

IODP Council/ IWG+ Meeting Minutes Amsterdam, 16-17 June 2011

Present:

NSF: Rodey Batiza, Thomas Janecek, Ian Ridley

MEXT: Shinji Hida, Shin'ichi Kuramoto, Shingo Shibata

ECORD : Fernando Barriga, Gilbert Camoin (observer), Anne De Vernal, Guido Luniger, Catherine Mevel (EMA), Mirielle Perrin, Mike Webb

Peoples Republic of China: Pinxian Wang (China PMO)

ANZIC: Chris Yeats

India: Ram Sharma, Rajan Sivaramakrishnan

Russia: Alexander Matul

IODP-MI: Kevin Johnson, Hans Christian Larsen, Kiyoshi Suyehiro

Implementing Organizations: Brad Clement – USIO, David Divins – USIO, Robert Gatliff – ESO, Wataru Azuma – JAMSTEC, Nobu Eguchi – JAMSTEC

Others: Gabe Phillipelli – SPC Chair, Susan Humphris – U.S. Liaison (IWG+ only), Hodaka Kawahata – JDESC Chair, Maureen Raymo – SASEC Chair, Jeff Schuffert – Ocean Leadership, Brian Taylor – IODP-MI BoG

IODP Council Session

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

The meeting was co-chaired by MEXT/NSF/ECORD with Catherine Mevel acting as main co-Chair for this meeting. Host Dr. Jan deLeeuw (Utrecht) reviewed some logistics considerations. Self-introductions were made by all meeting attendees.

2. Discussion of Agenda

One additional item was suggested for the agenda. The potential use of carry-forward comingled funds to be used for JOIDES Resolution (and possibly *Chikyu*) operations in FY12 would be discussed under Agenda Item 5 “Status of FY11 and FY12 Annual Program plans.

3. Approval of minutes from Kyoto meeting (June 2010)

The minutes of the 2010 IODP Council Meeting in Kyoto were approved.

4. Review of Action Items from Kyoto meeting

The one action item from the 2010 Kyoto meeting was addressed.

“Change Comingled funds ... etc. will need to be paid” to read as in current Points of Agreement document.

5. Status of FY11 and FY12 Annual Program Plans

The IODP Council was updated by IODP-MI on the status of FY11 and FY12 Annual Program plans. The FY11 plan has seen several modifications but has now been finalized. The FY12 program plan is progressing. Input has been received from the Implementing Organizations and IODP-MI has had one iterative discussion with them to-date.

A proposal was put forward by Shingo Shibata for IODP to utilize part of CDEX’s FY11 carry-forward request of \$2.9 M USD to help implement a 4th FY12 expedition on the *JOIDES Resolution*. David Divins of the USIO stated that \$2.3M USD would be required to conduct a fourth *JOIDES Resolution* expedition in FY2012 (Newfoundland Sediment Drifts). Shingo Shibata also discussed the possibility of utilizing the remaining funds for the Rapid Response Drilling project if it could be implemented in early FY12.

IODP Council members discussed the use of these carry-forward comingled funds for IODP platform operations. Members agreed, in principle, to allow comingled funds to be used for platform operations. However, specific proposals would need to be brought forward in an Annual Program Plan for evaluation by the IODP Council.

<p>Consensus Statement #1: The IODP Council agrees, in principle, to allow the use of comingled funds for IODP platform operations. Specific proposals for the use of these funds will need to be evaluated by IODP Council via submission through the Annual Program Plan.</p>
--

6. Phase out of current SAS/Phase in of new SAS

The phase-out of current SAS and phase in of new SAS were discussed. Hans Christian Larsen updated the IODP Council on the timetable for the new panels to start (e.g. PEP – Nov 2011, SIPCOM – Jan 2012, etc). The Terms of Reference for the new SAS will be formally approved at the IWG+ meeting.

7. IODP Audit report

Rodey Batiza discussed the results of the most recent IODP Audit report. He stated that no issues were raised in the report.

8. Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

9. Next IODP Council Meeting

The date for the next IODP Council meeting was tentatively set for June 2012, in conjunction with the SIPCom meeting. Boston, Chicago, Washington DC were all suggested as possible venues.

IWG+ Session

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

The meeting was co-chaired by MEXT/NSF/ECORD with Catherine Mevel acting as main co- Chair for this meeting. Host Dr. Jan deLeeuw (Utrecht) reviewed some logistics considerations. Self-introductions were made by all meeting attendees.

2. Discussion of Agenda

Two additional agenda items were added.

- a) Hans Christian Larsen requested that IWG+ set aside time early in the meeting to discuss and formally adopt the New Science Plan for the next phase of IODP.
- b) A request was made by Shingo Shibata for a description of the MOU process, what topics would be in the main MOU and what topics would be put into MOU annexes

3. Approval of Minutes from Miami 2011 Meeting

The meeting minutes from the Miami 2011 IWG+ meeting were approved with the following changes.

Under point # 5 in “Reading and Reconfirming of Points of Agreement:
The new wording of the first sentence should read: “All current Points of Agreement, except for point #4, were discussed and reconfirmed.”

4. Review of Action Items from Miami 2011 Meeting

- Action Items 1, 2, 5 were deemed completed.
- Action Item # 6 was deemed in progress (i.e., the “activities accomplished” document will be presented with the FY12 APP)
- Action Items 3 and 4 (Drafting of MOUs and delineating shipboard scientist and SAS participation rights in MOU Annexes) were not yet started.

5. Adoption of the New Science Plan

Hans Christian Larsen formally presented the New Science Plan for the International Ocean Discovery Program “Illuminating Earth’s Past, Present, and Future” to the IWG+ working group. Hans Christian described the development process for the New Science Plan, from the INVEST meeting in September 2009 to final printing in June 2011. Rodey Batiza thanked Hans Christian Larsen and the science plan writing team for all their efforts, after which the IWG+ gave a hearty round of applause to all of them.

Consensus statement #1: The IWG+ working group formally adopts the document ““Illuminating Earth’s Past, Present, and Future” as the science plan for the International Ocean Discovery Program.

6. MOU Process

Rodey Batiza briefly described the MOU process. He stated that the MOU is a high-level document between agencies and that the MOUs are usually bilateral in nature in accordance with US State Department policy. However, in the case of multiple Lead Agencies, the Lead Agencies together sign MOUs with each member. Rodey Batiza further explained that the main MOU usually contains the information and topics that do not change over time (e.g. overall principles, Points of Agreement, etc). Annexes are used to address the specific issues related to each country. This dual documentation (main MOU and Annex) can be used to generate a simpler MOU for all member countries to sign, with the detailed specific information contained in the individual annexes.

7. Points of Agreement

Point #4 of the Points of Agreement was revisited by IWG+ members. NSF representatives reiterated their position that the regular \$10M USD payment from comingled funds for operation of *Chikyu* cannot continue in the new program. Fiscal conditions have changed dramatically in the US over the past year and this business model is no longer acceptable to NSF management. Shibata-san reiterated that MEXT management is very firm that the \$10M USD contribution to *Chikyu* is essential to sustaining the platform’s riser operations.

The IWG+ members did reach a consensus that Item 4 in the Points of Agreement should simply state for now “that comingled funds will pay for integrative activities”.

Consensus statement #2: In Points of Agreement, point #4 will be changed to: “*Comingled funds will need to pay for integrative activities.*”

There was no consensus, though, regarding the use of \$10M USD of comingled funds for *Chikyu* operations, nor how surplus comingled funds would be allocated. Further discussion ensued on these issues.

It came to light during the discussion that there were different interpretations among members on (1) the amount of funding necessary for integrated activities both in the current program and the new program and (2) the actual pathways or Work Breakdown Elements in each IO program plan where the funds were allocated.

For example, IWG+ members were shown that in the new program (assuming the current membership and proposed yearly contributions) approximately \$12.7M USD would be collected per annum from partner contributions and that integrative activities would cost approximately \$10M USD/annum. This leaves approximately \$2.7M USD/annum for non-integrative activities, far short of the \$10M USD that some IODP members thought was available. Given this information, MEXT management stated that the costs for integrated activities in the new program would need to be significantly reduced in order to provide sufficient resources for a *Chikyu* riser fund. However, other members disagreed and stated that the same level of integrative activities (and expenses) were required in the new program, thus not leaving sufficient funds for \$10M USD to be regularly allocated to *Chikyu*.

To further clarify the issue of funding of integrative activities, IODP-MI agreed to provide clear and detailed information regarding the distribution of comingled funds.

<p>Action Item: IODP-MI to document how comingled funds are distributed along with an estimation of future integrative activity expenses and will circulate the document to the entire IWG+ membership.</p>
--

Shibata-san then informed IWG+ members that, without the \$10M USD/annum for *Chikyu* operations, *Chikyu's* availability to IODP would probably drop from 5 months to 3.5- 4.0 months per year and that the \$1M USD/annum contribution of Japan to comingled funds would need to be revisited by MEXT management. NSF representatives Ian Ridley and Tom Janecek both stated that, if the official position of MEXT was that the \$10M USD must continue for *Chikyu* operations, the US would not sign an MOU with Japan. Shibata-san then stated that, although this was MEXT's official position, he would consult further with MEXT management on this issue.

Other IWG+ members weighed in on platform priorities in the new program. Mike Webb pointed out that IODP presently had three great platforms, but that rising costs were putting large financial pressure on all three. He pointed out that a balanced program of *JOIDES Resolution* and MSP was critical for renewal efforts with ECORD, with *Chikyu* less so. Chris Yeats indicated that the *JOIDES Resolution* is critical to ANZIC scientific interests and that the core of present IODP was the *JOIDES Resolution*.

IWG+ members then discussed potential options for the use of surplus comingled funds (should there be any in a particular fiscal year). Tom Janecek gave the opinion that no comingled funds should go to any platform on a regular basis, but that the determining

factor should be based on science priorities as defined by the community. The creation of an “Opportunity Fund” was discussed. Some IWG+ members suggested that this fund could be used for site surveys, feasibility studies, engineering developments, observatories, LWD, etc but not for regular operating costs. Shibata-san suggested that priority should be put on strategic initiatives rather than operations, although the latter activity could also be eligible, when necessary. Several IWG+ members (Yeats, Janecek) suggested that IWG+ should not be too prescriptive. The IWG+ members ultimately reached a consensus that the opportunity fund should be used for platform operations and/or other strategic initiatives as recommended by the Science Community with the ultimate decision for allocation of surplus funds resting with the PGB.

Consensus statement # 3: Surplus comingled funds can be used for platform operations and/or other strategic initiatives as recommended by the science community. The final disposition of surplus comingled funds, however, rests with the PGB.

8. SAS Terms of Reference

Several topics regarding the SAS Terms of Reference were discussed by the IWG+ members including:

a. Technology Development advice to IODP

Catherine Mevel read SASEC consensus 1106-12 regarding Engineering Development/Transfer within the International Ocean Discovery Program. IWG+ briefly discussed the recommendation and approved it.

Consensus statement #4 : IWG+ approves SASEC consensus 1106-12 regarding Engineering development/transfer to the International Ocean Discovery Program

b. Membership of the Operations Task Force

IWG+ briefly discussed SASEC Consensus 1106-11 that provides for the Chair of SIPCOM to be a representative on OTF and then approved it for implementation.

Consensus statement # 5: IWG+ approves SASEC Consensus 1106-11 that recommends that the SIPCOM Chair be a member of the Operations Task Force.

c. IODP-MI Board of Governors Motions and Information

Brian Taylor informed the IWG+ members of several changes to the SIPCOM Terms of Reference adopted by the IODP-MI Board of Governors at their June 16 meeting including:

SIPCOM Chair

The chair of SIPCOM should be selected for scientific leadership and approved by the CMO (not the Board of Governors as previously written). Also the SIPCOM Chair shall be a member of OTF.

Mandate

SIPCOM shall approve an annual plan about 18 months before the associated fiscal year.

Meetings

SIPCOM shall convene at least once annually.

IWG+ Members were also informed that the IODP-MI Board of Governors will disband SASEC on September 30th, 2011.

It was also clarified that SIPCOM reports to the PGB, not the CMO. The president of the CMO (through his role on the PGB) informs the Board about PGB and SAS actions.

d. Representation on SIPCOM

IWG+ members discussed representation and voting rights on SIPCOM, in particular problems associated with representation for diverse consortia. The members agreed that having a seat at the table is of greater vital interest for the Associate Members than a voting right.

Consensus statement # 6: Voting rights on SIPCOM are accorded to full members paying \$6M USD/annum. Associate members will have representation at SIPCOM but will be non-voting members.

e. ANZIC representation on Program Evaluation Panel (PEP)

Given the current funding contribution level by ANZIC that is nearly twice that of other associate members, Chris Yeats requested an increase of one more member on the PEP. IWG+ members agreed this was appropriate.

Consensus statement # 7: The ANZIC consortium representation level on the Program Evaluation Panel will increase to two members.

IWG+ Members agreed to accept the SAS Terms of Reference (with the changes noted above). IWG+ members thanked everyone who helped prepare the Terms of Reference and provide input on their revisions, especially Hans Christian Larsen, Keir Becker, and Maureen Raymo.

Consensus statement # 8: IWG+ accepts the Science Advisory Structure Terms of References (as revised at this meeting).

Action Item: IODP-MI to provide the revised version of SAS Terms of Reference to IWG+

9. Site Survey funding

IWG+ members briefly discussed issues surrounding funding of site surveys. Funding mechanisms, rationale, and budgets vary significantly from country to country resulting in an ad hoc approach to this critical science and safety element of IODP. Many ideas were discussed including in-kind contributions. No consensus was reached and this item will be revisited again at the next IWG+ meeting.

10. Joint funding of post-cruise science by member countries

IWG+ discussed the possibility of joint funding of post-cruise science by member countries (e.g., joint calls for proposals by NSF-NERC). Members were generally positive about this idea. There are models for it within NSF. It was suggested that the Belmont Forum could be used to explore this idea further.

Action item: Rodey Batiza to discuss with Tim Killeen (NSF Representative of the Belmont Forum) about how to utilize the Belmont forum to examine joint funding mechanisms for post-cruise funding and site surveys.

11. Other Business –

a. Transition from IWG+ to PGB

IWG+ members discussed the transition of IWG+ to the Program Governing Board (PGB), in particular, when the PGB would begin operation. It was agreed that during the transition period to the new program (i.e., through 2013) that the IWG+ will act as the PGB. This will require a contract modification to the IODP-MI contract to change the reporting line for SAS from the CMO (IODP-MI) to the PGB (IWG+).

Consensus statement # 9: During the transition period to the new program in 2013, the IWG+ will act in the role of the Program Governing Board.

12. Next IWG+ Meeting

IWG+ will hold its next meeting in Goa, India either in mid January 2012 or February 2012.