

Agenda of the Joint Meeting of the  
Scientific Steering and Evaluation Panels for the  
Dynamics of Earth's Interior (ISSEP) and Earth's Environment (ESSEP)  
November 20-23, 2003, University of Colorado at Boulder (USA)

**Executive summary**

**Joint Session, Liaison Reports**

**SPC Report**

Mike Coffin summarized the staffing changes at SPC and IMI and reported on the endorsement of a two phase proposal evaluation process. Mike discussed SPC actions on proposals forwarded from SSEPs and the nomination of chief scientists. Highly ranked mission specific platform proposals will be forwarded to OPCOM for scheduling at the next meeting. SSEPs will decide when proposals are ready to go forward, SPC will endeavor not to send them back for review. Proposals from nonmember country proponents will be considered. Change in process of scheduling by SPC/OPCOM may require earlier SSEPs meetings.

**SSP**

Andre Droxler discussed the mandate of SSP and the development of an online, interactive site survey requirement package (Matrix).

**ILP and Project Management reports**

Harry Doust discussed the formation of the new Industry Liaison Panel (ILP) and continued efforts to build cooperative programs with industry. An environmental safety policy has been drafted and forwarded to PPSP. Primary development to date is a framework for project management for IODP expeditions.

**JOI Alliance**

Jay Miller presented an overview of JOI Alliance activities, US IODP funding, expedition staffing and the schedule for the non-riser vessel.

**CDEX**

Shin'ichi Kuramoto provided an update on the Chikyuu and JAMSTEC and reported on the recent IO meeting in Montana.

**ECORD**

Gilbert Camoin and Colin Devey presented the timing and status of ECORD participation in IODP.

**NSF**

Jamie Allan and Carolyn Ruppel presented an update on funding and international participation in IODP. Upcoming IODP related meetings were noted and new funding initiatives discussed.

**ISAS Office Report**

Nobuhisa Eguchi and Jeff Schuffert discussed the ISAS panel meeting schedule, status of proposals, and potential panel actions on proposals.

### **TAP / Project Scoping Group**

Kate Moran explained how TAP has evolved from TEDCOM to become a broader advisory panel. The panel has endorsed project scoping as part of the planning, implementation, and review process for IODP expeditions.

### **Cultural Educational Workshop**

George Brown (U. of Denver) was invited to host a cultural educational workshop to foster improved communication within the panel.

### **Meeting overview**

The panel chairs discussed the review process, elaborated on conflict of interest protocols, and presented a plan to organize working groups to discuss the proposal review process, proposal grouping, panel size, and the SSEPs mandate, with an eye toward fine tuning the panel's structure and protocols. Summaries of the outcome and recommendations from each working group are included in the body of this report. Panel members were subdivided into four breakout sessions for detailed discussions of the proposals considered at this meeting. The mandate of the breakout sessions was to build a consensus on recommended actions and present a summary to a joint session of the panel for discussion. The breakout sessions seemed to work quite well with active discussions of the merits of proposals and how proposals might be developed. In future meetings, the number of breakout session will be dictated by the number and overall scientific objectives of proposals and loosely following the Initial Science Plan.

### **Next SSEPs meeting:**

Probably May 17-20, 2004, Granada, Spain (optional field trip on 16th)

## **Thursday, November 20**

Joint Session, Reports

8:30 Joint Session, Reports

Introduction of new members to SSEPs (Arai, Byrne, Camoin and newcomers)

Opening Remarks by Host (Ge)

Introduction to the meeting (Arai, Byrne, Camoin)

Approval of the agenda, Policy, Style of the meeting.

### **SPC Report (Coffin)**

#### Structure

SPC took over from iSPC at their last meeting. Ted Moore is acting vice chair, Jamie Austin will take that position in spring when he steps down from IMI. Chair of SPC will alternate between US and Japan every two years. IMI acting program director is Jamie Austin. First meeting was in September, and included seven Japanese members, seven US, and ECORD as observers.

OPCOM will have two Japanese members, two US (all from SPC), and representatives from CDEX, JA, and ESO.

#### Proposal evaluation

SPC endorsed a two phase procedure for proposal evaluation.

Phase 1 : Any potential conflict of interest needs to be identified and watchdogs assigned. Chairs are to determine if the conflict is significant. If conflicted, panel member(s) must leave room during any discussion. Watchdogs present summary, but do not compare proposals.

Phase 2 : Ranking at SPC. Any conflicted attendees must leave room during entire discussion. SPC defines a pool of proposals to be ranked from those forwarded by SSEPs. All proposals forwarded from SSEPs may or may not be included in consideration pool. SPC will also compare proposals with similar interests. SPC will rank proposals in secret ballot, results tabulated by iSAS. From ranked proposals, a subset is selected and forwarded to OPCOM. OPCOM derives draft schedules that are presented to SPC. SPC selects schedule.

#### Proposal actions

17 proposals considered at last meeting. Arctic proposal was forwarded for scheduling without ranking ; 16 proposals were therefore ranked. Complete Juan de Fuca hydrogeology study as presented in proposal was considered too much for a single expedition, however a significant subset of objectives could be met with a single expedition, which was scheduled. North Atlantic paleoclimate converted triple piston coring to quadruple piston coring and added depth to one site, resulting in over one expedition operation time required.

OPCOM recommended Arctic drilling to be included in operations plan pending ECORD joining IODP. SPC formed a scoping group to determine if Arctic drilling was on track and operationally feasible for drilling in FY 2004. OPCOM/SPC endorsed Arctic drilling for FY 2004 plan.

OPCOM created 10 operations scenarios and three were forwarded to SPC. SPC approved a schedule including two proposals receiving two JR model expeditions.

### Chief scientist selection

SPC endorsed iPC recommendations and nominated chief scientists for all scheduled expeditions.

### Unscheduled proposals

SPC recommended ECORD develop operations plans for MSP highly ranked proposals and conduct a feasibility study. NJ Shelf, GOM overpressure, and South Pacific forwarded to OPCOM for scheduling next meeting (i.e. without re-ranking).

### Program plan

Program plan will be finished this week, considered by SPPOC at AGU.

### SSEPs topics

SSEPs will decide when proposals are ready to go forward, SPC will endeavor not to send them back for review. SPC asked SSEPs to review iSSEPs mandate and revise as necessary. SPC will consider the revised mandate at its March meeting. SSEPs were encouraged to think imaginatively on how panel should be structured. SPC recommended acceptance of proposals from non-member country authors.

### Publications

SPC formed a subcommittee to consider IODP publication, Tatsumi and Miller are group co-chairs.

### IMI

IMI headquarters will be in Washington, DC. Manik Talwani has accepted IMI President position, and Hans Christian Larsen has been offered the position of Vice President for Science Planning. Vice for Operations (to be officed in Sapporo) has been advertised. An EOS article has been submitted outlining structure and Nature will have a 3-4 page article in December. IODP will have a town meeting and booth at AGU.

### Potential changes that may affect SSEPs

SPC will consider a change in scheduling procedure at the next meeting. In order to give OPCOM more time to derive schedules, SPC may rank in June and give OPCOM until August to derive potential schedules. SPC would then meet again in August to select schedule. SSEPs would need to meet late April to early May. First week of May is a national holiday in Japan.

### From the floor

What are the criteria for ranking ?

Instructions are to select best science, do not consider cost, time, or operations.

Will co-chiefs be proponents ?

In every instance this schedule lead proponent was nominated as co-chief scientist.

Can a co-chief be from non member country ?

A country can agree to support a non member co-chief (by giving up one of theirs)

How will CDPs be ranked?

SPC cannot determine this until SSEPs to forward them for consideration.

Does SPC prefer SSEPs to group, rank, or forward ungrouped proposals ?

SPC wants as much information as the SSEPs can send. Groupings help, rankings would be really appreciated.

### **SSP (Droxler)**

#### Mandate

Mandate has not changed much from ODP, that is to assess data in the databank to see if it is sufficient to address the scientific objectives of a proposal. One change has been to assign watchdogs when a Full proposal is requested by the SSEPs to help PIs know what to expect.

3 readiness scales: 1=Viable (1B viable but not all data in), 2= possibly viable for FY200X, 3=unlikely for FY200X

#### Matrix table

SSP-PPSP working group put together an SSP-PPSP matrix table (i.e., minimum site survey requirements) that will be via web software package. This program is currently at proof of concept stage (software under development). Dan Quoidbach has put together a prototype available at <http://129.236.33.244:9006>.

#### From the floor

What is status of previous concern about digital data availability ?

Databank is CMO (IMI) responsibility, therefore implementation will be up to them.

### **ILP and Project Management reports (Doust)**

#### Mandate

This is a new panel formed to facilitate communication between IODP and a variety of industries. Mandate is to coordinate with and integrate industry expertise and data into IODP. Industry can provide IODP high quality seismic data, drilling and sampling expertise in new terranes, and management experience. Panel is dominated by industry members at present, and needs more academic presence (gaps in marine science, metals and mining, microbiology)

#### Environmental policy

A statement has been drafted and sent to PPSP.

#### Schedule

First meeting was in 2003, where they identified from the list of active proposals those of interest to industry and which might benefit from industry interaction. From active proposal list (only abstracts) 10 were deemed to be of direct interest, nine include data of interest to industry. Next meeting: February 22-24, 2004 Houston. Desire is to attract senior industry management.

#### Project management recommendations

- Project management of IODP: iSAS working group (representatives for most panels)
  - framework from which IODP can manage its activities
  - proposal process framework
  - industry best practice format
  - eight distinct phases separated by milestones (reviews)
  - prestages, operational, post-review (operations and science)
  - additional stages for complex drilling projects

## **JOI Alliance (Miller) (see attachment I)**

10:30 : Coffee break

11:00 :

### **Cultural Educational Workshop (Brown)**

Topics of discussion included perceptions and stereotypes. Exercises included pairing Japanese and non-Japanese participants to evaluating images of each culture. There was also a discussion of the historical development of culture and communication. Four key subjects were developed :

(1) Individualism (aggressive, confrontational, direct) vs. collectivism (indirect, nonconfrontational, consensus building –*Wa*)

(2) Power distance –interacting with authority: Hierarchy

(3) Uncertainty avoidance

(4) Male vs. Female

Names: last name preferred by Japanese, but in US first names are used (ambiguity is ok, i.e., *Aimai*)

Lunch 13:00 – 14:00

14 :00 Joint Session : reports

### **CDEX (Kuramoto)**

#### Chikyu update

Schedule has April 2005 delivery to CDEX. Shakedown will 1.5 yr. October 2006 delivery to IODP. The derrick (80 m) was installed (video presentation), September 2003. Most cabins are single occupancy. Four decks of labs. CT scanner and XRF scanner have been installed. Koichi University core repository and analysis center has been set up including TIMS, ICP-MS, XRD, XRF in preparation for drilling in 3-4 years. SciMP, PPSP will tour Chikyu in Nagasaki in December.

#### IO Meeting in Bozeman, MT

IODP wide HSE policy needs to be established as well as program wide curation policy. Marine technical exchange needs to be considered as well as IODP standard measurements packages. Also discussed was how to plan and execute multi year expedition (CDPs).

### **ECORD news (Camoin, Devey)**

#### Status

12 members have been identified, 6 interested members are a potential for growth.

ECORD Council met in October, participation was finalized. ECORD Council oversees, EMA (banker management agency), ESO (IO-BGS), ESAC (USSAC equivalent-panel nominations, shipboard participants). A website should be ready soon <[www.ecord.org](http://www.ecord.org)>. Early February they will begin staffing for Arctic, applications should be available in January.

ESO consortium-BGS science operator, Bremen (core handling & shipboard and shorebased labs);  
New BCR building, in progress to be completed Fall 2004, integrating the BCR into university science

ECORD still working on staffing procedures and implementation

MAR long term monitoring (MARidge),

LOVE-Long-term observation of vent ecosystems

KIDS Knowledge in the Deep Sea

### From the floor

Will cores be moved ?

Likely.

### **NSF (Allan, Ruppel)**

#### Status

ECORD participation still under negotiation as IODP Contributing member. China is negotiating as an Associate member (double previous participation level). MEXT has assigned a liaison to NSF (Kenji Kimura). CMO and USSSP are still in development. MREFC funds for conversion in FY2005 (\$100 million), maybe some in 2004. A full and open competition was held for SIC of non-riser vessel. A contract was signed with the JOI Alliance in September.

In August 2003 NSF issued a request for sources for CMO, only IMI responded. Draft solicitation of sole source contract with IMI released November 3 2003. Working on sole source offer for CMO establishment, and expect contract award February 2004.

#### Personnel Changes

Rodey Batiza replaces Paul Dauphin, Jamie Allan replaces Bruce Malfait, Carolyn Ruppel replaces Brad Clement.

#### NSF-ODP

In continuing resolution so FY04 funding is constant. There will be an ODaSSI site survey meeting at AGU, as well as an ODP Town Meeting. NSF ODP will be particularly concerned with community education efforts. Studies using IODP samples after moratorium period can be funded through NSF-ODP. A new initiative is to fund research to meet expedition objectives (more than available postcruise funds). USSSP contract is under full and open competition, review process is in January with a decision expected in Spring 2004.

### **iSAS Office Report (Eguchi, Schuffert)**

#### Meeting Schedule

December 2003: SSPOC, SciMP, PPSP

March 2004 : SPC

#### Proposal Status

109 active proposals, 50% Environment, 25% hard rock, 25% deep biosphere

Review guidelines for SSEPs

Pre-proposal possible actions

- Submit new preproposal

- Submit revised preproposal

- Submit Full proposal

- Submit CDP

Full proposal possible actions

- Submit revised Full proposal

- Submit Addendum

- Send to external review

- Forward to SPC

APL possible actions

- Submit revised APL
- Develop Pre-proposal
- Collaborate with other proponents
- Forward to SPC

15:00: Introduction to the proposal review process: Proposals, Conflict of interest rules. Breakout sessions (Camoin)  
Working groups (Byrne)

#### Grouping

Highest, Intermediate, Lowest (and to be discussed in Working Group 2).

#### Complex Drilling Projects (multi-year or multi platform project)

Defined as overarching science goal, with interlinked components that can be accomplished in a reasonably short time but cannot meet overall objective as stand alone projects. Two parts to proposal, including umbrella overview and full proposals for each expedition. Nankai (NantroSEIZE) and Costa Rica (CRISP) are the first two.

#### Review process

27 proposals to review, five have been previously externally reviewed. Proposals grouped into four subgroups. Breakout sessions of 7-9 panel members each will meet to discuss proposals in each subgroup, and deliver consensus to panel in joint session. Discussions should be on the order of 30 minutes for each proposal.

#### Conflict of Interest

All potential conflicts of interest were identified. General philosophy is, if you feel there may be a conflict, discuss it with a SSEPs chair. Panel members with recognized conflict must leave the room during discussions of relevant proposal(s)

#### Working groups

Four working groups were established from the panel membership to discuss issues and derive consensus on :

- Working Group 1** -- The review process
- Working Group 2** -- Grouping proposals
- Working Group 3** -- Panel size, liaisons, alternates
- Working Group 4** – SSEPs Mandate

16:00 : Breakout sessions :

- **Fluid flow and Deep Biosphere** (Chair : S. Ge)  
Proposals : 621-Full Monterey Bay Observatory, 635-Pre Hydrate Ridge Observatory, 637-Pre Nantuckett Hydrogeology, 505-Full5 Mariana Convergent Margin, 555-Add Cretan Margin, 591-Full2 New Ireland Forearc, 607-Full2 New Jersey Slope.
- **Seismogenic zones and Tectonic/climate links** (Chair : T. Byrne)  
Proposals : 537-CDP3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project, 537A-Full3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Stage 1, 603-CDP3 NanTroSEIZE Overview, 603B-Full2 NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults, 552-Add Bengal Fan, 628-Pre2 Mjolnir Crater.
- **Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology** (Chair : G. Camoin)



Proposals : 477-Full4 Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene, 556-Full Malvinas Confluence, 638-APL Adelie Drift, 634-Pre Antarctic Circumpolar Current, 600-Full Canterbury Basin, 602-Full2 Tropical Epeiric Seas, 605-Full Asian Monsoon.

- **Solid Earth and Geodynamics** (Chair : S. Arai)

Proposals : 522-Full3 Superfast Spreading Crust, 535-Full3 735B Deep, 623-Full Ontong Java Plateau, 620-Full Hotspot Seamounts, 636-Pre Louisville Seamounts, 639-Pre Izu-Bonin Arc Crust, 640-Pre Godzilla Mullion.

18:30 End of sessions

20:00 Dinner

## **Friday, November 21**

8:30 Breakout sessions

- **Fluid flow and Deep Biosphere** (Chair : S. Ge)
- **Seismogenic zones and Tectonic/climate links** (Chair : T. Byrne)
- **Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology** (Chair : G. Camoin)
- **Solid Earth and Geodynamics** (Chair : S. Arai)

10:30 Coffee Break

10:50 Breakout sessions

- **Fluid flow and Deep Biosphere** (Chair : S. Ge)
- **Seismogenic zones and Tectonic/climate links** (Chair : T. Byrne)
- **Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology** (Chair : G. Camoin)
- **Solid Earth and Geodynamics** (Chair : S. Arai)

12:30 Lunch

13:30 Joint SSEPs session: reviews

*505-Full5 Mariana Convergent Margin*

*555-Add Cretan Margin*

*591-Full2 New Ireland Forearc*

*607-Full2 New Jersey Slope*

*621-Full Monterey Bay Observatory*

15:30 Coffee Break

15:50 Joint SSEPs session: reviews

*635-Pre Hydrate Ridge Observatory*

*637-Pre Nantuckett Hydrogeology*

*522-Full3 Superfast Spreading Crust*

17:30 Working groups on SSEPs procedures and mandates:

- **WG 1: SSEPs reviewing processes** (Improve nurturing process and external review)

Guidelines for proposal writing

Can we require specific section formats?

Difficult to avoid repetition and no single format works

National programs can help with proposal writing by supporting educational workshops

Post general guidelines on SAS website

Best practices document-merged to current guideline

## Examples of well written, successful proposals posted

### Watchdogs

5 is a good number

Balances workload and is a good balance with breakout group size

Continuity of watchdogs for a proposal

ESSEP rotates lead for each meeting to provide fresh input and balance workload.

ISSEP maintains lead watchdog as long as possible.

Need a single contact for proponents

Strive for consistency and continuity in messages to proponents.

Need more detailed reviews and time for writing

### External Reviews

SSEPs decide when a proposal is ready to forward to SPC

SSEPs can discuss the review in summary (put in context if needed)

Quality of reviews is high in general

Review forms will be circulated to members after meeting for feedback

SSEPs should consider matching the SSEPs reviews with the questions on the external review forms

### Streamlining the process

Well written proposal minimum time is 2-3 years from submission to implementation

Conundrum: SPC wants only good proposals, SSEPs have no mechanism to kill proposals

Question: Can SSEPs be nurturing advocate and still remove poor proposals from the system ?

Number of cases is small

Sending out poor proposal for review can burden reviewers

Review proposals (poor or not) is the responsibility of the community

SSEPs should be a non-adversarial group

Wording of summary (suggest vs. must): be clear

Require brief cover letter from proponents addressing SSEPs comments for revision

Discussion question: Full proposals are to be rejected only after proposal has been externally reviewed and the proponents have submitted a letter responding to reviews.

Proposal from Shuffert to limit addenda at the SSEPs level to avoid problem of addenda + proposal going to review

- **Working group 2: SSEPs evaluations** (Grouping and optimum message to SPC)

### Voting

All panel members vote, but vote not required

### Ranking vs grouping

Proposal from working group

Not grouped by them

Not ranking one proposal against the other

Five point grouping scheme (Five = best)

Use 5 and 1 sparingly

Use distribution for cutoffs

Need language for categories (see attachment II)

Report category to SPC but not ranking

Extended discussion on not grouping at all vs. different scale vs. helping SPC as much as possible.

There was a short discussion about the length of watchdog presentations and putting time limits in the panel mandate. Decision was to have chairs to set time limit in agenda rather than mandate.

- **Working group 3: SSEPs structure** (Panel size ; liaisons ; alternates)

Panel size

Current 36 members (including 2 non-voting members) with four breakout sessions

Three panels for three themes of IODP science plan vs. one panel (so much crossover between ISSEP and ESSEP)

Fluid nature of number of breakouts is a positive and seen to work well at this meeting

General satisfaction with present meeting function

Concern about staffing from national committees with one panel, coordination among national committees: balance of expertise from each

Inclusion of higher contribution of European members + China (depending on when or if China joins IODP), could exceed 40 people

If panel size is reduced breakouts may not have required expertise

Through MOU minimum panel size must be 18 (7-US, 7-Japan, 4-Europe) by MOU: 2 panel minimum is 36; 3 panel minimum would be 54

Panel co-chair numbers with one panel? One from each national group-3? No mandated rules for balance except SPC and SSPOC chairs; flexibility: tradition: SSEP nominates co-chairs

Tentative conclusion: ~36 for panel with two panels ESSEP and ISSEP meeting jointly with commingled breakout groups for proposal discussion

Liaisons

Too many people at meetings, liaisons from within SAS, funding agencies, IOs

Co-chairs would like to invite who they want

No obligation/rules on liaisons except SSEPs chairs liaise to SPC

With 4 co-chairs could rotate responsibility (one from ISSEP, one from ESSEP

SSPOC will address liaisons from funding agencies and IOs).

Alternates

Alternates should have similar expertise

Should be selected in advance

Japan selects alternates for each member

USSAC members serve as alternates for other panelists in US

ECORD will select alternates for each member

- **Working group 4: SSEPs mandates** (SSEPs missions and goals).

Preserve mandate as it is currently written (removing “interim” from iSSEPs mandate)

Grouping or voting rules must be written into mandate (i.e., how are you making decisions on forwarding proposals to SPC. (see panel consensus from working group 2)

Process for making decisions (e.g., grouping) needs to be in the mandate

19:30 End of sessions

## Saturday, November 22

8:30 Joint SSEPs session : Working groups reports and general discussion.

- **WG 1: SSEPs reviewing processes** (Improve nurturing process and external review).
  - Donna Blackman PPT
  - Consensus Recommendations:
    - National programs can help with proposal writing by supporting educational workshops
    - Post general guidelines on SAS website
      - Best practices document-merged to current guideline
      - Examples of well written, successful proposals posted
  
- **Working group 2: SSEPs evaluations** (Grouping and optimum message to SPC).
  - Mike Underwood PPT
  - Consensus Recommendations:
    - Use five point (or star) grouping with five = highest and using 1 and 5 sparingly
    - SSEPs would like to communicate as much guidance as possible to SPC. In addition to grouping proposals, the SSEPs will submit a short narrative evaluation to SPC for each proposal that has been forwarded. The review will be a summary of the history of the proposal and an evaluation of the quality of the proposal.
  -
  
- **Working group 3 : SSEPs structure** (Panel size ; liaisons ; alternates).
  - Greg Ravizza

10:30 Coffee Break

10:50 Joint SSEPs session : Working groups reports and general discussion.

11:30 : Joint SSEPs session: Reviews

***537-CDP3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project***

***537A-Full3 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Stage 1***

***603-CDP3 NanTroSEIZE Overview***

12:30 Lunch

13:30 Joint SSEPs session: reviews

***603A-Full2 NanTroSEIZE Reference site***

***603B-Full2 NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults***

***552-Add Bengal Fan***

***628-Pre2 Mjolnir Crater***

14:45 Switch from Tectonics to Paleo Breakout review

***477-Full4 Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene***

***556-Full Malvinas Confluence***

15:30 Coffee Break

15:50 Joint SSEPs session: reviews  
*600-Full Canterbury Basin*  
*602-Full2 Tropical Epeiric Seas*  
*605-Full Asian Monsoon*  
*634-Pre Antarctic Circumpolar Current*  
*638-APL Adelie Drift*

18:00 End of joint SSEPs session

18:30 Working groups on SSEPs procedures and mandates:

- **WG-5 (grouping, proposal process, nurturing) : Brumsack, Devey, Filipelli, Flemings, Tokunaga Blackman, Kominz, Hasegawa.**
  - Consensus Recommendations:
    - National programs can help with proposal writing by supporting educational workshops
    - Making decisions : SSEPs will normally reach decisions by consensus. When consensus is not possible, decisions will be made by majority of all members. A quorum shall consist of at least 2/3 of the members. Members who are not comfortable voting for a proposal because of lack of expertise should abstain to maintain quorum.

### **Sunday, November 23**

8:30 : Joint SSEPs session: reviews  
*535-Full3 735B Deep*

9:00 : Joint SSEPs session :

- Working group 5 Report (grouping, proposal process, nurturing) Flemings
- Announcement on coming SSEPs Meeting  
**May 17-20**, with optional field trip on the 16<sup>th</sup>.  
Uncertainty in when the meeting will be because SPOCC is considering adding an additional (ranking) SPC meeting in June so OPCOM will have more time to schedule multiple platforms.

10:30 Coffee break

10:50 Joint SSEPs session : Reviews  
*620-Full Hotspot Seamounts*  
*623-Full Ontong Java Plateau*  
*636-Pre Louisville Seamounts*

12:15 Lunch

13:15 TAP/Project Scoping Group (Moran)

### Mandate

Advise SPC on matters related to technical developments to meet ISP. Not TEDCOM, this panel has a wide range of expertise from engineering to project management. The panel has provided advice to TAG II, Nankai, and Costa Rica proponents.

### Status

The panel has recommended more flexibility in coring and logging plans (i.e., no hard fast rules). The panel has also proposed ROVs be available on all platforms. Currently underway are evaluations of technology (e.g., in situ fluid recovery).

### Scoping

Project Task Group has been formed to utilize project management and define the scope of projects, particularly CDPs. Scoping includes describing a drilling project's operational activities, risk analysis, preliminary costs, etc. Has been started with CRISP and NantroSEIZE.

13:45 Joint SSEPs session : Reviews

*639-Pre Izu-Bonin Arc Crust*

*640-Pre Godzilla Mullion*

14:30 Joint SSEPs session : Grouping

15:00 Coffee Break

16:30 End of sessions

Meeting Attendees:

**ISSEP**

Arai, Shoji (co-Chair)  
Bach, Wolfgang (new member)  
Blackman, Donna  
Byrne, Tim (co-Chair)  
Devey, Colin  
Fulthorpe, Craig (new member)  
Henry, Pierre  
Kominz, Michelle  
Ogawa, Yujiro (new member)  
Ohara, Yasuhiko (new member)  
Pederson, Rolf (observer)  
Rosenberg, Nina  
Saffer, Damian (new member)  
Teagle, Damon  
Tokunaga, Tomochika  
Umino, Susumu (new member)  
Yamano, Makoto  
Ishikawa, Naoto (alternate for Yamakazi, Toshigutsu)

**ESSEP**

Brumsack, Hans  
Camoin, Gilbert (Chair)  
Edwards, Katrina  
Filippelli, Gabriel  
Flemings, Peter B.  
Ge, Shemin  
Hasegawa, Takashi (new member)  
Ito, Takashi (new member)  
Jordan, Rick (alternate to Hayashida, Akira)  
Kodama, Kazuto  
Naraoka, Hiroshi (alternate to Ishibashi, Jun-ichiro)  
Ohkouchi, Naohiko  
Ravelo, Christina  
Ravizza, Greg  
Thurow, Juergen (observer)  
Underwood, Mike (new member)  
Weissert, Helmut  
Yamamoto, Hiroyuki

**Liaisons and Guests**

Aoike, Kan, CDEX

Allan, Jamie, NSF  
Austin, Jamie, IMI  
Brown, George, Univ. Denver  
Coffin, Mike, SPC  
Divins, David, SCiMP  
Doust, Harry, ILP  
Droxler, André, SSP  
Eguchi, Nobuhisa, SAS  
Kimura, Kenji, MEXT  
Kuramoto, Shin'ichi, CDEX  
Malone, Mitchell, TAMU  
Miller, Jay, TAMU  
Moran, Kate, TAP  
Quinn, Terry, SPC  
Saito, Sanny, J-DESC  
Schuffert, Jeffrey, SAS



## **The JOI Alliance**

- JOI, LDEO, and TAMU responded to the NSF request for proposals seeking an implementing organization for the IODP non-riser platform with a single integrated proposal.
- The Alliance of JOI, TAMU, and LDEO will use an integrated, cross-functional, cross-organizational approach to provide clear roles and responsibilities for each component of the team.
- Six cross-organizational teams are being formed to address the IODP non-riser vessel operational and scientific needs. These teams consist of alliance members with expertise in systems integration, systems management, operations, technical development, information technology, and publications and education/outreach.
- Our objective is to substantially improve coordination, efficiency, and flexibility to address the evolving needs of the IODP community.
- Columbia and TAMU have made substantial institutional commitments to support and integrate IODP into the university communities, including resources for new educational and research initiatives at each university, 11 faculty positions, an endowed chair, and several post doctoral positions.
- At present TAMU is in the process of transition from ODP to IODP. This involves reorganizing to more efficiently meet the needs of the program and the expectations of the community.
- Frank Rack is the Director of Ocean Drilling Programs at JOI.

## **IODP funding**

- Costs are divided into platform operations costs (POCs) and science operations costs (SOCs)
- POCs for the non-riser ship are funded directly by NSF.
- Our initial working definition of POCs (pending minor modification and NSF approval) are costs associated with (1) safely making and completing a hole, (2) installation of subseafloor hardware and (3) safe delivery of core to the core lab. All other costs are SOCs.
- SOCs for all platforms are funded with co-mingled funds distributed via IODP Management International Inc. (IMI).

## **Expedition staffing**

- The IODP co-chief scientist agreement is in draft form, pending comments from SPC co-chairs. Invitations to co-chief scientists for Phase I expeditions will be issued as soon as the agreement is finalized.

- All applications for scientist participation should be submitted to the appropriate member country office. Nominations from each member country organization will be forwarded to the respective implementing organization, JOI Alliance for the non-riser vessel, ECORD Science Operator for mission-specific platforms, and CDEX for the riser vessel Chikyu. Staffing decisions for non-riser vessel expeditions will be made in consultation with co-chief scientists (process pending NSF approval).
- U.S. scientists now apply for participation through USSSP (not TAMU). Until NSF awards the contract for USSSP-IODP, JOI (USSSP-ODP) will coordinate staffing in consultation with USSAC. US applications are available at [http://www.joiscience.org/USSSP/CruiseApps/sailing\\_info.html](http://www.joiscience.org/USSSP/CruiseApps/sailing_info.html)

### **IODP Non-riser vessel schedule for Phase I**

Expedition	Port (Origin)	Dates	Total Days (Port/Sea)
Transit	Pusan	1 - 21 June '04	20 (2/18)
Juan de Fuca	Astoria	21 June - 24 Aug.	64 (6/58)
Transit	Acapulco	24 Aug. - 14 Sept.	21 (2/19)
North Atlantic 1	Bermuda	14 Sept.- 31 Oct.	47 (2/45)
MAR Core 1	Ponta Delgada	31 Oct. - 19 Dec.	49 (4/45)
MAR Core 2	Ponta Delgada	19 Dec. - 12 Feb. '05	55 (4/51)
North Atlantic 2	Ponta Delgada	12 Feb. - 7 April	54 (5/49)
Transit	Reykjavik	7 April - 25 April	18 (3/15)
Demobilization	Galveston	25 April - 17 May	22 (22/0)

Juan de Fuca- Juan de Fuca flank hydrogeology (proposal 545)

North Atlantic 1- Late Neogene-Quaternary climate (proposal 572)

MAR Core (1&2) – Oceanic core complex (proposal 512)

North Atlantic 2 – Cork Hole 642E (proposal 543) and

Late Neogene-Quaternary climate (proposal 572)

Expedition order and number of operation days are fixed.

Start date and location of the initial transit are to be finalized.

Phase II – The JOI Alliance will issue a Drilling Market Survey and an Invitation to Tender to drilling vessel owners in the near future and will develop an RFP for the Phase II vessel in consultation with NSF at the appropriate time.