

**10th Meeting of the
Science Steering and Evaluation Panel
May 19-22, 2008
Busan, Republic of Korea**

Final Minutes (v1.2)

1. Joint Session, Reports

1.1. Call to Order (SSEP co-chair Akira Ishiwatari)

SSEP co-chair Ishiwatari-san briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and described how the meeting would be organized.

1.2. Welcome and meeting logistics (host and SSEP member Dae Choul Kim)

1.3. Self-introduction of panel members, new ANZIC observer, liaisons, MSPHD students and guests.

1.4. Approval of present 10th SSEP meeting agenda

SSEP Consensus 0805-1: The SSEP approves the revised agenda of its tenth meeting on 19–22 May 2008 in Busan, Republic of Korea.

The agenda for the tenth meeting of SSEP is provided as **Attachment 1**.

1.5. Approval of last (9th) SSEP meeting minutes

SSEP Consensus 0805-2: The SSEP approves the minutes of its ninth meeting on 11–15 November 2007 in Arcachon, France.

1.6. SAS Panel Reports

1.6.1. SPC Report

SPC chair Jim Mori gave an update of the previous (March 2008) SPC meeting in Barcelona, and the January 2008 SASEC meeting.

A review was provided for 1) missions, 2) implementation plan, 3) preparation for renewal of IODP after 2013 including a large scale open planning conference in the style of COMPLEX in late 2009, 4) current scheduling, 5) current engineering issues in SAS, 6) Tier 1, tier 2 designation of proposals forwarded to OTF, 7) proposal ranking during the March SPC meeting, 8) progress of the Asian Monsoon DPG.

1.6.2. SSP Report (Site Survey Panel)

Gwang Lee (SSP liaison) reported on the outcome of the January 2008 SSP Meeting, held in Tokyo, Japan. Detailed site readiness information was provided for those proposals that the SSEP panel evaluated during the meeting. The detailed dispositions were:

Proposal:

605: site readiness classifications: 1Aa (9)

644 Mediterranean Outflow 1Ba

535 Atlantic Bank Deep 2Cc

551 Hess Deep Plutonic Crust 3A (4)

567-Full4: Paleogene: 2Ad (8), 3A (1)

errors in annotation, no data for one proposed site

601: 1Bb (10)

with SPC:

618: East Asia Margin 1Aa (4), ready to go

662: South Pac Microbiology 1Aa (11)
724 Gulf of Aden (data of poor quality?)
728APL (Papua), 3B(5)
SSEP 672, 692, 697

1.6.3. EDP Report (Engineering Development Panel)

Hiroshi Asanuma (EDP liaison) reviewed the role of the EDP and updated the SSEP on EDP activities. Asanuma-san reported on the detailed IODP-MI database that collects and reports engineering and technological issues relating to current proposals, and provided further information on IODP-MI engineering development activities: 1. SCIMPI (simple cable instruments from measuring parameters in situ), 2. Sediment CORK (S-CORK), 3. MDHDS (motion decoupled hydraulic delivery system).

1.6.4. CDEX Report (Japan Implementing Organization)

Nobu Eguchi (CDEX) reviewed the operations and results from the recent NantroSEIZE Stage 1a activities (Expeditions 314, 315, 316). He provided an update on the current status of *Chikyu*, and reported that scheduled expeditions 318 & 319 would be postponed until early 2009 for technical and permitting reasons.

1.6.5. USIO Report (United States Implementing Organization)

Jay Miller (TAMU) reported on the *JOIDES Resolution* conversion status and accomplishments, and its impact on the non-riser expedition schedule, and expedition Planning. Miller reviewed the enhanced capabilities of laboratory and logging facilities on the *JOIDES Resolution*.

1.6.6. ESO Report (European Implementing Organization)

Sarah Davies (EPC/ESO) introduced herself as the new manager of the European Petrophysics Consortium (EPC), replacing Tim Brewer after his untimely death. She reported on the status of the next planned Mission Specific Platform expeditions. She stated that the New Jersey shallow shelf expedition would be postponed (to 2009) but that the Great Barrier Reef expedition has now obtained an operations permit for 2009. She noted that the first publications from the recent Tahiti expedition are now forthcoming.

1.7 IODP-MI Report

Barry Zelt (science coordinator with the IODP-MI, Sapporo office) reported on activities at IODP-MI, showing an updated SAS meeting schedule (EPSP 16-18 June 2008 in Hannover, SASEC 23-24 June in Beijing, China, SPC 25-28 August 2008 in Sapporo), proposal submission statistics (109 active proposals, excluding CDPs; proposals to review for this meeting =14 + 2 with external review), possible SSEP recommendations, workshop update, SSEP rotations, and a new proposal submission system (undergoing testing). For the current SSEP meeting, he re-iterated that only 14 proposals were received, in addition to two proposals for which external reviews had been received (and with only four entirely new submissions). He presented new statistics on the number of unique proponents of currently active proposals (990 unique proponents). The current allocation of active proposals is 57 with SSEP, 22 with SPC, and 30 with OTF.

1.8 MS-PhD's Outreach Program

Charna Meth (USSSP) and Ithier-Guzman introduced this meetings' cohort of students participating in the SSEP meeting, and being mentored by U.S. SSEP members.

2. Reviewing process

2.1 Introduction

SSEP co-chair Akira Ishiwatari reviewed the SSEP terms of reference, and explained the conflict of interest (COI) rules that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The SSEP agreed to delete SSEP member Fumio Inagaki from the conflicted member list.

2.1 Breakout Sessions

A total of 16 proposals were reviewed during the meeting, including new external reviews available for two proposals. Panel members were divided into two breakout sessions for detailed discussions of the proposals: Breakout Session 1: *Solid Earth/Petrology* (chaired by A. Ishiwatari and B. John); Breakout Session 2: *Paleoclimate/oceanography, Faults/Fluids and Deep biosphere* (H. Pälike):

BREAKOUT Group 1 (Solid Earth, chairs Akira Ishiwatari and Barbara John)

Proposal	Short Title	Lead proponent	Watchdogs					
640-Full	Godzilla Mullion	Ohara	Zierenberg	Kimura	Berné	Yamaguchi	Tamura	
695-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Pre-Arc Crust	Arculus	Anma	Elliot	Christeson	Gutscher	Suzuki	Kimura
697-Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Reararc Crust	Tamura	Elliott	Takazawa	Christeson	Fujiwara	Anma	Kim
710-Pre2	Gulf of Corinth Rift	McNeill	Kopf	Vrolijk	Yamaguchi	Zierenberg	Jaeger	Spinelli
729-Pre	Western Lord Howe Rise Extension	Lister	Gurnis	Aiello	Jaeger	Nishi	Schulte	
731-Pre	Papua New Guinea Orogenic Lifecycle	Goodliffe	Tamura	Gutscher	Takazawa	Gurnis	Nishi	
636-Full3	Louisville Seamounts	Koppers	Fujiwara	Wilson	Gurnis	Kim	Tamura	Kimura
698-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust	Tatsumi	Christeson	Anma	Fujiwara	Zierenberg	Elliott	Takazawa

BREAKOUT Group 2 (Paleoceanography, Fluids & Faults, Geomicrobio, chair Heiko Pälike)

Proposal	Short Title	Lead proponent	Watchdogs					
635-Full3	Hydrate Ridge Observatory	Torres	Takeuchi	Wilson	Eynaud	Rosenthal	Berné	Yamaguchi
645-Full2	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat	Aiello	Brinkhuis	Li	Gutscher	Vrolijk	Inagaki
672-Full2	Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment	Andren	Li	Eynaud	Suzuki	Kuroda	Takeuchi	Brinkhuis
705-Full2	Santa Barbara Basin Climate Change	Kennett	Vrolijk	Rosenthal	Hinrichs	Inagaki	Li	Takeuchi
715-Full	Mediterranean Landslides	Camerlenghi	Schulte	Kopf	Aiello	Jaeger	Kuroda	Spinelli
716-Full2	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	Webster	Suzuki	Hinrichs	Torres	Eynaud	Wilson	Berné

730-Pre	Sabine Bank Sea Level	Taylor F.	Nishi	Hinrichs	Rosenthal	Kopf	Torres	
732-Full	Antarctic Peninsula Sediment Drifts	Channell	Brinkhuis	Kuroda	Torres	Inagaki	Schulte	Spinelli

The conflict of interest rules and confidentiality requirements were respected during the entire review procedure (breakout sessions, general sessions, and grouping). The table below lists the conflicted SSEP members, liaisons and guests who left the room during the review of the relevant proposals.

BREAKOUT Group 1 (Solid Earth, chairs Akira Ishiwatari and Barbara John)

Proposal	Short Title	Lead proponent	COI
640-Full	Godzilla Mullion	Ohara	
695-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Pre-Arc Crust	Arculus	Gurnis
697-Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Reararc Crust	Tamura	Tamura, Kimura
710-Pre2	Gulf of Corinth Rift	McNeill	
729-Pre	Western Lord Howe Rise Extension	Lister	
731-Pre	Papua New Guinea Orogenic Lifecycle	Goodliffe	
636-Full3	Louisville Seamounts	Koppers	
698-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust	Tatsumi	Tamura, Kimura

BREAKOUT Group 2 (Paleoceanography, Fluids & Faults, Geomicrobio, chair Heiko Pälike)

Proposal	Short Title	Lead proponent	Conflicts
635-Full3	Hydrate Ridge Observatory	Torres	Torres
645-Full2	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat	
672-Full2	Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment	Andren	
705-Full2	Santa Barbara Basin Climate Change	Kennett	Schulte
715-Full	Mediterranean Landslides	Camerlenghi	
716-Full2	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	Webster	
730-Pre	Sabine Bank Sea Level	Taylor F.	
732-Full	Antarctic Peninsula Sediment Drifts	Channell	Jaeger

3. Joint Session, Proposal Dispositions

The recommendations for each of the 16 proposals reviewed during the Busan meeting was achieved by consensus of the full panel. The summary dispositions were as follows:

Pre-Proposal: request Pre2 Proposal =	3
Pre2-Proposal: request Full Proposal =	1
Full Proposal: forward to SPC =	2 (Groupings: 4*: 1, 5*: 1)
APL: invite APL2 =	0
APL: forward to SPC =	0
Full Proposal: send for External Review =	4
Full Proposal: request revision =	6
Full Proposal: request new submission =	0

Pre Proposal: request new submission =	0
APL: request new submission =	0

The specific dispositions for each proposal were as follows:

Proposal	Short Title	Lead proponent	Country	Theme	SSEP disposition
635-Full3	Hydrate Ridge Observatory	Torres	USA	1	revise to Full4
640-Full	Godzilla Mullion	Ohara	Japan	3	revise to Full2
645-Full2	North Atlantic Gateway	Jokat	Germany	2	revise to Full3
672-Full2	Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment	Andren	Sweden	2	revise to Full3
695-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Pre-Arc Crust	Arculus	Australia	3	send for ext review
697-Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Reararc Crust	Tamura	Japan	3	send for ext review
705-Full2	Santa Barbara Basin Climate Change	Kennett	USA	2	send for ext review
710-Pre2	Gulf of Corinth Rift	McNeill	UK	3+2	revise to Full
715-Full	Mediterranean Landslides	Camerlenghi	Spain	1+3	revise to Full2
716-Full2	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	Webster	Australia	2	send for ext review
729-Pre	Western Lord Howe Rise Extension	Lister	Australia	3	revise to Pre2
730-Pre	Sabine Bank Sea Level	Taylor F.	USA	2	revise to Pre2
731-Pre	Papua New Guinea Orogenic Lifecycle	Goodliffe	USA	3	revise to Pre2
732-Full	Antarctic Peninsula Sediment Drifts	Channell	USA	2	revise to Full2
636-Full3	Louisville Seamounts	Koppers	USA	3	SPC 5stars
698-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust	Tatsumi	Japan	3	SPC 4stars; review by EDP

Theme totals

1	2	Deep biosph. & subseaf.
2	6	Environment
3	8	Solid Earth

A qualitative grouping was assigned to those proposals forwarded to the SPC using the 5-star scale grouping. Grouping was obtained by consensus of the full panel, after evaluation against the individual grouping criteria.

4. SSEP Discussion Items

4.1. Input of SSEP into renewal process for IODP post 2013

IODP-MI Vice President (Science Planning) Hans-Christian Larsen updated the SSEP on recent deliberations of SASEC, which resulted in a proposed schedule for preparation of efforts towards IODP renewal after Phase II of IODP (post 2013). He noted that preparations should begin in 2009, and include, amongst others, a broad, bottoms-up, conference in the spirit of CONCORD and COMPLEX, late in 2009, probably in Bremen. The identification of new challenges and major scientific questions and themes would benefit from the knowledgeable input of the SSEP, and at this point the panel members were requested to prepare more detailed input in time for the next SSEP meeting (Nov. 2008). Larsen explained, that one form such input could take would be through white papers (e.g., what has been achieved, what still

should be achieved, and what new science is missing in the current Initial Science Plan, ISP).

4.2. Effective communication between SSEP and SPC

Science Planning Committee (SPC) Chair Jim Mori reviewed the process by which SPC undertook the most recent ranking of proposals during the March 2008 meeting in Barcelona, and explained that because a large number of proposals had been moved back to SPC from the Operations Task Force (OTF), SPC desired a discussion of how the input from the SSEP could be made more effective and efficient. It was noted that the SPC watchdogs repeat to a large extent the discussions that take place in the SSEP, and Mori requested suggestions by the SSEP as to how the process could be streamlined. It was noted that the SSEP had trialed a more detailed number of subheadings in their review form during the Potsdam meeting in May 2006, and the detailed criteria and evaluation subheadings were re-circulated to the SSEP members. In addition, the SSEP received the request by SPC chair Mori that for future March ranking meetings of SPC all three SSEP co-chairs will be present if at all possible. A lively discussion of the SSEP members ensued, with various proposals as to how the system could be changed in more fundamental ways, including a risk-reward matrix as is often used for national funding agency evaluations and modifications to the star grouping system. However, there were many views that it was of fundamental importance that the SSEP does not rank proposals against each other, and SPC chair Mori explained that SPC was not really interested in significant changes to the current system, but simply an effort to achieve more consistent review forms.

5. Presentations by MScD students

Andrea Balbas, Fabian Batista, Yaika Echevarría Román and Isaiah Corley presented their experiences and thoughts on the science review process. All expressed their gratitude to their SSEP mentors.

6. Next SSEP meetings

After considering a conflict of the previously suggested meeting in Portland, Oregon, during the week 17-20 November with a major Microbiology conference in Japan, Barbara John suggested an alternative date (10-13 November 2008) and location (Texas) for the next 11th SSEP meeting. The following 12th SSEP meeting in Europe is to be held in Utrecht, The Netherlands, co-hosted by new SSEP member Henk Brinkhuis.

7. Resolutions for outgoing SSEP members

Resolutions were presented thanking outgoing SSEP members for their years of dedication: Christeson, Eynaud, Fujiwara, Konnerup-Madsen and Wilson.

8. Conclusion

The co-chairs Akira Ishiwatari, Barbara John and Heiko Pälike thanked again the hosts Dae Choul Kim, Gil Young Kim and Young Joo Lee, as well as K-IODP, KIGAM and KIMST, for their excellent organization and arrangements, field trip coordination, and hospitality throughout the meeting. The co-chairs thanked all of

the panel members for their dedication and hard work. Watchdogs submitted drafts of all proposal reviews to the IODP-MI science coordinators (Hiroshi Kawamura and Barry Zelt) before the meeting ended.

**SSEP 0805 Minutes, Appendix A
Meeting Participants**

Name (*co-chair)	Affiliation	Comment
Aiello, Ivano	SSEP	
Anma, Ryo	SSEP	
Berné, Serge	SSEP-alt.	Alt. for Menez
Brinkhuis, Hendrik	SSEP	New member
Christeson, Gail	SSEP	
Elliott, Timothy	SSEP	
Eynaud, Frederique	SSEP	
Fujiwara, Toshiya	SSEP	
Gallagher, Stephen	SSEP-prov.	New provisional member
Gurnis, Mike	SSEP	
Gutscher, Marc-André	SSEP-alt.	Alt. for Konnerup-Madsen
Hinrichs, Kai-Uwe	SSEP	
Inagaki, Fumio	SSEP	New member
Ishiwatari, Akira*	SSEP	
Jaeger, John	SSEP	
John, Barbara*	SSEP	
Kim, Dae Choul	SSEP	Co-Host
Kimura, Jun-ichi	SSEP	
Konnerup-Madsen, Jens	SSEP	Not attending
Kopf, Achim	SSEP	
Kuroda Junichiro	SSEP	
Li, Tiegang	SSEP	
Marsaglia, Kathleen	SSEP	Not attending
Menez, Bénédicte	SSEP	Not attending
Nishi, Hiroshi	SSEP	
Pälike, Heiko*	SSEP	
Qiu, Xuelin	SSEP	Not attending
Rosenthal, Yair	SSEP	
Schulte, Mitch	SSEP	
Spinelli, Glenn	SSEP-alt.	Alt. for Marsaglia
Suzuki, Atsushi	SSEP	
Takazawa, Eiichi	SSEP	
Takeuchi, Mio	SSEP	
Tamura, Yoshihiko	SSEP	
Torres, Marta	SSEP	
Vrolijk, Peter	SSEP	
Wilson, Alicia	SSEP	
Yamaguchi Kosei	SSEP	
Zierenberg, Robert	SSEP	

Name (*co-chair)	Affiliation	Comment
Asanuma, Hiroshi	EDP	
Davies, Sarah	ESO	
Eguchi, Nobu	CDEX	
Guerin, Gilles	USIO	
Janecek, Tom	IODP-MI	
Kawamura, Hiroshi	IODP-MI	
Kim, Gil Young	KIGAM	Co-Host
Larsen, Hans Christian	IODP-MI	
Lee, Gwang	SSP Ocean	
Meth, Charna	Leadership	
Miller, Jay	USIO	
Mori, James	SPC	
Myers, Greg	IODP-MI	
Zarikian, Carlos	USIO	
Zelt, Barry	IODP-MI	
Balbas, Andrea	MSPHD'S	
Batista, Fabian	MSPHD'S	
Echevarria Roman, Yaika	MSPHD'S	
Corley, Isaiah	MSPHD'S	
Ithier-Guzman, Warner	MSPHD'S	Administrator

SSEP 0805 Minutes, Appendix B
Criteria for Grouping Proposals by the SSEP
Revised 05-2006

Preamble: The purpose of the grouping system is for the SSEP to convey as much information as possible to the SPC when forwarding proposals for the global ranking exercise. The 5-star system must be applied by the SSEP and interpreted by the SPC within the context of the *final review*. The *final review*, therefore, must contain explicit justification for each grouping.

5 stars: Exceptional proposal. The science plan is innovative, cutting-edge, and extends beyond the vision of the Initial Science Plan. In all probability, the expedition(s) will generate major conceptual breakthroughs and exciting new discoveries.

4 stars: Outstanding proposal. Addresses one of the high-priority initiatives of the Initial Science Plan. If scheduled, drilling is likely to result in significant refinements of existing scientific concepts. In all probability, the expedition(s) will be regarded as a major achievement of scientific ocean drilling.

3 stars: Very good proposal. Objectives are consistent with thematic priorities of the Initial Science Plan. The science plan is likely to result in successful expedition(s) typical of the majority of ODP and IODP legs. If scheduled, drilling will build on a long history of scientific achievement by refining existing concepts, filling a gap in the global database, or resolving a pointed scientific debate.

2 stars: Good proposal. The project is “drillable” and the science plan, if scheduled, is likely to result in successful expedition(s) typical of the majority of ODP and IODP legs. The scientific objectives, however, are either excessively narrow or peripheral to thematic priorities of the Initial Science Plan.

1 star: Project is “drillable”, but the scientific objectives are either not relevant to the Initial Science Plan or the proposal contains deficiencies in organization and/or strategy, as identified by both panel reviews and external reviews. The nurturing process has culminated, so the proponents may need additional help in their planning and preparation. With effective guidance, the science plan could result in successful expedition(s), typical of the majority of ODP and IODP legs.