

**JR Facility Science Evaluation Panel (SEP) Meeting  
21-23 June 2016  
MARUM, University of Bremen, German**

Meeting Roster

Science Subgroup

---

Natsue Abe	JAMSTEC
Steven Bohaty	University of Southampton
Anders Carlson	Oregon State University
Cristiano Chiessi	University of Sao Paolo
Cornelia Class	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory – Columbia University
Bernard Coakley	University of Alaska
Deniz Cukur <sup>1</sup>	Korea Institute of Geoscience & Mineral Resources (KIGAM)
Sarah Feakins	University of Southern California
Eric Ferre	Southern Illinois University
Marguerite Godard	Université Montpellier
Marc-André Gutscher	University of Brest – Institut Universitaire Europeen de la Mer
Steve Hovan	Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Minoru Ikehara	Kochi University
Satoko Ishimaru	Kumamoto University
Samuel Jaccard	University of Bern
Jens Kallmeyer	GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences
Kathie Marsaglia	California State University, Northridge
Andrew McCaig	University of Leeds
Cecilia McHugh	City University of New York – Queens College
Ken Miller	Rutgers The State University of New Jersey
Yuki Morono	JAMSTEC
Werner Piller	University of Graz
Julia Reece	Texas A&M University
Marci Robinson	United States Geological Survey
Brian Romans	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech)
Ashok Singhvi	Physical Research Laboratory
Weidong Sun	Guangzhou Institute of Geochemistry
Jason Sylvan	Texas A&M University
Andreas Teske	University of North Carolina
Jun Tian	Tongji University
Kohtaro Ujiie <sup>2</sup>	University of Tsukuba
Heiner Villinger	University of Bremen
Masanobu Yamamoto	Hokkaido University

Unable to attend

---

<sup>1</sup> Alternate for Jang-Jun Bahk

<sup>2</sup> Alternate for Ryota Hino

## Site Subgroup

---

Juichiro Ashi	University of Tokyo
Rebecca Bell	Imperial College of London
Cara Burberry	University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Calvin Campbell	Geological Survey of Canada – Atlantic
Ben Clennell	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Org. (CSIRO)
Roger Flood <sup>3</sup>	Stony Brook University
Gilles Guerin	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University
Seung-Sep Kim	Chungnam National University
Sebastian Krastel	Christian-Albrechts University at Kiel
Jiabiao Li	Second Institute of Oceanography
Johanna Lofi <sup>4</sup>	Université de Montpellier – Géosciences Montpellier
David Mallinson	East Carolina University (SEP Co-Chair)
Dhananjai Pandey	National Center for Antarctic and Ocean Research
Robert Pockalny	University of Rhode Island
Michael Riedel	GEOMAR – Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel
Zhen Sun	South China Sea Institute of Oceanology
Helenice Vital	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte
Peter Vrolijk	ExxonMobil Upstream Research Co.
Lindsay Worthington	University of New Mexico

## Liaisons and Observers

---

Jamie Austin	IODP Forum Chair – University of Texas at Austin
Rita Bauer	IODP Science Support Office (SSO) - UCSD/SIO
Nobu Eguchi	JAMSTEC Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX)
Holly Given	IODP Science Support Office (SSO) - UCSD/SIO
Tom Janecek	National Science Foundation (NSF)
Yoshi Kawamura	JAMSTEC
Hanno Kinkel	GEOMAR
Adam Klaus	JRSO –TAMU
Anthony Koppers	<i>JOIDES Resolution</i> Facility Board Chair – Oregon State University
Denise Kulhanek	JRSO –TAMU
Gilles Lericolais	European Consortium for Ocean Res. Drilling (ECORD) Facility Board (Chair)
Leah LeVay	JRSO –TAMU
Mitch Malone	JRSO –TAMU
Sally Morgan	ECORD Science Office (ESO) – University of Leicester
Angela Slagle	USSSP - LDEO
Shouting Tuo	IODP China – Tongji University
Michiko Yamamoto	IODP Science Support Office (SSO) - UCSD/SIO

Unable to attend

---

<sup>3</sup> Alternate for Sean Gulick

<sup>4</sup> Alternate for Louis Géli

**JR Facility Science Evaluation Panel (SEP) Meeting**  
**21-23 June 2016**  
**MARUM, University of Bremen, Germany**

Meeting Minutes

---

**Tuesday**

**21 June 2016**

**09:00-17:30**

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Science Evaluation Panel (SEP) Co-Chair, Dr. Ken Miller, welcomed the SEP to Bremen, Germany.

### *1.1 Call to Order*

Dr. Miller called the meeting to order with a welcome and an introduction of Dr. Michael Schulz, the Director of the Center for Marine Environmental Sciences (MARUM) at the University of Bremen.

### *1.2 Welcome to MARUM and Bremen*

Dr. Michael Schulz welcomed the SEP to MARUM and provided information regarding MARUM and their ongoing programs.

### *1.3 Panel Charge, thanks to past members, and self-introductions*

Dr. Miller provided a brief description of the panel's charge, a thanks to past members, and he asked attendees to perform self-introductions.

### *1.4 Logistical Announcements*

Meeting host, Bremen Core Repository Manager, Dr. Ursula Röhl, reviewed the basic logistics for the meeting, including safety and Internet access.

### *1.5 Approval of Meeting Agenda*

Dr. Miller asked the SEP members to review the agenda and provide changes or additions. No members presented additions or changes, and they approved the agenda.

## **2. Reports from IODP Entities**

### *2.1 Perspectives from the JRFB Chair*

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Chair, Dr. Anthony Koppers, presented updates from the JRFB meeting in May, including:

- JRFB acceptance of a simplified version of the Proposal Submission Guidelines.
- JRFB acceptance of modifications to the Guidelines for Joint Review of Amphibious Drilling Proposals.
- The updated JR Expedition Schedule FY17-19.
  - Five Expeditions in FY17-19 (one extra per year)
  - Two Antarctic Expeditions (pending ice breaker support)
- JRFB acceptance of a modified long-term JR Cruise Track, which resulted from lagging proposal pressure in the South Atlantic.

For more detailed information regarding this report, please see Dr. Koppers' presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

## 2.2 NSF Report

NSF Program Manager, Dr. Tom Janecek, reviewed the key points of progress and/or change within the IODP. These included:

- FY17 Budget
  - Positive Financial Situation (Low fuel prices, efficient operations, and Complementary Project Proposal (CPP) funding)
  - Expected FY17 Contributions to JR operations by NSF, IODP partners, and CPPs
  - This funding provides for 10 months/year of JR operations for FY17-19, icebreaker support, logging while drilling, and a new XRF scanner.
- JR Facility Review
  - 5-year Cooperative Agreement (CA) for JR operation requires annual reviews
  - Reviews provide for “mid-course” corrections and for input on renewal or re-competition of the CA
  - NSF Panel met at the *JOIDES Resolution* Science Operator (JRSO) in February 2016 for the FY15 review
    - U.S., European, Japanese, Australian, and Canadian scientists served on the panel
    - NSF received the FY15 co-chief review report
    - The final report is confidential, but shared with NSF financial partners and the JRFB
  - NSF was pleased to receive the determination that “The *JOIDES Resolution* Science Operator Site Visit Panel concludes that the facility is being **managed exceptionally well by the JRSO**, and that it is **also being overseen effectively by the *JOIDES Resolution* Facility Board (JRFB)** and the National Science Foundation (NSF) to meet the IODP Science Plan.”
  - NSF accepted all Panel recommendations and has asked the JRSO to implement or consider the recommendations important for:
    - Implementing a 10 month operation model
    - Reducing operational risk
    - Improving program visibility
    - Having modest budget implications

Dr. Janecek then reviewed the schedule obtaining NSF funding authorization for for the next phase of the IODP, reminding the group that the NSF is not renewing the IODP (which is operating under a 10 year plan; 2013-2023), but rather seeking authorization for funds to operate the US contribution to the IODP (the JR) over the period from 2019-2023. He noted that a key point in this schedule is the U.S. Community Workshop (similar to the 2012 Denver workshop), which will work to evaluate the effectiveness of the JR toward achieving the Science Plan challenges, and determine how essential the JR is in meeting the remainder of the Science Plan challenges.

As the final part of his presentation, Dr. Janecek gave the following overview of the JR100 Program:

- Program utilizing **non-IODP NSF** funds to conduct APC coring up to 100 mbsf for 2-4 weeks during the JR’s annual tie-up periods, at available and appropriate locations in the geographic area of the tie-up port.
- Takes into consideration deeper coring needs by the US community, lack of long-coring capability in the US, and the availability of the JR.

- Non-IODP NSF funding would be provided by NSF science programs (e.g., Marine Geology and Geophysics) and the NSF Ship Operations program.
- 100 meter limit is primarily set by environmental assessment issues (drilling vs. coring)
- Coring period determined after JRFB sets the JR's IODP schedule.
- Science staffing, similar to typical UNOLS cruise, is driven by scientific needs and funding availability.
- Cores resulting from the program would be stored as determined by the proposal.

Dr. Janecek noted that the first opportunity to implement this program would most likely be FY2019 (or possibly late FY2018). The program will start later this fall with an explanatory Dear Colleague letter from NSF. NSF will decide to continue their support of the program based on funding availability and the success of preliminary efforts.

For more detailed information regarding this report, please see Dr. Janecek's presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

### 2.3 JR Science Operator (JRSO) Report

Dr. Mitch Malone, JRSO Liaison, presented highlights of the JR's recent expeditions (360 and 361) and he updated the attendees regarding:

- FY15 Co-chief review (353-356): 22-23 February
- NSF Facility Review Panel: 24-26 February
- Scientific Staffing status
- Search for Expedition Project Manager (in progress)

Dr. Malone concluded his report with a map showing upcoming JR Expeditions. For more detailed information regarding this report, please see Dr. Malone's presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

### 2.4 MSP / EFB, Science Operator Report

Dr. Gilles Lericolais, ECORD Facility Board (EFB) Chair, presented a report of progress for the EFB from their March 2015 meeting, which included:

- A current list of ECORD Facility Board members
- A summary of 2015 and 2016 Expedition progress:
  - Expedition 357: Atlantis Massif – A review committee will convene in 2016
  - Expedition 364: Chicxulub Crater – The Onshore Science Party will start in September
- A summary of the two expeditions schedule for 2018
  - Expedition 373: Antarctic Cenozoic Paleoclimate
  - Expedition 377: Arctic Ocean Paleoceanography
- A review of proposals at the EFB and their current status
- The current Mission Specific Platform (MSP) scheduling strategy
- EFB consensus statements and action items

Dr. Sally Morgan, ECORD Science Operator (ESO) Liaison, presented a summary of ESO operations completed in 2015 and 2016:

- Expedition 357: Atlantis Massif: Serpentinization and Life
- Expedition 364: Chicxulub Impact Crater

And she summarized plans/progress regarding upcoming Expeditions 373 and 377.

She noted that the ECORD School of Rock was held in Portugal in 2015, the Second ECORD Training Course was held in Bremen in March, the 1<sup>st</sup> ECORD Petrophysics Summer School was scheduled in Leicester in late June, and the 10<sup>th</sup> ECORD Summer School (Submarine Geohazards) was scheduled in Bremen in September.

For more detailed information, please see Dr. Lericolais' and Dr. Morgan's presentations, which are posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

### **2.5 Chikyu / CIB, Science Operator Report**

Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX) liaison Dr. Nobu Eguchi provided the CDEX/CIB (Chikyu IODP Board) Report, which included summaries of:

- Expedition 365 results
  - Successful retrieval of GeniusPlug and installation of LTBMS (Long-Term Borehole Monitoring System) in fewer days than scheduled
  - Extra time used for coring
  - Good outreach program
  - LTBMS DONET (Dense Ocean Floor Network system for Earthquakes and Tsunamis) hook up completed just a few days ago
- CIB meeting #4 consensus statements and board membership changes
- Expedition 370: T-Limit of the Deep Biosphere off Muroto
  - Section of Site ODP11-74B – original site was too close to a submarine cable

For more detailed information, please see Dr. Eguchi's presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

### **3. Science Support Office Report**

Dr. Holly Given, IODP Science Support Office (SSO) Executive Director began her report with a reminder regarding the need for those present to abide by the IODP Proposal Confidentiality Policy, and she updated the group on the recent developments at the SSO, including:

- Updates to the IODP Proposal Submission Guidelines and where to find them
- The new web site:
  - Highlights and features – sorting tables and improved links
  - A request to please review the site and email comments to Dr. Given
- Revisions to the Proposal Data Base (PDB) submission system
  - Guides the creation of proposal parts.
  - All input parameters are now stored in a relational database
- Proposal / Review Developments
  - Link sites (in table) to Site Forms
  - E-notification to co-proponents
  - FY17: Site Survey Data Bank (SSDB) to add concept of “data package submission” to align with proposal submission
  - FY17: SSO will add expertise in marine seismic imaging

Dr. Given concluded her report with a review of proposal submission, proposal distribution, and data file statistics. For more detailed information, please see Dr. Given's presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

#### **4. The Proposal Review and Advisory Process**

Drs. Miller and Mallinson (SEP Co-Chairs) provided an update regarding the panel status and function, and a more detailed review of panel procedures.

##### *4.1 Review Procedures and Discussion of data guidelines and site characterization*

Dr. Miller reminded those in attendance of their requirement to keep the content and discussion of all proposals confidential. He provided a brief update regarding the SEP status and function, and he reviewed the results for the proposals reviewed in the previous two SEP meetings.

Dr. Miller then summarized proposal review procedures through:

- Highlights from the SEP Terms of Reference
- General evaluation criteria for IODP proposals and response letters
- Rating of the proposal (after external review)
- Notes regarding drilling plan review and having sufficient alternate sites

Dr. Dave Mallinson continued the overview by providing details of Site Survey Data review procedures, including:

- Characterizing Site Survey Data
- General data requirements and accepted formats (from the Guidelines)
- Classification System
- WD preparation of proposal reviews
- Proposal Evaluation Form
- Actions for panelists with Conflicts of Interest

Dr. Miller then presented a summary of the proposals submitted for the April 1 deadline and their possible destinations, and he reminded the panelists to submit their written reports to Dr. Michiko Yamamoto.

For more detailed information, please see Dr. Miller and Dr. Mallinson's Review Procedure presentation, which is posted at <http://www.iodp.org/sep-presentations/sep-2016-june-presentations>.

#### **5. Review of Proposals**

The SEP reviewed one new proposal (out of normal order) at the start of the review process, to accommodate the panel's schedule. The SEP then proceeded with:

##### *5.1 Revised proposals*

The SEP began their reviews of revised proposals.

**18:00 Meeting Adjourned for the Day**

### 5.1 Revised proposals (Continued)

The SEP completed their reviews of revised proposals.

### 5.2 Externally Reviewed Proposals

The SEP reviewed externally reviewed proposals.

Prior to the lunch break, Dr. Achim Kopf gave a short science talk, in which he presented the results of Expedition 365: NanTroSEIZE Shallow Megaspill LTBMS.

### 5.3 New proposals

The SEP began their reviews of new Pre-proposals.

## 17:35 Meeting Adjourned for the Day

### 5.3 New proposals

The SEP completed their reviews of new Pre- and APL proposals.

## 6. Discussion of the role of long coring (Calypso type) in IODP

Dr. Miller presented a summary of issues encountered with the 2014 review of a Multiphase Drilling Proposal (MDP) and the review of one of its daughters as a pre-proposal at this SEP, where proponents specified the use of a particular vessel as a mission-specific platform. He noted that in the June 2014 review of the MDP, the reviewers reminded the proponents that it is not appropriate for the proponent to specify platforms, and advised them to better identify science-based targets. Unfortunately, the daughter pre-proposal reviewed by this SEP ignored this guidance. Further, SEP found that the pre-proposal emphasized multiphase drilling coring, but did not present hypothesis-driven science questions.

Dr. Miller then summarized the guidance provided to the SEP from NSF regarding this issue:

- The current bilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between NSF and ECORD Management Agency (EMA) provides for the use of long piston coring by ESO when conducting MSP operations.
- The IODP advisory panels report to the JRFB, but NSF has agreed to let other platform providers use the SEP and Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP) to evaluate proposals for their platforms. Therefore, SEP will need to evaluate IODP proposals that might be conducted by ESO using a long piston coring facility.
- This aspect of the NSF-EMA MOU may or may not be part of the next MOU between NSF and EMA (to be negotiated in 2018, operative in 2019)

Dr. Gilles Lericolais recalled Appendix C of the ECORD-NSF MoU signed for the period 2014-2019 concerning the participation of the members of the JR consortium to MSP operations. Appendix C says that ECORD will be responsible for funding and implementing MSP operations for IODP as an independent Platform Provider. ECORD considers that if the proposal will contribute to the IODP Science Plan, it is logical that SEP should review it. Nevertheless, Dr. Lericolais supports the statement that it is not up to the proponents to decide which platform should be used to fulfill their

objectives. This is under SEP mandate. But, if an MSP is considered by SEP necessary to reach the scientific objectives of a positively-evaluated proposal, it is the responsibility of the ECORD entities to plan and implement the operations. If long piston coring is considered appropriate to achieve the objectives, there is no reason not to use it.

Dr. Janecek also reminded the attendees that the role of Watch Dog 5 (WD5) was created to give the operators a chance to reality-check proposals for their appropriateness on the available platforms.

In general discussion, the attendees agreed that all long-coring (Calypso-type) proposals that address the IODP Science Plan via hypothesis-driven science are welcome. The participating operators determine if the sampling or platform proposed is appropriate, but the platform providers will only consider funding proposals if the science is deemed worthy by the SEP.

Dr. Marguerite Godard noted that proponents have the option of proposing some or all of their IODP related coring directly to the agencies funding their preferred platform. She suggested that we make this clear to proponents who are not part of the IODP community. Others noted that the advantage of submitting this type of proposal within the IODP system is the quality of core storage, as well as data and publication management.

Dr. Miller reiterated that for this pre-proposal review, the proponent is specifying the platform, and they should not.

## 7. Summary of SEP reviews

As summarized below, Dr. Miller reviewed the results and ratings (as necessary) for each of the proposals discussed at this meeting.

Proposal#	Type	Title	PI	Stage	Platform	Theme	Result
835	Full2	Japan Trench Tsunamigenesis	Shuichi Kodaira	SEP	NR-Chikyu	EM	CIB -Excellent
852	CPP2	North Sea GlaciStore	Heather Stewart	SEP	MSP	CO	Deactivate
853	Full	South Atlantic Transect	Rosalind Coggon	SEP	JR	CO	Revise
859	Full	Amazon Margin Drilling	Paul Baker	SEP	JR	CO	Revise
871	CPP2	Lord Howe Rise Continental Ribbon	Ron Hackney	SEP	Chikyu	EC	External Review
887	Add (CPP2)	Gulf of Mexico Methane Hydrate	Peter Flemings	SEP	JR	EM	JRFB - Excellent
895	Pre(ADP)	Mediterranean-Atlantic Gateway Exchange	Rachel Flecker	SEP	JR	CO	Full
896	Pre	North Atlantic Fjord Sediment Archives	Jacques Giraudeau	SEP	MSP	CO	Deactivate
897	APL	Southern Ocean Cretaceous Anoxia	Simon Holford	SEP	JR	CO	JRFB - Exp369
898	Pre	Fore Arc Mohole-to-Mantle	Katsuyoshi Michibayashi	SEP	JR-Chikyu	EC	Full
899	Pre	Tyrrhenian Continent-Ocean Transition	Nevio Zitellini	SEP	JR	EC	Deactivate
900	Pre	Rainbow Massif Hydrothermalism	Muriel Andreani	SEP	JR	BF	Full
901	APL	Taiwan Arc-Continent Collision	Tim Byrne	SEP	JR	EC	Deactivate
902	Full	Iceberg Alley Paleooceanography	Michael E. Weber	SEP	JR	CO	External Review
903	Pre	Argentine Margin Seaward Dipping Reflectors	Denise K. Kulhanek	SEP	JR	EC	Full
904	Pre	Sao Paulo Plateau Continental Rifting	Julio Almeida	SEP	JR	EC	Deactivate
905	APL	Goodenough Basin Subduction System	Roger Buck	SEP	JR	EC	Deactivate
863A	Pre	ISOLAT: Indian Antarctic Paleooceanography	Xavier Crosta	SEP	MSP	CO	Deactivate

	: Came back from external review
	: Revised
	: New

Dr. Miller also reminded the team that their review reports were due to Michiko no later than Monday 27 June 2016.

Dr. Heiner Villinger asked if or how SEP members can determine if an expedition was able to complete their proposed science. Other attendees indicated this information could be found in or through:

- The Preliminary Expedition Report - If the desired samples were collected, the science can be done, and a section of this report should indicate if the science questions were answered.
- Publications resulting from the expedition – These generally lag by 3 years.
- The IODP Forum – The Forum Chair tracks expedition science questions to Science Plan challenges.
- The proposal and possibly the Proposal Review Report
  - Proposals in the vicinity of a previous expedition should indicate how the previous expedition answered their science questions.
  - Proposal Review Reports should detail expectations for the proponent to compare their work to that done in other (similar or nearby) expeditions.
- SEP meeting science talks.

Several participants request that, as part of future SEP meetings, someone present an informal summary of the recent cruises and how well or how completely the science from the individual expeditions was performed: Answering the question “Did they achieve the expected outcome?”

## **8. Schedule of next SEP Meeting**

Dr. Miller announced that the next SEP Meeting is scheduled for 10-12 January 2017 in La Jolla, California, at Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

He also asked for input from the attendees regarding the venues for the 20-22 June 2017 meeting. Of the venue options discussed (Edinburgh, Scotland and Lisbon, Portugal), Lisbon emerged (in a raised-hand vote) as the preferred venue.

## **9. Consideration of the next SEP Co-Chair for Site Characterization**

Dr. Miller reviewed the process of seeking, vetting, and submitting nominations for the SEP Co-Chair to replace Dr. Mallinson. From this process, he gathered the following four nominees, and asked the SEP for comments regarding these nominees.

- Sean Gulick, UTIG
- Lisa McNeill, Southampton
- Peter Vrolijk (ret.)
- Gabrielle Uenzelmann-Neben, AWI

Dr. Miller stated that all four nominees were contacted and are willing to be considered. Following a brief discussion, the SEP agreed to send all four nominations to the JRFB for their review and selection of the next SEP Co-Chair.

## **10. Thanks to Members Rotating off**

Dr. Miller extended thanks on behalf of the SEP to the members who are rotating off the SEP following this meeting. He also led the meeting attendees in gaining consensus in support of the following statement:

The SEP would like to thank Dave Mallinson for his service and commitment to the IODP, the PEP, and the SEP. Dave’s enthusiasm for the science and his great optimism were infectious and

provided a much needed stimulus to panelists during long meetings. His communication and organizational skills were a tremendous factor in the successful navigation of the muddy waters involved in the transition from PEP/SCP to the SEP, and the advancement of numerous proposals to the expedition phase. His term as chair represents a major contribution to the Earth Sciences.

Dr. Miller and Dr. Given asked that JRFB Chair, Dr. Anthony Koppers send this statement to an appropriate person at East Carolina University.

### **11. All Other Business**

Dr. Miller reminded the SEP members that co-chief nominations are needed for proposals 567 and 751, and he asked that the members email these to the SSO at [science@iodp.org](mailto:science@iodp.org)

In addition, Dr. Miller requested and received consensus support for the following letter of thanks to Dr. Michael Schulz (with special thanks to Dr. Ursula Röhl) and MARUM for hosting this meeting.

Michael Schulz  
Director, Center for Marine Environmental Sciences (MARUM)

23 June 2016

Dear Michael,

The IODP Science Evaluation Panel has enjoyed another very successful meeting at MARUM, in large part due to the hospitality and thoughtfulness of our gracious host, Dr. Ursula Röhl. We would like to express our gratitude to Ursula and her staff for coordinating this meeting with great care and consideration of our needs. We offer you our sincere thanks for allowing us to once again conduct our meeting at MARUM in this beautiful and befitting location.

Sincerely,  
The IODP Science Evaluation Panel

Finally, Dr. Miller reminded the group that an email would arrive in the next few days with the Meeting Satisfaction Survey and asked all attendees to take a few minutes to respond.

### **Announcements:**

- Dr. Rob McKay and Dr. Tim Naish are setting up a regional workshop (first half 2017) to cover SE Indian Ocean, Southern Ocean, Antarctic margin, and the SW Pacific, with a special emphasis on building proposals to attract the JR back into the region in the early 2020s. They will submit a workshop proposal to the USSP for the 1 December deadline.
- IODP sessions at AESC (Australian Earth Sciences Conference) next week, with an excellent array of talks from foreign (US, ECORD, Japan) and ANZIC speakers, and much support from US, ECORD, and Japan for ANZIC/IODP booth. Jamie Austin will be giving a brief talk at a VIP lunch in Canberra on 30 June 2016.
- IODP has a special session at the International Geological Congress. Forum Chair, Dr. Jamie Austin, will attend and will seek to bring South Africa on as an IODP member nation.
- A New England Hydrogeology workshop is tentatively scheduled for late Fall 2016 (USSSP funding secured, ICDP funding pending, proposal for funding at EFB).

- Dr. Kathie Marsaglia is teaching a Short Course on Shipboard Sedimentology: Data Collection, Interpretation, and Integration at College Station, TX from 14-17 November 2016.

To conclude the meeting, Dr. Miller thanks the Science Support Office for facilitating another successful SEP meeting.

**15:55 Meeting Adjourned**