

Agenda

IODP Council Meeting

Paris, Saturday, July 10, 2004
Hotel Concorde St. Lazare, Champagne Room
9:00 am

(9:00-11:30)

1. Introductions, Logistics of Meeting, Agenda Review (Chair)
2. Opening Remarks (MEXT and NSF)
3. States of the IODP (Chair and Co-chair)
 - Organizational Issues and Membership status
 - Financial status and Planning
 - Facilities and operational planning 2004-2006 and beyond
4. Scientific Planning (Coffin or Tamaki)
 - Status of SAS
 - 2005 - 2006 Scientific Planning
 - Other SAS activities

(11:30-13:30)

Lunch Break

(13:30-15:00)

5. CMO Report (Talwani)
 - 2004 Activities
 - 2005 Program Plan
 - Other activities
6. IODP member reports
 - China
 - ECORD Countries
 - Japan
 - U.S.
7. Calendar for 2004, 2005 and Next Council Meeting
8. Other items

**Minutes for
IODP Council Meeting**

**Paris, Saturday, July 10, 2004
Hotel Concorde St. Lazare, Champagne Room
9:00 am**

Attendees:

Members

Yucheng Chai
David Falvey
Hermann Kudrass
John Ludden
Bruce Malfait
Catherine Mével
José Monteiro (apology)
Raymond Schorno
Yasuhisa Tanaka (Chair)

Planning/Operation representatives

Steve Bohlen
Mike Coffin
Dan Evans
Asahiko Taira
Kensaku Tamaki

Guests

Eiichi Kikawa
Dae Choul Kim
Gaku Kimura
Jimmy Kinoshita
Evgeny Kontar
Motoyoshi Oda
Frank Rack
Takafumi Shimizu
Kiyoshi Suyehiro
Svetlana Zolokikova

IODP-MI

Nobuhisa Eguchi
Tom Janecek
Hans Christian Larsen
Yoichiro Otsuka
Manik Talwani

Lead Agency Staff

Rodey Batiza
Kenji Kimura
Tsuyoshi Kogo
Shingo Satomura

1. Introduction, Logistics of Meeting, Agenda Review

Tanaka: Good morning everybody, welcome to the second IODP council meeting in Paris. We had a very productive SPPOC meeting yesterday and the day before yesterday here in beautiful Paris. On behalf of NSF and MEXT I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the people who work very hard to arrange this meeting, especially Catherine and Sveltana for arrangement, I welcome all of you to the meeting and I looking forward to having a fruitful meeting today. Now I would like to ask Catherine for the meeting logistics.

Mével: Welcome everybody to this council meeting in Paris. [and announced coffee break, lunch, internet connection and photo copy etc. at the meeting.]

Tanaka: I would like to introduce meeting agenda, I hope all of you have meeting agenda, I give you a rough idea of timing of the agenda. The meeting starts from introduction and opening remarks follows, after the morning coffee break we will have scientific planning

Introductions around the room.

2. Opening Remarks

Malfait: There are clearly many developments during last six or seven months since the San Francisco IODP council meeting. The EMA members increasing very quickly and all the activities will occur in a short period of time. For this meeting we can see four IODP-MI reps attending, management and operation of the program with staffing etc. will be shown in the presentation soon. The first expedition of the IODP is now in operation on Juan de Fuca Ridge and also the first MSP expedition in the Arctic is coming soon. The riser ship "Chikyu" status will also be reported during this meeting. Extending use of JOIDES Resolution is optimistic in the Congress. Finally, we welcome Russia and Korea to this council meeting.

Tanaka: MEXT also would like to make opening remarks for you. It is great honor to chair this second IODP council meeting.

3. States of the IODP

Kimura: I would like to explain about agenda item number three "Status of the IODP".

Organizational issues and membership status

- 1) Entering into CMO contract with IODP-MI
- 2) IODP Initiation
- 3) Participation of ECORD and China with information on their level of contribution and participation units

Financial status and Planning

- 1) FY2004 Annual Program Plan approval
- 2) FY2005 Budget Guidance
- 3) Annual Program Plan Approval Process

Facilities and operational planning 2004-2006 and beyond

- Extending JOIDES Resolution drilling and Non-riser vessel conversion
- Chikyu
- MSP

Organizational issues and membership status

1) Entering into CMO contract with IODP-MI
 NSF Solicitation issued: November 2003
 IODP-MI submitted proposal to NSF: January 2004
 Evaluation: January, February 2004
 NSF-MEXT meeting to discuss evaluation and concurred on establishing
 contract: 18-19, February 2004
 IODP-MI contract finalized and signed: 31 March 2004
 IODP-MI contract became effective 1 April 2004

2) IODP Initiation

- ODP ended 31 September 2003
- IODP started 1 October 2003
- Interim CMO October 2003 – March 2004
 - Interim IODP-MI Officials
 - Dr. Paul Stoffa Interim President, IODP-MI
 - Dr. James A. Austin Interim Program Director, IODP
 - Both are University of Texas at Austin
 - 2004 Annual Program Plan
 - Initial IODP Planning

3) Participation of ECORD and China with information on their level of contribution and participation units (1)

- ECORD joined the IODP as a Contributing Member (1, Oct. 03-30, Sep. 13)
 - CNRS/INSU signed memorandum as the EMA (Mar, 04)
 - ESO (the British Geological Survey) has agreed to operate MSP activity
 - 4 participation units
 - 8 scientists per core drilling cruise or program
 - 3 voting, 1 non-voting member to each SAS panel or committee
 - Contribution schedule
 - FY04 = no money transfer to IODP (Support ESO directly), but 4 P.U. (SOCs and POCs) to support the Arctic expedition
 - FY05, 06= no less than \$7M+2 P.U. of MSP POCs
 - FY07- 13= no less than \$16.8M+1 P.U. of MSP POCs
- People's Republic of China joined as an Associate Member (1, Oct. 03 - 30, Sep. 08)
 - MOST (Ministry of Science and Technology) signed a Memorandum of Participation (Apr., 04)
 - 1/4 participation units
 - ◆ 6 participation months per year (non-riser vessel) FY04 - FY08
 - ◆ 6 participation months per year (riser-vessel) FY07, FY08
 - ◆ 1/4 participation units (MSP)
 - Membership
 - ◆ Non-Voting Membership SPC, TAP FY04 -FY08
 - ◆ Membership ISSEP, ESSEP, SCIMP, SSP, ILP FY04 -FY08
 - Contribution schedule
 - FY04 = \$1.5M FY05 - FY08 = \$1M

Financial status and planning

1) FY2004 Annual Program Plan approval

Process

- Draft APP submitted by Interim IODP-MI November 2003
- Draft APP presented by Interim IODP-MI to SPPOC for approval December 2004

- Principal officials of Lead Agencies reached agreement to approve the draft APP December 2003
- Funding started April 2004

Approval

- Non-riser activities: \$22.121M Provided directly to the JOI Alliance by NSF
- MSP activities: \$12.493M Provided directly to ESO by EMA
- Riser drilling activities \$3.4M Provided directly to CDEX by MEXT
- IODP-MI: \$2M Provided as commingled funds

Apportionment of budget items to POC/SOC is subject to review

L.A. asked for identification of mobilization costs from the estimated total cost of the Arctic expedition \$11.774M

2) FY2005 budget guidance (March 2004)

- Principal Officials of L.A. provided IODP-MI for developing APP
- Target budget guidance \$20M
 - Assumption / Expectation to provide support
 - ◆ All IODP SOC to be incurred by the JA and ECORD including drilling programs recommended by SAS
 - ◆ Central Management Office necessary / prepare and plan for long-term IODP science operations
 - ◆ Contribution (ECORD – no less than \$7M, China - \$1M, L.A. – under contract)
 - ◆ APP and Budget is to be submitted no later than 9 Aug., 04
 - ◆ NSF, MEXT and EMA will provide POC directly to IOs

3) Annual Program Plan approval process

This process is in conformity with the MOU between NSF and MEXT signed 11 Apr. 2003

- Principal Officials provide IODP-MI with budget guidance for developing APP - January
- IODP-MI sends draft APP to NSF for NSF and MEXT Principal Officials' information - June
- NSF sends draft APP to MEXT – Upon receipt
- Draft APP presented by IODP-MI to SPPOC for approval – June/July
- Draft APP submitted by IODP-MI to NSF for approval by Principal Officials – August
- NSF sends draft APP to MEXT – Upon receipt
- Principal Officials reach agreement to approve the draft APP (by having NSF-MEXT meeting if necessary) - August
- Modify the draft APP by IODP-MI if any changes requested by NSF based on concurrence of Principal Officials - August
- Lead Agencies' approval letter signed by Principal Officials - September
- Technical representative recommends approval of APP to NSF Contracting officer - September
- NSF Contracting officer sends letter formally approving APP (with Principal Officials' letter) to IMI - September
- Funding starts - October

MEXT liaison acts on behalf of MEXT in APP approval process.

Facilities and operational planning 2004 – 2006 and beyond

- Possibility of extending JOIDES Resolution drilling last 4 months of FY05 and into FY06
- Non-riser vessel conversion
 - NSF FY2005 budget request to Congress includes initial funds

- Converted vessel is expected to be available around mid-2006
- Chikyu
 - Construction of Chikyu will be completed in April, 05 and after the crew training cruise, IODP operation will be started in FY07
 - In the FY05 and FY06, engineering site survey will be carried out towards the start of IODP operation
- MSP
 - The MSP operation in Tahiti is scheduled for FY05, the ECORD council has approved to allocate the POCs.
 - MSP operation in FY06 will be subject to specific objectives of the science plan. ESO has started working on the implementation of the New Jersey Margin proposal in FY06.

Mével: I just want to ask about the process of annual program plan approval and this is related to MSP. If I understood it correctly the timing of the final approval is in August or September. I would like to bring to the attention of the SAS that at that time for MSP, project is still provisional because each time you have to find new ship, have to have RFP and it takes long time to process RFP. So probably we expect signed budget will not finish till August or September

Malfait: Yes, we realize it. Probably platform operation cost may change and at some point we should revisit FY04 suggestions.

Falvey: The last slide please. The second bullet says that MSP operation in FY06 will be subject to specific objectives of the science plan. This is slightly different from any others by platform operation, it's proposal driven.....

Tanaka: This is exactly a commerce of the memorandum of understanding regarding MSP. In the IODP, there are two principle of platforms, one for riser and non-riser platform and the other is for MSP. For MSP, you see the memorandum you can read...

Falvey: Which sentence are we talking about?

Malfait: It said that MEXT and NSF will be running platform each year but I don't believe there is commitment of MSP each year in IODP. Clearly for FY05 there is no identification and commitment by EMA that supporting MSP activity in FY05. But EMA is not, as far as I know, commit to doing MSP program in each year. So that is why it says in FY06, subject to specific objectives, those objectives are generated for MSP if there is highly rated proposal and it is recommended by SPC and SPPOC

MEXT

Mével: ECORD willing to have at least one MSP operation each year.

Falvey: Another issue for MSP operation. I would like to make it clear that BGS is the host for ESO. It is not a sole component of science operator, there are two other components in science operator ESO is not just BGS but with two other components and BGS is a lot more than just a ESO,

Tanaka: But this is exactly what it said in the memorandum between MEXT, NSF, and ECORD. There is Annex C in the memorandum. The title of Annex C is "The British Geological Survey (BGS) as primary implementing organization for mission specific platforms (MSPs)" and it said that "It is the intent of the ECORD Managing Agency (EMA) to support the British Geological Survey (BGS) (the ECORD Science Operator – ESO) as the primary Implementing Organization for the management of mission specific platform (MSP) drilling in the IODP.

Falvey: I would like to mention there is not a one to one relationship between ESO and BGS.

Ludden: MSP operation in FY06. New Jersey Margin proposal, we are negotiating with ICDP for co-funding for that proposal.

Schorno: Question regarding clarification on this council. In that presentation where the council fits in the process?

Mulfait: One of the major purposes of this council meeting is to inform the council what's happening in the IODP.

Schorno: My question is what is the scheme and reference in the hierarchy of council meeting in certain stage of the program.

Mulfait: We will come back to this issue at the end of IMI discussion and will discuss how the council meeting works and fits in the process.

4. Scientific Planning Status of SAS

Tanaka: Next is the forth item in the agenda, Scientific planning, I would like to ask Tamaki-san first to present

Tamaki: I would like to start with my presentation as the SPPOC chair and I will pass to Mike for more detail of the science plan. We had two days SPPOC meeting, I would like to briefly report what we decided the last two days.

At first, this is the very important issue, we approved the IODP program plan for FY05, the detail of the science plan will be presented by Mike Coffin. This is the first program plan prepared by IODP-MI and we recognize that there were huge efforts during the short period of time because they set up their office just April 1st. Some discussion about consistency with the Initial Science Plan. Some SPPOC members were concerned about how the ISP is implemented in the annual program plan. However the stage is very beginning so it may not very easy at this stage to implement. Our next December meeting we will make an agenda item "how to implement ISP in the annual program plan". Anyway, I would like to report that the FY05 annual program plan has been approved by the SPPOC without any change.

The second issue is that we approved the IODP conflict of interest policy. The IODP started from October last year but at that time there was no COI policy so we were using ODP COI policy instead. This time we approved three-page document, that will soon be distributed. The former ODP policy was brief, only one page. We start with the definition of the COI policy with a general statement. On the screen I will show you some extracts from the policy. This document is very good to show the policy to the outside community, how do we carefully treat the conflict and how do we evaluate it fairly. I just introduce simple principle of the policy.

An individual scientist can be a regular member of only one standing SAS committee or panel.

Any representative of IODP Management International, Inc. (IODP-MI), IODP lead funding agencies, implementing organizations (IOs), and their subcontractors can not serve as a member on standing SAS committees and panels, other than the IODP-MI Board of Governors members who also serve as Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee (SPPOC) members.

All potential conflicts of interest will be declared at the start of every meeting, or at an otherwise appropriate time during the meeting. Committee and panel members, or other attendees having a potential conflict of interest regarding a proposal, or potential or actual contract, should not be present when that proposal is evaluated, considered for ranking or ranked, or considered for scheduling or scheduled. Proponents may be present for the general discussion of proposals (e.g.: how proposals address long-range objectives).

These are principles and later in this document rather more detailed description of treatment of COI and actual process at the SAS meeting is described. And during the discussion transparency of evaluation, (SPC ranking ballots) was raised and there were positive discussion towards this issue. So far, the ranking process of the proposal was not open so we will discuss this transparency issue at our next meeting.

We had three ad-hoc committees. We set up three ad-hoc committees at our last meeting. The first one is evaluation of the SAS, the second one is COI, this committee made the COI policy and this committee continues to work till the next meeting, and the third one is POCs/SOCs definition. This time we received report of POCs/SOCs definition. There were some concerns about long-term instrumentation, and mobilization/demobilization issues. But all these issues should be decided by the lead agencies so we just discuss POCs/SOCs definition from scientist point of view. There is no consensus document but the detail of the discussion will appear in the minutes.

SPPOC also received the IODP sample, data and obligation policy. At the end of last month, the first IODP expedition started and we need this policy. This policy was prepared by SPC and we received it and passed it to the IODP-MI. The part of the policy will be presented by Mike Coffin. We also received the IODP publication policy from the SPC and forwarded it to the IODP-MI, this policy will be also shown by Mike Coffin.

SPPOC means Science Planning and Policy Oversight and this is very new issue compared with the ODP EXCOM. So at the second meeting we started serious discussion how we can really act as Science Planning and Policy Oversight. We decided that a big part of the agenda is for this issue at the next meeting in December. The part of the discussion I listed here, 1) implementation of the ISP to annual program plan, 2) process of program assessment, 3) riser drilling.

Tanaka: Is there any questions for Tamaki-sensei's presentation?

Falvey: I'm very pleased to see evolution of the conflict of interest policy. I just want to point out a clarification. And I do approve that the management, funding agencies, IOs and subcontractors can not serve as a member of panels, but I point out the clarification that this does not preclude JAMSTEC for example, be a member of the panels just because CDEX is inside the JAMSTEC.

Tamaki: Yes, this committee discussed in very detail and there will be additional documents appearing in the next meeting. Some appendices will be included in this policy and Appendix C will be a description of IOs for each country and discrimination of complicated issue such as CDEX is conflicted but generally JAMSTEC is ok, will be described.

Falvey: Presumably, that discussion should go beyond JAMSTEC.

Tamaki: Yes.

Malfait: Thanks for your comment, Dave and Ken. Clearly, you've been involved in conflict of interest discussion in the drilling program and multi national programs with varying perspective on conflict of interest. And I think one of the most difficult aspects in this issue is organizations and subunits. We at NSF are still debating the issue of the University of California system with different universities within the system Posing interesting questions about COI. The debate will probably continue for years.

Ludden: I have a comment on an evolution of the SPPOC I am proposing, based on a discussion with European SPPOC member last night, IODP should not be a continuation of ODP. Two major differences in the IODP are "Chikyu" and "deep biosphere" and it is important that "deep biosphere" will become a major part of this program

Malfait: I think from the lead agencies perspective that that is certainly and absolutely correct. IODP is the new program and ODP had ended although we are still doing some ODP activities. I think that in the program there are number of new things, clearly the program is based on the Initial Science Plan which has many aspects including biosphere stuff. Whether you choose to consider that that is the most significant or not is a matter of taste. Different countries, different groups of scientist will have different ideas on what is most important. . In ODP, there was clearly some concern that all the items identified in COSOD were not all completed during ODP. In IODP there has been concern about the lack of biosphere activities in the 2005 plan but, as pointed out at the SPPOC meeting, a significant part of Juan de Fuca drilling has deep biosphere implications.

Tanaka: Any other questions or comments? Ok, we will invite Mike Coffin, SPC chair.

2005-2006 Scientific planning

Coffin: I will continue on with the presentation of the science plan of the IODP. Personally I am very happy to see a representative from Korea here. I visited KORDI January last year and had very fruitful IODP discussions. People are very interesting in IODP science and we look forward to Korea joining the IODP.

My presentation covers three areas, Status of the science advisory structure, planning for late 2005 and 2006 fiscal year and other activities in the science advisory structure. Just to remind you what the science structure looks like.
----explanation of SAS, each panel----

Most of the SAS panels and committees meet twice a year, this is the recent schedule since start of the IODP last October.

This is a summary of what proposals currently are in the system as of May. Total number of proposals is currently 114 and many of those are carried over from ODP. As the three major themes in the ISP break out, about one quarter is solid earth cycles, geodynamics, one quarter is deep biosphere and subseafloor ocean and about one half have to with environmental themes..

This diagram summarizes basically how quickly a proposal moves through the system and an average length of the time a proposal takes from the proposal being submit until it reaches the possibility of being scheduled is somewhere between 3 to 5 years. These "Full" designations indicate each iteration of the proposal.

This is the global distribution of the proposal in the system now and you can see they pretty much cover the earth.

Moving on to the science planning, last September we ranked and scheduled FY04 and part of FY05, last month we conducted ranking exercise for FY05 remainder, two programs which NSF and MEXT advised us might be possible at the end of the fiscal year and for FY06. In October we will conduct scheduling exercise for remainder of FY 05 and FY06 and then next March we will conduct ranking exercise for FY07 and this will be the first year of three-platform operation, full operation of the IODP.

This is what the schedule looks like and the first expedition in FY05 will be part one of North Atlantic climate study and will be back to back expeditions of Core Complex on the mid-Atlantic ridge and the second part of this climate expedition plus another proposal which combined with this expedition will finish out what's in the current program plan for FY05 non-riser operations. MSP operation will be Tahiti and weather window is sometime during May – October and dynamic positioning vessel will be chartered for that although this is at a very preliminary stage right now. As Kimura-san mentioned, possibility of two additional traditional non-riser legs may fill out the FY05 program plan which will be considered by SPPOC in December meeting following October SPC meeting.

This is distribution geographically expeditions in FY05 schedule.

I just got through briefly the scientific objectives and what we hope to achieve during the drilling programs.

First objective of this climate study is look at late Neogene and Quaternary climate record in order to calibrate geomagnetic intensity, isotope stratigraphies, and regional environmental stratigraphies. And the purpose is developing a template on thousand years scale for understanding how climate changes and in particular relationships among atmosphere, cryosphere and ocean.

This is series of sites in north Atlantic ranging from Labrador Basin, sedimentary ridges, sites along the mid-Atlantic Ridge franks and Orphan Knoll in New Foundland. Also shows a location of Norwegian Margin Bottom water experiment.

The other part which was included in the second expedition in North Atlantic is studying Norwegian Margin Bottom Water history of past few hundred years. Its objectives is to understand how bottom water temperature changes on scale of tens to hundreds of years. A hole is sealed off and thermistor string and packer will put in the hole and left for monitoring. And what makes this experiment possible is that very close by where a ship has been deployed yearly for the past 50 years and continually monitor bottom water temperature at 2000m in depth so we think we know what the fluctuations in bottom water temperature have been and that way you can work backward to find what is the change in longer time period. This is the location of where the new site will be drilled and this is Hole 643-E and this is the weather station.

Oceanic Core Complex is another expedition it will be back to back sandwich between the climate expeditions. It has multiple objectives it's going to look at variations in rock type, structure, and alteration with depth at those ultramafic oceanic core complex including how the detachment fault developed. It also looks at how melt was produced, how migrated, and relationships between deformation and tectonics and melting. Lastly, critical problem is to look at alteration front within the oceanic mantle and try to answer the question of whether Moho is a hydration front in the crust or a crust mantle chemical boundary. This is where the expedition take place, and this side scan sonar image shows the mid Atlantic ridge coming down like this.

Next expedition, the last one of talk about is South Pacific Sea Level it has four major objectives, one is try to reconstruct deglaciation curve between 20k to 10k years ago to establish minimum sea level during the Last Glacial Maximum, another is to assess the validity, timing, and amplitude of meltwater pulses, the third objective is try to establish sea surface temperature variations accompanying with sea level changes, and lastly try to identify and establish patterns of short-term paleoclimatic changes since the Last Glacial Maximum.

This is a record of sea level over past 18k year since the Last Glacial Maximum.

There has also have been an ancillary project letter (APL) submitted which is a classification of IODP proposal generally three days or less of ship time. This one is geophysically complementary to the drilling study of the reef and very sophisticated way to use both P-wave and S-waves for watching image and tomography as well as using ocean bottom cable P and S-wave tomography. The IODP contribution to this project is modest and most of the work will be funded externally by an industry consortium. IODP contribution is to install liners in bore holes and instruments strings and re-entry cones. They will only do this for one of the transects in this figure.

As I said earlier we conducted ranking exercise in Yokohama at Science Planning Committee meeting. This is the results of the ranking exercise. We divided ranked proposal into three groups, highest science priority, second priority, and third priority. You see this one pure biosphere proposal here (547-Full4) this is only one the SPC has seen so far. I just give you a brief summary of each one of these highly ranked proposals.

Other SAS Activities

Coffin: Ok, now we move on to third topic other SAS activities, I just remind you that all SAS committees and panels are highly active and motivated for initiating the IODP, we have extremely dedicated group of panel and committee members and they deserve our congratulations for working together to provide everything we need in IODP.

Two major items, policy development and committee, panel, and working group activity.

Policy development

- publications policy
- DSDP, ODP, and IODP core distribution
- Sample, data, and obligations policy

Committee, panel, and working group activity

- Observatories and the IODP
- SAS review (SPPOC and SPC)
- Proposal handling (SSEPs and SPC)

Publications policy recommended to IODP-MI includes five points. One is the expedition report be produced as web version and designated as the permanent archive. As the scientific results will be an electronic version and that it includes an expedition science summary coordinated by the co-chief scientists, continually updated bibliography of all publications that includes everything published in outside literature and data reports and technical notes. Third point is we need to make some provisions for permanent archiving, it could be electronic, but the way publication people are thinking of permanent is greater than 100 years and whether electrons may last in a particular place for 100 years may be open to speculation. Significant part of the community wants paper production of IODP results so we suggest that some provisions will make for this- less than archival quality but better than news print, less than current scientific results, on-demand copies or subscriptions basis. Lastly, the

scientific community is very concerned that IODP product would be integrated, to be uniform in style and this was suggest that one organization be responsible for technical editing, layout, and production.

Next topic is expedition designation, this is another differences from previous scientific ocean drilling programs. We recommended prime identification of all expeditions be a name which describes the location and/or science objectives. Reason to doing this is we have communication problem within the community. The other purpose is outreach and education. So we have a hybrid system for expedition designation.

Distribution of cores and other critical and important topic, SPC had a consensus at the last month meeting, all cores divided into three IODP core repositories based in principle on the geographic considerations. IODP-MI is now working on defining the cost implications, logistics and how does this get implemented. And come back to us with more refined information later. This is a tentative scheme IODP-MI proposed; Bremen: Atlantic, Arctic, Mediterranean, TAMU: Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, Eastern Pacific, Southern Ocean, Kochi: Western Pacific and marginal seas, Indian Ocean.

Moving on to the sample, data, and obligations policy, this is a lengthy document and I just give you an overview. This policy describes how sample and data get distributed. Specific objective of the policy is to ensure samples and data available to scientific party members so they can fulfill the scientific objectives as well as their responsibilities. Encourage scientific analyses throughout the scientific community and preserve archival materials for future work. The sample, data, and obligations policy consists of seven parts.

Observatories and the IODP, SPC charges the panels to coming up with a scheme of integrating observatory science into the IODP. We considered that is important. Two panels are charged to examine existing IODP policies and recommending revisions for incorporation of observatory science. As start for this, the Monterey Bay test sites, two panels are also working for how we can integrate and coordinate management of these sites, especially in transition from after the drilling by IODP to install fiber optic cable. And we will think about how we can manage the data and use the facility, a lot of consideration here.

Tamaki-san mentioned that major review of the science advisory structure is on the way, the IODP-MI asked SPPOC and SPPOC asked SPC to address four points, one is how to effectively implement program evaluation and assessment, how we can make multi-platform and long-term science planning effectively, how we can make interaction between the management agency and the SAS effectively, and lastly how we can effectively integrate with other international earth science programs such as the ICDP. Within the SAS, there is the SPC working group, three members here represent US, ECORD and Japan, mid-term report was presented our meeting in last month and final report will done during October. We are working in conjunction with the SPPOC ad-hoc committee chaired by Judy McKenzie, mid-term report was presented yesterday's and the day before yesterday's SPPOC meeting and final report will be due in December and this SPC working group report is duck tailed to this SPPOC report because the chair of this committee will attend the SPC meeting in October. This is the initial diagram produced by ad-hoc committee with funding agencies in blue, management organization and implementing organizations in green, and brown represents well defined roles for SAS, and these white bubbles need refinement or improvement of how their roles are carried out. SPPOC will examine this at the next meeting as Tamaki-san mentioned. These two panels [TAP and ILP] currently within the SAS and mainly consist of engineering and industry people and we are not sure whether their advice is more appropriate given directly to the

management or whether it should be filtered by SAS. I just noted one of the problem with the SAS is we have very few engineers and industry people at the upper most level where these two panels report to, hence we do not really understanding what they are recommending, so reporting route through SPC and SPPOC is not the most efficient way. Other significant areas need to be consider, observatories how do we incorporate them into the IODP, how do we get the science plan translated into programs, eight initiatives in the Initial Science Plan but we only four of them have significant number of proposal in the system, other four are hardly presented or not presented at all by proposals, so not just biosphere which is under represented with respect to the ISP.

The SPC has charged another topic “proposal handling”, SPC is asked SSEPs to consider such issues as how long unscheduled proposals should remain with the SPC or OPCOM before it meets the updated or revised and need to develop procedures for handling CDPs after they forwarded to the SPC and this group will report to the SPC at March 2005 SPC meeting.

Otsuka: Tamaki-san referred to publication policy and sample, data, and obligation policy. I think better describe it as “SPC recommended those two policies to IODP-MI” and SPPOC recognized that now it is at the implementation stage now those policies are developed by SPC and received by IODP-MI and IODP-MI is now the process of reviewing from implementation side, so although these are pretty mature policies as Mike described please note that they are not finalized yet, they are in the process of further development by IODP-MI.

Coffin: The SAS is very aware we are advisory group and that is why a heading of the slides said “policy development” and did not say “policy implementation”. We are careful for wording what the recommendations were. So I hope that is clear, the IODP-MI actually works out how things are implemented-- we provide advice.

Ludden: Why SPPOC has one chair? Maybe it is useful to think about co-chair or vice chair. Second question is publication, do you think open access for the publications?

Coffin: For the first comment, you have to ask lead agencies because SPPOC chair and SPC chair and vice chair more or less agreed by lead agencies. Second question, yes I did not give much background how these publication policy recommendations were developed but both the SciMP and SPC devoted significant time on this. At the SPC level we polled the J-DESC, ESSAC, and USSAC and we had over one hundred responses, so we think given the history of publication we have got broad community input as possible. I think the recommendation we came up with show that there is no unity among the community as to how publication should be.

Tanaka: Regarding your first question, chairmanship of SPPOC is in conformity with the memorandum between NSF and MEXT it said that chairmanship of SPPOC is expected to initially rotate between Japan and USA with term of two years. Now is the time for Japanese chair for two years. The lead agencies consider further but keeping in conformity with this memorandum.

Larsen: Publications and core repository issues are under consideration by IODP-MI Sapporo office task forces.

Ludden: Mike, you mentioned four of the initiatives in the ISP are not represented in the proposals, which are they?

Coffin: They are Deep Biosphere, 21st Century MOHO, Large Igneous Provinces, and Continental Breakup and Sedimentary Basin Formation.

-----Coffee Break-----

5. CMO Report

Tanaka: I would like to continue the morning session, agenda item 5, CMO report we invite Dr. Manik Talwani, president of IODP-MI.

Talwani: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Tanaka-san made my job easier by giving me a set of questions, so my presentation is basically a response to the questions. By way of introduction let me say that management of this program is a challenge because everybody wants to have managing role. In fact, sometimes I am surprised that the number of people who have management responsibility but I very aware to the fact this is a huge program and budget for FY05 is about \$62M and contractually we have been given a responsibility to manage. Therefore, we would take the advice that people have to offer but in the end we have to decide how we want to manage. Our management will be reviewed obviously by SPPOC, BOGs, and IODP council.

2004 Activities

Talwani: I would like to summarize what has happen to date since the previous Council Meeting, the topics to be reported on will be: CMO contract with NSF, organizational structure, personnel and tasks of IMI, 2004 budget allocation, 2004 science activities, 2004 education and outreach meeting report.

Start with what has happen to date since the previous Council meeting, previous Council meeting was in the last December and from December to April we are not running this thing, Paul Stoffa and Jamie Austin were interim president and director so I asked Paul what you did during that time and he loaned this slides.

<u>Event</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>
<u>NSF/MEXT Meeting to Discuss IODP-MI Proposal</u>	11/21/03	Washington DC
Manik Talwani and Paul Stoffa met with Patrick Welsh, Contract Specialist for NSF, to discuss IODP-MI's Proposal for the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program-CMO RFP		
<u>IODP-MI Sends Initial Request for Preliminary Funding to NSF</u>	12/01/03	
<u>SPPOC Meeting to Approve Program Plan</u>	12/05-06/03	San Francisco
<u>IODP-MI Board of Governors Executive Committee Meeting</u>	12/06/03	San Francisco
<u>IODP Council Meeting</u>	12/07/03	San Francisco
<u>Request to Expedite Application for Tax Exempt Status Submitted to IRS</u>	12/09/03	
<u>Request to Expedite Application for Tax Exempt Status Approved by IRS</u>	12/10/03	

IODP-MI Vice President of Science Operations 12/16/03
Application Deadline

President Takes Office 01/01/04 Washington, DC

Interim IODP-MI Washington DC Office to be located in JAMSTEC Washington, DC office

IODP-MI Proposal Submitted to NSF 01/10/04

IODP-MI Search Committee Interviews for Vice President of Science Operations 01/13/04 Washington DC

IODP-MI Search Committee conducts interview of 3 candidates for IODP-MI Vice President of Science Operations

IODP-MI Chief Financial Officer Candidates Interviewed 01/14/04 Washington DC

Manik Talwani and Paul Stoffa conduct interviews of 3 candidates for IODP-MI Chief Financial Officer

Stephanie Murphy Named IODP-MI Chief Financial Officer 01/16/03

Stephanie Murphy accepts IODP-MI invitation to become the first Chief Financial Officer effective February 16, 2004

Request from IRS for Clarification of Information Provided in IODP-MI Application for Tax Exempt Status 01/23/04

Request received from IRS Exempt Organization Specialist for clarification regarding ownership of patents, copyrights, processes, or formulas and how intellectual property will be shared and publicized; clarification on compensation of governors/officers; established policy to safeguard against conflict of interest

Thomas R. Janacek Named IODP-MI Vice President of Science Operations 01/26/04

Thomas R. Janacek accepts IODP-MI invitation to become the first Vice President of Science Operations effective April 1, 2004

Revised Application for Tax Exempt Status Submitted to IRS Exempt Organization Specialist 01/27/04; 01/29/04

Amended section of application to provide clarification

Discussion with IRS Exempt Organization Specialist Regarding Revised Application 01/30/04

Request for Tax Exempt Status Under Section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code Approved by IRS 02/10/04

IODP Education and Outreach Meeting 02/20-23/04 Austin

Approximately 20 participants from the US, Japan, and Europe with experience in a broad range of outreach and educational activities and involvement in scientific ocean drilling met at The University of Texas at Austin to (1) consider the full range of education and outreach

activities that IODP-MI should undertake to support education and outreach on the international level, treating education and outreach as distinct efforts; and (2) to develop a plan and realistic budget for these activities.

Reviews and NSF Comments on IODP-MI Proposal Received 02/23/04

IO Second Meeting 02/27-28/04 Edinburgh

Meeting chaired by James Austin with representatives from designated Implementing Organizations (IO's) along with selected representatives from IODP Management International, Inc., SAS and the Lead Agencies to continue discussions initiated at Bozeman meeting (08/18-20/03) regarding cross-platform integration.

SPC Meeting 03/21-26/04 Washington DC

IODP-MI Annual Meeting 03/29/04 Sapporo

Annual meeting of members of IODP Management International, Inc. as required by the By-Laws "for the transaction of such business as may properly come before the meeting."

IODP-MI Board of Governors Meeting 03/30/04 Sapporo

Annual meeting of the Board of Governors as required by the By-Laws "for the election of officers and for the transaction of such other business as may properly come before it."

Vice President of Science Planning Takes Office 04/01/04 Sapporo

Vice President of Science Operations Takes Office 04/01/04 Washington DC

Interim IODP Planning Office Ceases "Official" Operations 04/01/04

Talwani: Next issue is entering into CMO contract with NSF. We were awarded 9.5 years contract to run the IODP-MI office as the central management office and MEXT and NSF worked very hard to make the contract taken from April 1st 2004. [shows provisional budget table] For FY04, let me emphasize this, only had budget for office in Washington and Sapporo and other activities both SOCs and POCs would be directly funded. The total budget for 9.5 years is \$429M.

Organizational structure, personnel and tasks of IODP-MI. We have established two offices, one in Washington, D.C. and the other in Sapporo. The Sapporo office is headed by vice president for science planning, Hans Christian Larsen. We do want video conferencing facilities between the two locations. Beside the president there are three key personnel, vice president for science operations (Tom Janecek), he has important job of chairman of OPCOM and put together the annual operational plan in conjunction with the IOs and the SAS. Vice president for planning (Hans Christian Larsen), he has a major liaison function with SAS and he also supervises the SAS support office in Sapporo in addition to data management and publication responsibilities. The last member of key personnel is the senior advisor to the president (Yoichiro Otsuka) and I am very happy that he is able to join us. He has a long experience with MEXT. In addition, we have financial and administrative officer (Stephanie Murphy) and new contracts officer who is part time and we are in the process of hiring director of communications. [shows wiring diagrams of IODP-MI] In Washington office, all these stuffs except director of communication and executive program associate were already hired. Director of communication will hire as soon as

we can and executive program associate, in part because of our budget limitation, will be hire later on in the FY05.

I am supposed to supervise the personnel in the corporation and be responsible for the operation of the CMO office. In this capacity, I have to construct the IODP annual program plan for SPPOC and IODP-MI Board of Governors approval, and we will submitted the program plan to NSF and MEXT very soon and we will negotiate this contract. I emphasize this is in our contract that I will be ultimately responsible for the execution of the program plan. We have subcontracts and these will be done with the help of vice presidents and senior advisor.

In this diagram [page 21], you can see the block shaded means subcontracted. We already have VP science operations and we will hire manager for operations by middle of FY05 and project assistant will also hired. We have not have any contract out for sample repository and engineering development yet.

VP for science operations will work with IOs to develop implementation strategies to achieve the science objectives of IODP. He will be responsible for subcontracts for the sample repositories and perhaps most importantly he will serve as chair of the Operations Committee (OPCOM).

This is the wiring diagram for the VP for Science Planning and this is in Sapporo. In this diagram, fenced area is SAS Office, Nobu and Jeff, they are the ones who handled incoming proposals and others, this is more or less continuation of interim IODP. Others basically green areas are subcontractors, Program and administrative Associate, we have one in the office right now but new one will be hired and Manager of Data, Education and Publication will be also hired later on. The VP for Science Planning is a interface between the international scientific community and IODP. And also interface to the SAS by supporting and coordinating the SAS activities and also very much responsible and this is important part of the job, the deliverables to oversee the production of the key products of IODP's data, publications, and education. He also serves as an advisor to the SPC and SPPOC chairs. He will directly oversee the subcontract for the Site Survey Data Bank, so he has got two roles, one is liaise advisory structure and other is be in charge of deliverables. As a practical matter, the Sapporo office is subcontracted to AESTO under a sole source arrangement. The VP for Science Planning will oversee this subcontract. This is current personnel of the Sapporo Office, Hans Christian is the head of the office, Jeff Schuffert and Nobu Eguchi are Science coordinators, Sakamoto-san is the Program and Administrative Associate, and there are a part-time Contract Officer and two assistants. Hans Christian has to fill these other three positions [Program Data and Publication Manager, Data Management Specialist, and Associate Science Coordinator] and had a good response for the advertisement and will have interview next month (August). IODP-MI and its Sapporo Office staff extend its thanks and acknowledgements to Hokkaido University for providing excellent office space and Okada-san (Hisatake Okada) is especially helpful and AESTO has been also helpful. And University of Hokkaido will add a faculty position which especially work for the IODP. We are very appreciate for the help provided by Hokkaido University.

This is outline of the job of Director of Communications and he has to be hire people here [Public Affairs, Web Site, and Project Assistant]. We are very conscious for Outreach and it is very important, but outreach has some difficulty because IOs and national/consortium have their own outreach program, we somehow need to coordinate those activities and help each other for excellent out reach program, we have to be conscious for a large amount of money we are spending and general public does not get much return for that money very least they must be inform to see what is happening. This is a statement of what the Director of Communications will have to

do, and one of the things we will have very soon is IODP website. This is very important because recently first thing you will do to know about some organization is to go to website. Different websites have to be organized and linked and we think it is very important to have an excellent website. We will have Finance and Administrative Officer, Contracts Officer, Executive Program Associate later.

I have shown this diagram [p. 33] before but this is for FY05, green arrows indicate flows of money, yellow part represent POCs activities and those are directly funded by each agencies. Other arrows, SOC's are all come through CMO and we have a job of subcontracting SOC funds not only to the IOs but also to other science services subcontractors which should be all given through RFPs and you have to be find out what is a different rules for RFP because you want them to be global RFPs and not focused on single country. Very important part of this diagram is Science Advisory Structure, we have advisory and consultation responsibility with them. Science community is the principle stake holder and we have to be very sure that in managing this program we are responsible to what they need and demand but at the same time we have to manage the program and physically responsible within the budget and present budget preparation shows that does not have to be very simple matter and does have complications.

I put this slide to show one of the most important operation that is where operation plan is divided, basically advice comes from left side [SAS] then the SPC advice to one of the most important IMI's committee, OPCOM, then OPCOM asked to IOs how to fulfill what SAS wants and come up the schedule and then iterated with SPC to make sure SPC thinks the plan satisfied requirements and that goes to the annual program plan send it to SPPOC for the approval then goes to the Board of Governor for their approval and submit to NSF and MEXT and you have heard Kenji Kimura's presentation about what happened after the program plan was sent to NSF and MEXT. Hopefully, it will take couple of months to approve and funding starts.

Tanaka-san asked about 2004 activities and what is the budget allocation, I will show these slides but we are not in the operation to approve the budget 2004 it was done between the interim IODP-MI and of course and it was done directly by funding agencies to the IOs. Basically this is the budget for FY04, IODP-MI received the money [\$2000k] for start up the offices and all the other categories were funded directly by the funding agencies to JOI Alliance, ESO, and CDEX and the total was \$40000k. This is the detail of our budget, for the Washington Office was about \$1467k, and for the Sapporo Office was about \$596k.

The next question from Tanaka-san was what 2004 scientific activities including numbers of onboard scientists for each cruise and IODP science activities and estimated costs for the Arctic expedition. This is the budget for ACEX and ESO maintenance and it is \$12.5M and I emphasize it was negotiated between the funding agencies, IODP-MI was not involved in this. This is a country breakdown of scientific party participants for Expedition 301 and you can see US 45%, Japan 31%, and ECORD countries are remaining. This is for 302, the distribution are US 32%, Japan 24%, ECORD 41%, and others 3%. IODP-MI is not responsible for putting scientists onboard, but IOs decide which scientists go onboard. We have a job for monitoring that making sure the distribution is as specified in Memorandum of Understanding. And it is not quite clear to us that what is the integrating time frame of which we have for averaging these things out, if some country sends less to one expedition is it entitled to sending more to another expedition.

Ludden: You have shown as ECORD countries but we would like to be shown as ECORD not breakdown to each country.

Malfait: I do think it is important to this program to maintain a record of distribution of countries.

Ludden: I think in an average of years, three or four years, we can provide such kind of information to you, but we would like to see "ECORD" used in IODP statistics.

Talwani: It is totally up to the funding agencies to tell us how you want to see.

Malfait: The information kept by IOs, we will want that information

Ludden: I am not sure why you want that information

Malfait: When ship goes to port, such information is needed, identified as ECORD will not work, we would like to know who is on the ship. We have to have that information.

Ludden: I think there are two issues, the political representation and scientists from different countries on ship. ECORD, Japan and US and other countries representation is one issue and we feel that it is up to us to decide. In terms of onboard scientists, it is technically important to operators when ship comes to the port I think operator will manage the cases.

Malfait: It is operator's problem but at least from the US perspective sailing a ship under a contract with NSF, we would like to know which country, the nationality of the people onboard.

Ludden: That information will provided by ECORD to the operators.

Malfait: That information of nationality is very important to the operators.

Ludden: ECORD provides a list of people to the operators and each operator will decide, we agree to that. The ECORD is a member as a group of European countries to the program. At the Council level, I think we could decide how to break down, we could provide these statistics.

Talwani: I want you gentlemen to decide what you want us to show.

Talwani: [back to his presentation] What else have we been doing last three month is that in large part we developing Program Plan which is now been approved by the Board of Governor and send to MEXT and NSF. We have set up Education and Outreach Task Force and this will meet again. And again, I stressed this is important task. Let me point out since we are a very small organization and why we will get an advice from SAS we will probably have a number of areas in which appointed task forces give us more pointed advice on exactly how to go ahead to implement those things, so this is the one of the task forces. There was a meeting of OPCOM which Tom Janecek chaired and had a very productive meeting with IOs and science representatives and they are responsible for FY05 Program Plan. Two things in progress are web site which hopefully implement by the 2nd week of July at least first version of the site and also hopefully by the end of July we will start video conference.

These couple of slides I call them as house keeping slides, give you examples of what we have to go through to get this office set up. There are various job you have to do, you have to have accounting system, you have to think of retirement plan, you have to do historical accounting, then you have to put together manuals for procurement, travel human resources and accounting and you have to find out what the fringe

benefit is, see none of these are known, you have to figure out what you want to do. And we did get a lot of help from JOI, then you have to report to government what you are doing. Then we began searching for long-term lease space and corporate insurance, then you have to identify buildings and we had to negotiate for space, then we selected the building facilitate telephone system and so on so forth. And we are searching for Director of Communications.

Briefly I give you a report of Education and Outreach Meeting. This was based on a workshop held in Austin and the task force job is advise us on immediate education and outreach priorities, developing education and outreach plan, and prepare education and outreach guidelines and policies. This is participants list, our task force include conflicted people, we think in order to manage this program we need best opinions for all of the people involved only when we start to getting business of RFPs we will worry about who is responsible for those.

Mével: I was there [her name was not on the list].

Talwani: Oh, you were there? This is the task force meeting in March, this is not a workshop. Catherine was a very important participant in the February workshop.

Talwani: [back to his presentation] The expert tells us that our Logo is not good enough it has to be modified. One job is maintain and compile common content resources, we keep master schedule which covers all major IODP activities. This task force decided brief description of IODP (60 and 200 words) is needed. We will have a booth or display activities at AGU, IGS in Florence. We need a spokesperson for international media relations and common procedure should be developed and policies and guidelines are developed.

Tanaka: We should finish our morning session here, is there any questions or comments?

Schorno: Short question, the new web site is still **iodp.org**?

Talwani: Yes. I was hoped this will be finalized by the time of this meeting but we are not quite ready yet. In the absence of Director of Communication, Tom Janecek and Yoichiro Otsuka have been working hard to get this things going and we have obtained help from IT and program people at JOI.

Ludden: I want to come back to ECORD-country issue again. Europe needs to be sitting here as a single group.

Malfait: I can understand the perspective of Europe as one member of the IODP, but Council represents the countries involved in the IODP. That's conceivably one reason to choose presenting country membership.

Ludden: Yes, the Council represents all the countries involved in the IODP, ECORD chooses to be represented by three vice presidents of EMA at ECORD council.

Malfait: So, the council members are discouraged from being candidates?.

Ludden: No, not at all. We were presented by the group and everyone could be a candidate when time comes.

Falvey: ECORD council decided the representation of this council

Tanaka: We actually were expecting all member country of ECORD coming to this council meeting.

Mével: ECORD council member feel that we are well representing.

Tanaka: I think it is up to ECORD.

Talwani: Can I make one further point? Our contractual relationship is with NSF and MEXT but I would like the contributing countries, ECORD, China and others feel free to talk to us, give us advice. We feel very strongly you are contributing the program and you need to talk to us occasionally.

Tanaka: Any further comments or questions? Ok, we stop the morning session and we will have a lunch break till 13:50.

Tanaka: We reassemble for the afternoon session and start continue Manik's presentation.

Talwani: The next question was the status of formulating the FY2005 Annual Program Plan to be submitted to the IOs as well as deliberation on SOC/POC identification. The plan is now sent to MEXT and NSF for final approval, negotiation and etc. We were asked to report SOC/POC and let me say two things, one is division for FY05 had already been done and also SOC/POC division is something that funding agencies responsible for. This is a chronology of the events which led to the determination of SOC/POC division for FY05. It was start at September 2003, MEXT-NSF meeting in Tokyo and it was decided that the Lead Agencies should be represented by Jamie Allan and Kenji Kimura in making POC/SOC determinations as defined in the MEXT-NSF Memorandum, they put together the division and JOI alliance Steve Bohlen sent a refined list of POC/SOC classifications on November, basically he submitted this list to a request from the contractor to clarify cost divisions. Then, Kimura and Allan wrote a draft Lead Agency memo response for JOIDES Resolution operations for FY05 for consideration at the December MEXT-NSF Lead Agency meeting, the point is that MEXT and NSF had a input from JOI Alliance in order to put together the division. During the December meeting some modifications were made to the draft Kimura-Allan memo. MEXT requested time to consider that with JAMSTEC and some correspondence took place between MEXT and NSF. In the end, Lead agency did determinations for POC/SOC and it was communicated to IODP-MI in February and March. So basically this was a done deal as far as we were concerned. There is some idea that SPPOC should be looking at it and they want to look at it for FY06 and to get started. At ad-hoc committee and manager's meeting which was chaired by Tom Janecek together with IOs and two SPPOC members raised some issues and clarify some points about what POC/SOC division should be. Basically raised some questions and some idea of what is the point to be resolve in POC/SOC discussions. The point is that they (SPPOC ad-hoc committee) can raised some issue and discuss some points but the resolution has to be made by the funding agencies. In the end, funding agencies got some recommendation from science community, us, and IOs but they have to make POC/SOC determination, we do not.

Next and I think the last slide is a impression of the website we are making and hopefully we will have it next week or so. I think it is all I want to say and I thank you for your attention.

Tanaka: Thank you very much Manik, is there questions or comments?

Coffin: I would like to acknowledge the timely support of the IODP-MI for Science Advisory Structure, especially the respect to the science coordinators, they have a

very critical role in the new program for several reasons. Main one is being corporatememory for Science Advisory Structure, they know what is going on in the panels can help the panel chairs realize what other panels are doing, how to constructively interact. Another important function is they bring new people up to this new program, a lot of inexperienced people into the Science Advisory Structure. And the third and perhaps major function is their contribution is we now have at least 15 native languages within the IODP, communication lines and cultural barriers to trying to overcome is greatly enhanced by the presence of science coordinators. They worked extremely hard during the transition period they eased the transition greatly for the people who are not in the interim Science Advice Structure but now in the IODP Science Advisory Structure. So thank you very much for science coordinators and IODP-MI Sapporo for supporting them. I noted in one of the slides before lunch, there are no science coordinator liaisons to three of the panels (SciMP, TAP and ILP) which is sort of discontinue their liaison capability those panels reduce the amount of knowledge they retain through the entire SAS. Was this a mission? or are there changes in the attendance of science coordinators at SAS meetings?

Larsen: This is a list of staff of the office and there are assignments at the moment, two science coordinators Jeff at the moment covers SciMP, SSEPs, SPC and SPPOC and responsible for SPC and SPPOC minutes and Nobu is EPSP, SSP, SSEPs, SPC and SPPOC and our webpage. So two panels you do not see are TAP and ILP, for FY05 does not see either manpower nor travel fund to cover those two panels. But I should point out figures of those two panels will change probably we rethink about it.

Talwani: I would like to add that I also have very high opinion of the science coordinators and Hans Christian is going to determine what is the best use and what is the best duty so leave it up to him.

Larsen: We will review the whole scheme and we might create new procedures and in the future hopefully it will be more efficient.

Tanaka: Any questions or comments? Ok, I think now we finished the CMO report.

6. IODP member reports

China

Chai: Thank you Mr. chairman. Good afternoon everyone. In April, MOST signed the Memorandum with MEXT and NSF. China become a associate member of the IODP.

China joined IODP at the time when our country is formulating the middle-to-long term plan for science and technology development. The ocean science research is selected as a special emphasis area. More attention will be paid to deep-sea research and international program in the next 15 years. The activities of IODP-China are follows: 1) IODP-China office was set up, the director of the office is Dr. Liu. 2) IODP-China web site began to provide service. 3) we organized translation and publication of Chinese version of IODP Science Plan "Earth, Oceans, and Life". An IODP special issue was published in the Chinese journal "xxxxx in Earth Science" with 25 papers introducing various scientific aspects from ODP to IODP written by Chinese, Japanese and US scientists.

The leading scientific journal in China "Chinese Science Bulletin" published a special section, briefing the major findings from the ODP Leg184 at the South China Sea. Scientific committee of IODP-China was set up, first meeting elected the chair, vice chair and discuss the national science plan. We trying to broaden it's coverage of

research fields, for example tectonics of South China Sea, preparing deep biosphere studies. After the meeting, we organized a short course on geo/microbiology. Thank you for your attention.

ECORD

Ludden: I would like to make ECORD report on behalf of the ECORD council. Official IODP Council representatives for ECORD are Soeren Duerr, Raymond Schorno, Catheline Mével and myself.

ECORD officially joined IODP in 16 March 2004. On behalf of the consortium, the director of CNRS-INSU signed a memorandum with NSF and MEXT in Bremen. Now ECORD has 15 member countries, these are Austria, Denmark, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. Ireland is close to join and also Belgium and Greece are newly integrated states as part of ERA net activities. We ECORD need to amend the MOU to include new members.

Seven European Institutions have joined IMI and three more are in the process of signing up. We hope that a few more will do so in the near future.

The European Commission has funded an ECORDnet – 2.32M Euro over four years coordinated by CNRS-INSU to implement the ECORD structure in order to move forward towards a single research and operational funding network for scientific ocean drilling and marine geoscientific surveys and associated research in Europe. We expect this ECORDnet to be a first step towards more substantial funding within EC Framework 7th program.

MSP operations, for FY04 ESO is undertaking ACEX in the summer of 2004. For FY05 plan, following the Washington SPC and the OPCOM meetings, the ECORD Council has made the decision to commit the ECORD FY05 POCs to the Tahiti expedition. The ESO has presented a provisional budget that was approved at the last council meeting in Trieste in this June.

PROMESS 1 is EC funded ocean drilling project. Although it is not part of IODP, PROMESS1 is considered by the EC as a test for the use of MSPs. This project is to undertake scientific drilling on continental shelves and slopes in the Mediterranean Sea, at 50-300 m water depth to research sea-level changed, slope stability, canyon history and climate variability.

ESO has been tasked as the science operator for Mission Specific Platforms. The PROMESS drilling funded by the EC in progress in the Mediterranean demonstrates our ability to carry out scientific drilling from MSP's. We stress that when ESO has been tasked with an operation it is key who has the final decision on the appropriate tools and vessels for drilling.

Malfait: Ocean drilling scientific community recommends IO has final decision.

Ludden: EMA requested funding for activities considered to be taken out on behalf of the entire Programme. We have been informed that this request was not accepted by the Lead Agencies. We ask the Lead Agencies to consider the status of EMA, which is both a “managing agent on behalf of the ECORD funding agency” and equivalent of JOI in that it carries out activities such as, budget negotiation, liaisons, reporting, outreach and publicity for the IODP.

Tanaka: This issue was discussed at Yokohama. EMA is not JOI and I believe more like NSF or MEXT.

Mével: You can not compare EMA to MEXT and NSF.

Falvey: Careful think about this issue, NSF and MEXT are not only working for the IODP. However the EMA is internal agency among ECORD and only working for the IODP. And I think JOI is a direct analog for EMA.

Mével: Let's discuss this issue later.

Ludden: Mobilization cost of ACEX will be about \$3 million and will commonly be approximately 20 to 30% of an operation. Mobilization costs could be applicable to assets provided to IODP for a long, or intermediate term drilling operations. A mission specific operation could be considered as an expedition that requires "expedition preparation costs" which may include modification of vessels and contracting of vessels which may be in operation in different parts of the planet.

Falvey: NARC already funded to BGS for piston corer and hard rock drilling equipment.

Ludden: We request formal answer for this issue.

Ludden: Lead agencies define MSP is different in Annex of MOC.

Tanaka: This is first time to hear officially. We need official request letter.

Ludden: We will submit an official letter soon.

Ludden: We stress, in the European context, the importance of IODP links with other drilling and science activities. Notably in the field of sea floor observatories, but also land drilling, in which there should be close links between IODP and the appropriate programme and perhaps including joint funding of science projects. We note here that 1) the IODP SAS refused to evaluate a proposal which involves drilling of the Reykjanes peninsula which should be of interest to IODP, involves considerable industry funding, looks at drilling in supercritical hydrothermal environments etc. and, 2) ICDP is proposing to provide \$500000 in POC's to ECORD for the New Jersey margin drilling in 2006. SPPOC should thus revisit the problem of the boundaries of IODP drilling activities.

Tanaka: In the IODP, science oriented decision is important.

Coffin: We are waiting for Lead Agencies and SPPOC to show these boundary guideline.

Malfait: New Jersey transect science target in the ICDP is committed by Ken Miller not through our program. This commitment is not necessarily through our system. IOs could cooperate in engineer stand point. Also think closer relationship is important in the future. I think more cooperation in operator engineer level than at proposal level.

Ludden: That is understandable, liaisons between the programs are important and most of these cooperations occur in engineer side.

Mével: Yes, there is technical cooperation between ICDP and ESO.

Kudrass: Cooperation with other program is written in the ISP. I think we should think about not only technical side but also should think about scientific cooperation. It may be mixed evaluation panel or mixed proposal planning.

Larsen: We are approaching to ICDP to processing joint journal and they are favorable.

Tamaki: SPPOC ad hoc SAS committee is now working for modification of IODP SAS. One proposed new SAS function is integration with other scientific program. We will see the results and its implementation in near future. I think ICDP and IODP should have more coordination efforts.

Bohlen: I agree the concept of cooperation however we should be careful in terms of budget providing we need some kind of boundary.

Coffin: I think cooperation with the ICDP will occur on a case by case basis.

Japan

Kogo: There were several activities and events since last December in Japan related to the IODP. Since this July, in MEXT we have a new director Hiroshi Sato and under his oversight Tanaka-san, Satomura-san, Kimura-san he is in NSF, and also I am working in MEXT since this April. Also this April JAMSTEC change their entity and not it is the independent administrative institution, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology but the acronym is same JAMSTEC, so you can send e-mail to JAMSTEC same as before. Also JAMSTEC has new president, Mr. Yasuhiro Kato. Also J-DESC has new chair, Dr. Shunzo Ishihara succeeding Dr. Kushiro.

There were several meetings which Tanaka-san and Kimura-san attended. JAMSTEC and AESTO hosted the 3rd SPC meeting in Yokohama. University of Tokyo and AESTO hosted 1st TAP meeting in Nagasaki. Committee on Ocean Drilling hold their 2nd and 3rd meeting to discuss domestic IODP issues, such as facilitating science activity and strengthening education and outreach strategy.

Here is symposium and campaign, in this March J-DESC, JAMSTEC and AESTO organized symposium called "A new Science creating by IODP in Asian Waters". Tanaka-san presented the IODP to Asian scientists and the scientists discussed developing IODP proposal. From this April, J-DESC and JAMSTEC started campaign called "IODP Campaign in Universities and Museums". The first run was taken in Fukuoka and second run was taken in Tochigi.

Here is BOP installation on "Chikyu" in April. This is very big equipment.

IODP-MI Sapporo Office has established in Sapporo Hokkaido. This is a building in Hokkaido University and here is the staff of the office.

Is there any questions or comments?

Tanaka: Ok, thank you very much Kogo-san.

U.S.

Malfait: You have already known but JOIDES Resolution is now back to operation. The ship contract is extending through May 2005. Over last month or two we evaluating the budget situation which we think is getting better. We advanced to science planning structure to be prepared with scientific programs adding present schedule May 2005 through October. Within next month or so the Congress will finalize budget situation, hopefully extend JR into 2006. I am wondering 2006 operation is still unclear but as I said we will formally request from IODP-MI an addition to the program plan. The situation with respect to money to do a conversion of non-riser ship is first implementing funding which is 40 M USD, which has been submitted to congress. The congress is working on this issue but still unclear. Present point, if we do get 40 M and 60 M for vessel conversion, we have little hiatus 6 months or so.

In addition to operation areas, we have extended support renewal for USSSP and money for US scientists for participating in science meetings, workshops, and cruises. Also we provide support for ODP phase down cost, for example data archiving for FY06-07. NSF facilitates seismic vessels for site survey for IODP

proposals in early 06. Presently we are considering replacement of ALVIN. Regarding the personnel issue in NSF, Lita Cornell left and Linen extended, etc. NSF is working on several issues on the IODP-MI contract. One of the issues will be on mechanism of establishment of new IO from the IODP-MI. The IODP-MI is working for RFP to make contract with any other IOs, we are working with IODP-MI for basic policies and procedures of RFP issue. And the second issue related to the contract is annual member contribution level. Japan is relatively clear, the memorandum identified minimum level of annual financial contribution.

Korea

Kim: Brief introduction to current situation of Korea-IODP. Korea joined ODP as a member of PacRim Consortium from 1997 to 2003. Funding agencies are Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) during 1997-2000, Korea Research Council of Public Science & Technology (KORP), and Ministry of Maritime and Fisheries (MOMAF) from 2004. Korean IODP structure is composed of three bodies, Council (ultimate decision-making body), SciCom (recommend and select the shipboard scientists), and Secretariat (KODP budget handling). Current funding situation is continuously increasing; 500,000USD for 2004 and 700,000 for 2005 (scheduled but not confirmed). We are looking for partners for making new consortium.

Tanaka: Thank you Dr. Kim, are there any question or comments?

Russia

Kontar: Russian Scientists are very much interested in participating IODP. Many Russian scientists sailed on JOIDES Resolution during ODP. We have 10 research vessels and 2 submersibles. But unfortunately, because of difficult transition period and budget is decreasing every year, difficult to operate our fleets. We used our vessels for tourist to make money for science. An initiative group is trying to lead for participating in IODP. Potential funding organizations are Russian Academy of Science, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Science and technology, and industrial companies. If industry connection does not work, funding situation is still difficult. We still need time and effort.

Tanaka: Thank you Dr. Kontar, any questions or comments?

Mével: Regarding mobilization cost issue which John has raised. On behalf of the ECORD council I did send an official letter to the Lead Agencies in February this year.

Tanaka: That issue will be discussed later.

Mével: Yes I know but this should in the minutes because I did send the e-mail officially in February.

7. Calendar for 2004, 2005 and Next Council Meeting

Malfait: What I am trying to do is layout and identify on calendar the meeting in next two years. The meeting right now is in July and sometime in June or July each year SPPOC and IODP Council we have tentatively identified the meeting at which Annual Program Plan will be considered. We NSF in order to process and funding close to our fiscal year which begins in October must approve the Annual Program Plan. For FY05 approve APP will be arriving at least by 9th August, Lead Agencies need essentially two month to approve it. The meeting identified in SAS will be OPCOM meeting (30 September and 1st of October). The OPCOM meeting will look

at scheduling for remainder of FY05 and FY06, they will be reporting back to the SPC (third week of October) and SPPOC meeting in December (11 and 12 December), subsequent SPC in March and followed by the Council meeting and SPPOC meeting that is planned to be in Japan and hopefully conjunction with visiting Chikyū. Council meet after the SPPOC meeting and at that time we will hear a draft plan discussed for FY06. So we look at meeting schedule, unless we need additional Council meetings, the Council meeting once a year in June or July time frame and it will be immediately following the SPPOC meeting which APP will review and approve. Of course the plan with necessary modifications will be submitted to the Lead Agencies in August. In January each year the Lead Agencies will be providing budget guidance to IODP-MI for constructing the APP and this budget guidance will reflect Science Operation Cost. JOI Alliance and NSF will be identifying Platform Operation Cost for FY05 and 06 and MEXT and CDEX identifying Platform Operation Cost for Riser vessel when it comes on line in FY07. Extension of JR operation in FY05, by OPCOM meeting in October we will provided guidance to IODP-MI for producing an amendment or modification to the existing plan which will identify the science to be done through the end of FY05 for drilling of JR. We expect to IODP-MI to submit modification request in November and that will be approved and examined by SPPOC. If it is a change to FY05 APP, it will be reviewed by SPPOC in December and modification approval will come soon after that. So reasonably busy schedule but we are beginning to see yearly basis how planning will interface with decisions of the Lead Agencies.

Tanaka: Thank you Bruce, are there any questions or comments?

8. Other items

Tanaka: Bruce raised the issue regarding SOC/POC.

Malfait: One of the issues we dealt with in IWG plan and is identified in the Memoranda is platform mobilization cost with respect platforms. In the Memoranda, mobilization costs are not identified as a program cost. If a member chooses to contribute a platform in the program, the mobilization cost is necessarily part of the package. We discussed this during the IWG planning and according to Memoranda we are not considering this a program cost. What we actually did not deal with during IWG planning was demobilization cost. This is important because in the present program plan we identified demobilization cost for the JR if the JR comes out of operation in FY05. I think the Lead Agencies would prefer to eliminate demobilization cost as program cost, we realized there is still a question which ECORD and EMA have raised about mobilization and demobilization cost in general. Our preference to consider both those cost together either they are in the program as program cost or not in the program as program cost. I think with respect to present 2005 budget, we will eliminate the cost identified as demobilization cost.

Falvey: Which platform demobilization cost?

Malfait: For the JR.

Tanaka: Any question or comment? Ok, any other issue?

Malfait: There was a question that was raised by ECORD on modifying Memoranda with respect to the list of countries, an easy way to do this would be for ECORD to send a dated revision of this Annex to the Memorandum.

Mével: Regarding the list of members, because we are negotiating with somebody quite often, my plan is every six month or so we will submit new members I think it is not useful to submit each time but I do not know what you prefer.

Tanaka: I feel like I prefer at least and I do not know officially or not but probably informing us every time might be helpful. I look at your ECORD website just before I leave Japan and I found that name of the countries who signed the memorandum, for example Canada is provisional member for one year.

Mével: It only happened two days ago, I am sorry.

Tanaka: But it was on the website already in 5th of July.

Mével: This was when Canada signed memorandum, as you can see it is pretty fast.

Tanaka: I see, your website is very productive.

Ludden: We will make sure when we negotiating new country if possible we will let you know. At the next council meeting, is it possible to attend all the ECORD countries to the meeting.

Tanaka: I also keep you in mind is that regarding the attendees of the council meeting, I am always appreciate and all the countries which are signed ECORD memorandum are welcome even though they are not in the annex of the memorandum.

Ludden: We had the meeting in Trieste two weeks ago and ECORD council discussed who will go, some members would like to attend but did not, now we know that you invited them all. However some member are far from the program so they may not want to attend this meeting.

Falvey: It is quite important that we appear as single entity and dealt with the European consortium. And politically this is increasing additional funding from European Union.

Tanaka: I would like to add one thing to modification of the memorandum. Now we just seen views of Bruce and Catherine regarding a modification of memorandum, changing ECORD membership. From MEXT view, this memorandum has been signed by our minister so we are rather conscious, and that is our domestic procedure, we can officially amend annex in accordance with changing membership. I found in ODP memorandum, at the ODP time the memorandum signed annually regarding to the membership change and level of contribution change. But I do not know whether applicable to the IODP. In addition to that regarding mobilization cost which John Ludden just released and Catherine just mentioned that you sent us an e-mail regarding this issue. I do not have a clear memory of what was in your e-mail in February however we signed the memorandum in March and the memorandum contains the issue of mobilization and also program cost identification, so in that sense I think we are not in the position to response your e-mail regarding this issue.

Tanaka: Dealing with these modification of program cost in the memorandum takes lot of effort and energy. Amendment of the memorandum is, in my view, too early to be repeated at this moment.

Ludden: We agree to discuss this issue later during my presentation, are we now discussing or we will discuss it later.

Tanaka: We will have several discussions later.

Ludden: Ok, then we will leave this discussion now.

Falvey: The issue of ACEX, what we call platform preparation cost in lingo have to be discuss at that later discussion.

Tanaka: Let's discuss these issues at our informal discussion.

Ludden: We are finishing official level of this meeting, we are comfortable if we resolve the problem at additional discussion but if we do not resolve the problem I think the ECORD council will have to meet in October.

Tanaka: I think your comment is well taken.

Tanaka: Ok, any comments or questions? Now we have finished all the agenda items for this council meeting. I appreciate everyone's cooperation. We will have ten minutes break and we will hold informal discussion. Participation of the discussion is voluntary basis everybody will be welcome to attend. I believe we had very productive and fruitful meeting, we will see the success of this year's program soon and the council meeting is now adjourned and see you on Chikyu next year, thank you.

The council adjourned the meeting at 16:30