

**11th Meeting of the
Science Steering and Evaluation Panel
November 10-13, 2008
Hotel Whitcomb, San Francisco, CA, U.S.A.**

Draft Minutes (v1)

1. Joint Session, Introduction

1.1. Call to Order (SSEP co-chair Barbara John)

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

1.2. Self-introduction of panel members, liaisons, and guests

The following attendees briefly introduced themselves, and explained their function during the meeting:

Aiello, Ivano	SSEP	
Anma, Ryo	SSEP	
Berné, Serge	SSEP	New
Brinkhuis, Hendrik	SSEP	
Brunelli, Daniele	SSEP	New
Elliott, Timothy	SSEP	
Gallagher, Stephen	SSEP	
Gurnis, Mike	SSEP	
Harris, Robert	SSEP	New
Hinrichs, Kai-Uwe	SSEP	
Inagaki, Fumio	SSEP	
Ishiwatari, Akira*	SSEP	Co-chair
Jaeger, John	SSEP	
John, Barbara*	SSEP	Co-chair
Kim, Dae Choul	SSEP	not attending; no alt.
Kimura, Jun-ichi	SSEP	
Kopf, Achim	SSEP	
Kuroda Junichiro	SSEP	
Li, Tiegang	SSEP	
Marsaglia, Kathleen	SSEP	
Menez, Bénédicte	SSEP	
Nishi, Hiroshi	SSEP	
Pälike, Heiko*	SSEP	Co-chair
Qiu, Xuelin	SSEP	
Rosenthal, Yair	SSEP	
Schulte, Mitch	SSEP	
Suzuki, Atsushi	SSEP	
Takazawa, Eiichi	SSEP	
Takeuchi, Mio	SSEP	
Tamura, Yoshihiko	SSEP	
Torres, Marta	SSEP	
Vrolijk, Peter	SSEP	not attending; no alt.
Yamaguchi Kosei	SSEP	
Zierenberg, Robert	SSEP	

Bangs, Nathan	SSP
Charna Meth	USSSP

Davies, Sarah	ESO
Geldmacher, Joerg	USIO
Guerin, Gilles	USIO
Janecek, Tom	IODP-MI
Kawamura, Hiroshi	IODP-MI
Klaus, Adam	USIO
Kubo, Yusuke	CDEX
Mori, James	SPC
Myers, Greg	IODP-MI
Powell, Emily	USSSP
Roehl, Ursula	ESO
Toczko, Sean	CDEX
Ussler, William	EDP
Zelt, Barry	IODP-MI

1.3. Welcome and meeting logistics (hosts and SSEP members John and Aiello)

The SSEP thanked SSEP members Ivano Aiello, Rob Zierenberg as well as Eldridge and Judy Moores (UC Davis) for guiding a much appreciated field trip “A streetcar to subduction” prior to the SSEP meeting in Nov. 09th 2008, taking participants across the Golden Gate Bridge to Point Reyes National Seashore, and the Marin Headlands National Recreational Area. Local SSEP co-chair John announced that a busy meeting schedule could be expected, with required reviews for 34 drilling proposals (19 new or revised proposals, 4 with external review, but also 11 proposals that currently reside at the Science Planning Committee (SPC) or Operations Task Force (OTF) awaiting ranking or drilling, and for which SPC requested re-evaluation and star grouping assignment). John reminded participants to speak slowly and clearly, to be sensitive to cultural and style differences, that only one person would speak at a time (through the co-chairs), and that cross talk should be avoided.

1.4. Approval of 11th SSEP meeting agenda

SSEP Consensus 0811-1: The SSEP approves the revised agenda of their 11th meeting on 10-13 November 2008 in San Francisco, U.S.A.

The agenda for the 11th meeting of SSEP is provided as **Attachment 1**.

1.5. Approval of last (10th) SSEP meeting minutes

John asks for approval of the most recent 10th SSEP meeting in Busan (May 2008). Greg Myers asks for clarification of the recommendation for Proposal 698-Full2 (Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Middle Crust) to be reviewed by EDP. Elliott mentions that the boxes for a request to review Proposal 698 by EDP and STP were ticked by the watchdogs, and that thus further paper work by way of statements could be avoided. Myers expressed that if external review is required, a consensus statement would be favorable, specifying in detail the questions SSEP would like EDP and STP to address. Zelt agreed that a consensus statement would be a good idea, as a request for review should not just be a yes/no question, and it would be helpful for EDP/STP to obtain a mandate and or detailed reasons for the review. John asked for a consensus to approve the minutes ‘as is’, and all members agreed.

SSEP Consensus 0811-2: The SSEP approves the minutes of their 10th SSEP meeting on May 19-22 2008 in Busan, Republic of Korea.

1.6. SAS Panel Reports

1.6.1. SPC Report

SPC chair Jim Mori gave an update for the last SASEC meeting in Beijing (June 2008), for which he provided a review for 1) the 2009 INVEST renewal meeting, 2) Thematic Reviews, 3) workshops, 4) proposal submissions, 5) (delayed) approval of the program plan.

He also provided an updated on the most recent August 2008 SPC meeting in Sapporo: 1) Report on NanTroSEIZE, 2) Completion of the Asian Monsoon Detailed Planning Group (DPG), 3) Explanation of the new Complementary Project Proposal (CPP) submission and evaluation process, 4) SPC Proposal Ranking, including Tier 1 and 2 sub-groups, and finally 5) initiated a discussion about the SPC request to SSEP to provide a re-evaluation and star groupings for 11 proposals currently residing with SPC/OTF.

For 5), Mori explained that SPC would like to rely more on the SSEP evaluation of proposals during the annual SPC ranking in March, and therefore one of the resolutions of SPC during the last August meeting was to ask SSEP to provide a star grouping for those proposals that predate the star grouping system (SPC: 547-Full4, 551-Full, 552-Full3, 553-Full2, 555-Full3, 557-Full2, 584-Full2, 589-Full3; OTF: 505-Full5, 581-Full2, 595-Full3). Mori asked for star groupings to be consistent with the current and known star criteria. Schulte asked Mori a practical question relating to proposals that have been in the system for a long time might be difficult to evaluate relative to existing proposals, and due to their length within the system might score poorly even though the underlying scientific idea is ok. He expressed doubt as to whether proposals should be evaluated as originally written, or based on the current state of the art. Mori explained that SPC would prefer a current scientific evaluation. This might not be fair to some proponents, but even though the proposals have been in the system for a long time, they were given the chance to be updated annually through invited addenda. Torres asked whether the proponents will get to see the requested re-evaluation and wondered about the mechanism of communication. Mori replied that the SSEP re-evaluation would be addressed to SPC but open to the public. Rosenthal observes that the SPC comments were back to the proponents with an opportunity to reply, but wondered whether the proponents know they will be re-evaluated by SSEP. Mori countered that the proponents are well aware that their proposals are re-evaluated at every SPC meeting. Elliott states that there are many heritage proposals, some over a decade old, and with many Addenda and PRLs, some of it out of date. He recognizes the difficulty of evaluating such a culmination of information, and suggested a “double or quits” option, whereby proponents are given one chance to pull all information together in one single coherent document for re-evaluation. Specifically, proponents should indicate whether they are still actively pursuing the advancement of the proposal. Zierenberg observed that some proposals are

very old, with new data potentially affecting their grouping, and whether the current re-evaluation would be potentially unfair to proponents. Why would the proponents of, e.g. a proposal in the Mediterranean, bother to update a proposal if the ship was in the Pacific for a long period of time?

Aiello wondered why the SPC could not simply make these decisions themselves, and wondered why the proposals were sent back to SSEP in the first instance. He questioned whether SPC had ever de-activated a proposal. Mori re-iterated that SPC would welcome a SSEP evaluation on whether a proposal is out-dated or not, to provide a star grouping where possible, or otherwise state why it is not applicable. All SPC want is that proposals are evaluated consistently. Elliott replies that it is easy to provide star groupings if that is what SPC wants. Torres wonders whether proponents should be given a chance to update or to withdraw. Hinrichs states that proponents were free to update proposals, and gives an example of a proposal that was updated regularly for the last 10 years. He opines that there is nothing wrong with evaluating a proposal to not be state-of-the-art. Zelt adds that proposals are as up-to-date as they can be, as the proponents have been given the chance to update every March. If the addenda are included, they should be up-to-date. Zierenberg disagreed, explaining that the Addenda and PRLs are often used to lobby with SPC. He thinks that the SSEP can give star groupings, but that they would not be consistent with younger proposals with stars. Rosenthal suggested being pragmatic and rating those proposals that we can rate. Pälke observed that there is a timing issue, as SPC needs all information by March 2009. John observes that none of the currently to be evaluated proposals have Tier-1 status, and thus SSEP has been asked to help to sort between these. Zelt disagrees, and states that some of the to-be evaluated proposals are highly ranked. He assumes that the SSEP will use the regular evaluation form for re-evaluation. Mori adds that the deadline for new addenda by proponents would be mid-January in time for the March 2009 SPC ranking meeting.

The discussion was ended with the following consensus:

<p>SSEP Consensus 0811-3: The SSEP intends to re-evaluate the 11 proposals currently residing with SPC or OTF to the best of their ability, and providing a consistent star grouping where possible. The re-evaluations will be addressed to, and sent to SPC. SSEP suggests to SPC to provide these evaluations to the proponents through the SPC chair Jim Mori as soon as possible, and in time for the proponents to provide an addendum or PRL to SPC by mid-January 2009.</p>

1.6.2. SSP Report (Site Survey Panel)

Nathan Bangs (SSP liaison) explained the role of the SSP, and reported on the outcomes of most recent 2008 SSP Meeting, done for the first time electronically by email. Detailed site readiness information was provided for most proposals that the SSEP panel evaluated during the meeting. Bangs stated that 4 full proposals had new data submissions (2 with OTF: 519 and 482; 1 with SPC: 636; one with SSEP: 716), one pre-proposal and 1 new submission as full proposal (710,732)

are to be reviewed by SSP in February 2009. Bangs provided information relevant to the current SSEP meeting for proposals 716-Full2 and 732-Full.

1.6.3. EDP Report (Engineering Development Panel)

Bill Ussler (EDP liaison) reviewed the role of EDP and updated the SSEP on EDP activities. He reviewed the Contamination Microbiology Sampling Document (STP Request 0802-06), and how EDP was appraised on the issue in July 2008. He also reviewed a new activity to evaluate the mud recovery systems on both riser- and riserless platforms, and that this review would be relevant and benefit the following proposals: (OTF: 477, 505, 522, 537A&B, 545, 595, 601, 633, 662, 677; SPC: 547, 549, 553, 557, 584, 589, 637; SSEP: 569, 635, 673, 696, 701, 715, 733, 739).

Ussler then provided a review of ultra deep-drilling statistics, and compared past drilling performance in ultra-deep holes with proposed drilling activities. He stated that one lesson from the German deep-drilling project (KTB) was that the stress in the crust needs to be better known. He estimated that the planning process for deep holes will likely be lengthy, that one should consider a 10 year time scale, and identify technology gaps.

Ussler mentioned the current EDP Technology Roadmap Prioritization (TR), which is available at <http://www.iodp.org/eng-dev>.

1.6.4. CDEX Report (Japan Implementing Organization)

Sean Toczko (CDEX) provided an update on the current CDEX and *Chikyu* status. He reported that *Chikyu* is currently in dry dock, with repairs for azimuth thrusters underway, prior to a shakedown of these repairs. The vessel would then be moved to Kobe to undergo repairs to the riser tensioners. Toczko stated that a new drilling/operations company had been signed up, called Mantle Quest. This was a joint venture between Japan Drilling Co., Ltd., and Nippon Yusen, replacing SeaDrill. During 2009, *Chikyu* would spend 150 days at sea for Expeditions 319 and 322. Exp 319 was in the back part of the accretionary prism, and includes activities at Sites NT2-11A, and NT2-01J. Exp 322 would last 40 days, while Exp 319 would last 110 days.

1.6.5. USIO Report (United States Implementing Organization)

Adam Klaus (TAMU) reported on the *JOIDES Resolution* conversion status and accomplishments, and its impact on the non-riser expedition schedule, and expedition planning. Klaus reviewed the enhanced capabilities of laboratory and logging facilities of the *JOIDES Resolution*, and stated that the ship conversion had now moved to nearing completion, and a shift of work towards commissioning, dock/harbor trials, and Singapore departure. He stated the pacing items were the heating and ventilation system, and air conditioning, as well as electrical systems and bridge and dynamic positioning (DP) work. The anticipated timeline from now on would be the incline experiment in mid-November, early December harbor trials, late December shipyard departure, with a latest start date of 25 January for transit to sea trials. By 5th February the vessel would do a Guam port call to load the Science Readiness Assessment Team, and transit towards Site

807 (Ontong Java Plateau) for trials. Expedition 320 would then begin on March 5, 2009 in Honolulu.

The current expedition schedule begins with Pacific Equatorial Age Transect (PEAT) 1 & 2, Juan de Fuca remedial cementing, and then runs through Bering Sea, Shatsky Rise, Canterbury Basin, and then Wilkes Land, including the Adelie Drift APL. Non-IODP drilling might then include DEEPSTAR dual gradient drilling systems, Korean gas hydrates, Petrobras gas hydrates, Ocean Drilling Consortium activities (rifted margins, reservoir architecture and properties, source rocks), and Fugro activities. The first initial opportunity for these non-IODP activities would be in March 2010, after Wilkes Land.

Klaus reported that Steve Bohlen had now taken over as Interim Director at the USIO, and that a search for a permanent director was underway (http://www.iodp-usio.org/Employment/tamu/Director_TAMU.pdf), with a 1 Dec 2008 application screening date. The Texas A&M Dean of Geosciences position is also advertised, with a Nov 15 2008 application screening date.

1.6.6. ESO Report (European Implementing Organization)

Sarah Davies (EPC/ESO) provided an update on the MSP expeditions for calendar year 2009. New Jersey drilling would be conducted May-July 2009, and Great Barrier Reef (GBR) operations are planned for Oct-Dec. 2009 (FY2010). New Jersey (Exp 313) will have a May 1st start. The onshore science party is planned for November 2009. The GBR expedition will have Jody Webster and Yusuke Yokoyama as co-chief scientists, and a call for applications to the science party has been sent out.

1.7 IODP-MI Report

Hiroshi Kawamura (Science Coordinator, IODP-MI, Sapporo Office) reported on activities at IODP-MI. He provided information about the IODP organizational structure to brief new and update existing SSEP members, and gave an overview of the current Science Advisory Structure (SAS) meeting schedule. He then provided proposal submission statistics: For this SSEP meeting, IODP-MI received 19 proposals (9 environment, 7 solid earth, 3 microbiology and sub-seafloor). As of 9 October 2008, 109 proposals were active in the system (43 solid earth, 42 environment, 23 deep biosphere). 995 unique proponents contributed to currently active proposals, with 431 ECORD, 312 US, 134 Japanese, 28 Australia-New Zealand IODP Consortium (ANZIC), 5 Korean, 25 Chinese, and 60 other geographic proponents. Excluding three Complex Drilling Project (CDPs) proposals, 54 proposals are in the Pacific, 25 in the Atlantic Ocean, 14 in the Indian Ocean, 4 in the Mediterranean, 3 in the Arctic, and 6 in the Southern Ocean. Currently, 53 proposals reside with the SSEP, 22 are at SPC, and 31 with OTF, including 78 non-riser, 14 multiple, and 3 riser expeditions. For the current SSEP meeting there would be 11 full (5 new full, 6 revised), and 4 pre-proposals, as well as 4 proposals with external reviews. Kawamura explained the potential outcomes and recommendations for each

proposal type. He then concluded with a reminder of the current SSEP member rotation schedule.

2. Reviewing process

2.1 Introduction

SSEP co-chair Barbara John reviewed the SSEP terms of reference, and explained again the conflict of interest (COI) rules that had been circulated prior to the meeting. John reviewed the star grouping system, and reminded the panel that if an EDP and/or STP review was requested, a detailed justification will be added in the review.

2.2 Breakout Sessions

A total of 34 proposals were reviewed during the meeting, including new external reviews available for 4 proposals. Panel members were divided into three breakout sessions for detailed discussions of the proposals: Breakout Session 1: *Solid Earth/Petrology* (chaired by B. John); Breakout Session 2: *Paleoclimate/oceanography* (chaired by A. Ishiwatari), and Breakout Session 3: *Faults/Fluids and Deep biosphere* (chaired by H. Pälike):

BREAKOUT Group 1 (Solid Earth, chair Barbara John)

Number	Short Title	Lead Proponent	WD #1	WD#2	WD#3	WD#4
548-Full3	Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater	Morgan	Yamaguchi	Qiu	Brinkhuis	Marsaglia
681-Full2	Lesser Antilles Volcanic Landslides	Le Friant	Tamura	Torres	Gurnis	Kimura
696-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Deep Forearc Crust	Pearce	Qiu	Anma	Elliott	Brunelli
733-Pre	Red Sea Salt Glaciers	Mitchell	Berné	Anma	Suzuki	Marsaglia
735-Pre	South China Sea Tectonic Evolution	Li	Kopf	Elliott	Kimura	Tamura
738-APL	Nankai Trough Submarine Landslides	Strasser	Kimura	Jaeger	Berné	Kuroda
740-Full	Galicia Margin Rift History	Reston	Gurnis	Tamura	Qiu	Brunelli
741-Pre	Global Salt Body History	Hovland	Gurnis	Anma	Harris	Tamura
695-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Pre-Arc Crust	Arculus	Anma	Brunelli	Elliott	Qiu
697-Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Reararc Crust	Tamura	Elliott	Takazawa	Anma	Zierenberg
551-Full	Hess Deep Plutonic Crust	Gillis	Brunelli	Zierenberg	Takazawa	Kimura
505-Full5	Mariana Convergent Margin	Fryer	Takazawa	Marsaglia	Tamura	Gurnis

BREAKOUT Group 2 (Paleoceanography/Palaeoclimatology, chair A. Ishiwatari)

Number	Short Title	Lead Proponent	WD #1	WD#2	WD#3	WD#4
615-Full2	NW Pacific Coral Reefs	Matsuda	Jaeger	Suzuki	Gallagher	Li
625-Full	Pleistocene Pacific Southern Ocean	Gersonde	Gallagher	Brinkhuis	Nishi	Kopf
680-Full	Bering Strait Climate Change	Fowell	Aiello	Gallagher	Jaeger	Nishi
702-Full	Southern African Climates	Zahn	Berné	Rosenthal	Harris	Schulte
732-Full2	Antarctic Peninsula Sediment Drifts	Channell	Brinkhuis	Kuroda	Torres	Inagaki
736-APL	Gulf of Mexico Paleoclimatology	Flower	Kuroda	Brinkhuis	Gallagher	Berné
737-Pre	North Sea Cenozoic Climate Change	Donders	Li	Rosenthal	Nishi	Suzuki
705-Full2	Santa Barbara Basin Climate Change	Kennett	Rosenthal	Takeuchi	Hinrichs	Inagaki
716-Full2	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	Webster	Suzuki	Hinrichs	Menez	Li
552-Full3	Bengal Fan	France-Lanord	Hinrichs	Jaeger	Gallagher	Nishi
581-Full2	Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks	Droxler	Menez	Brinkhuis	Jaeger	Hinrichs

595-Full3	Indus Fan and Murray Ridge	Clift	Kopf	Kuroda	Hinrichs	Li
BREAKOUT Group 3 (Faults/Fluids, subsurface Geology, microbiology, chair H. Pälike)						
Number	Short Title	Lead Proponent	WD #1	WD#2	WD#3	WD#4
569-Full3	CO2 Sequestration	Goldberg	Marsaglia	Takazawa	Zierenberg	Aiello
673-Full	Morocco Margin Mud Mound	Van Rooij	Harris	Inagaki	Takeuchi	Torres
734-APL	Cascadia Accretionary Prism CORK	Davis	Menez	Kopf	Zierenberg	Harris
739-APL	Bering Sea Subseafloor Life	D'Hondt	Inagaki	Torres	Aiello	Takeuchi
547-Full4	Oceanic Subsurface Biosphere	Fisk	Takeuchi	Schulte	Menez	Aiello
553-Full2	Cascadia Margin Hydrates	Riedel	Yamaguchi	Kuroda	Schulte	Rosenthal
555-Full3	Cretan Margin	Kopf	Nishi	Li	Yamaguchi	Harris
557-Full2	Storegga Slide Gas Hydrates	Andreassen	Torres	Rosenthal	Schulte	Qiu
584-Full2	TAG II Hydrothermal	Rona	Zierenberg	Inagaki	Kimura	Elliott
589-Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	Flemings	Schulte	Yamaguchi	Suzuki	Takeuchi

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.

Number	Lead Proponent	Conflicts
477-Full4	Takahashi	
505-Full5	Fryer	Inagaki Harris
547-Full4	Fisk	Harris
548-Full3	Morgan	
551-Full	Gillis	
552-Full3	France-Lanord	
553-Full2	Riedel	Torres
555-Full3	Kopf	Kopf
557-Full2	Andreassen	
569-Full3	Goldberg	Guerrin
581-Full2	Droxler	
584-Full2	Rona	Harris
589-Full3	Flemings	
595-Full3	Clift	
615-Full2	Matsuda	
625-Full	Gersonde	
673-Full	Van Rooij	
680-Full	Fowell	
681-Full2	Le Friant	
695-Full2	Arculus	Gurnis Marsaglia Tamura
696-Full2	Pearce	Gurnis Marsaglia Tamura
697-Full3	Tamura	Gurnis Marsaglia Tamura Kimura
702-Full	Zahn	
705-Full2	Kennett	Schulte
716-Full2	Webster	
732-Full2	Channell	Jaeger
733-Pre	Mitchell	

734-APL	Davis	Torres
735-Pre	Li	Qiu
736-APL	Flower	
737-Pre	Donders	Brinkhuis
738-APL	Strasser	Kopf
739-APL	D'Hondt	
740-Full	Reston	
741-Pre	Hovland	

3. Joint Session, Proposal Dispositions

The recommendation for each of the 23 SSEP proposals reviewed during the San Francisco meeting was achieved by consensus of the full panel. The summary dispositions were as follows:

Pre-Proposal: request Pre2 Proposal =	1
Pre-Proposal: request Full Proposal =	1
Full Proposal: forward to SPC =	4 (Groupings: 3*:1; 4*: 2, 5*: 1)
APL: invite APL2 =	1
APL: forward to SPC =	3
Full Proposal: send for External Review =	3
Full Proposal: request revision =	7
Full Proposal: request new submission/deactivate =	1
Pre Proposal: request new submission/deactivate =	2

The recommendation for each of the 11 SPC/OTF proposals reviewed during the San Francisco meeting was achieved by consensus of the full panel. The summary dispositions were as follows:

Full Proposal: returned to SPC with stars =	7 (3*:2; 4*: 5, 5*: 0)
Full Proposal: returned to SPC without stars, comments provided =	4

The specific dispositions for each proposal were as follows:

Number	Short Title	Lead Proponent	ISP Theme	SSEP disposition
548-Full3	Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater	Morgan	2+1	external review
569-Full3	CO2 Sequestration	Goldberg	1+2	deactivate
615-Full2	NW Pacific Coral Reefs	Matsuda	2	revise full
625-Full	Pleistocene Pacific Southern Ocean	Gersonde	2	revise full
673-Full	Morocco Margin Mud Mound	Van Rooij	1	revise full
680-Full	Bering Strait Climate Change	Fowell	2	revise full
681-Full2	Lesser Antilles Volcanic Landslides	Le Friant	3	external review
696-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Deep Forearc Crust	Pearce	3	revise full
702-Full	Southern African Climates	Zahn	2	revise full
732-Full2	Antarctic Peninsula Sediment Drifts	Channell	2	external review
733-Pre	Red Sea Salt Glaciers	Mitchell	2+1	deactivate

734-APL	Cascadia Accretionary Prism CORK	Davis	3+1	SPC, review by EDP
735-Pre	South China Sea Tectonic Evolution	Li	3	develop full
736-APL	Gulf of Mexico Paleoclimatology	Flower	2	revise APL
737-Pre	North Sea Cenozoic Climate Change	Donders	2	revise Pre2
738-APL	Nankai Trough Submarine Landslides	Strasser	3	SPC
739-APL	Bering Sea Subseafloor Life	D'Hondt	1	SPC
740-Full	Galicia Margin Rift History	Reston	3	revise full
741-Pre	Global Salt Body History	Hovland	3	deactivate
	Proposals with external review			
695-Full2	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Pre-Arc Crust	Arculus	3	SPC, 5 stars
697-Full3	Izu-Bonin-Mariana Reararc Crust	Tamura	3	SPC, 3 stars
705-Full2	Santa Barbara Basin Climate Change	Kennett	2	SPC, 4 stars
716-Full2	Hawaiian Drowned Reefs	Webster	2	SPC, 4 stars
	Proposals at SPC			
547-Full4	Oceanic Subsurface Biosphere	Fisk	1	No grouping
551-Full	Hess Deep Plutonic Crust	Gillis	3	No grouping, recommend proposal be updated
552-Full3	Bengal Fan	France-Lanord	2	Grouping: 4stars
553-Full2	Cascadia Margin Hydrates	Riedel	1	Grouping: 4 stars
555-Full3	Cretan Margin	Kopf	1	Grouping: 4 stars
557-Full2	Storegga Slide Gas Hydrates	Andreassen	1	No grouping
584-Full2	TAG II Hydrothermal	Rona	1	No grouping, recommend proposal be updated
589-Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	Flemings	1	Grouping: 3 stars
	Proposals at OTF			
505-Full5	Mariana Convergent Margin	Fryer	1	Grouping: 4 stars with CORK program
581-Full2	Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks	Droxler	2	Grouping: 3 stars
595-Full3	Indus Fan and Murray Ridge	Clift	2	Grouping: 4 stars

A qualitative grouping was assigned to those proposals forwarded to the SPC using the 5-star grouping system (see Appendix 2). Grouping was obtained by consensus of the full panel, after evaluation against the individual grouping criteria.

The SSEP notes the urgency for some of the APL proposals forwarded to SPC. Proposal 739-APL (D'Hondt et al.), for the Bering Sea, requires immediate attention by the implementing organization (USIO). **The SSEP suggested to the SPC chair (Mori) and IODP-MI Vice President for Operations (Tom Janecek) to take this proposal forward as soon as possible.** Similarly, SSEP suggests to SPC to take proposal 734-APL to be a contingency operation for the Juan de Fuca cementing operation currently scheduled post Expedition PEAT 2.

SSEP Consensus 0811-4: The SSEP agrees by consensus that the technical aspects of the simplified "one-pipe trip CORK" are not presented in the proposal 734-APL (Davis et al.), and that this panel is incapable of evaluating the CORK design. The

SSEP is requesting that EDP evaluate the function and capability of the CORK with the re-entry cone at ODP Hole 889C considering the specific evaluation from the SSEP panel comments 11/08.

4. Nominations for new SSEP co-chair, to replace Barbara John

John Jaeger nominates Marta Torres, Mitch Schulte seconds. Nishi reminds the panel that it is desirable to have subject expertise rotation amongst the co-chairs.

31 votes were cast

30 votes were valid

30 votes confirm nomination of Marta Torres.

5. Next SSEP meetings

Henk Brinkhuis presented the logistics and details for the next planned SSEP meeting in Utrecht, The Netherlands, 25-28 May 2009 (pre-meeting field trip 24 May 2009). For the November 2009, Stephen Gallagher reiterated the offer to host the meeting in Melbourne, Australia. Should economic considerations prohibit this, a meeting in Japan is envisaged.

6. Resolutions for outgoing SSEP members

Resolutions were presented thanking outgoing SSEP members for their years of dedication: Anma, John, Menez, Takeuchi, Tamura.

7. Conclusion

The co-chairs Akira Ishiwatari, Barbara John and Heiko Pälike thanked all of the panel members for their dedication and hard work, and again thanked Ivano Aiellio, Rob Zierenberg and Eldrige and Judy Moores for fieldtrip organization. Watchdogs submitted drafts of all proposal reviews to the IODP-MI science coordinators (Hiroshi Kawamura and Barry Zelt) before the meeting ended.

**SSEP 0811 Minutes, Appendix 1
Science Steering and Evaluation Panel**

11th Meeting, November 10-13, 2008
Hotel Whitcomb, San Francisco, CA

DRAFT MEETING AGENDA

Sunday, November 9

Optional field trip to Golden Gate National Recreation Area – ‘a streetcar to subduction’

Monday, November 10

08:30-17:00

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Call to order
 - 1.2. Welcome and meeting logistics
 - 1.3. Self -introduction of attendees
 - 1.4 Approval of SSEP meeting agenda
 - 1.5 Approval of SSEP minutes from Busan, S Korea
 - 1.6. Introduction to meeting organization
 - 1.7.1 SAS Panel Reports
 - 1.7.2 IO Reports
 - CDEX Report
 - USIO Report
 - ESO Report
 - 1.8. IODP-MI Report
 - 12:30 ----- lunch -----
2. Meeting Overview
 - 2.1. Reviewing process, breakout group overview, COI
3. Breakout Sessions
 - Group 1** “Solid Earth” (chairs: John and Ishiwatari)
 - Group 2** “Environment”/ “Deep biosphere, seafloor ocean”
 - 15:30 ----- Coffee break -----

Breakout group proposal review continued

18:00- Reception hosted by Ocean Leadership (place TBD)

Tuesday, November 11

08:30-17:00

- Breakout group proposal review cont
- 10:30 ----- Coffee break -----
- Breakout group proposal review cont.
- 12:30 ----- lunch -----
- Breakout group proposal review cont.

15:30 ----- Coffee break -----

4. Joint Session: Proposal review (

----- Meeting dinner (optional) (TBD)-----

Wednesday, November 12

08:30-17:00

4. Joint Session: Proposal review (cont.)

5. Discussions and recommendations to SPC

Thursday, November 13

08:30-12:30

Discussions and recommendations to SPC (cont.)

10:30 ----- Coffee break -----

6. Announcements

Discussion of upcoming SSEP meeting May 2009

8. Resolutions for outgoing SSEP members

9. Conclusion

SSEP 0811 Minutes, Appendix 2
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.