficiency, panel membership and chairs, project management, and the charge from the SPPOC with reference to the IODP Initial Science Plan. They proposed that each panel should a) produce an executive summary within one week and draft minutes within one month of its meetings, b) create a one-page handout of the roles and responsibilities of each chair, c) reconsider the liaison relationship with regard to meeting attendance and effective communications, and d) schedule two meetings in advance. Murray said that the panel chairs determined that panel memberships must adhere to the normal international balance unless a panel could justify that it required a different balance to operate satisfactorily. They also favored selecting panel chairs or co-chairs by experience and leadership, with national balance assessed across the SAS and not within one panel. Concerning the charge from the SPPOC, the panel chairs agreed that each panel should examine how well the current proposals address the Initial Science Plan and how to engage a

broader scientific community in the program. Murray announced that Camoin and Doust would coordinate the next PANCH meeting in March 2005.

Prell suggested that each panel should provide a list of the types of expertise needed among its membership. Murray replied that the panel chairs hoped to foster that through better communication between the panel chairs and the national offices. Given appreciated the efforts to operate the SAS as efficiently as possible from the perspective of budgeting for travel support. Coffin invited a discussion on making some recommendation of whether all panels must follow the same international balance of membership. Kenter suggested waiting until later when discussing the terms of reference.

## **6. Project management**

Coffin outlined the purposes of discussing the project management system at the SPC. He said that the working group report deserved airing at this level and the SPC deserved a chance to provide input. Coffin identified two options of either forwarding the report directly to the IODP-MI or establishing an SPC working group to examine it and suggest changes.

Doust presented the proposed project management system for the IODP. He briefly noted the terms of reference for the working group and identified the main objectives of ensuring that the program accomplishes its scientific objectives comprehensively, efficiently, and with the highest standards. The working group recommended developing a pilot system for the first IODP projects. They envisioned creating a clear, simple, and thorough system that would include guidelines and a road map, allow flexibility, and serve the Initial Science Plan. It should also account for overall operations and individual projects and incorporate existing IODP procedures as much as possible. The group essentially tried to combine a typical industry project management system with the existing operational timetables and science advisory structure of the IODP. Doust diagrammed the involvement of the various program components in the successive stages of project management. He outlined the eight distinct phases of the proposed system, each separated by clear milestones or decision points marked by reviews. Doust described the specific objectives of each phase and estimated that the entire process could take as little as two and a half years or longer than six years for CDPs, not including the time between scheduling and operations. He identified several important issues for discussion, such as investing the project management team or detailed planning group (DPG) with full responsibility for the progress of the project, convening reviews on a regular basis, and deriving approval to proceed or not from the reviews. He advised exercising project quality control throughout and including independent external advisers on the review teams, with overall management conducted by the project team, the OPCOM, or the IODP-MI. Doust recommended adopting the system as described and establishing a working group to complete the details. He also suggested evaluating the effectiveness of the initial system after one to two years.

Kate Moran explained the concept of project scoping groups. She listed the members of the interim CDP scoping group established for the two existing CDPs and outlined the major planning tasks and timeline. Moran described the general approach that scoping groups should follow and identified the biggest issue for CDPs as designing the completion of the holes.

Prell saw the first few stages of the proposed system as business as usual, whereas creating new project management teams would cost money unless it meant just repackaging the existing personnel. Doust responded that the team could evolve over time but still might cost extra. Becker viewed this approach as not really that different from the previous approach in

the ODP. Miller commended this approach and cited the seventh phase as a new area where the IODP could greatly improve on past performance. Moore commended the working group for its effort and appreciated the usefulness of the outline and diagrams for giving a comprehensive view of how the program would work. Moran noted that the IODP faced even bigger technical challenges than in the past, and she believed that the project management system presented an opportunity to do a better job of meeting those challenges.

Kato asked how the SPC judgment would get transmitted to the project management team. Coffin noted that the SAS panel members would all change over the lifetime of the project, and he suggested that the IODP-MI Sapporo office would have the necessary corporate memory to conduct or organize the reviews. Doust proposed still involving the SAS in all stages of review. Ildefonse urged paying attention to making the system understandable in order for it to work. Doust conceded that difficulty and indicated that it might require involving outside experts.

Becker suggested that if the SPC established the working group it should include the IODP-MI and the operators, not just the SPC. Austin added that the working group must estimate the costs and identify the expertise needed at each position. Given stressed the importance of examining the cost estimates for the new framework. Larson recalled that the ODP abandoned post-cruise reviews as budgets tightened.

Tatsumi accepted forwarding it to the IODP-MI but remained uncertain on the differences among PPGs, DPGs, scoping groups, and the OPCOM and how the SPC would contribute to the process. Doust characterized the project team as responsible for individual projects and the OPCOM as responsible for all projects. Moran identified the OPCOM as responsible for identifying the individuals for planning hole completions. Austin stated that the IODP-MI currently envisioned a much more pervasive role for the OPCOM than now shown in the project management system, as evidenced in the detailed proposal submitted to the lead agencies.

Mori supposed that for CDPs with more than one proposal at different stages of development, the process would get very complicated with branches and loops and not proceed linearly. Moran explained that the system would have to consider CDP proposals together. Mori recognized that if the gateways acted upon the whole project and not the individual pieces then it really involved making a strong commitment up front. Quinn favored the gateway approach because it provided a chance to stop projects that would not work. Coffin wanted to defer further discussion of CDPs and focus for now on the general plan for the project management system.

Miller agreed on passing the report to the IODP-MI for implementation but expressed concern on maintaining scientific involvement in the review process. Given thought that the system would require a watchdog for tracking the status of each project. Coffin looked for a consensus to forward the report to the IODP-MI for implementing. Becker suggested accepting the report in principle and forwarding it. Larson thought it sounded like an issue that the SPPOC should examine at some point. Coffin questioned at what stage the SPPOC should receive it. Fisher preferred not asking the SPPOC to examine it yet. Prell said that the IODP-MI could decide if they wanted the SPPOC to review it as a policy document. Gillis hesitated sending it forward with so many unresolved details and wanted to ensure that the SAS remained active in further developing the system.

Doust recommended making precisely clear to the IODP-MI exactly what still needed doing. He estimated that it probably would take two or three months of work to finish it. Prell asked

if it required advice from the SPC now or if a working group could do it before the June meeting. Coffin cited the choice of keeping it in the SAS for a few more months or sending it to the IODP-MI now. Becker proposed forwarding it now. Moran thought it would behoove everyone to move this to the management now. Miller said that it had to go to the IODP-MI since it involved the OPCOM. Quinn regarded it as in the best interests of the IODP-MI to proceed with implementing this framework. Kenter suggested indicating a sense of urgency in the recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-9:** The SPC accepts the project management system report in principle and forwards it to the IODP-MI as a framework for further development of an IODP project management system, in consultation with SAS representatives. The SPC requests a progress report by June 2004.

## **7. OPCOM and SAS-OPCOM interactions**

Tom Janecek outlined the charge and expected membership of the OPCOM. He emphasized that the OPCOM would get significant input from the science community through members from the SPC and through iterative consultations with the entire SPC. Janecek showed an optimum timeline for OPCOM activities and outlined some of its additional responsibilities. He planned to hold the first OPCOM meeting sometime in April 2004.

Moore appreciated the philosophy and spirit but wondered where the executive oversight would occur. Janecek said it would happen when the program plan went to the SPPOC for approval. Becker noted that the SPPOC might see the proposal rankings one meeting before seeing the program plan. Prell asked if the SPC would have a chance to approve the final schedule. Janecek expected to have several iterations between the OPCOM and the SPC, but fiscal and operational concerns might ultimately preclude satisfying everyone. Miller cited the potential loss of having proposals fresh in mind when those iterations occurred the next day. He imagined that the SPC might start acting more restrictively in forwarding proposals to the OPCOM. Fisher noted the gain of allowing the operators more time to determine cost estimates.

Coffin asked if the SPC could agree on the SPC membership on the OPCOM. Fisher suggested giving consensus approval rights to three SPC members plus the two vice presidents of the IODP-MI. Moore saw less need for the IOs to have voting rights now that the IODP-MI controlled the OPCOM. Austin asked if the outside experts would ever include proponents. Janecek suggested that perhaps they could attend as guests. Austin thought that would entail a serious conflict of interest. Moran suggested assigning the SPC members as requested by the SPC.

Coffin did not understand how the SPC no longer had approval over the final schedule when the IODP-MI proposal showed three SPC meetings per year, with one for ranking and one for scheduling. Prell added that the SPC terms of reference gave the committee approval, by a two-thirds majority, of the drilling schedule forwarded from the OPCOM. Kenter recognized the chance of having very different solutions among the schedules developed by the OPCOM, so he regarded it as very important for the SPC to have approval.

Prell thought that the SPC had responsibility for forming scoping groups. He wondered whether scoping groups belonged to management or the SAS and noted the important distinction for supporting their travel costs. He also wondered about the criteria for determining what the program needed in terms of the scoping groups. Janecek replied that the program would have to determine the appropriate level and timing of scoping needed for each

project, and he wanted scoping groups to involve management and the SPC. Coffin deduced that since the OPCOM belonged to management and the scoping groups reported to the OPCOM then scoping represented a function of management. Larsen asked about the conceivable necessity of forming scoping groups for certain proposals before they reached the SPC. Coffin expected it to happen later at this meeting for the CDPs.

The committee resumed the discussion after recessing for lunch. Coffin asked if the committee had any further concerns about how the OPCOM would operate. Miller wanted to clarify that the OPCOM would not meet at the same time as the SPC. Janecek replied no, not in the same time window. Becker wanted to clarify that the SPC would still have a scheduling meeting. Coffin confirmed that it appeared in the proposal written for the IODP-MI contract. Tatsumi asked about the role of the extra SPC members on the OPCOM. Janecek explained that they would provide broader scientific input. Kato asked about the possibility of rotating the SPC members on the OPCOM as needed. Miller wanted to maintain three positions for SPC members on the OPCOM and also favored remaining flexible in choosing the specific individuals for each meeting.

### **8. SPC SAS working group**

Coffin proposed establishing an SPC working group to examine the SAS and suggest changes to the SPPOC ad hoc committee. Becker asked if that meant that other efforts had not succeeded. Coffin said no, it would just give the SPC a chance to provide input. He described it as part of the SPC terms of reference anyway, but added that he had not expected to have to address it so soon. Tatsumi, Ildefonse, and Duncan volunteered to serve on the working group

**SPC Consensus 04-03-10:** The SPC establishes a working group to evaluate the current IODP Science Advisory Structure and recommend modifications in light of the IODP-MI requests issued on and after 2 October 2003. The modified IODP SAS should implement effectively the following functions: program evaluation and assessment, multi-platform and long-term science planning, interaction between the IODP-MI and the SAS, and integration with other international earth science programs. The working group of Duncan, Ildefonse, and Tatsumi should give a mid-term report at the June 2004 SPC meeting and a final report at the August 2004 SPC meeting. (*Note: the SPC subsequently postponed its August meeting until October 2004*)

### **9. Review SAS panel terms of reference**

Coffin reminded the committee that they had requested revised terms of reference from all of the SAS panels at their previous meeting. He proposed forming a working group to make the terms of reference uniform and suggested Prell, Kenter, and Mori as members.

**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.

#### **9.1. SSEPs**

Camoin presented revised SSEPs terms of reference based on discussions at the November 2003 SSEPs meeting. Moore suggested that the terms of reference should not include the grouping scheme for proposals because it frequently changed. Byrne wanted to leave it in to make it harder to change. Larsen inquired about the motivation or necessity of the grouping scheme instead of just expressing a judgment in words. Moore noted that the ranking



committee had always asked the SSEPs for a value judgment without ranking. Mori asked if the SSEPs grouped on an absolute scale rather than a relative scale. Camoin said yes. Coffin thought it also might assist the OPCOM in comparing proposals left in the scheduling pool but ranked at different times. Soh regarded ranking as easier than grouping to understand, especially for proponents. Larsen suggested describing the basis for the grouping system so that proponents could understand the criteria.

Prell suggested including a term limit for panel members in the terms of reference and wondered if three years represented the standard. Coffin described the three-year term as an undefined tradition. Brumsack noted the difficulty of ensuring continuity when some proposals stay in the system longer than the panel members. Moore asked if the SSEPs considered whether they should have chairs or co-chairs. Camoin replied that they discussed it and felt satisfied with the current arrangement of having three chairs for the two SSEPs. Coffin suggested moving on and letting the working group address these questions.

### **9.2. SSP**

Okino presented revised SSP terms of reference. Byrne expressed mild concern about a possible overlap between the work of the SSP and the SSEPs in regard to evaluating science. Prell asked if the SSP looked at preliminary proposals. Okino said yes, they do it to provide early feedback to proponents and to educate the watchdogs. Kenter suggested standardizing the terms of reference to reflect the process of nominating chairs and co-chairs through each panel.

### **9.3. PPSP**

Katz presented revised PPSP terms of reference. Kenter saw the membership as dominated by industry expertise and wondered if the PPSP had any problem populating the panel with the 7:7:3+1 ratio. Katz said no, but the panel could use more expertise in exploration geophysics. He added that the panel historically had maintained experience by not rotating its members on a regular basis, but only through occasional attrition. Tatsumi asked if the PPSP needed to have eighteen members. Katz thought that the panel worked just fine with only fifteen or sixteen members. Soh wondered if PPSP members should rotate and after how long a term of service. Katz recommended terms of at least six years. Coffin noted that the memorandum of cooperation provided an entitlement but not a requirement for membership. Allan suggested having term limits but allowing reappointment. Kenter proposed leaving this panel alone and letting them proceed as in the past. Okino suggested that having only a one-way liaison between the SSP and the PPSP could reduce travel.

Katz wondered about the general feeling for changing the panel name to the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel. Coffin proposed the following recommendation for the SPPOC, and the committee agreed.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-12:** The SPC recommends renaming the Pollution Prevention and Safety Panel (PPSP) to the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP), effective immediately.

### **9.4. SciMP**

Murray presented revised SciMP terms of reference. He emphasized that the panel worked well as a single unit and saw no reason to split into more panels. The committee did not object to the revised terms of reference.

### **9.5. TAP**

With Moran absent, Coffin presented the revised membership section for the TAP mandate. Murray noted that Moran had said that the TAP wanted to remove the phrase "long-term" from its mandate. Austin explained that the IPSC had deliberately inserted that term to discourage the TAP from getting too involved in the day-to-day activities of the operators.

### **9.6. ILP**

Doust presented a revised ILP mandate with the original seven points now combined into six points. He also noted that the current ILP membership deviated from the preferred 7:7:4 ratios. The committee did not object to the revised mandate.

## **10. Arctic drilling (533-Full3) update**

Dan Evans reported on the progress in planning for the Arctic Coring Expedition (ACEX). He outlined ESO activities to date and said that they had appointed the co-chiefs and invited all members of the science party but had not yet completed the contracting for the third icebreaker or the logging contractor. Other remaining tasks included producing a scientific prospectus with an agreed measurements plan, testing the piston corer, setting up the database, and developing an outreach program. Evans referred to two phases of mobilization, first in Aberdeen, Scotland, and then in Landskrona, Sweden. He also described plans for the transit, on site operations, and core logging. Evans characterized the science party as dominated by micropaleontologists. He explained that only a portion of the science party would participate in the offshore expedition and the onshore science party would meet in November 2004 at the Bremen repository.

Moore stated that he would feel more comfortable having a backup piston corer. He expressed serious doubt that the other push-type core barrels would adequately meet the scientific objectives. Larson agreed on the need for a proven coring system as a backup. Austin worried that the plan for testing the piston corer had fallen behind schedule since the Arctic scoping group report last October. Becker read the relevant passage from the scoping group report. Janecek saw a clear need for more scoping and perhaps another meeting of the scoping group and the ESO. Miller asked what happened to the plan to use the GLAD-DOSECC tools as a backup. Evans said that that plan changed a long time ago. Kawahata noted that certain organic geochemical and microbiological analyses required frozen samples. Evans replied that the expedition would have freezer equipment and a microbiologist on the science party.

## **11. ODP Leg 207 report**

Dave Mosher presented the results from ODP Leg 207 to the Demerara Rise. He cited the objectives of recovering expanded sections of Cretaceous to Paleogene cores of deep ocean sediment and black shale. Mosher reported that holes drilled on the flank of the plateau encountered largely nannofossil chinks in the Paleogene section, with the Paleocene-Eocene boundary marked by a distinctive green clay bed devoid of microfossils, and they also penetrated the K-T boundary and Cretaceous black shale layers.

Duncan asked about the nature of the basement and its relation to tectonic subsidence. Mosher described it as a rifted margin with volcanic deposits at depth. Kawahata asked about the fluctuating contributions of marine versus terrestrial organic carbon. Mosher characterized the sedimentary organic matter as mostly marine in origin but with some terrestrial component.

## 12 Proposal review

Coffin reviewed the timetable for FY2005 program planning and explained that the committee had issues to consider regarding three proposals.

### 12.1 Proposal 519-Add3 South Pacific Sea Level

*Watchdogs:* Quinn

*Conflict-of-interests:* Camoin (SSEPs co-chair) as lead proponent

*Recommendation:* split into two expeditions

Camoin left the room as the lead proponent. Terry Quinn presented Proposal 519-Add3. He identified technology as the only link between the Tahiti and Great Barrier Reef components of the proposal. Quinn characterized the science objectives as highly complementary but independent and stated that they justified drilling at Tahiti with or without drilling on the Great Barrier Reef.

Katz asked if the program had a policy for drilling on living reefs and whether this project should proceed before having such a policy. Coffin asked if the ESO had any policy in place for this. Evans said no, the ESO did not have a written policy for this specific issue, but they would certainly take the greatest care. He supposed that only the drill cuttings would have any impact. Evans also noted that the ESO had done extensive environmental reviews for the Arctic Coring Expedition, and they anticipated similar efforts for this project but had not yet begun to investigate it. Miller suggested investigating this issue before the June SPC meeting. Kenter thought it would help for starters to identify the living parts of the reef. Quinn noted that reports exist from other projects that have drilled on live coral reefs. Ildefonse wondered about the impacts of previous reef drilling in Tahiti.

Fisher argued for taking a more active approach in describing and publicizing preventative measures. He encouraged increasing the pace for examining this issue and preparing an explanation in advance for anything that might go wrong. Kenter cautioned against taking the matter too seriously for a project that involved drilling only 100 m boreholes. Kato believed that the program could not act too cautiously on this issue because public concerns continued to grow stronger and stronger. Austin said that any assessment would have to demonstrate a minimal impact far outweighed by the science objectives. Baldauf remarked that the program would have to submit a formal document of environmental assessment no matter what. Katz supposed that places might exist where the program could never drill.

Prell said that since the responsibility for getting clearances rested with the IOs, the SPC should request a report from the ESO about this topic at the next meeting. Coffin noted that it would affect the other IOs as well, so the IODP-MI probably should undertake it. He added that the OPCOM would have to address this issue immediately if the SPC recommended Proposal 519-Full2 for drilling in FY2005. Katz stated that the EPSP would review this proposal in June immediately after the next SPC meeting. Coffin suggested that the SPC might prudently consider it for FY2006 instead of FY2005 in the absence of a suitable policy. Austin suggested putting Proposal 519-Full2 and Proposal 564-Full New Jersey Margin in the program plan and deciding which one to do later after working hard to develop the policy. Evans called it a challenge to create a program plan for both of those MSP projects by May 2004. Coffin recommended choosing which one to put in the FY2005 and FY2006 plans.

Mevel described the New Jersey project as much more expensive than Tahiti, and said that ECORD might find it extremely difficult financially to implement it next after the Arctic Coring Expedition. Coffin believed that the survey off the Great Barrier Reef would not happen until late this year at the earliest. Evans confirmed that the proponents and their colleagues had obtained permission for a December survey. Gillis preferred evaluating proposals for splitting on a case-by-case basis. Becker remarked that many projects changed after scheduling, and he just wanted to ensure that significant changes would come back to the SPC for approval.

Coffin asked if the committee had any specific advice for the OPCOM. Miller and Austin left the room as proponents of Proposal 564-Full. Becker wanted to inform the OPCOM that the Tahiti portion of Proposal 519-Full2 could stand on its own. Quinn agreed. Prell expressed concern that the SPC had already forwarded projects that remained unready for scheduling. Larsen asked if the Great Barrier Reef portion would have to reenter the ranking process. Moore asserted that the SPC had forwarded the proposal as a complete project and therefore it did not need to come back. Coffin also preferred letting it remain with the OPCOM. Prell asked what would trigger scheduling of the Great Barrier Reef part. Coffin expected a clearer answer to emerge after seeing the site-survey results. He asked Quinn to draft a recommendation for the OPCOM.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-13:** The SPC recommends that the OPCOM split Proposal 519-Full2 South Pacific Sea Level into two MSP expeditions. The Tahiti component should be considered for scheduling in FY2005.

Coffin asked about developing an environmental policy before the June SPC meeting. Katz said that the EPSP would definitely need some guidance. He preferred having a broad, coherent policy that would preclude handling each proposal differently. Kenter doubted the likelihood of accounting for all specific cases. He expressed confidence about overcoming the issue for drilling in Tahiti, but it required acting fast and perhaps involving specialists. Coffin cited the question of whether this gets done by the SAS or the IODP-MI. He referred to the overarching HSE policy heard at the start of meeting and suggested letting the IODP-MI take this on and have something ready by June. Larsen suggested letting a working group do something and report in June through the SPC and the EPSP and on to the SPPOC in July. Coffin said that the EPSP would have another chance to look at it in December in case the policy still needed revising after June. Becker thought that the working group should involve the operators as well as the SAS. Moore suggested that the working group should include one member from each operator and the draft policy would have to pass through the SPPOC to the IODP-MI. Coffin proposed forming an SPC working group to draft a policy on reef drilling for the June meeting, with input from the IOs and the EPSP. He recommended Quinn, Kenter, and Kato as members.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-14:** The SPC establishes a working group to formulate an environmental policy for drilling on reefs. The working group of Quinn, Kenter, and Kato should consult with the Environmental Protection and Safety Panel and the implementing organizations and present a draft policy at the June 2004 SPC meeting.

## 12.2 Proposal 584-Add2 TAG II Hydrothermal

*Watchdogs:* Tatsumi, Kawahata, Gillis

*Conflict-of-interests:* Ildefonse as possible participant of potentially affected expedition

*Recommendation:* no action

Ildefonse left the room as a possible participant on the potentially affected Oceanic Core Complex Expedition. Tatsumi presented Proposal 584-Add2 outlining three alternative suggestions for changing the currently approved operations schedule. After briefly discussing the issues of timing, funding, staffing, and technology, and with concern for following proper procedures, the committee decided merely to receive the addendum and take no action. Coffin asked the watchdogs to draft a letter to the proponents.

## 12.3 Proposal 641-APL Costa Rica CORK II

*Watchdogs:* Fisher, Ito, Becker

*Conflict-of-interests:* none

*Recommendation:* forward to OPCOM

Fisher presented Proposal 641-APL and noted that it involved exceptional circumstances because the proponents never intended originally to use the drill ship for recovering the instruments and samples. Baldauf assured the availability of enough time to insert it within the existing schedule. The committee briefly discussed the issue of third-party tools. After determining that this now presented the only reasonable chance for recovering the instruments before the samplers would lose the fluids of interest, the committee agreed to forward the APL to the OPCOM for scheduling as long as it would not affect other expeditions.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-15:** The SPC forwards Proposal 641-APL Costa Rica CORK-II to the OPCOM for consideration for scheduling in FY2004 provided that it does not impact any other previously scheduled expeditions.

## 13. CDP proposals presentation

Soh left the room as a proponent of Proposal 603-CDP3. Tim Byrne defined CDPs in general and outlined the components and different characteristics of the two existing CDPs related to the seismogenic zone. Byrne described the scientific objectives of Proposals 603-CDP3 and 537-CDP3 and recommended that SPC designate these proposals as CDPs and establish a separate scoping group for each one. He explained that the SSEPs would continue reviewing these proposals and eventually forward them to the SPC for ranking.

Kenter asked how much time it would take to develop and implement these projects. Byrne replied that both projects could make use of the non-riser drilling vessel immediately. Ito asked about the status of Proposal 537-CDP3. Byrne said that both proposals had gone out for external review. Coffin summarized the main purpose of starting the necessary planning to permit the possibility of drilling these holes in the future. Mori did not get a good sense of the new and exciting aspects of these projects as presented. Moore believed that the component proposals contained exciting science and the SPC would see that when they received them. He stressed the importance of starting the scoping right now. Ildefonse asked about the sequence of the drilling stages and whether drilling the reference sites should wait until after successful drilling at the other sites. Fisher thought that these proposals clearly represented CDPs, and he recognized the importance of drilling the reference sites first to characterize the materials going into the subduction zone. Becker agreed that these constituted CDPs. He also suggested sending them to the service panels for an advance look.

Coffin looked for a consensus on designating these proposals as CDPs and asking the OPCOM to establish scoping groups. Larsen wondered if the SAS should handle this for now through a DPG instead of a scoping group. Coffin thought that scoping represented a part of the operational planning handled by the IODP-MI Washington office. Moore added that the initial scoping of these two CDPs already occurred last summer under the iPC. Becker agreed that the OPCOM should oversee scoping. Austin worried that the OPCOM might not have enough science input with only three members from the SPC. Coffin asked Becker to draft a recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-16:** The SPC approves the recommendation of the SSEPs to designate Proposal 603-CDP3 Nankai Trough Seismogenic Zone (NanTroSEIZE) and Proposal 537-CDP3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP) as complex drilling projects (CDPs) and forwards them to the OPCOM to determine the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity. We request a report from the OPCOM on scoping activities at the June 2004 SPC meeting. These CDP proposals should also be distributed to the SAS service panels for providing initial technical advice to the SSEPs and the SPC.

Coffin raised the issue of asking the OPCOM to begin scoping for the other proposals already residing with them. Janecek assured everyone that it would occur anyway as part of normal planning. Coffin proposed asking the OPCOM to begin scoping for Proposal 595-Full3 Indus Fan and Murray Ridge. The committee agreed after a brief discussion and Prell drafted the following recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-17:** The SPC requests that the OPCOM determine the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity for Proposal 595-Full3 Indus Fan and Murray Ridge.

## 14. IODP publications policy

### 14.1. SciMP report

Rick Murray presented SciMP Recommendation 03-02-07 on the publications policy for the IODP. He noted that the panel agreed unanimously that the central management organization should oversee program publications.

SciMP Recommendation 03-12-07: SciMP recommends that the publications program of the IODP include the components listed below. The responsibility for implementing and overseeing these components will lie within central management of the IODP. The publication obligations incurred by a member of the Scientific Party are described in the IODP Sample and Data Policy.

1. A print and electronic Expedition Report volume. Both versions will capture all information produced by the Scientific Party for each drilling project, including core images and descriptions, and will be consistent and standardized across all platforms and shorebased components. The Expedition Report may include electronic supplemental information.
2. A continually updated on-line bibliography of each drilling project.
3. An on-line peer-reviewed journal (e.g., Journal of Scientific Ocean Drilling). This journal may include, but is not limited to, scientific papers, data reports, and technical developments.
4. An Expedition Science Summary coordinated by the chief scientists of the expedition. The Expedition Science Summary will be submitted within the lifetime of the Editorial Review Board of that expedition.

Duncan asked if the program or an outside organization would produce the on-line journal. Murray indicated that the IODP-MI could handle it however they want. Gillis asked about the envisioned status of the journal. Murray replied that the panel conceived of it as peer reviewed but not as strictly as a top-level journal. Austin suggested that it could include thematic syntheses as well. Rack noted that the ODP had trouble getting synthesis papers from co-chief scientists in the past, and he wondered what strategy would improve that record. Murray said that he would leave that up to the IODP-MI and the IOs. Doust suggested that the expedition science summary could comprise part of the post-project reviews in the project management system.

Ildelfonse liked the idea of an on-line journal because it allowed for including papers from multiple expeditions, but he felt quite surprised by the recommendation to go back to a print version. Murray explained that certain segments of the community, such as micropaleontologists, prefer print for looking at plates and figures. Katz worried about maintaining a long-term archive of electronic publications. Larsen said that he would appreciate getting input on the implementation issues and mentioned the idea of not restricting the journal to ocean drilling. Kenter thought it sounded like an electronic JOIDES Journal. Gillis wanted to avoid giving the impression that the journal contained all of the best science. Doust worried that it could lead to an insulated community. Kato believed that calling it a journal meant something specific to most academics. He wanted to maintain honesty about the quality of publications and not call it a journal if it did not represent the highest quality of peer-reviewed literature. Byrne also worried about calling it a journal and whether it would require a subscription to access if published by an outside organization. Murray referred to the suggested name as just an example.

Rack asked if the panel discussed the concept of publishing data reports and metadata and linking them to the database. Klaus stated that if the program imposed a requirement for participants to publish then it must provide a venue for publishing things that do not qualify for publication elsewhere. Murray noted that the SciMP counted on the idea that most scientists would want to publish in other literature. Austin suggested collecting data reports in the database and considering them as part of the publication obligation. Kenter noted that funding for European scientists depended on publishing in peer-reviewed journals. Gillis agreed with the idea of putting data reports in the database but said it would still require review. Mevel thought that outside journals provided much better visibility. Coffin asked where the results of the ICDP get published. Harms answered that the data remain captured in the ICDP database and participants generally publish their results as special volumes of regular journals. Allan said that the lead agencies had a strong interest in seeing the data made available to the community, whatever the perceived quality of the publication.

#### **14.2. SPC WG report**

Ken Miller reported on the findings of the publications working group. He cited the survey questions posed to JDESC, USSAC, and ESSAC and said that the responses yielded a consensus that publications from all platforms should use a common format, with oversight by the IODP-MI Sapporo office. No consensus emerged on having an electronic journal because of fears that it might represent gray literature. He added that it would also need a strong editorial board. Miller outlined the cost differences for paper and electronic volumes, noting that paper would cost an additional \$500,000 per year. He recommended a compromise of publishing hard copies on demand or by subscription.

Austin noted that the recommendation from the PEC-VI called for electronic and paper publications and the Japanese community wanted paper. Brumsack cited the difficulty of relying on electronic volumes as an archive, even after only ten years. Ildefonse agreed on the need for at least some paper copies as an archive. Klaus stated that a print run of 100 copies would not cost much less than a run of 1700. Quinn remained skeptical about the usefulness of printing hard copies when anyone could easily print electronic images whenever necessary. Janecek said that print copies enabled laying out several different volumes at once for comparative purposes. Ildefonse preferred an electronic version for the exact same reason but conceded the need for a paper version for archiving. Kenter wondered about the possibility of generating a low-cost paper copy for those who really wanted it. Kato suggested finding a cheap publisher to reduce the paper costs. Allan noted that electronic format allows for animation and motion pictures.

Kato suggested not deciding on a permanent plan now and assessing the matter again in a few years. Klaus urged choosing one course at the beginning and sticking with it for the life of the program. She favored pursuing an electronic version as the permanent archive. Austin suggested that the SPC could revisit the issue after seeing the bids submitted in response to a request for proposals. Klaus advised that the program could not wait six months to a year to institute a publications policy. Miller proposed that the electronic version could comprise the permanent archive, with some sort of paper copy available on demand. Coffin asked Miller, Tatsumi, and Murray to draft a recommendation. After a short recess the committee briefly discussed a few minor points and agreed on the following recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-18:** 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.



Friday

26 March 2004

8:30-15:00

Fisher and Miller did not attend the proceedings the entire day, leaving the committee with sixteen members present.

### 15. Expedition and site designation scheme

Rick Murray presented SciMP Action Item 03-12-20 on developing a scheme for identifying expeditions and sites. He said that a working group recommended that expeditions have descriptive names emphasizing science and not reflecting any platform dependence, and they did not want database limitations to control the naming of expeditions.

SciMP Action Item 03-12-20: Murray chair an *ad hoc* WG on the naming of IODP expeditions, sites, and holes. This WG will meet by email and develop a recommendation to the SPC that will be voted upon by the SciMP by email in advance of the IO meeting in Scotland. Members of the WG will include representatives from the IOs and SciMP members (Okada, Sreaton, Gulick, Aita, Escartin).

Gillis believed that the simpler the site designation scheme the better. Kato suggested that post-cruise scientists could benefit from knowing the repository where the core resides. Janecek wanted to adopt the easiest scheme for the database system to handle, and he opposed having a different designation scheme for the public and the repositories. Katz stated that industry had used a parallel identification scheme for years without problems. Austin favored a straight numbering scheme for expeditions. Prell proposed using a name as the primary expedition identifier and including a platform code in the site designation. Mori suggested that acronyms would probably work better for the Japanese community because otherwise they would have to translate English names. Coffin supposed that the IODP-MI should work out the conventions for expedition naming. He asked Prell, Ildefonse, and Mori to draft a recommendation. The committee agreed on the following consensus statement.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-19:** The designations of IODP expeditions are important for communicating the program results to the broad community as well as for use within the program. The SPC recommends that the prime identification of all IODP expeditions be a unique expedition name that describes the location and/or science objectives. Drilling sites should have a unique, sequential, platform- or expedition-based designation.

### 16. IODP core distribution

Coffin raised the issue of determining how to distribute cores among the repositories at Bremen, Kochi, and TAMU. Rack presented a plan for closing the LDEO and Scripps repositories and consolidating the existing DSDP and ODP cores in the Bremen and TAMU repositories along with expanding those facilities. He also proposed a geographic model for distributing IODP cores, with those from the eastern Pacific and Indian Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean Sea going to TAMU, those from the Atlantic and Arctic oceans going to Bremen, and those from the western Pacific and marginal seas going to Kochi.

Moore favored having a geographic plan but wanted to ensure that it would provide the best science. Brumsack saw value in maintaining consistency from the old to the new program. Soh asked about ownership of the cores. Rack referred to the memoranda of among the funding agencies. Evans noted that the ESO intended to have shore-based sampling parties at Bremen but could conceivably ship cores elsewhere for final storage. Gillis wondered if the geographic model implied the relocation of all western Pacific cores to Kochi. She also wondered if any practical or technical reasons existed for storing all of the riser cores at Kochi

as well as any related cores from other platforms. Soh noted that the Kochi lab would have the identical instrumentation as on the *Chikyu*. Coffin suggested that the cores could go to the place with the best equipment for doing the proposed science. Kato asked who would decide which cores go where. Murray said that the SciMP would still look at the details, though not in time for the FY2005 program plan. Brumsack did not just want to let the IODP-MI decide because it concerned scientific issues. Coffin asked Moore, Brumsack, and Soh to draft a consensus statement. They proposed the following:

The SPC recommends that a guiding principle for the distribution of IODP cores to the IODP core repositories be based on establishing a geographic coherence to the collections for the benefit of the science community. As a general principle it is recommended that all three repositories strive to acquire comparable basic laboratory instrumentation and trained technical personnel. The three core repositories should assure intercalibration of methods and instruments.

Baldauf advised against making a recommendation without knowing the full capabilities of each of the facilities. Coffin suggested that the OPCOM needed some recommendation very soon for FY2005. Tatsumi saw no need to make a specific recommendation now for the Kochi repository given the operations schedule for FY2004-2005. Murray added that the SciMP had not finished addressing the issue of basic minimum measurement capabilities for the core repositories. Austin suggested mentioning the scientific rationale for the geographic plan. Brumsack preferred sending a stronger message about where the FY2004 cores would go instead of issuing such a general statement that did not really decide anything. Coffin asked if the committee agreed on at least the issue of geography. All agreed. Rack indicated that the operators had already decided on a plan for FY2004 and FY2005 unless advised otherwise. Coffin tabled the issue until the August meeting to wait for further input from the SciMP. (Note: the SPC subsequently postponed its August meeting until October 2004)

### 17. Guide to the IODP

Coffin briefly outlined the history of developing the *Guide to the IODP*. He proposed handing it over to the IODP-MI Sapporo office to pull all of the pieces together and request more input from the SAS as necessary. Becker deemed that as an appropriate move because the JOIDES Office had developed the *Guide to the ODP*. He suggested asking for an update from the IODP-MI Sapporo office in June. Austin questioned the practicality of having a hard copy of a document that would likely remain in a constantly evolving state. Coffin asked Becker, Kawahata, and Ildefonse to draft a consensus statement, and the committee later agreed on the following.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-20:** The SPC commends the contributors to the draft *Guide to the IODP* for their outstanding work so far. We ask the IODP-MI Sapporo office to assume the task of producing a completed version for community wide distribution, and we request an update on their efforts at the June 2004 SPC meeting.

### 18. Education and outreach report

Jamie Austin reported on the IODP-MI education and outreach workshop held in February 2004 in Austin. He identified the participants from the U.S., Europe, and Japan and outlined the major education and outreach functions that they proposed for the IODP-MI. These included 1) coordinating and promoting integrated planning, execution, and evaluation, 2) creating materials to ensure a single program identity and message, 3) compiling and maintaining common content resources for the community, 4) facilitating international

program activities, 5) advancing education by engaging the international community, 6) fostering language and cultural awareness, and 7) developing and producing broader scientific information. Austin reported that the group developed several short-term recommendations on identifying financial resources for FY2004, forming an advisory task force for interim planning, forming an operational team for implementing the interim plan, and creating and promoting a coherent IODP identity. He also summarized several longer-term recommendations on the proposed functions of the IODP-MI, including establishing an education and outreach advisory committee and a new position in the IODP-MI for a director to oversee the education, outreach, and communications efforts.

Kenter applauded the report. Duncan hoped to see improved efforts at synthesizing the scientific results. Coffin asked if the advisory committee should exist within the SAS or as part of the IODP-MI. Austin replied that the working group had not decided on the appropriate expertise for the committee. Mevel added that the working group thought the committee would report directly to the IODP-MI. Moore wondered how ECORD, as a consortium, would handle education and outreach given the diverse viewpoints among its members. Kenter responded that they want to have good coordination at the top and have made a good start with a modest budget. Mevel added that the efforts must concentrate at the ECORD level because the funding opportunities reside at the European Union level. Tatsumi recognized the value of receiving content from broad sources, though the approach and delivery would differ significantly internationally.

## **19. Discussion of written reports from other scientific programs**

### **19.1. ICDP**

Uli Harms reported on ICDP activities. He described ongoing projects at Unzen Volcano in Japan and Chelungpa Fault in Taiwan. He also noted the upcoming Lake Bosumtwi project on schedule for next fall and the San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth (SAFOD) project in California this year. Harms mentioned several other projects still in the planning or proposal stage. He presented some of the results from the Chicxulub drilling project and cited several examples of cooperation between the ICDP and IODP.

Austin asked about the offshore data acquisition and management system loaned for the Arctic expedition. Harms described the system and confirmed that the ICDP had loaned it to the ESO for the Arctic expedition.

### **19.2. InterMARGINS**

The agenda book included a copy of InterMARGINS Newsletter No. 3 from December 2003 as submitted by Bob Whitmarsh, who was invited but could not attend the meeting. The committee offered no comments on the InterMARGINS program.

### **19.3. InterRidge**

Kristen Kusek reported on the activities of the InterRidge program. She outlined the broad objectives and structure of InterRidge, noted several upcoming meetings, and identified the principal, associate, and corresponding program members. Kusek stated that the new decadal plan (2004-2013) involves seven core themes of ridge research, with a new working group associated with each theme. She also mentioned several efforts at international education and outreach, including a new video entitled *Voyage into the Abyss*.

Mevel noted that one of the new InterRidge working groups would focus on drilling ocean crust, thus offering plenty of potential for collaboration between programs. Kato asked about

the disciplinary balance of the InterRidge community. Kusek replied that it consisted mostly of geologists but also included a significant number of biologists. Tatsumi asked about the availability of the video for distribution in Japan. Kusek believed that a version had already gone to Japan.

#### **19.4. IAVCEI**

The agenda book included a brief summary of activities of the Large Igneous Provinces (LIPs) Commission of the International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior (IAVCEI) as submitted by Richard Ernst, who was invited but could not attend the meeting. The committee offered no comments on the LIPs Commission or IAVCEI.

#### **20. Other business**

In follow-up to the previous discussion on the North Atlantic and Core Complex Expeditions (see Section 3.2), Gillis presented a draft recommendation on shipboard versus shore-based scientific parties.

Participants of multiple expeditions that form a project may be considered as a single science party. The SPC may designate a project that arises from a single proposal on a case-by-case basis.

Austin thought it might result in more complications, particular for pieces scheduled a long time apart. Murray characterized the existing sample and data policy as flexible enough to accommodate this idea. Baldauf suggested restricting the recommendation to the specific expeditions now planned instead of taking a general approach because of the many conceivably different circumstances and consequences. Fisher agreed on focusing on current examples and not trying to make an all-encompassing recommendation now. He thought it might rarely happen to have two expeditions scheduled at the same time from the same proposal. Becker hoped it would happen more often. Gillis stated that the scientists now applying for these split expeditions did not have a complete understanding of what would happen on each piece. Baldauf anticipated less of a problem in the future with greater lead-time for planning. The committee later approved the following revised recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-21:** The SPC recommends to the IODP-MI that participants of the North Atlantic I and II and Core Complex I and II expeditions be considered as single science parties, respectively.

In follow-up to an earlier report and comments (see Section 3.2), Coffin described two changes to the FY2004 program plan concerning triple versus quadruple APC on the North Atlantic Expedition and drilling a new hole for the CORK at Site 642 on the Norwegian Margin Bottom Water Expedition.

Concerning the North Atlantic Expedition, Baldauf sought guidance on the scientific priorities for taking spot cores to fill in any gaps in the section. Moore did not want to get too specific on the operational requirements because the objective of recovering a complete section might not always require drilling four complete holes. He therefore recommended doing whatever necessary to recover a complete section rather than requiring four complete holes. Coffin asked Prell to draft a recommendation, and the committee approved it without further debate.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-22:** The SPC recommends making all efforts necessary to collect a complete sedimentary section at each drilling site on the North Atlantic I and II expeditions. We understand that obtaining such complete sections may require drilling three or four holes to cover gaps in the core record and that MST correlations of the cores must be carefully evaluated to identify the gaps during the drilling operations at each site.

Concerning the CORK at Site 642, Becker explained the objective of measuring a detailed temperature profile in the upper 100 m of sediment. He added that the proponents originally proposed using an existing hole and have since requested drilling a new hole. Austin stated that the proposal might not have ranked as highly if the SPC had known from the beginning that they wanted to drill a new hole. Moore thought that these circumstances completely changed the complexion of the proposed project. Becker asked about the costs. Baldauf answered that it would take two or three extra days and about \$80,000 for the hardware and casing.

Ildelfonse noted that the proposal had made a strong case for using the existing hole, and he wondered when the proponent realized the necessity of drilling a new hole. Becker explained that from recent discussions the proponent recognized the greater likelihood of detecting the targeted signal in a new hole with a single-trip deployment of the thermistor string. Prell asked about the total time for the operation. Baldauf replied that it would take about ten days including transit. Rack added that it could still fit into the 365-day schedule of the ship contract. Fisher noted that although the proponent should have explored this option sooner, the scientific objectives had not changed and the only real issue concerned the extra cost and time. He recommended taking the best approach for achieving the science within the available time and budget. Austin suggested making the same recommendation as for the APL.

Byrne wondered if the proposed site still represented the best place to conduct the experiment now that it involved drilling a new hole. Austin said that the proposal made the case for doing it there. Quinn felt uncomfortable with changing so substantially from the original proposal that the SPC ranked. Moore suggested that the proponent could withdraw the proposal if it no longer represented what he wanted to do. Allan noted that the proponent had always known the age of the hole. Miller did not see how the committee could discuss the problem or reach a decision without any new document to review. Baldauf stated that the IO intended not to proceed with the new hole unless recommended by the OPCOM. Austin could consider other science priorities. Prell suggested the possibility of dropping the expedition if the proponent did not want to use the existing hole and reallocating the time to the North Atlantic Expedition. Larsen suggested accepting an APL for review before the OPCOM meeting. Coffin asked Fisher to draft a recommendation, and the committee approved it with little further debate.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-23:** The SPC was briefed about discussions with the JOI Alliance regarding drilling a new hole for achieving the objectives described in Proposal 543-Full2. The proposal indicated that Hole 642E would be suitable, and in many ways ideal, for the proposed experiments. We are concerned that drilling a new hole will require additional time and funds, and we request that the lead proponent prepare a proposal addendum that justifies additional ship time and program costs if these are required to achieve the primary project objectives. The addendum should be submitted in time for consideration at the OPCOM meeting on 15-16 April 2004. Otherwise, the proponent and the JOI Alliance should determine the best approach to accomplish the proposed science within the currently allocated ship time and budgets.

Kenter asked for clarification on the meaning of membership balance. Allan said that the same membership rights applied to all panels. Prell proposed that proportional representation rights should only apply strictly to the SPC, the SSEPs, and other voting service panels such as the EPSP and the SciMP. Quinn wanted simply to get the best scientific advice. Kato asked if the relevant numbers concerned ratios or size. Austin stressed the greater importance of discipline balance and functioning rather than numbers.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-24:** The SPC acknowledges that proportional representation rights (defined in the memoranda as 7:7:3+1) are important for the SPC and the SSEPs with respect to making decisions on the disposition of proposals. However, we recommend some flexibility of representation in satisfying the disciplinary needs of the service panels (EPSP, SSP, SciMP, TAP, and ILP).

Prell presented a draft recommendation on balancing the proportional participation on scientific parties. Allan stated that program members had a right to proportional participation on every expedition, though he hoped to leave some room for flexibility. Mevel questioned why the recommendation should specify platforms when it referred to a supposedly integrated program. Janecek said that the IODP-MI board of governors would want to know the balance on a platform basis. Kenter insisted on preserving some level of flexibility. Baldauf said that the ODP had historically maintained the participatory balance over a two- to three-year period. The committee approved the following slightly modified recommendation.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-25:** The memoranda among the funding agencies define the proportional participation in scientific parties by contributing IODP members. We recommend that the IODP-MI should balance the overall participation utilizing a multi-year rolling timeframe and considering the scientific requirements and multi-platform nature of the program.

Coffin called for co-chief nominations for Proposals 519-Full2 and 641-APL. The committee nominated ten scientists for the first proposal and five for the second. After the meeting, J-DESC nominated an additional five scientists for the first proposal.

## 21. Future meetings

### 21.1. Liaisons to other panels and programs

The committee identified Brumsack as a new liaison to the SSEPs and Kenter as an SPC representative for the OPCOM.

### 21.2. 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> SPC meetings

Coffin noted that the venue for the third SPC meeting on 14-17 June 2004 had shifted from Tokyo to the Yokohama Earth Institute of JAMSTEC, with a possible field trip on 13 June. He also noted the possibility of a one-day field trip preceding the fourth SPC meeting scheduled for 16-18 August 2004 in Corvallis, Oregon, U.S.A. (*Note: the SPC later decided during the preparation of these minutes to postpone the fourth meeting in Corvallis, Oregon until 24-26 October 2004.*) Coffin proposed holding the fifth SPC meeting in early 2005 in Europe, possibly in Lisbon, Barcelona, Montpellier, or Berlin.

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

Coffin promised to review the motions and consensus items immediately following the meeting and to circulate a draft executive summary as soon as possible.

**SPC Consensus 04-03-26:** The SPC greatly appreciates the efforts of our host, Steve Bohlen and the JOI Alliance in bringing us together in their new office location. The facilities for this meeting have been excellent, and we have wanted for nothing in the way of a comfortable, commodious room, audio-visual equipment, electronic connection, and food and drink. We thank Steve, Frank, Holly, Bob, Bridget, Maureen, Amy, and Jennifer for their warm hospitality.