

IODP MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL, Inc. (IMI)

Minutes of the Initial Meeting of the Members

March 27 1003-1040

Radisson Waikiki Prince Kuhio-3rd floor Ballroom

Attendance

Full Members and Observers:

Hokkaido University	Hisatake Okada
Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC)	Hajimu Kinoshita, Kiyoshi Suyehiro
Kochi University	Masahiro Kamiyama, Masao Iwai
Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory	Michael Purdy
National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST)	Teruki Miyazaki, Hisao Ito
Oregon State University	Alan Mix
Rutgers University	Dennis Kent
Scripps Institution of Oceanography/ UCSD (SIO)	John Orcutt
Texas A & M University	Jeff Fox
The U Tokyo	Gaku Kimura
Tohoku University	Motoyoshi Oda, Tsunemasa Saito
Tokai University	Toshiyasu Nagao
UC, Santa Cruz	Eli Silver
U Florida	Neil Opdyke
U Hawaii	Barry Raleigh
U Miami	Chris Harrison
U Michigan	Ted Moore
U Texas	Paul Stoffa
U Washington	Russell McDuff
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute (WHOI)	Bob Detrick

Other observers:

Judy Rubano (U Hawaii), Masakuni Hanada (JAMSTEC), Takeo Tanaka, Yoshiko Suzuki (Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization [AESTO])

Agenda Item 1: Treasurer's report

Harrison reported on the current balance of account of IMI (\$86,000). 19 Members have paid up and 3 Members have payment pending.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of members of the Board of Governors (BOG) as presented by Japanese and U.S. Members

Okada presented the 5 BOG nominations made by the Japan Earth Drilling Science Consortium as:

Takemi Ishihara (AIST)
Gaku Kimura (U Tokyo)
Hajimu Kinoshita (JAMSTEC)
Hisa Okada (Hokkaido U)
Tsune Saito (Tohoku U)

Alternate Governors as:

Teruki Miyazaki (AIST)
Kiyoshi Suyehiro (JAMSTEC)

All these nominations were approved by the Members.

Raleigh explained the U.S. voting was completed recently and the nominations are:

Bob Detrick (WHOI)
Dennis Kent (Rutgers U)
John Orcutt (SIO)
Nick Piasias (OSU)
Paul Stoffa (UT Austin)

Alternates Governors are:

Eli Silver (UCSC)
Neil Opdyke (U Florida)

Agenda Item 3: Reports on recent meetings and budget situation

3-1: interim Planning Committee (iPC) Report (Ted Moore)

Moore reported on the recent iPC meeting in Austin, TX, USA (March 18-20). He reported on the following items in the order of importance. The Executive Summary of the iPC Meeting was distributed.

- (1) The Operations Committee (OPCOM) mandate was accepted based on recommendation from iPC OPCOM Working Group (WG). This will be presented to the International Working Group (IWG) in June.
- (2) Efforts to expedite the science planning are being made through joint panel meetings (interim Industry Liaison Panel [iILP] + interim Technical Advisory Panel [iTAP]) and

implementation of new WGs reporting to the iPC (Riser Scoping WG, Project Management WG) (*cf. Distribution*)

- (3) Database WG will be established and work with interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP).
- (4) Microbiology WG will be established and work with interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP).
- (5) interim Site Survey Panel (iSSP) and iILP will work together to establish better link to existing industry database and to refine seismic database characteristics.

After his report, following discussion ensued:

Transition from Ocean Drilling Plan (ODP) to Integrated Ocean Drilling Plan (IODP)

Implications to IMI, particularly if 2004 drilling occurs. Moore said that the first Science Planning Committee (SPC) meeting in September would rank enough proposals for planning consideration.

The Science Advisory Structure (SAS) makeup will be based on membership units. The European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling (ECORD) said they would purchase 2 membership units. Science panels would thus have 7 (Japanese) + 7 (U.S.) + 2 (Europeans) representatives in general, but technical panels will be formed by expertise (Moore). Some questions followed on the probability of ECORD membership.

Moore said OPCOM would be formulated in time for budget panning.

Fox said the present ODP IO may help in the planning process. Purdy appreciated this but cautioned that IMI not be accused of predetermining IODP non-riser IO. He also said National Science Foundation (NSF) planning should go quickly. Allegedly, Malfait said that NSF would require the budget plan for FY2004 in December 2003. Fox said that would mean technically sophisticated cruises (i.e., requiring extensive use of Advanced CORKs [ACORKs] and other non-standard downhole equipment) would not be possible on the non-riser ship. Raleigh asked the readiness of existing non-riser platform. Fox said JOIDES/Resolution (J/R) would be the viable candidate and could be prepared very quickly according to the ship owner.

3-2: NSF/MEXT Budget Report (no reps)

JAMSTEC reaffirmed the operation of Chikyu to start in late 2006 after 1.5 years of test drilling.

Agenda Item 4: Establishment of procedures for the hiring of an interim President and procedures for the appointment of a President

Okada suggested a Search Committee be formed for both the President and the IMI office location. This matter needs full BOG discussion.

Raleigh said IMI has to start to function within 2-3 months. One suggestion was to have an interim President and interim Office, but that implies temporary staffing. Opdyke asked if this staff could be funded by contract with NSF. Purdy said the key matter was the location of the office and that this consideration required full BOG discussion.

Rubano gave a viewgraph presentation of the startup process envisioned by her. In essence, 3 months are required for IMI to become functional (April for startup and organization; April-May for programmatic startup with an operational director and office manager in place) and could be ready in September. It requires 3 months to contract and adapt existing management resources such as "web-based Info and Reporting System (eRA)", which is capable of handling multiple languages. Rubano said an accountant and a contract specialist would be required. Rubano emphasized that the startup process requires full-time commitment, i.e. working extra hours. She foresees expanding the staff number to 15 by October. Harrison asked if the office could be moved. Rubano said that was not assumed.

Okada asked how the location of the U.S. Office would be decided and went on to explain the Japanese proposal for the IMI Office in Japan, which was approved by the Japan Consortium. Opdyke suggested a U.S. caucus be held to discuss this matter. The meeting was suspended till after lunch for U.S. caucus.

Discussion resumed after lunch. Stoffa summarized that there will be further discussion among U.S. members, but that the focus was to locate on west coast or Hawaii. Starting from a permanent office was favored over moving to a permanent place after interim location.

**

Free discussions:

-Structure and function of IMI (TAB 6)

Okada read through the Tab 6 pages and went on in a questions and answer style. Harrison asked what the formal arrangement with the Leading Agencies meant. Purdy answered that it meant the contract with NSF.

Purdy pointed out that a close relationship between the Lead Agencies and IMI is important.

Orcutt reported on a telephone conversation with Malfait, the content of which was distributed as e-mail printout. The essence is that the IMI BOG should proceed with scheduling 2003 and 2004 considering resource requirements, and structuring IMI including the decision process and timing for President and Office location. Taking the opportunity of April 21-22 Tokyo meeting of NSF/Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) for BOG to meet should be considered.

Harrison asked about outside contracts whether contracts are made through IOs. Moore answered Request for Proposals (RFPs) will be for anyone including IOs.

Raleigh asked about the “promotion of the program” as it might take place at different levels. Fox suggested IMI might coordinate and integrate these efforts.

Rubano asked about Platform Operation Costs (POCs). Moore answered that the planning process will determine which platform will be used for what purpose.

Harrison commented that the ensuring liaison with other scientific programs might be at the level below the “SAS executive authority.” Moore said yes, but policy might come from the authority.

Opdyke referred to possible Mission Specific Platform (MSP) capability such as developed by Navy for near shore drilling. Moore said the Europeans are considering many types of MSPs under a wide variety of ownership.

-Science Planning and the role of proposed SAS Executive Authority

Stoffa suggested a Standing Committee of IMI BOG fill this role. Detrick noted that in this case the lines of authority will be clear. This committee will be populated according to the intergovernmental Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs), so that the membership will not be entirely by IMI. This committee might be named the “Science Policy and Planning Oversight Committee” (SPPOC) and will constitute the SAS for IODP. Moore was asked if that would satisfy iPC and he said it was fine. Suyehiro asked if that followed what NSF had in mind. U.S. members were confident that NSF would be satisfied. No opinions were heard from Japanese members.

-AESTO's role in IMI-Japan science support office in Sapporo

Tanaka explained the AESTO (Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization) and IMI-Japan (IMI-J) Office scheme (proposal). AESTO is to be subcontracted by IMI. Questions followed. Tanaka said about 10-15 staff members will be necessary at Sapporo IMI-J Office depending on the required tasks. Okada suggested that an IMI Vice President to head this Office.

-Interim organizational structure of IMI, March 28 - October 1, 2003

Discussion was deferred to next day.

-Science Planning post October 1, 2003

Constitution of SAS is important, which would be based on MOUs and IWG approval. But Moore suggested BOG to plan ahead. Purdy said tri-lateral MOU after NSF-MEXT agreement signing in April 21-22 would give additional guidance. Moore said Program Plan would be needed in December at the latest, thus the key science planning parts of the IODP SAS need to be set up and functioning soon – perhaps even before other MOUs are signed. The SPC Meeting in September needs a defined membership and authorization.

Next Member meeting will be in January, but electronic meeting may be held as needed for approving new Members and Associate Members.

Meeting was adjourned at 1500.