

IODP Council Meeting
17 June 2005
ANA Hotel Nagasaki Gloverhill
Nagasaki, Japan

IODP Council

Reinhard Belocky*	Austrian Science Fund (FWF), Austria
Jonas Björck	Swedish Research Council, Sweden
Are Birger Carlson*	Research Council of Norway, Norway
Sören Dürr*	German Research Foundation (DFG), Germany
Chris Franklin	Natural Environment Research Council, United Kingdom
Kathy Gillis*	School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Canada
Anu Huovinen*	Research Council for Natural Sciences and Engineering, Academy of Finland, Finland
Anders Kjaer*	Natural Science Research Council, Danish Research Agency, Denmark
Kristján Kristjánsson*	Icelandic Centre for Research (RANNIS), Iceland
Marcel Kullin*	Swiss National Science Foundation
John Ludden*	National Institute of Earth Sciences and Astronomy (INSU-CNRS), France
Bruce Malfait	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Esteban Manrique Reol*	Ministry of Education and Science, Spain
Catherine Mevel	ECORD Managing Agency (EMA), France
José Hipólito Monteiro*	Department of Marine Geology, Geological and Mining Institute (IGM), Portugal
Sergio Persoglia*	National Institute of Oceanography and Experimental Geophysics (OGS), Italy
Raymond Schorno*	Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), Netherlands
Jianzhong Shen	Ministry of Science and Technology, China
Yasuhisa Tanaka	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan

*Unable to attend.

Liaisons, Observers, and Guests

Jamie Allan	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Richard Arculus	Department of Earth & Marine Sciences, Australian National University, Australia
Rodey Batiza	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Steve Bohlen	JOI Alliance, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Nobuhisa Eguchi	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
Dan Evans	ECORD Science Operator, British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Jeff Fox	JOI Alliance, Texas A&M University, USA
Tom Janecek	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA
Kenji Kimura	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Hajimu Kinoshita	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), Japan
Tsuyoshi Kogo	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Gee-Soo Kong	Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources, Korea
Hermann Kudrass	Federal Institution of Geosciences and Natural Resources (BGR), Germany
Pushpendra Kumar	Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited, India
Shin'ichi Kuramoto	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Young-Joo Lee	Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources (KIGAM), Korea
Takao Miyazaki	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Yoshihiko Orita	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Soo-Chul Park	Oceanography & Ocean Environmental Sciences, Chungnam National University, Korea
A. V. Sathe	Directorate General of Hydrocarbons, India
Jeff Schuffert	IODP Management International, Inc., Sapporo, Japan
A. K. Sethi	Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited, India
Manik Talwani	IODP Management International, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA

IODP Council Meeting

17 June 2005

**ANA Hotel Nagasaki Gloverhill
Nagasaki, Japan**

Friday

17 June

08:00-12:00

Tour of *Chikyu*

The IODP Council meeting participants toured the riser drilling vessel *Chikyu* at the shipyard of Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. in Nagasaki. The ship lay in dry dock in the final stages of construction and outfitting, approximately six weeks before delivery to JAMSTEC.

Friday

17 June

13:30-17:30

Bruce Malfait welcomed everyone to the fourth IODP council meeting and asked the meeting participants to introduce themselves. He applauded the efforts of Japan to deliver the new riser drilling ship, as viewed firsthand on the morning tour, and welcomed any comments on the joint session with the SPPOC and the IODP-MI Board of Governors the previous afternoon. Malfait also thanked the meeting hosts, MEXT and JAMSTEC, for the excellent arrangements.

IODP-MI Management Report

Manik Talwani listed the current membership of the IODP-MI, with eight institutions from Japan, fifteen from the U.S., and ten from Europe. He identified the University of Bergen in Norway and the European Institute for Marine Studies (IUEM) of the University of Western Brittany (UBO) in France as two new members that had joined since July 2004. Talwani reported on the most recent IODP-MI members meeting in early February 2005. He noted that the members reviewed and approved the latest new member, the FY2004 annual audit, the corporate funds budget for FY2005 and FY2006, and the election of regular and alternate governors. They also changed the bylaws to change formally the name IMI to IODP-MI, set deadlines for electronic voting (must be unanimous in selecting new members), describe the process for selecting alternate governors and alternate members of the executive committee, and broaden the definition of potential members. Talwani announced that the IODP-MI members would hold their next meeting in February or March 2006 at an undecided location. He cited the goal of building toward a corporate balance of \$1million through increased membership and noted the absence of any currently outstanding membership issues.

Talwani also reviewed the status and development of IODP membership. He listed the current membership and mentioned efforts to recruit new members. Talwani reported that a group of scientists in Australia had applied for funding to participate in the IODP, a group of scientists in Korea had begun negotiating with MEXT and the NSF, seeking to establish an Asian consortium, and Belgium and Ireland had recently joined ECORD. He also mentioned discussing a new mechanism with the lead agencies for encouraging new membership.

Mevel remarked that a portion of the ECORD funding from the European Commission goes toward a work package for recruiting new members from within Europe. Franklin asked about the current mechanism for joining the IODP-MI. Talwani described it as relatively simple, involving as little as a one-page application and a dues payment of \$5,000 per year. He added that members have the privilege of electing the board of governors and must meet within sixty days of 1 January each year. Malfait asked if the IODP-MI had received any applications for

corporate associates. Talwani replied that they had not actively sought corporate associates. He explained that corporate associates would pay lower dues than corporate members and could participate in members meetings but could not vote in selecting the board of governors.

Malfait referred to the recent quarterly report required under the NSF–IODP-MI contract as a superb document for identifying the activities of the IODP-MI and also the implementing organizations (IOs). He asked if the council members could all receive a copy. Talwani acknowledged that the council members should have received it and would in the future. Tanaka asked who else received the report. Talwani said that it went to the board of governors and lead agencies, but not the IOs. Malfait noted that recommendations from the SPPOC to the board of governors either get rejected or implemented as policies. He wondered how the IODP-MI tracked and organized those policies. Talwani referred to the continuing process of adding new policies to the policy book, as handled by Janecek. Malfait also sought insight on the process of issuing requests for proposals (RFP). Talwani explained that IODP-MI staff members develop RFPs with input from working groups or task forces, and the RFP for the site survey data bank (SSDB), for example, had wide notification in Japan, Europe, and the U.S. and a clear deadline for responding. He added that the IODP-MI returned to the bidders with questions to clarify specific issues, and an advisory board of four persons evaluated the bids and decided unanimously on the favored bidder. Talwani expressed his intent to follow the same process in the future.

Franklin proposed that the EMA would like to participate in the communications loop as the IODP-MI prepares the annual program plan. He suggested that Figure PP-2 should show EMA input. Talwani explained that Figure PP-2 merely described the flow of proposals through the system, eventually leading to the program plan. He wondered at what stage the EMA should have input, noting that the IODP-MI receives commingled funds from one agency and thus had not worried up to now about the different sources. Mevel characterized the ECORD budget for POCs as not independent from the SOCs budget. Malfait acknowledged that the NSF should probably confirm with the IODP-MI on decisions by ECORD to provide mission specific platforms. Talwani deduced that the IODP-MI should not distribute SOC funds before knowing the platform availability and POCs budget. Malfait said yes. Mevel suggested at least maintaining a dialog, though the EMA could not always say exactly what ECORD could provide. Talwani asked about the optimal timing for such communication. Mevel replied that the EMA probably could not provide input until at least January. Talwani asked ECORD to inform the IODP-MI when budget information becomes available. Franklin suggested that it would still help to have an earlier look at the draft program plan. Mevel hoped to receive the final draft of the program plan before council meetings. Talwani wondered what part of the program plan he could appropriately distribute to the council and when, given that it had not yet received approval from the board of governors. Malfait believed that it should suffice to distribute just the text part without the appendices, as background material for council discussions. Talwani agreed to send the EMA a copy of the draft plan when completed.

IODP Management Report

Jamie Allan noted that the lead agencies had begun considering the process for evaluating engineering development for FY2007 and beyond as given in the FY2006 program plan.

2005 contract activity

Allan reported on the contract in place with the Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (AESTO) for supporting the IODP-MI Sapporo office. For program operations he cited the memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed in November 2004 with

JAMSTEC, the contract in place since mid March 2005 with the British Geological Survey (BGS), and the contract since early April 2005 with the Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc. On program tasks Allan noted the contract in place since October 2004 with the Bremen core repository and the one signed recently for the new site survey data bank at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography of the University of California, San Diego. He explained that the new data bank began in May 2005 and would work toward full operations by September 2005. Allan also referred to the ongoing evaluation of other data management needs that would represent an FY2006 activity.

Franklin inquired about the geographical boundaries for distributing cores among the repositories. Malfait cited the SAS agreement on distributing cores geographically, according to specific lines drawn on maps, but still allowing for scientific considerations on a case-by-case basis. He understood that the EMA deemed it acceptable to transfer cores from the Tahiti expedition to the Gulf Coast repository. Evans said that it would only involve the cost of packing and shipping one container. Franklin asked about legacy cores. Allan replied that the geographic distribution scheme would also apply in principle to legacy cores, pending the final plan from the IODP-MI.

Allan stated that the lead agencies developed guidance for SOCs and POCs with input from the IODP-MI and the IOs and using the program memoranda as defining guidelines. He explained that the guidance concerning specific items and defining third-party costs appeared in the program plan, though it should appear in its own appendix instead of in the appendix related to the IOs. Malfait identified the goal of uniformly interpreting the definitions of SOCs and POCs, though it might take several cycles to satisfy everyone on everything. Allan noted that the list of SOCs now included more expensive items than initially imagined. He welcomed suggestions from all involved for refining the process. He mentioned that draft versions went to the EMA and wondered if they should also go to MOST. Shen said yes, please do. Malfait agreed.

Budget and funding

Allan explained that the lead agencies had decided to use the program plan budgets as the basis for accounting. He gave a breakdown of the FY2004-2006 budgets according to SOCs and POCs for core capabilities, for mission-specific platforms (MSPs), and by member contributions. Allan presented revised budgets for FY2004-2006 after removing mobilization and demobilization costs.

Franklin asked if the council could see the budget breakdown between the lead agencies. Allan showed the requested information.

2006-2007 facilities

Bruce Malfait diagrammed the facilities planning and participation costs for FY2005-2008. He noted that the unit cost of participating in the program would increase from \$3.5 million to \$5.6 million in 2008, when the *Chikyu* and the new non-riser vessel both come on line, as opposed to the increase originally planned for FY2007. Malfait added that some uncertainty remained concerning the estimated total FY2007 program costs, but the lead agencies would accommodate any difference from the current estimates.

IODP Membership

Yasuhisa Tanaka explained that representatives from several potential new members, Australia, Korea, and India, would give reports describing their strong interest in joining the IODP.

Australia

Richard Arculus reviewed the background of Australian involvement in the ODP. He noted that the country as a whole had enjoyed a very favorable economic return of nine times its investment in the program. Arculus described the Australian economy as currently booming and said that the government experienced a budget surplus for the last six or seven years and owes no debt to anyone. He cited criticism from the opposition, however, about a failure to invest in critical intellectual and research infrastructure. Arculus reported that astronomers had recently succeeded in pushing the government to create a collaborative research fund of nearly \$100 million, aimed at promoting health, safety, and an environmentally sustainable society. He explained that the guidelines for the new fund refer to access to world-class facilities and subscription fees to international programs, with specific mention of the IODP. Arculus stated that a group of scientists had already submitted a bid aiming for full membership in the IODP beginning in July 2006, but they would consider other options if that falls short.

Bohlen asked when they would receive an answer. Arculus replied that the government would decide in the next two months and dictate to the winners what would happen. Malfait asked whether the government would decide the management structure. Arculus said yes. Franklin wondered if the structure would reflect what they had asked for in the bid. Arculus said yes, at least in part. Malfait welcomed the very good news from Australia and remarked that he always found it interesting to note that many countries receive a very good return on their investment of joining the program.

Asian Consortium

Young-Joo Lee reviewed the background of Korean involvement in the ODP. He noted that Korea had joined in 1996 with Canada and Australia and then formed the PacRim consortium the following year. Lee reported that Korea has already established a national IODP program with funding from the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF), and they hope to join the IODP as part of an Asian consortium in 2005, with an anticipated budget for Korea of perhaps \$7 million for 2004-2010. He identified the Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources (KIGAM) as the main participating institution, but with many other organizations and private companies also involved, such as the Korean Ocean Research Development Institute (KORDI).

Lee explained that the IODP-Korea structure includes a council, science committee, secretariat, and task force team, and he said that they had begun preparing a national IODP plan for geoscientists. He stated that the science committee would select shipboard scientists and panel members, evaluate IODP-related research activities, and deliberate on other national issues, while the secretariat would support the council and science committee and manage the national program. Lee announced that the science committee decided that Korea should join the IODP as part of an Asian consortium, and he listed Australia, India, and Taiwan as other possible members. He stated that Korea has begun negotiating an agreement with NSF and MEXT, and he briefly explained the concept of an interim Asian membership. Lee also outlined various activities of IODP-Korea such as managing the national office, participating in domestic and international IODP meetings, conducting workshops and seminars, promoting the program, preparing drilling proposals in Korean waters, and developing the Asian consortium.

Malfait recognized the difficulty of forming a consortium of different members at the same time with the necessary funds, and he suggested a couple of other potential contacts. Kudrass suggested that the Coordinating Committee for Geoscience Programs in East and Southeast

Asia (CCOP) might have a strong interest in hearing ideas for an Asian IODP consortium. Lee appreciated the idea, though he believed that the CCOP focused more on resources than basic science. He also cited the political problems of membership for Taiwan. Otsuka expressed excitement at hearing of these efforts and said that the IODP-MI would gladly help in any way possible.

India

A. K. Sethi recalled that India had tried for two years to join the ODP but did not succeed. He then outlined a forthcoming proposal from India for IODP membership. Sethi described the general motivation for Indian membership and identified several specific scientific objectives, primarily related to gas hydrate research, and he stated that India would submit a formal proposal in the next few weeks. He illustrated some of the geological features and depositional models of sedimentary basins around India and the major offshore tectonic elements in the region of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. He also explained that the Directorate General of Hydrocarbons (DGH) serves as an advisory body to the government, with regulatory functions on certain technical matters, and it works to promote the sound management of hydrocarbon resources. Sethi identified twelve major Indian institutions involved in geological studies, and he showed the structure of the National Gas Hydrate Program under the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (MOPNG), as partially funded by the Oil Industry Development Board (OIDB). He also reviewed the background of gas hydrate research and development in India, especially concerning seismic studies, and he described in detail the geophysical and geological studies of several regional basins. Sethi concluded that India possesses the necessary scientific base to join the IODP.

Malfait appreciated the presentation as welcome news. He looked forward to working together with Indian scientists and asked about the next steps of their efforts to join the program. Sethi replied that funds would come from the petroleum industry, so he would hope that such a project could be undertaken on a priority basis. Kudrass wondered if India also had any interest in supporting studies of earthquakes in the Andaman Sea area. Sethi said certainly, if India becomes a member of the program. Malfait remarked that India has already discussed matters with the lead agencies and those talks should continue. He recommended getting started early on securing Indian membership in the event that a drilling proposal comes to the forefront early in the second phase of non-riser drilling.

Malfait thanked the representatives of Australia, Korea, and India for their presentations and said that he looked forward to a new phase of expanded program membership. He noted that the lead agencies had also discussed the matter of trying to expand participation opportunities to smaller countries, not necessarily as regular members but through some type of limited participation or outreach. He presented a long list of countries who had obtained samples from the ODP, indicating that the scientific ocean drilling community extends far wider than just the regular members of the program. Malfait promised that the chart would appear as an appendix to the minutes.

Before entering an executive session of the council, Malfait asked for any additional comments from the current IODP members. Mevel remarked that the program had advanced a long way since the previous council meeting in Paris last July. She cited the full year of non-riser operations, the first MSP expedition, and the riser ship nearing completion, and she expressed excitement at hearing about the potential new members. Tanaka offered encouragement to continue moving ahead through cooperation between the scientific, administrative, government communities. Malfait added that the contractors of the USIO had

done a remarkable job of responding to scientific plans in the past year, often on short notice. He also expressed optimism toward resolving the new members in a relatively short time.

Next Meeting

The council decided in the closing executive session that the next council meeting should coincide with the SPPOC meeting for approving the next annual program plan, probably in mid 2006 in the Pacific Northwest of the United States.

Executive Session of Council

The council entered executive session at 16:45 and adjourned the meeting at 16:50.

Appendix: Curatorial Statistics - Query Results for ODP (1985-2003)

	Science Participants	Sample Requests	Number of Samples
Argentina	2	6	105
Australia	108	269	39,464
Austria	1	4	102
Bangladesh	1	1	-
Belgium	9	42	2,536
Brazil	16	19	2,272
Bulgaria	1	1	9
Canada	143	326	38,380
China	79	66	36,183
Colombia	7	16	2,703
Czech Republic	1	1	80
Denmark	41	76	8,005
Ecuador	1	3	300
Ethiopia	1	2	756
Fiji	1	4	336
Finland	2	6	1,039
France	339	721	108,240
Germany	375	1,206	239,786
Ghana	2	1	219
Greece	4	5	18
Hungary	4	1	20
Iceland	2	11	2,430
India	17	47	7,372
Indonesia	1	4	-
Ireland	4	4	324
Israel	5	10	1,170
Italy	132	297	66,849
Jamaica	1	1	223
Japan	320	658	169,115
Mexico	8	13	1,652
Morocco	3	3	107
Netherlands	68	183	41,949
New Caledonia	1	1	-
New Zealand	30	53	4,988
Northern Mariana Island	1	1	-
Norway	65	207	55,282
Oman	2	3	131
Panama	1	2	27
Papua New Guinea	6	15	1,215
Peru	2	2	679
Philippines	1	1	-
Poland	2	7	771
Portugal	8	12	4,535
Russia	60	76	8,713
South Africa	4	13	5,008
South Korea	12	16	6,457
Spain	61	109	36,244
Sri Lanka	1	1	158
Sweden	34	149	38,525
Switzerland	54	167	35,330
Taiwan	25	43	17,420
Tonga	1	1	183
Tunisia	1	2	-
Turkey	5	5	435

Ukraine	2	2	7
United Kingdom	406	1,301	189,932
United States	1,483	5,488	821,394
Venezuela	3	2	38
Vietnam	1	1	-
West Indies	1	6	860
Total	3,972	11,693	2,000,076