

***JOIDES Resolution* Facility Board Meeting:  
23-24 April 2014  
Washington, DC USA**

**Summary of Consensus Statements and Action Items**

**Consensus Statements**

***Consensus 1***

The JRFB approves the Agenda with the changes discussed.

***Consensus 2***

The JRFB approves the August 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.

***Consensus 3***

The JRFB affirms the need to maintain the ability to do Fast Track reviews of proposals, but recommends that the SEP request them in only exceptional circumstances.

***Consensus 4***

The JRFB accepts the *JOIDES Resolution* Third Party Tools and Instruments Policy with one minor revision to be made before posting on the website.

***Consensus 5***

Based on the availability of proposals ready for scheduling, and on considerations regarding geographic location, costs and minimizing transit times, the JRFB recommends the following proposal for scheduling in FY'16 and into the first part of FY'17:

Proposal 820 (Maldives Monsoon) with Proposal 849-APL (Indian Peninsula Paleoclimate)  
Proposal 800 – Expedition 1 (Indian Ridge Moho)  
Proposal 702 (South African Climates) with Proposal 845-APL (Agulhas LGM Density Profile)  
Proposal 837 (Sumatra Seismogenic Zone)  
Proposal 799 (Western Pacific Warm Pool)

***Consensus 6***

The JRFB reiterates that, based on current and anticipated proposal pressure, the *JOIDES Resolution* will follow a path from the western and southwestern Pacific Ocean, through the Southern Ocean, and into the Atlantic Ocean for opportunities for drilling there starting in 2018 and 2019.

***Consensus 7***

The *JOIDES Resolution* Facility Annual Program Plan is approved in principle. A final plan will be circulated for approval by e-mail in July 2014.

***Consensus 8***

The Science Support Office Annual Program Plan is approved in principle. A final plan will be circulated for approval by e-mail in July 2014.

***Consensus 9***

The combined Sample, Data and Obligations Policy and Implementation Plan is approved in principle. The final Policy will be circulated for e-mail approval in the next two weeks.

***Consensus 10***

The JRFB approves an increase in its science representative membership from 5 to 6 to include 3 U.S. members.

***Consensus 11***

The JRFB approves the appointment of Rick Murray as its next Chair beginning on 1 October 2014.

***Consensus 12***

The JRFB thanks Susan Humphris, the inaugural chair to the JRFB for her service. She started the group off in a fantastic way!

***Consensus 13***

The JRFB thanks the current USIO members (David Divins (COL), David Goldberg (LDEO), and TAMU) for their contributions over the last 10 years to the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program. They leave behind a legacy of a highly successful program!

**Action Items**

***Action Item 1***

The Science Support Office will review pages 5 and 9 in the Proposal Guidelines for inconsistency between “requested” or “not requested” documentation. They will also work to define which of the multiple versions on iodp.org is the current document.

***Action Item 2***

David Divins will finalize the Sample, Data & Obligations Policy and include the input from the curators on the Implementation Plan. The document will be circulated to the JRFB for review and approval within two weeks.

***Action Item 3***

Susan Humphris will draft a letter to the editors of Nature, Science, and Nature Geoscience regarding sanctions against publications based on the existence of the Preliminary Report for Expeditions. This will be circulated to the JRFB for review and a decision as to whether it should be sent.

***Action Item 4***

Susan Humphris will revise the JRFB Terms of Reference to change the number of science members to 6, including 3 U.S. members.

***Action Item 5***

USSSP is requested to conduct a process to nominate two new U.S. members of the JRFB for terms starting in October 2014.

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Meeting Roster:  
23 – 24 April 2014      Washington, DC USA**

*JOIDES Resolution Facility Board – JRFB*

---

James Allan	National Science Foundation, USA
Ryo Anma	University of Tsukuba, Japan
Brijesh Bansal	Ministry of Earth Science, India
Marcio da Castro Silva Filho <sup>1</sup>	Coord. for Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), Brazil
David Divins	US Implementing Org., Consortium for Ocean Leadership (COL), USA
Neville Exon <sup>2</sup>	Australian IODP Secretariat, The Australian National Univ., Australia
Susan Humphris, Chair	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
Gil Young Kim	Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources (KIGAM), ROK
<not attending>	ECORD Managing Agency
Rick Murray	Boston University, USA
Heiko Pälike	University of Bremen, Germany
Andrew Roberts	The Australian National University, Australia
Jianzhong Shen	Ministry of Science and Technology, China

*Liaisons, Guests, and Observers*

---

Rita Bauer	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Keir Becker	IODP Forum Chair, University of Miami, USA
Holly Given	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Barry Katz	EPSP Chair, Chevron Corporation, Houston, TX, USA
Dick Kroon	SEP Co-Chair, The University of Edinburgh, UK
Shin'ichi Kuramoto	Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX), JAMSTEC, Japan
Dave Mallinson	SEP Co-Chair, East Carolina University, USA
<not attending>	European Science Operator (ESO), British Geological Survey, UK
Donna Blackman	National Science Foundation, USA
Brad Clement	USIO, TAMU, USA
Nobu Eguchi	CDEX, JAMSTEC, Japan
Katie Fillingham	USSSP, COL, USA
Karsten Gohl	ECORD Facility Board Chair, AWI-Bremerhaven, Germany
Dave Goldberg	US Implementing Organization, Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory, USA
Cleverson Guizan Silva	CAPES, Brazil
Bob Houtman	National Science Foundation, USA
Akira Ishiwatari	Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC), Japan
John Jaeger	US Advisory Committee, University of Florida, USA
Thomas Janecek	National Science Foundation, USA
Yoshi Kawamura	JAMSTEC, Japan
Gaku Kimura	Chikyu IODP Board Chair, University of Tokyo, Japan
Yuzuru Kimura	Ministry of Edu., Culture, Sports, Sci. and Tech. (MEXT), Japan
Mitch Malone	US Implementing Organization, Texas A&M University, USA
Charna Meth	US Science Support Program (USSSP), COL, USA
Jeff Schuffert	USSSP, COL, USA
Meagan Thompson	National Science Foundation, USA
Shouting Tuo	IODP-China Office, Tongji University, China
Dominique Weis	ECORD FB Member, PCIGR <sup>3</sup> , Canada
Michiko Yamamoto	IODP Science Support Office, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Ping Zhong	Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the USA, China

---

<sup>1</sup> Alternate for Manoel Cardoso

<sup>2</sup> Alternate for Chris Yeats

<sup>3</sup> Pacific Centre for Isotope and Geochemical Research

**JOIDES Resolution Facility Board Meeting Notes:  
23-24 August 2014  
Washington, DC USA**

**Wednesday**

**23 August 2014**

**08:00-18:00**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

JOIDES Resolution Facility Board (JRFB) Chair Susan Humphris welcomed the group and reviewed the needs for this meeting. She then asked for introductions around the room of all Members, Liaisons, and Observers.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Susan Humphris requested we add three items to the agenda:

Under Agenda Item 4

Proponents and Reviews of Proposals

    Use of expedited reviews

    Communications with proponents

Under Agenda Item 21

    Schedule of this meeting in relation to the schedule of the advisory panels of this board.

**Consensus 1**

The JRFB approves the Agenda with the changes discussed.

**3. Approval of August 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes**

Susan Humphris asked if the members had recommended changes? None are voiced.

**Consensus 2**

The JRFB approves the August 2013 JRFB Meeting Minutes with no changes.

**4. Science Support Office Report**

Holly Given presented a summary of activities and accomplishments at the Science Support Office since August 2013. Her highlights were that:

- Board and Advisory Panel membership is stabilizing.
- 2014 meetings were scheduled too close together.
- Submission deadlines, and SEP/JRFB meeting dates should be reexamined.

Her concerns included:

- There is no standard definition of the “fast track e-review” process
- The impact of the “fast track e-review” on the integrity of the proposal review process
- The perceived fairness of the proposal review process
- Confusion caused by unclear communication channels
- The stress to SSO resources created by the “fast track e-review” (too many, too complex)

Holly acknowledged that, in general, a common submittal date (for proposals and site survey data) is not in the foreseeable future; it would certainly require significant thought as to how the process might work.

Finally, Holly pointed out that the SSO's website mission is different from the website mission of the IODP-MI; the SSO's priority is to keep accurate content on the most active pages. NSF representative, Jamie Allan, stated that NSF would like to retain IODP legacy documents currently on the web page, and that NSF received funds from MEXT to assure that legacy materials were supported going forward. Jamie thanked MEXT for these funds and stated that there will be further discussion regarding implementation of retention, access and storage of these documents.

Dave Mallinson expressed a desire to "merge" the PDB and SSDB systems such that Proposals and Site Survey data were available in one location (easy access for reviewers). Holly added to this the desire to move to a more "online" review system. While the SSO acknowledges these desires, there has not been time to think about a technical approach or workload estimate due to the intense 2014 schedule.

#### **4a. Use of expedited reviews**

Susan Humphris pointed out that recently, the SEP has been using a "fast track e-review" process to get some highly rated proposals near the ship track to the JRFB for scheduling. However, if this is done for a large number of proposals, there is a danger/possibility that the review process could be compromised because of the speed of the reviews. Holly Given pointed out that the SSO had no dedicated staff to support this year's "fast track" effort, and with an extremely high volume of uncontrolled e-mail communication, some mistakes were made. Michiko Yamamoto pointed out that it's difficult to get reviewers when they have such little time to perform their review. This increases the workload of the SSO to find a sufficient/fair number of reviewers. The SSO's position is that the current level of fast track reviews is unsustainable without increased human resources.

Susan also pointed out that a long-term cruise track is now published, so proposals should follow that cruise track, diminishing the need for fast track reviews. Jamie Allan pointed out that NSF designed the Science Support Office to be "lean and mean," and the use of the "fast track e-review" strains their limited resources.

Susan and others recommended that we retain the flexibility of the "fast track e-review", but implement it only on rare occasions (for only a few critical proposals) and in exceptional circumstances, sticking to the principle of what we expect of our external review process.

#### ***Consensus 3***

The JRFB affirms the need to maintain the ability to do Fast Track reviews of proposals, but recommends that the SEP request them in only exceptional circumstances.

#### **4b. Communications with proponents**

Susan Humphris asked the board, liaisons and observers to define/determine when communications with or from proponents should be included in the official proposal package, and when communications should not. Jeff Schuffert, Rick Murray, and Keir Becker agreed that the Proposal Guidelines document defined when and how proponent related communications are managed.

##### ***Action Item 1***

The Science Support Office will review pages 5 and 9 in the Proposal Guidelines for inconsistency between “requested” or “not requested” documentation. They will also work to define which of the multiple versions on iodp.org is the current document.

Michiko Yamamoto pointed out that some proponents are hesitant to submit unsolicited letters providing additional information about their proposal because this type of letter is not mentioned in the Proposal Guidelines document. She recommended that to accept these letters, the JRFB should modify the Proposal Guidelines document to give proponents direction. After some discussion on various options, Holly stated that the SSO will receive and catalogue any information that is important to the proposal package, but asked that the JRFB give the SSO a few weeks to discuss internally on how this might best be done.

Jamie Allan stressed the importance of formal documents being incorporated into the official record. Dick Kroon defined formal documents as those that have an impact on the program or the proposal. Heiko Pälke suggested that the SSO look into available tools (for example, those used by journal editors) to manage e-mail traffic.

Susan Humphris concluded that the SEP Co-Chairs have a good sense when correspondence should go to the SSO. In relaying specific recommendations to the proponent, the SEP Co-Chairs should copy the SSO. Proponents should be reminded that formal replies must be submitted as an Addendum or a PRL (as defined in the Proposal Guidelines).

#### **5. Facility Board Reports**

**ECORD** – Karsten Gohl reported on the most important items from the March 2014 ECORD Facility Board (E-FB) meeting. He stated that their next meeting was scheduled for March 25-26 2015 in Aix-en-Provence (France). Karsten pointed out that the E-FB agreed to change their agenda as follows: The first day would be used to discuss proposals and the second day would be used to review discussion points, decide upon schedule, and address other business items. The E-FB also agreed that they needed a terminating strategy for proposals that cannot be drilled in the current IODP Phase. Karsten proposed that this might be a topic for the IODP Forum.

**Chikyu** – Gaku Kimura reported on the consensus items from the last CIB meeting, and Nobu Eguchi reported on progress of *Chikyu* expeditions completed since the last meeting. The next CIB meeting is scheduled for July 10-11, 2014.

Barry Katz noted that the Environmental Principles document has already received review and comments and those comments should be/will be run by all of the operators and boards. Susan Humphris stated that the CIB had approved the Environmental Principles document (in principle). If necessary, the CIB may wish to re-discuss or perhaps they will accept it as it's currently worded.

## 6. Report on SEP Meeting #1

Dick Kroon presented a summary of the January SEP session and asked for Board input on how we might improve the meeting. He also asked for Board input regarding the addition of a 5<sup>th</sup> (Implementing Organization (IO)) Watchdog.

Susan Humphris stated that the integration of the Science considerations with the Site Survey data was powerful and effective, and she recommends that the Co-Chairs give the Watchdogs a maximum number of slides allowable for their presentations.

Mitch Malone stated that the USIO fully supported the Co-Chairs assigning an IO Watchdog, as it cements their involvement. Karsten Gohl stated that ECORD also supports the 5<sup>th</sup> WD, and if the assignment were considered an official function, ECORD would send someone to the SEP meetings. Shin'ichi Kuramoto stated that CDEX would be happy to send a representative as a 5<sup>th</sup> WD when *Chikyu* pre-proposals were being considered.

## 7. Remaining Policies/Procedures

### Third Party Tools Guidelines

Rick Murray summarized the changes made for this version as:

- Accommodating large-scale engineering devices or even individual instruments (not part of standard IODP inventory) without compromising safety and quality.
- Decoupling of accommodation from funding. The PI will seek external support (not from the IO itself) and this funding is no guarantee that the instrument would be used while on board.
- PIs working closely with the IO in terms of use of the instrument/device in the laboratory: staffing implications, the type of data generated, etc.
- Removing the discussion regarding certification, as it is no longer relevant to the program.

Mitch Malone clarified that the PIs **must** consult with the IO prior to shipping instruments/devices and asks for this to be changed in the document.

Dave Goldberg questioned if there should be a statement regarding motivation for third-party tools. Mitch, Jamie Allan, and Rick agreed that while third-party tools are almost always a challenge, they are necessary. The program doesn't have the funds to do R&D, so the need for third-party tools won't go away. Susan Humphris suggested that while we should not change the policy, we might want to state levels of encouragement or discouragement on the website.



**Consensus 4:**

The JRFB accepts the *JOIDES Resolution* Third Party Tools and Instruments Policy with one minor revision to be made before posting on the website.

**IODP Sample, Data & Obligation Policy**

David Divins summarized how the new draft brought obligation requirements into reality:

- Science party members have obligations.
  - Post-moratorium data and obligations. Scientists are requested to provide data, regardless of if or when they publish.
  - No one will police what happens several years down the road, so scientists are asked to contribute within 36 months (longer is fine, but shorter is encouraged).

Jamie Allan asked the Board to adopt a document at this meeting and consider additional comments in the next cycle. David Divins took comments from the JRFB overnight and presented a final draft document on April 24.

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION FROM 24 APRIL**

David presented a revised document as per yesterday's discussion. He worked to maintain the simplicity of the document, while removing confusing aspects and contradictions. David stated that the substance of the document hadn't changed from the previous drafts.

- Under Section 2, Sample Data Requests: The review team reduced the categories to two: moratorium and post moratorium. The new text walks the user through the web link to show which form the user must fill out.
- Under Moratorium Expedition Requests: The review team was more specific on the role of the Sample Allocation Committee.
- Under Section 3, Obligations: The review team clarified the definition of Research Scientist and science party members.
- In multiple locations: The review team changed references to the term for publishing and submitting data to consistently state: Submit a publication or make the data otherwise available in 36 months.
- In multiple locations: The review team now directs all Requests for Press Embargoes or Moratoriums to the chair of the respective facility board (page 7, last paragraph, under science party). Susan Humphris, Karsten Gohl, and Gaku Kimura approved having the appropriate chair make this decision unilaterally.
- In the section regarding Editorial Review Board (ERB): The review team revised the current text to recommend that all submitted manuscripts go to the ERB.

Heiko Pälike asked that the curators make available (on-line) to investigators the records of samples taken (the samples and who has them). He stated that it would be useful to investigators to know if someone has gotten samples on something they're requesting. Susan stated that she must talk to the curators to see what they can do. She noted that while the

curators could likely do this, it would be a low priority task (but the JRFB will encourage the curators to move in that direction).

Upon finalization of the JRFB approved document:

- The CIB and E-FB will review it and provide comments to the JRFB.
- The SSO will post the approved document to the website.
- The JRFB will (at future annual meetings) adjust the document (based on E-FB and CIB comments).
- The E-FB will do an e-mail approval process as soon as the final version is out.

### ***Consensus 9***

The combined Sample, Data and Obligations Policy and Implementation Plan is approved in principle. The final Policy will be circulated for e-mail approval in the next two weeks.

### **Sample Policy Implementation Plan**

Susan Humphris asked the meeting attendees if the previously discussed policy meet the needs of the implementation plan? Jamie Allan stated that the problem is that each repository has a different software system. For the purposes of this program, it's more important (and equally acceptable) to have software systems that permit the scientists to submit their data to any of our repositories in a somewhat similar format.

Neville Exon stated that it would be ideal if the scientists could go to one person or one location to search for samples or obtain data. Jamie and Susan confirmed that this is not possible (at least not at present). Jamie identified the web site map (that defines where the cores are stored), as the closest thing we have to a "single source" for core information, thereby reducing the burden on the researchers. He also noted that advances are being made in technology to make things more discoverable.

Rick Murray and Susan discussed the conflict between the sample policy and implementation plan regarding the selection of the curatorial advisory board (CAB). Susan stated that the Boards (JRFB, E-FB, and CIB) could approve nominees, but that recommendations to the CAB would come from the curators. Jamie asked if each FB would like to assign a member to the curatorial board? Karsten Gohl and Susan agreed that each FB should have the option of assigning a member to the CAB (or not). Mitch Malone and Jamie pointed out that having the FBs approve CAB member selection assures the curators have a large say in the CAB membership.

### ***Action Item 2***

David Divins will finalize the Sample, Data & Obligations Policy and include the input from the curators on the Implementation Plan. The document will be circulated to the JRFB for review and approval within two weeks.

## **8. Progress towards science challenges and themes**

Keir Becker summarized his own assessment of progress toward the science plan in the new program since the Forum has not yet met to conduct its own assessment.

The Board discussed the new science plan as it related to the new IODP. Susan stated that the JRFB would have to start developing arguments for program continuation in 2-3 years given the current Cooperative Agreement is only for five years. Rick Murray recommended that the JRFB implement a selection/scheduling process that emphasizes both cost effectiveness and scientific outcomes. Susan stated that, given the program will need to be renewed, the JRFB may need to deviate from the most cost-effective scenario to get the best science (within reason).

## **9. Overview of All Proposals at the Facility Board**

Michiko Yamamoto summarized the proposal list with the SEP and the JRFB. The Board discussed the removal of “old” proposals and Susan recommended the Board implement the previous policy of removing those with no activity for five years; no conclusion was reached on this.

## **10. Overview of JR Proposals Ready for Scheduling**

Prior to the JRFB discussion of potential schedules, Susan Humphris identified direct conflicts (Karsten Gohl for 839 and 732, and Dick Kroon on 595 and 778) and stated that the group would review the question of conflicts when they began the scheduling discussion. Rick Murray self-declared as a proponent on 830-APL.

Dave Mallinson and Dick Kroon presented their review of proposals ready for scheduling.

Andrew Roberts asked Susan to instruct the Board Members as to scheduling proposals if the data are incomplete. Susan stated that it’s reasonable to consider those proposals where data are known to exist, and the proponents would be pushed for the data prior to finalizing the schedule.

## **11. Options for a FY’16 JR Schedule**

Mitch Malone presented the rationale for the possible 2016 schedule:

- To set up the IODP for renewal for its next five years
- Understanding that we cannot do them all, per funding and schedule restrictions

Dick Kroon presented the list of the proposals that meet these requirements, including an overview of the SEP priorities as established in January 2014.

### **11a. JR and Security Concerns**

Mitch Malone presented the piracy status for the sites in areas impacted by piracy. While incidents have decreased, piracy is still a significant risk that precludes scheduling of several proposals.

## 12. Discussion of the FY'16 Scheduling Options

Susan led several hours of discussion of potential schedules, their scientific importance and impact, as well as cost implications, and asked Mitch to prepare some alternate schedules for discussion in the morning.

Thursday

24 April 2014

8:30 – 18:00

## 13. Development of a FY'16 JR Schedule

### **Consensus 5**

Based on the availability of proposals ready for scheduling, and on considerations regarding geographic location, costs and minimizing transit times, the JRFB recommends the following proposal for scheduling in FY'16 and into the first part of FY'17:

Proposal 820 (Maldives Monsoon) with Proposal 849-APL (Indian Peninsula Paleoclimate)  
Proposal 800 – Expedition 1 (Indian Ridge Moho)  
Proposal 702 (South African Climates) with Proposal 845-APL (Agulhas LGM Density Profile)  
Proposal 837 (Sumatra Seismogenic Zone)  
Proposal 799 (Western Pacific Warm Pool)

### **Consensus 6**

The JRFB reiterates that, based on current and anticipated proposal pressure, the *JOIDES Resolution* will follow a path from the western and southwestern Pacific Ocean, through the Southern Ocean, and into the Atlantic Ocean for opportunities for drilling there starting in 2018 and 2019.

Susan Humphris asked the meeting attendees to keep the selected expedition schedule completely confidential until the Science Support Office has informed the proponents of the status of their proposals.

## 14. Overview of JR Facility Draft FY'15 Annual Program Plan

Brad Clement presented an overview of the JR Facility Annual Program Plan. Susan Humphris asked that this draft be discussed and approved (in principle) and the group will follow up with a final approval by e-mail.

## 15. Discussion of Facility Annual Program Plan

Dick Kroon asked if unspent budget could be used on following years. Jamie Allan stated that, with NSF approval, the USIO could consume unused funds in following fiscal years. He also noted that NSF reduced the FY13 program plan by \$2.5 million from the savings from commercial work.

Jeff Schuffert asked whether logging costs were being passed off to Program Member Offices if the IO would no longer staff a logging scientist. Brad Clement questioned if the facility should

be doing science, which included wire-line logging? John Jaeger asked if the Board anticipated requiring logging on every expedition? Mitch Malone reminded the attendees that the JRFB had adopted a standard measurement plan that stated, in principle, that every site should be logged. Brad stated that the JR currently logs only when it advances the science objectives, but that at the pre-cruise meetings the operator will strongly encourage logging. Because they currently log 12 to 14 days per year, it's more cost effective to contract Schlumberger to log. Jamie stated that NSF is looking to help maintain current levels of logging support, but they will take this opportunity to see how the new awardee, and their different approach, will work. NSF plans to convene a panel (annually) to review facility performance.

Brad said getting industry work is very challenging; they have to be the "right tool, in the right place, at the right time." However, in the model for keeping the ship affordable, ODL sees their profit margin shrink with oil prices rising, so they are motivated to do industry work.

Brad noted that the budget he presented included publication closeout costs (\$1.4 M) from the previous program; these will show a rapid ramp-down over the next several years.

Susan Humphris and Jamie Allan clarified for the Board that they were approving (in principle) the activities presented by the Operator, but not the financial aspects of those tasks. NSF must approve a budget and make an award prior to the start of FY15. Because NSF is changing their fund management system, the award might be later than normal.

#### ***Consensus 7***

The *JOIDES Resolution* Facility Annual Program Plan is approved in principle. A final plan will be circulated for approval by e-mail in July 2014.

### **16. Overview of Support Office FY'15 Annual Program Plan Elements**

Holly Given presented a summary of the financial and task aspects of the SSO Annual Program Plan for FY2015, including estimates for the additional resources needed if fast-track e-reviews become the norm, and if faster developments to the e-systems for PDB and SSDB or the website are desired.

### **17. Discussion of Support Office Annual Program Plan**

Jamie Allan stated that the performance of SSO has been outstanding, even under great stress, but that there aren't resources at NSF for increasing the scope or budget of the SSO. Jamie also clarified that SSO support of the Forum was not in the NSF solicitation, nor was it budgeted. Holly will remove any reference to supporting the IODP Forum and make that a liaison function in the program plan.

#### ***Consensus 8***

The Science Support Office Annual Program Plan is approved in principle. A final plan will be circulated for approval by e-mail in July 2014.

### **18. Publications in the New IODP**

Brad Clement gave a presentation about TAMU's approach to publications in the new program.

Brad requested feedback on a new layout that is better suited to digital publications. Susan thought it looked good and no other Board Members voiced opinions or concerns.

Brad summarized an emerging issue regarding the Expedition Preliminary Reports. IODP researchers who plan to publish in major journals have started requesting that IODP Publications embargo the Preliminary Report, so journals don't view the work as "already published."

The Board discussed the pros and cons of embargoing the Preliminary Reports, protecting them behind a password so they are not considered published, etc. The JRFB felt that a letter could be sent to prominent editors to ask why IODP Preliminary Reports are considered "publications" when there are many counter-examples involving other cruise reports. Susan Humphris agreed to write such a letter but viewed this as a short-term fix that would change with the editor. In the interim, Susan felt we must live with the policy as currently practiced and perhaps find a way to raise the bar for future requests for embargoes.

Rick Murray suggested that we review successful interactions with editors, and based on those, generate standard guidance for the Co-Chiefs to respond to publishers. There was also a discussion about whether the expected content of the Preliminary Report could be changed to address this issue.

***Action Item 3***

Susan Humphris will draft a letter to the editors of Nature, Science, and Nature Geoscience regarding sanctions against publications based on the existence of the Preliminary Report for Expeditions. This will be circulated to the JRFB for review and a decision as to whether it should be sent.

**19. Membership of JRFB**

Susan Humphris proposed an increase to the JRFB US science membership from 2 to 3 and increasing the total Board science membership from 5 to 6. The US science community feels the US should have more representation. In addition, since the chair needs to be a US scientist, it then provides greater options for succession planning. Susan asked for Board Member input, and she interpreted their silence as approval of the proposal.

***Consensus 10***

The JRFB approves an increase in its science representative membership from 5 to 6 to include 3 U.S. members.

***Action Item 4***

Susan Humphris will revise the JRFB Terms of Reference to change the number of science members to 6, including 3 U.S. members.

After asking Rick Murray to leave the room, Susan stated that the Board must appoint a new chair to take effect with the fiscal year, on October 1, 2014. She said that the Board could ask

for external applications or they could select/appoint Rick Murray (the other US science member). All Board members voiced their support for Rick.

Susan welcomed Rick Murray back into the room and asked him to accept the position of Chair.

### ***Consensus 11***

The JRFB approves the appointment of Rick Murray as its next Chair beginning on 1 October 2014.

### ***Action Item 5***

USSSP is requested to conduct a process to nominate two new U.S. members of the JRFB for terms starting in October 2014.

## **20. Review of Consensus Statements and Action Items**

The Board collectively added the following Consensus Items:

### ***Consensus 12***

The JRFB thanks Susan Humphris, the inaugural chair to the JRFB for her service. She started the group off in a fantastic way.

### ***Consensus 13***

The JRFB thanks the current USIO members (David Divins (COL), David Goldberg (LDEO), and TAMU) for their contributions over the last 10 years to the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program. They leave behind a legacy of a highly successful program.

## **21. Other Business and Next JRFB Meeting**

Several APLs and proposals in the Holding Bin were discussed. 830-APL could potentially be scheduled with Pacific Warm Pool (FY2017) but needs some work to clear the Holding Bin. 770 will be asked for a Response Letter and 777 will be reminded that their site survey data is awaiting SEP review.

3) 2015 schedules for various meetings were discussed:

- E-FB is scheduled for March 25-26, 2015.
- EPSP can move to September in 2015.
- Forum cannot move next year, as the host (Australia) had only a 4-week window to support the 2015 meeting. A move in 2016 might be possible.
- JRFB agreed to meet next May 12-13, 2015.

Holly said that the SSO would like to see some meetings be scheduled the second half of the year. Dick and Holly agreed to discuss the SEP schedule. No other business was raised.

The Board thanked the Consortium for Ocean Leadership for the meeting arrangements and NSF (Tom, Jamie) and Brad for the reception. Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.