Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the
Science Steering and Evaluation Panels for the
Dynamics of Earth's Environment (ESSEP) and Earth's Interior (ISSEP)

May 17-20, 2004, Universidad de Granada (Spain)

Excutive summary :

Joint Session, Liaison Reports

MEXT report

Kimura-san presented an update on funding and international participation in IODP and gave the last news regarding MEXT activities.

SPC, SPPOC & OPCOM reports

Mike Coffin presented the updated IODP schedule for FY'04, '05 and '06. He discussed the new Conflict of Interest rules decided by the SPPOC and indicated that the SSEPs will keep the rules applied during the last years. He reported on the last SPC meeting, including the recommendation to OPCOM to split Proposal 519 South Pacific Sea Level into two MSP expeditions, the forwarding of Proposal 641-APL Costa Rica CORK-II to the OPCOM, the approval of SSEPs recommendation 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 to forward them to the OPCOM, the updated plans regarding IODP publications and . Finally, Mike summarized the OPCOM decisions to schedule the Costa Rica Hydrogeology APL for FY'04 and the South Pacific Sea Level (Part I - Tahiti) for FY'05.

Summary of SAS panel activities and relationships (ILP, TAP, SciMP, SSP, PPSP now EPSP)

Tim Byrne presented the general purpose (mandate) and membership of SAS panels.

SSEPs report to the SPC, Washington March'04 and SSEPs mandates

Gilbert Camoin presented the SSEPs report given at the March'04 SPC meeting and presented the changes to the SSEPs mandates proposed by the SSEPs co-Chairs at that meeting.

JOI Alliance report

Mitch Malone presented an overview of JOI Alliance activities and summarized the updated schedule for the riserless vessel from June 2004 to June 2005 and the nominated co-chiefs for the relevant expeditions, the operational aspects of the North Atlantic I & II and North Atlantic II CORK expeditions and the organization of the science parties for the Core Complex and North Atlantic expeditions.

CDEX report : Kuramoto

Kuramoto-san provided an update on the Chikyu and JAMSTEC.

ESO report : Brewer

Tim Brewer summarized the roles of ESO (European Science Operator), presented the operational aspects (fleet, drilling plans, borehole geophysics and petrophysics) of the Arctic Coring Expedition planned for August-September 2004 and the relevant ESO activities, summarized the organization of the offshore and onshore science parties and gave some insights on the Tahiti expedition which is planned in 2005.

IMI-Sapporo Office report : Eguchi

Eguchi-san presented the new IODP-MI offices in Sapporo, summarized the activities of IMI-Sapporo Office and presented the Staff before updating the status of active proposals and reporting on the scheduling of the forthcoming SAS meetings.

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, external review forms and the evaluation of proposal pressure vs the ISP. Summaries of the outcome and recommendations from each working group are included in the body of this report. Panel members were subdivided into three 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 worked quite well with active discussions of the merits of proposals and how proposals might be developed. The 5-star grouping of the proposals forwarded to the SPC was obtained by consensus.

Next SSEPs meeting: The November 2004 SSEP meeting will be held November 15-18 either in Okinawa (Japan) or in Kochi (Japan). Hiroki Yamamoto will host the meeting. A field trip is planned.

Monday, May 17

8:30 : Joint Session, Reports

1. Introductory Remarks

Gilbert Camoin opened the Second meeting of the Scientific Steering and Evaluation Panels.

The co-Chairs, Shoji Arai, Tim Byrne and Gilbert Camoin thanked the hosts Menchu Comas and Juan Carlos Braga for the excellent arrangements for the meeting ; the panels are also grateful to Bridget Chisholm, of the JOI office, for her help in arranging the meeting.

They thanked Juan Carlos Braga, the field trip leader, for the organization of an oustanding one-day field trip on Miocene reefs and evaporites from the Sorbas Basin.

After introduction of panel members, liaisons, and guests, the minutes of the Boulder meeting and the agenda of the present meeting were approved, Menchu Comas and Juan Carlos Braga offered some information on local logistics of the meeting.

2. MEXT report : Kimura

Kimura-san presented an update on funding and international participation in IODP and gave the last news regarding MEXT activities. He noticed that ECORD is now a contributing member and that China became an associate member through its Ministry of Science and Technology.

3. SPC, SPPOC & OPCOM reports : Coffin

Mike Coffin presented the updated IODP schedule for FY'04, '05 and '06 and noticed that there is a possibility to plan one cheap non-riser expedition in '06. He then summarized the membership for all SAS panels : 7 Japanese, 7 Americans, 4 ECORD (including 1 non-voting) and 1 Chinese in the following panels : SSEPs, SciMP, SSP and ILP (voting); SPC, TAP (non-voting); SPPOC, PPSP (observer); more than 150 scientists are involved in the SAS panels. Mike Coffin also noticed that 3 Chinese scientists will sail on IODP expeditions.

- SPPOC : Mike Coffin reported on the SPPOC meeting held in San Francisco on december 5 and 6, 2003. The major outcomes of that meeting include :

- The transfer of OPCOM responsibilities from the SAS to the IMI, with the IMI vice president for science operations serving as the chair of the OPCOM.
- The approval of the IODP Program Plan for FY2004 and the requests for an FY2005 Program Plan for consideration at its July 2004 meeting and an FY2006 Program Plan for consideration at its December 2004 meeting.
- The establishement of an *Ad hoc* Committee-1 including three SPPOC members (one serving as chair) *[McKenzie (chair), Delaney, Tsuji]*, the SPC chair *[Coffin]*, and the IMI vice president for science planning *[Larsen]*, to evaluate the current IODP Science Advisory Structure and modify it in light of the IMI requests issued on and after 2 October 2003.
- The establishment of an *Ad hoc* Committee-2, including the SPPOC *[Fukao (chair), Le Pichon, Rea]*, the SPC *[Becker, Coffin, Ildefonse]*, and SAS panel members, to recommend a conflict of interest policy for the IODP Science Advisory Structure.
- The acceptance of the SPC Consensus 03-09-44 on the handling of proposals irrespective of the nationalities of the proponents.

- The direction to the IODP Science Advisory Structure to consider only proposals that require ocean drilling or drilling related capabilities.
- The discussion of new Conflict of Interest rules for SAS panels. Mike Coffin noticed that after SSEPs co-Chairs' reactions, those rules were modified for the SSEPs :
    (1) SSEPs members who are proponents/co-proponents of active proposals are to be excluded from discussions of the specific proposal/s on which they are proponents/co-proponents. They can participate in the discussion of all other proposals, including serving as watchdogs.
    (2) These SSEPs members can participate in the grouping of proposals for transmission to SPC, with these members indicating their conflicts and the chair/s keeping a record of these conflicts.
    (3) The chair/s should clearly announce and document all conflicts of interest and resulting recusals, including in the minutes. The chair/s retain the paper ballots from the grouping exercise to document adherence to the COI policy.

- SPC : Mike Coffin reported on the March'04 SPC meeting and presented the forthcoming meetings including the 14-17 June'04 meeting (with ranking) in Yokohama, the 24-27 October'04 meeting in Corvallis and the March'05 meeting (with ranking) in Lisbon. The major outcomes of the March'04 are the following :

- The acceptance of the project management system report as a framework for further development of an IODP project management system, in consultation with SAS representatives.
- The establishment of a working group to evaluate the current IODP Science Advisory Structure
- The establishment of 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 recommendation to OPCOM to split Proposal 519 South Pacific Sea Level into two MSP expeditions, the Tahiti component being considered for scheduling in FY2005.
- The forwarding of 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.
- The request that the OPCOM determines the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity for Proposal 595-Full3 Indus Fan and Murray Ridge.
- The approval of the SSEPs recommendation 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 to forward them to the OPCOM to determine the required level of scoping activity and initiate that activity.
- The recommendation 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.
- The recommendation 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.

- IODP publications. 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.

- OPCOM : Mike Coffin summarized the outcomes of the April'04 OPCOM held in Washington DC where the SAS representation included Mike Coffin (SPC Chair), Keir Becker (SPC Vice-Chair) and Jeroen Kenter (SPC member, ESSAC Chair). He reported on OPCOM decisions to schedule the following expeditions :

- FY04: Costa Rica Hydrogeology APL
- FY05: South Pacific Sea Level (Part I - Tahiti)

and to establish a NanTroSEIZE Scoping Group.

Unscheduled proposals include : 519-Full2 South Pacific Sea Level (Part II - Great Barrier Reef), 564-Full New Jersey Shelf, 589-Full3 Gulf of Mexico Overpressures, 545-Full3 Juan de Fuca Ridge Flank Hydrogeology (Part II).

Mike Coffin ended his talk by presenting the Staff of the IODP Management International, Inc. (IMI) (official Inception: 1st April 2004) :

President (Washington) :
Prof. Manik Talwani (mtalwani@iodp.org)
Vice-President for Science Operations (Washington) :
Dr. Tom Janecek (tjanecek@iodp.org)
Vice-President for Science Planning (Sapporo) :
Dr. Hans Christian Larsen (larsenhc@cris.hokudai.ac.jp)
Science Coodinators (Sapporo) :
Drs. Nobu Eguchi and Jeff Schuffert (imi-sp@cris.hokudai.ac.jp)

Questions from the meeting attendees concerned the expedition designation, the membership for the science parties and the nationalities of co-chiefs.

4. Summary of SAS panel activities and relationships (ILP, TAP, SciMP, SSP, PPSP now EPSP) : Byrne

Tim Byrne presented the general purpose (mandate) and membership of SAS panels.

- Industry Liaison Panel (ILP) purposes :

- To develop links and identify barriers between academic and industry scientists,
- To develop mechanisms for sharing industry data, expertise and resources,
- To act as the liaison for IODP to industry and promote IODP educational and

outreach activities within industry,

- To assist with the identification of scientists and engineers from industry to serve on panels, committees and working groups of IODP as needed.
- To define industrial priority research within the IODP context and facilitate communication and cooperative scientific and technical development activities between IODP and industry

- Technology Advisory Panel (TAP) purposes:

To advise the SPC on matters related to the technological developments necessary to meet the scientific objectives of the IODP Initial Science Plan.

- Scientific Measurements Panel (SciMP) purposes :

To contribute information and advice to the IODP community through the SPC with regard to the handling of IODP data and information, on methods and techniques of IODP measurements, on laboratory design, portable laboratory needs and downhole measurements and experiments.

- Site Survey Panel (SSP) purposes :

- To review the site survey data packages prepared by the IODP Site Survey Data Bank.
- To verify the data quality and identify the data gaps for each proposed IODP expedition.
- To make recommendations regarding the degree of completeness of each drill site package to the SPC and the proponents.
- To provide early guidance to the proponents and different IODP panels regarding the necessary site characterization data.
- To examine and encourage opportunities for the use of new site survey technologies.
- To foster cooperation and coordination for site survey data acquisition.

- Pollution Prevention and Safety (PPSP) now Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP) purposes :

To advise on safety requirements and appropriate technology needed to meet these requirements. The EPSP independently reviews each site to determine if and how drilling operations can be conducted safely.

The panel may recommend :

- approval as proposed,
- amendment of a site with respect to location and/or depth
- specific drilling order or drilling platform for an expedition,
- the acquisition of additional data
- denying approval.

Tim Byrne ended his presentation by presenting the benchmarks in Drilling Project Management and raised the question of the role that the SSEPs should play in multi-expedition projects.

5. SSEPs report to the SPC, Washington March'04 and SSEPs mandates : Camoin

Gilbert Camoin presented the SSEPs report that he gave at the March'04 meeting of the SPC. This report included both the conclusions of the working groups organized at the November'03 meeting of the SSEPs and subsequent discussions between SSEPs co-Chairs on the following topics :

- Reviewing processes (guidelines for proposal writing, external reviews, watchdogs, streamlining the process)

- SSEPs structure (number and size of the panels, alternates);
- "Messages" to the SPC (grouping proposals, final review).

Many of these topics were listed in the agenda of the working groups organized at the present meeting for further condideration.

He then presented the changes to the SSEPs mandates proposed by the SSEPs co-Chairs at the March'04 SPC meeting. The draft of the updated version of the SSEPs mandates was distributed to all panel members.

6. JOI Alliance report : Malone

Mitch Malone summarized the updated schedule for the riserless vessel from June 2004 to June 2005 and the nominated co-chiefs for the relevant expeditions :

- Juan de Fuca : 27 June-21 August (co-chiefs : Andrew Fisher and Testuro Urabe);
- Costa-Rica Hydrogeology : 21 August-22 September (co-chiefs : TBN);
- North Atlantic Climate 1 : 22 September-14 November (co-chiefs : James Channell and Tokiyuki Sato);
- Oceanic Core Complex 1 : 14 November-5 January '05 (co-chiefs : Chris MacLeod and Barbara John);
- Oceanic Core Complex 2 : 5 January-27 February (co-chiefs : Donna Blackman and Yasuhoko Ohara);
- North Atlantic Climate 2 : 27 February-22 April (co-chiefs : Rudiger Stein and Toshiya Kanamatsu).

Mitch Malone then presented the operational aspects of the North Atlantic I & II and North Atlantic II CORK expeditions and updated the status of the staffing (Juan de Fuca is complete, NAC I, OCC I and OCC II are in progress, NAC II will be organized this summer). He noticed that technical exchanges exist among the IOs :one CDEX LO (Takamitsu Sugihara) will sail on Juan de Fuca and discussions with ESO through the BGS were initiated.

He also presented the organization of the science parties for the Core Complex and North Atlantic expeditions.

He ended his talk with the presentation of the phase 2 activities of the JOI Alliance and the proposed outreach to stakeholders :

- Sollicit comments from SAS (via IODP-MI) on the design document(s) for the onboard science capability of the U.S. SODV;
- invite selected members of the science community to review and provide comments on the ITT responses;
- invite selected individuals from USSAC and/or SCIMP to serve as community representatives on each of the design teams tasked with planning the onboard science capability for the U.S. SODV;
- hold, as appropriate, "town meetings" and/or provide updates at appropriate SAS or USSAC panel meetings;
- disseminate information via the MREFC-SODV web site (http://www.joialliance.org);
- invite the USSAC chair, or delegate to serve as a nonvoting member on the U.S. Scientific Ocean Drilling Vessel (SODV) selection team.

7. CDEX report : Kuramoto

Kuramoto-san provided an update on the Chikyu and JAMSTEC. He indicated that JAMSTEC changed its name (but not its acronym) which is now : Japan Agency for Marine Earth Science and Technology.

For the Chikyu, schedule has April 2005 delivery to CDEX. Shakedown will 1.5 yr. October 2006 delivery to IODP. The derrick (80 m) was installed in September 2003. Most

cabins are single occupancy. Four decks of labs. CT scanner and XRF scanner have been installed.

8. ESO report : Brewer

Tim Brewer summarized the roles of ESO (European Science Operator) which is the Primary MSP implementing organisation (IO) for IODP and formed to undertake Mission Specific Platform (MSP) operations for IODP on behalf of ECORD. ECORD includes three components :

- The British Geological Survey that ensures the ESO Co-ordination and that is responsible for operational, scientific and data managements.
- The University of Bremen which has the responsibility for the management of curation and laboratory facilities, the onshore science parties, the provision of core repository and data management services.
- The European Petrophysics Consortium (University of Leicester – Co-ordinator, Université de Montpellier, RWTH Aachen University, Vreije University of Amsterdam- which is in charge of the management and the provision of logging and petrophysical services.

Tim Brewer then indicated that the projects will be allocated to MSPs according to scientific ranking by the IODP SAS. The three projects considered at the moment are the following :

- Lomonosov Ridge, Arctic Ocean, previously ranked n°1, now in implementation stage and planned for August-September 2004.
- Tahiti and Great Barrier Reef (Proposal 519), newly ranked n°1 and planned for 2005.
- New Jersey Margin (Proposal 564), newly ranked n°4.

He then presented the operational aspects (fleet, drilling plans, borehole geophysics and petrophysics) of the Arctic Coring Expedition planned for August-September 2004 and the relevant ESO activities. He summarized the organization of the offshore and onshore science parties (total of 29 members including co-chiefs), the starting of the onshore science party being scheduled on the 1st of November 2004.

Finally, Tim Brewer gave some insights on the Tahiti expedition which is planned in 2005, including results of the first meeting between ESO and the first proponent. He then concluded that ESO looks forward to help scientists achieve their objectives through MSP drilling.

9. IMI-Sapporo Office report : Eguchi

Eguchi-san presented the new IODP-MI offices in Sapporo, summarized the activities of IMI-Sapporo Office and presented the Staff.

He then presented the list of proposals received for the April 1st 2004 deadline and reported on the status of active proposals. There are 114 active proposals in the system. With respect to the ISP broad scientific themes, these 114 active proposals are distributed as follows : Environment : 57 (50 %), Deep Biosphere : 25 (22 %), Solid Earth : 32 (28 %).

With respect to their status, these 114 active proposals are distributed as follows : Full 5: 2 (2 %), Full 4: 5 (4 %), Full 3: 14 (12 %), Full 2: 23 (20 %), Full: 26 (23 %), CDP: 2 (2 %), APL: 1 (1 %), Pre: 33 (29 %), Pre-2: 7 (6 %), Rev3: 1 (1%).

Among these proposals 12 were ranked by SPC but not scheduled, 2 are ready for ranking, 72 are not ready for ranking and 28 not ready for reviewing.

Eguchi-san presented a map of proposed IODP sites.

Finally, Eguchi-san briefly reported on the scheduling of the forthcoming SAS meetings :

- SPC : Yokohama (June 14-17) ;
- SciMP : Boston (June 23-25) ;
- EPSP : College Station (June 21-22) ;
- TAP : Nagasaki (June 29-July 1) ;
- SPPOC : Paris (July 7-9) ;
- SSP : Palisades (August 2-4).

Eguchi-san raised the question of proposals that were not reactivated during the last three years and Mike Coffin that of the time limit for the proposals ranked but not scheduled by the SPC. The SSEPs co-Chairs proposed to organize two working groups on those issues at the SSEPs Fall meeting and to report to the SPC at its March'05 meeting.

10. Introduction to the meeting : Proposals, Conflict of interest rules. Breakout sessions. Working groups.

Gilbert Camoin presented the general agenda of the meeting and presented the status of the proposals to be reviewed : 10 externally reviewed proposals, 14 new and revised full proposals and 9 new and revised pre-proposals. The panel responsabilities are the following : 3 E proposals, 12 E/I proposals, 14 I/E proposals and 4 I proposals. He then introduced the breakout sessions by listing the proposals to be considered in each of them (see below). Finally, he presented the three working groups organized for Tuesday May 18th (see below).

Before starting with the reviewing processes, Gilbert Camoin reviewed the conflict of interest rules and confidentiality requirements prior to the start of proposal reviews :

- If any panel member has any interest that might be affected by, or might reasonably be perceived to be affected by, any action under consideration, such member is required to declare the existence of such interest to the Chair.
- Conflicted proponents and/or their collaborators will be excluded from being in the room during discussion and grouping of their proposal.
- SSEP members at the same institutions as a proponent must identify themselves to the SSEP chairs prior to review discussions.
- All declared or proposed possible conflicts of interest, and the actions taken, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

During the review meetings (May 17-20) the panels considered the following proposals:

Externally reviewed proposals :

Proposal N°	Title	Lead proponent
477-Full4	Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene	Takahashi
505-Full5	Mariana Convergent Margin	Fryer
537-CDP3	CRISP CDP	von Huene
537A-Full3	CRISP Stage 1	Vannucchi
552-Add	Bengal Fan	France-Lanord
600-Full	Canterbury Basin	Fulthorpe
603-CDP3	NanTroSEIZE Overview	Kimura (Tobin)
603A-Full2 (*)	NanTroSEIZE Reference Sites	Underwood
603B-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults	Kinoshita
621-Full	Monterey Bay Observatory	McNutt (Paull)

New and revised full proposals :

Proposal N°	Title	Lead proponent
537B-Full	CRISP Stage 2	Ranero
537-CDP4	CRISP CDP	vonHuene
549-Full5	Northern Arabian Sea Monsoon	Lueckge
601-Full	Iheya Ridge	Takai
603C-Full	NanTroSEIZE Phase 3: Plate Interface	Suyehiro (Tobin)
604-Full	Ulleung Basin	Lee
612-Full2	Geodynamo	Yamazaki
618-Full2	East Asia Margin	Clift
620-Full2	Hotspot Seamounts	Sager
623-Full2	Ontong Java Plateau	Neal
626-Full2	Pacific Equatorial Age Transect	Paelike
633-Full	Middle America Slope	Brueckmann
636-Full	Louisville Seamount Trail	Koppers
648-Full	Big Blue Seamount	Fryer

New and revised pre-proposals :

Proposal N°	Title	Lead proponent
603D-Pre	NanTroSEIZE Observatories	Screaton
617-Pre2	Hudson Bay and Strait	White
639-Pre2	Izu-Bonin Arc Crust	Tamura
643-Pre	Okinawa Trough - Ryukyu Forarc	Wei
644-Pre	Gulf of Cadiz	Molina
645-Pre	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat
646-Pre	Iceland Hotspot	Murton
647-Pre	Lisbon Seismogenic Zone Experiment	Gutscher
649-Pre	Portuguese Submarine Canyons	Lebreiro

The conflict of interest rules and confidentiality requirements have been respected during the whole review procedure (breakout sessions, general sessions and grouping). The table below lists the conflicting SSEPs members, liaisons and guests who left the room during the review of the relevant proposals.

Proposal N°	Title	Lead proponent	Conflicting attendees
477-Full4	Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene	Takahashi	Ravelo
537-CDP3	CRISP CDP	von Huene	Fulthorpe
537A-Full3	CRISP Stage 1	Vannucchi	Fulthorpe
600-Full	Canterbury Basin	Fulthorpe	Fulthorpe, Kominz
603-CDP3	NanTroSEIZE Overview	Kimura (Tobin)	Henry, Saffer, Underwood, Yamano

603A-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Reference Sites	Underwood	Henry, Saffer, Underwood, Yamano
603B-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults	Kinoshita	Henry, Saffer, Underwood, Yamano
537B-Full	CRISP Stage 2	Ranero	Kuramoto
537-CDP4	CRISP CDP	vonHuene	Fulthorpe
601-Full	Iheya Ridge	Takai	Ishibashi
603C-Full	NanTroSEIZE Phase 3	Suyehiro (Tobin)	Henry, Saffer
603D-Pre	NanTroSEIZE Observatories	Screaton	Saffer, Underwood
612-Full2	Geodynamo	Yamazaki	Yamazaki
623-Full2	Ontong Java Plateau	Neal	Coffin, Ohkouchi, Ravizza
636-Full	Louisville Seamount Trail	Koppers	Norris
639-Pre2	Izu-Bonin Arc Crust	Tamura	Yamazaki, Ishibashi
644-Pre	Gulf of Cadiz	Molina	Escutia
645-Pre	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat	Stein
646-Pre	Iceland Hotspot	Murton	Searle

The procedure included both reviews in breakout sessions and in joint sessions.
5 watchdogs have been nominated for each of the proposals of joint interest : 2 (iESSEP)/3 (iISSEP) for E/I proposals, 3 (iESSEP)/2 (iISSEP) for I/E proposals. For the I-only and E-only proposals, a watchdog of the other panel has been nominated.

The SSEPs dispositions for the proposals reviewed at that meeting are reported in the attachment n°1.

14:00 : Breakout sessions

- **Seismogenic zones** (Chair : T. Byrne)

537-CDP3	Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project	von Huene
537-CDP4	Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project	vonHuene
537A-Full3	Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Stage 1	Vannucchi
537B-Full	Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Stage 2	Ranero
603-CDP3	NanTroSEIZE Overview	Kimura (Tobin)
603A-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Reference Sites	Underwood
603B-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults	Kinoshita
603C-Full	NanTroSEIZE Phase 3: Plate Interface	Suyehiro (Tobin)
603D-Pre	NanTroSEIZE Observatories	Screaton
647-Pre	Lisbon Seismogenic Zone Experiment	Gutscher

SSEPs members :

ESSEP : Hine, Kodama, Ito, Hayashida, Ishibashi, Ge, Underwood (except for 603 CDP and Full proposals), Norris.

ISSEP : Blackman, Pedersen, Tokunaga, Rosenberg, Ogawa, Fulthorpe (except for 537 CDP and Full proposals), Saffer (except for 603 CDP and Full proposals) Henry (except for 603 CDP and Full proposals), Ertzinger, Yamazaki

- **Solid Earth & Geodynamics and Fluid flows/Deep Biosphere (**Chair : S. Arai)

Fluid flows and Deep Biosphere :

505-Full5	Mariana Convergent Margin	Fryer
601-Full	Iheya Ridge	Takai
621-Full	Monterey Bay Observatory	McNutt (Paull)
633-Full	Middle America Slope	Brueckmann
648-Full	Big Blue Seamount	Fryer

Solid Earth :

612-Full2	Geodynamo	Yamazaki
620-Full2	Hotspot Seamounts	Sager
623-Full2	Ontong Java Plateau	Neal
636-Full	Louisville Seamount Trail	Koppers
639-Pre2	Izu-Bonin Arc Crust	Tamura
646-Pre	Iceland Hotspot	Murton

SSEPs members :

ESSEP : Ge, Underwood, Yamamoto, Ishibashi (except for 601-Full), Kodama, Ito, Hayashida, Weissert.

ISSEP : Teagle, Yamano, Ohara, Umino, Henry, Yamazaki (except for 612-Full2 and 639-Pre2), Ertzinger, Rosenberg, Kominz, Blackman, Saffer.

- **Palaeoceanography/Palaeoclimatology and Climate-Tectonic links** (Chair : G. Camoin)

Paleoceanography/Paleoclimatology :

477-Full4	Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene	Takahashi
549-Full5	Northern Arabian Sea Monsoon	Lueckge
600-Full	Canterbury Basin	Fulthorpe
617-Pre2	Hudson Bay and Strait	White
626-Full2	Pacific Equatorial Age Transect	Paelike
643-Pre	Okinawa Trough - Ryukyu Forarc	Wei
644-Pre	Gulf of Cadiz	Molina
645-Pre	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat
649-Pre	Portuguese Submarine Canyons	Lebreiro

Tectonic-Climate links :

552-Add	Bengal Fan	France-Lanord
604-Full	Ulleung Basin	Lee
618-Full2	East Asia Margin	Clift

SSEPs members :

ESSEP : Ravelo (except for 477-Full4), Filippelli, Ravizza, Ohkouchi, Thurow, Norris, Stein (except for 645-Pre), Hasegawa, Weissert, Hine.

ISSEP : Kominz (except for 600-Full), Ogawa, Ertzinger, Pedersen, Fulthorpe (except for 600-Full).

The breakout sessions ended at 19:00.

Tuesday, May 18

8:30 : Breakout sessions (cont.)

The breakout sessions ended at 17:00

17:30 : Working groups :

- **Working group 1** (Chair : D. Teagle)

Themes :

* What areas ("topics)" are well –represented by current proposals ?
* What areas are not well represented ?
* What can be done to engage a broader scientific community in scientific drilling ?

Members : Arai-san, Norris, Rosenberg, Fulthorpe, Brewer, Ravizza, Weissert, Blackman, Teagle, Stein, Ishibashi-san, Given, Iturrino

- **Working Group 2** (Chair : G. Filippelli)

Theme : SSEPs reviewing procedures.

Members : Filippelli, Ohkouchi-san, Umino-san, Ohara-san, Hayashida-san, Pedersen, Kominz, Erzinger, Camoin

- **Working Group 3** (Chair : T. Byrne)

Theme : Review of the external review forms and SSEPs grouping.

Members : Underwood, Saffer, Tokunaga-san, Ravelo, Hine, Henry, Ogawa-san, Hasagawa-san, Ito-san, Thurow, Yamano-san, Ge, Byrne

The working group sessions ended at 19:30.

Wednesday, May 19

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

- **WG 1** :

Damon Teagle reported on the conclusions of the working group concerning the three questions discussed :

* **What areas ("topics)" are well –represented by current proposals** ?

Based on recent and future cruises and submitted proposals, the working group identified the following "areas" as well represented :

- Slow spreading ridges / core complexes (735B, ODP 209, IODP 3 and 4);
- Gas hydrates;
- Extreme climates (Legs 198, 198, 207, 208);
- Seismogenic Zone;
- Gateways;
- Ocean basement hydrology

* **What areas are not well represented** ?

Based on recent and future cruises and submitted proposals, the working group identified the following "areas" as not well represented :

- Accretion of the lower oceanic crust at fast spreading rates;
- Arcs and Back Arc Basins;
- Evolution of ocean crust and chemical cycles;
- Zero Age crust / Hydrothermal systems;
- Active Experiments;
- Hydrothermal/hydrates/hydrology/microbes/geophysics
- High latitude paleo-oceanography (large amplitude signals);
- Extreme high resolution paleoceanography (e.g., Sannich Is, Santa Barbara Basin);
- Epicontinental Seas (modern analogs of ancient shallow water);

- Mesozoic paleoceanography;
- Structure and Tectonics (Alpine Tectonics?);
- Whole Earth Geodynamics / Observatories;

The working group also noticed the scarcity of proposals involving industry links.

On geographical grounds, the following regions appear as being not enough considered : Southern Pacific, Southern Ocean, Southern Atlantic, Indian ocean, Mediterranean sea and adjacent seas (Black Sea, Marmara Sea, Red Sea). Furthermore, in a broader sense, shallow-water settings should deserve more attention.

The reasons of the scarcity of proposals and poor development of these themes are possibly related to :

- technological problems (e.g. difficulty of tool development : Hi-T; Zero-Age; diamond coring; hard rock : chert, reefs, MORB; active real-time sensors; holes as laboratories; memory tools). The working group sees this problem as being international and that a co-ordinated approach is needed including the organization of international workshops with links between Engineering , Science and Industry and the necessity to pool funds.
- The acquisition of site survey data that appears also as an international will be solved by a co-ordinated approach; the working group felt that panel recommendations to the funding bodies would be needed and that the Site Survey Panel could be more pro-active and mentoring.

* **What can be done to engage a broader scientific community in scientific drilling ?**

The working group felt that the Program Plannning Groups were efficient structures in the past (with the example of the « Extreme Climates » PPG). It recommended the organization of both inclusive, international thematic working groups and thematic science meetings that could be co-sponsored by IODP.

The working group also recommended a direct mentoring of proponents and proposals, international exchanges (PhD, Post-Doc, Sabbatical) inside and outside member states, to provide the classic teaching aids and to increase the outreach to Joe-Public (e.g. NASA, Alvin - National Geographic etc).

- **<u>WG 2</u>**

Gabe Filippelli reported on the conclusions of this working group which debated on Proposal handling/procedures including the following topics : Addenda, APLs, Pre-Proposals, Full proposal rejection criteria, Review format for proposals forwarded to SPC.

* **Addenda** : Addenda are additions in response to specific request from the panels. They are packaged with a revised full proposal to SPC, perhaps as a historic legacy of paper copy distribution. The working group found that this procedure may be confusing and allow violation of page limit.

It is suggested that the SSEPs no longer accept addenda and recommended that a new process be considered. Additions to a proposal should be submitted in a revised version of the proposal. This will enhance balance and full consideration at the SPC level and will necessitate unbiased view toward relatively high proposal numbers. It was noticed that if SPC wishes to send a revised proposal back to SSEPs they may do so; in this case it will be a revised proposal.

* **Ancillary Project Letters** : APL are add-ons to scheduled legs. Some of them have been extremely successful (e.g., Santa Barbara Basin, Palmer Deep).

It is suggested that the scientific review of the APLs be conducted by the SSEPs. The SSEPs understand that time factors may require an alternate review scheme (i.e., electronic review by a SSEPs subcommittee) be employed in some cases. The SSEPs review will consist of a recommendation and justification for the SPC to consider.

* **Pre-proposals** : Some proposals come in as Full proposals with little possibility of efficiently handling in terms of ISP because of review process.

It is suggested that all newly submitted proposals be submitted and/or considered as Pre-proposals, except CDPs. The SSEPs recommend that the National Committees notify community that all new proposals will be considered pre-proposals, following SAS guidelines; subsequent format recommendations of SSEPs must then be followed.

* **Rejecting proposals** : The rejection of the proposals is part of the nurturing processes. It is suggested that the proposals may be rejected at the pre-proposal level by the SSEPs; only 2 versions of a pre-proposal will be considered by the SSEPs. It is suggested that the full proposals can be removed from the review process only after the proposal has been externally reviewed and the proponents have submitted a letter responding to the external reviews (i.e., a PRL).

* **Final Review format** : The SSEPs feel that the SPC should be informed as clearly as possible about the scientific assessment of a proposal that they receive. Some problem exist from inconsistent review format and sometimes inadequate summary of total package, including previous versions of SSEP and external reviews.

It is suggested that the final review from the SSEPs may include both a review of the current version of the proposal and an additional general review including information and recommendations to the SPC. This final review would mark the end of the SSEPs nurturing process and should not require a PRL from the proponents.

The final form, written by watchdogs and co-chairs, with help from other SSEPs members, might be of the structure:

a. Overall objective;
b. Simple history;
c. Relevance to ISP;
d. General impression on past successive reviews (SSEPs, external);
e. Strengths and challenges of final proposal as it stands;

The SSEPs feel that this final review will provide clear guidance and more straightforward reviews at the SPC level. It will also allow the summary of previous external reviews not included in package.

All of the final review is transmitted to proponents. Final rating is not, but must be consistent with written review. A PRL will not be explicitly invited, but if submitted, would go to the SPC not to SSEPs.

- **WG 3** :

Tim Byrne reported on the activities of the working group 3 which discussed the review of the external review forms and the SSEPs grouping.

* External review forms : the working group critically reviewed those forms. It has been noted that questions to be sent to external reviewers should be shared with proponents. A

revised version of those forms was presented in general session by Mike Underwood on Thursday May 20. The co-Chairs decided to send this revised version by email to all panel members for additional discussions and comments.

* SSEPs grouping : The major objective was to provide a definition of the "star grouping" that was introduced at the Fall '03 SSEPs meeting held in Boulder. An example from U.S. National Science Foundation proposal review process was provided as a working document :

- Five Stars – Excellent : Outstanding proposal in all respects; deserves highest priority for support.
- Four Stars - Very Good : High quality proposal in nearly all respects; should be supported if at all possible.
- Three Stars – Good : A quality proposal, worthy of support.
- Two Stars – Fair : Proposal lacking in one or more critical aspects; key issues need to be addressed.
- One Star – Poor : Proposal has serious deficiencies.

No consensus was reached on those definitions and the working group considered that this system is not appropriate.

Hasegawa-san presented the evaluation system for students (crediting) in universities which may represent the best analogy for Japanese system with the 5-star rating :

- "Five" nearly equivalent with "優 You (excellent)"
- "Four" with "良 Ryou (good)"
- "Three" with "可 Ka (fair)"
- "Two" with "可 Fuka (bad)"
- "One" with "棄 Houki (abandoned)"

Based on that system, he noticed that we should draw a clear boundary between three and two stars : three stars and above meaning that it is worth to drill those proposals but we should send clear reason why it is three or five stars as a written message to SPC; two or one stars may exist when we don't want to schedule it but intend to remove it from the system.

A consensus was reached among the panel members to maintain the 5-star grouping as a priority scale, with "5 stars" representing the very highest priority; 5 stars and 1 star will be used sparingly. The clarification of SSEPs recommendation should be in the review but the star grouping is for SPC only.

11:15 : Joint SSEPs session : reviews

The panel sessions ended at 18:30.

Thursday, May 20

8:30 : Joint SSEPs session

- Reviews (cont.).

The reviews ended at 16:00.

- Election of incoming co-Chair :

As indicated in the draft of the SSEPs mandates presented by the SSEPs co-Chairs at the Spring'04 SPC meeting, the SSEPs co-Chairs should be nominated by the SSEPs membership and approved by SPC.

It was decided by consensus to nominate the incoming SSEPs co-Chair to replace Tim Byrne who will rotate off after the Fall'04 SSEPs meeting. Three candidates were identified : Donna Blackman , Dick Norris and Mike Underwood. A vote of panel members organized by the IMI-Sapporo Office representatives designated Mike Underwood as the SSEPs nominate.

16:15 : Joint SSEPs session :

- Grouping

The proposals forwarded to the SPC were grouped by the SSEPs members.
The panel members were invited to group the relevant proposals in 5 categories (« stars »), 1 being the lowest rate and 5 the highest. All decisions have been made by consensus.

Proposal	**Title Code**	**Lead proponent**
477-Full4	Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene	Takahashi
537-CDP3	CRISP	von Huene
537A-Full3	CRISP Stage 1	Vannucchi
600-Full	Canterbury Basin	Fulthorpe
603-CDP3	NanTroSEIZE Overview	Kimura (Tobin)
603A-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Reference Sites	Underwood
603B-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults	Kinoshita
621-Full	Monterey Bay Observatory	McNutt (Paull)

One proposal has been grouped as "5 stars", six as "4 stars" and one as "3 stars".

- Announcement on coming SSEPs meetings :

The November 2004 SSEP meeting will be held November 15-18 either in Okinawa (Japan) or in Kochi (Japan). Hiroki Yamamoto will host the meeting. A field trip is planned.

The SSEPs 2005 Spring meeting is tentatively planned in Shangai (China).

The co-Chairs, Shoji Arai, Tim Byrne and Gilbert Camoin thanked again the hosts Menchu Comas and Juan Carlos Braga for the excellent arrangements for the meeting and closed the meeting at 17:30.

The drafts of all reviews were provided to the IODP-MI Office representatives before the end of the meeting.

The reviews will be edited and passed around to all panel members before being forwarded to the IODP-MI Office for transmission to proponents.

Meeting Attendees :

ISSEP
Arai, Shoji *
Blackman, Donna
Byrne, Tim **
Ertzinger, Jörg
Fulthorpe, Craig
Henry, Pierre
Kominz, Michelle
Ogawa, Yujiro
Ohara, Yasuhiko
Pedersen, Rolf
Rosenberg, Nina
Saffer, Demian
Teagle, Damon
Tokunaga, Tomochika
Umino, Susumu
Yamano, Makoto
Yamazaki, Toshitsugu

ESSEP
Camoin, Gilbert **
Filippelli, Gabe (alternate for Katrina Edwards)
Ge, Shemin
Hasegawa, Takashi
Hayashida, Akira
Hine, Al (alternate for Peter Flemings)
Ishibashi, Jun-ichiro
Ito, Takashi
Kodama, Kazuto
Norris, Richard
Ohkouchi, Naohiko
Ravelo, Christina
Ravizza, Greg
Stein, Rudiger
Thurow, Juergen
Underwood, Mike
Weissert, Helmut
Yamamoto, Hiroyuki

Liaisons and Guests

Brewer, Tim	ESO
Brumsack, Hans	SPC
Coffin, Mike	SPC
Eguchi, Nobuhisa	IMI-S
Escutia, Carlota	SSP
Given, Holly	JOI
Hideki, Masago	CDEX
Iturrino, Gerardo	LDEO
Kimura, Kenji	MEXT
Kleinrock, Marty	JOI
Kuramoto, Shin'ichi	CDEX
Malone, Mitch	TAMU
Miller, Jay	TAMU
Schuffert, Jeffrey	IMI-S
Searle, Roger C.	SSP

Attachment n° 1 : SSEPs decisions on pre-proposals, proposals and addenda reviewed

Pre-Proposals for revision

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
643-Pre	Okinawa Trough - Ryukyu Forearc	Wei
644-Pre	Gulf of Cadiz	Molina
647-Pre	Lisbon Seismogenic Zone	Gutscher
649-Pre	Portuguese Submarine Canyons	Lebreiro

Pre-Proposals to be developed to Full Proposals

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
603D-Pre	NanTroSEIZE Observatories	Screaton
645-Pre	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat
646-Pre	Iceland Hotspot	Murton

Full Proposals for revision

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
537B-Full	CRISP Stage 2	Ranero
549-Full5	Northern Arabian Sea Monsoon	Lueckge
601-Full	Iheya Ridge	Takai
604-Full	Ulleung Basin	Lee
618-Full2	East Asia Margin	Clift
620-Full2	Hotspot Seamounts	Sager
623-Full2	Ontong Java Plateau	Neal
633-Full	Middle America Slope	Brueckmann
636-Full	Louisville Seamount Trail	Koppers
648-Full	Big Blue Seamount	Fryer

Proposals sent out for external review

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
505-Full5 (*)	Mariana Convergent Margin	Fryer
537-CDP4	CRISP	vonHuene
552-Add (*)	Bengal Fan	France-Lanord
603C-Full	NanTroSEIZE Plate Interface	Suyehiro (Tobin)
612-Full2	Geodynamo	Yamazaki
626-Full2	Pacific Equatorial Age Transect	Paelike
	(*) 2nd set of external reviews needed	

Proposals forwarded to SPC

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
477-Full4	Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene	Takahashi
537-CDP3	CRISP	von Huene
537A-Full3	CRISP Stage 1	Vannucchi
600-Full	Canterbury Basin	Fulthorpe

603-CDP3	NanTroSEIZE Overview	Kimura (Tobin)
603A-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Reference Sites	Underwood
603B-Full2	NanTroSEIZE Mega-Splay Faults	Kinoshita
621-Full	Monterey Bay Observatory	McNutt (Paull)

Rejected proposals

Proposal	Title Code	Lead proponent
617-Pre2	Hudson Bay and Strait	White
639-Pre2	Izu-Bonin Arc Crust	Tamura