IODP interim Planning Committee

1st Meeting, 29-30 August 2001
Embassy Suites Portland Downtown
Portland, Oregon, USA

interim Planning Committee - iPC

Jamie Austin*	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Andrew Fisher	Department of Earth Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
William Hay	GEOMAR Research Center, University of Kiel, Germany
Peter Herzig[a]	Institut für Mineralogie, Technische Universität Bergakademie, Freiberg, Germany
Hisao Ito	Geological Survey of Japan
Kenji Kato	Institute of Geosciences, Shizuoka University, Japan
Jock Keene*	School of Geosciences, University of Sydney, Australia
Jeroen Kenter	Faculty of Earth Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, the Netherlands
Hajimu Kinoshita (Co-chair)	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
John Ludden	Centre de Recherches Pétrographiques et Géochimiques, CNRS-Nancy, France
Larry Mayer	Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping, University of New Hampshire, USA
Ted Moore (Co-chair)	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
Delia Oppo*	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
Alastair Robertson	Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Matt Salisbury	Geological Survey of Canada Atlantic, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Canada
Ryuji Tada	Department of Earth and Planetary Science, University of Tokyo, Japan
Yoshiyuki Tatsumi	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Zuyi Zhou*	Department of Marine Geology and Geophysics, Tongji University, P. R. of China

[a] Alternate for William Hay during overlap with JOIDES OPCOM Meeting.
*Unable to attend.

Liaisons

Bruce Malfait	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Toshiya Uenoyama	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan

Guests

John Armentrout	Private consultant, Portland, Oregon, USA
Jan Backman	Department of Geology and Geochemistry, Stockholm University, Sweden
Keir Becker	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Sherman Bloomer	Department of Geosciences, Oregon State University, USA
Kevin Brown	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, USA
Gilbert Camoin	Institute de Recherche pour le Développement, Centre de Noumea, New Caledonia
George Claypool	Private consultant, Lakewood, Colorado, USA
Brad Clement	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Millard F. Coffin	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Steven D'Hondt	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
John Diebold	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA
Patricia Fryer	Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawaii, USA
Alexandra Isern	National Academy of Sciences, USA
Teruaki Ishii	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Yoshihisa Kawamura	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Eiichi Kikawa	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Jörn Lauterjung	GeoForschungsZentrum Potsdam, Germany
Neil Lundberg	Department of Geology, Florida State University, USA
Tadao Matsuzaki	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Yoshiro Miki	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Kathryn Moran	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
Julie Morris	Department of Earth and Planetary Science, Washington University, USA
Nicklas G. Pisias	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, USA
David Rea	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
JoAnne Reuss	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA

Izumi Sakamoto	International Working Group (IWG) Support Office, USA
J. Frederick Sarg	ExxonMobil Exploration, Houston, USA
Thomas Shipley	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Alister Skinner	British Geological Survey, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Kiyoshi Suyehiro	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Narumi Takahashi	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan
Douglas Wiens	Department of Earth and Planetary Science, Washington University, USA

iSAS Office

Nobuhisa Eguchi	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Jeffrey Schuffert	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Minoru Yamakawa	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan

IODP interim Planning Committee

1st Meeting, 29-30 August 2001
Embassy Suites Portland Downtown
Portland, Oregon, USA

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

iPC Consensus 1-01: The interim Planning Committee approves the agenda for its first meeting.

iPC Motion 1-02: The interim Planning Committee will accept the chairs of the panels in the JOIDES science advisory structure as the chairs of the corresponding panels in the interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS).

Mayer moved, Robertson seconded; 13 in favor, none opposed.

iPC Consensus 1-03: The interim Planning Committee approves the following nominees to serve as co-chairs of the interim Science Steering and Evaluation Panel for the Environment (iESSEP), the interim Science Steering and Evaluation Panel for the Interior (iISSEP), and the interim Site Survey Panel (iSSP).

iESSEP: Gilbert Camoin and Kozo Takahashi
iISSEP: Tim Byrne and Hitoshi Mikada
iSSP: Shinichi Kuramoto and Roger Scrutton

iPC Motion 1-04: The interim Planning Committee moves to establish an interim panel to facilitate exchange of scientific information and advice between scientific and industrial communities.

Fisher moved, Salisbury seconded; 10 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstained (Kato, Kinoshita, Tada).

iPC Consensus 1-05: The interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS) will not accept or evaluate ancillary project letters. Proponents of JOIDES ancillary project letters may submit preliminary proposals to iSAS.

iPC Motion 1-06: The interim Planning Committee recommends that IODP adopt a sample and data distribution policy based largely on current ODP policy. The interim Planning Committee requests the interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP) to review the current ODP sample and data distribution policy, as a panel and through a working group if necessary, and report to the interim Planning Committee with a revised policy for review, discussion, and possible adoption.

Fisher moved, Salisbury seconded; 13 in favor, none opposed.

IODP interim Planning Committee

1st Meeting, 29-30 August 2001
Embassy Suites Portland Downtown
Portland, Oregon, USA

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Introduction

1a. Meeting logistics

Ted Moore welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the interim Planning Committee (iPC) for IODP. He noted that this meeting would follow the same logistical plan as announced for the JOIDES Science Committee (SCICOM) meeting. Jimmy Kinoshita, the other iPC co-chair, introduced himself and his alternate, Kiyoshi Suyehiro. The rest of the participants introduced themselves.

1b. Approval of agenda

Bill Hay requested to add an item to the agenda concerning a proposal to establish an interim program planning group or working group for investigating tropical epeiric seas. He said that John Armentrout, who lives nearby, could attend the meeting tomorrow to assist in presenting the material. Moore suggested that the committee could discuss this topic under Other Business (Item 9), and he asked for approval of the agenda.

iPC Consensus 1-01: The interim Planning Committee approves the agenda for its first meeting.

2. Opening remarks on establishment of interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS)

Yoshiro Miki spoke on behalf of MEXT representative Yochiro Otsuka, who could not attend the meeting. Miki expressed sincere wishes for the success of all iSAS activities, beginning with the first iPC meeting here in Portland and lasting until October 2003. He noted that iSAS must integrate scientists from all over the world into IODP activities, and he hoped that the iPC could make good progress toward realizing the objectives of the IODP Initial Science Plan.

3. Status of IODP

Bruce Malfait outlined the history of events leading up to this first iPC meeting, from the announcement in 1988 that Japan would build a new riser drill ship, through the establishment in 1997 of the International Working Group (IWG) and in 1999 of the IODP Planning Subcommittee (IPSC), to the publishing earlier this year of the IODP Initial Science Plan. Malfait explained that NSF and MEXT have agreed upon a set of basic principles for IODP and must now turn these principles into formal agreements, ideally by next year. At the IWG meeting in Ottawa, the Europeans presented a set of principles for how they hope to participate in IODP. Although IODP will certainly have a more complicated organizational structure than ODP and DSDP, many questions remain open for discussion, such as how and when to begin implementing the plans for IODP. The IWG will hold its next meeting in January 2002 in Kobe, Japan.

Moore asked about the status of the NSF request for proposals for the non-riser ship. Malfait replied that NSF continues to work on preparing the request for proposals.

4. Country Reports on IODP Planning Efforts

4a. European Steering Committee for Ocean Drilling (ESCOD)

John Ludden defined ESCOD as an *ad-hoc* committee composed of the European members of EXCOM and SCICOM and devoted to the task of securing the necessary funding for establishing membership in IODP. He reported that the European countries intend to join IODP as a unified entity. They also intend to provide the operating costs for mission-specific platforms as well as contribute to the shared costs of the international scientific program. Ludden explained that the European countries must work as a block or group through the European Commission if they want to increase their level of funding for IODP compared to ODP. He added that ESCOD has already obtained two years of funding from the European Commission to support the Joint European Ocean Drilling Initiative (JEODI) aimed at providing the infrastructure for operating mission-specific platforms in IODP. ESCOD has also proposed to establish a lead agency for managing the European element of IODP, known as the European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling (ECORD).

Ludden announced that JEODI would soon have a proceedings volume available from the technology meeting held in Brussels in January 2001. He also noted that more than 120 scientists from around the world attended the Alternate Platforms Conference (APLACON) in Lisbon in May 2001. The sixty scientific abstracts submitted for APLACON should provide a good background for preparing drilling proposals that involve the use of mission-specific platforms. Ludden stated that JEODI would like to have mission-specific platforms available for use by late 2003 or early 2004, with the initial years of IODP perhaps serving as a trial operating period. He therefore hoped that iSAS could identify several valid drilling projects for undertaking by 2004.

Miki asked who would make the final decision on the European funding and organizational structure. Ludden explained that each European country must first submit a proposal to its own national funding agency, and then the various funding agencies would discuss matters and make a recommendation to their ministries. Eventually, the ministries would designate a lead agency for representing Europe in outside negotiations. Suyehiro asked about the possibility of non-European countries joining ECORD. Ludden replied that ECORD wants to keep the door open. Kinoshita said that Japan had considered asking other Asian countries such as China, India, South Korea, and Russia to join the Japanese efforts.

Suyehiro asked whether mission-specific platforms would require special engineering considerations and whether or not the suggested trial operating period would fall under the umbrella of IODP. Ludden thought that mission-specific platforms would probably require a higher level of special considerations for management rather than engineering. Moore opted to defer discussing the issue of a trial operating period because the iPC cannot rank proposals and thus has a limited ability to provide any science proposals geared specifically toward the European efforts. He suggested, however, that the Europeans could officially request the IWG to allow the iPC to rank those proposals that would require mission-specific platforms. Salisbury agreed that it might improve the visibility of IODP to provide a ranking of proposals for mission-specific platforms. Robertson felt encouraged by the scientific strength of the existing proposals and by the good progress of the European planning efforts during the past year. He stressed the importance of getting approval from the funding agencies and urged patience as those efforts continue to develop.

4b. European Consortium for Ocean Drilling (ECOD)
Jeroen Kenter stated that the twelve science agencies represented by ECOD have endorsed the principles of a common European effort as presented at the IWG meeting in Ottawa. He expressed optimism about further rapid developments in organizing the European efforts.

4c. France
John Ludden had nothing to add on behalf of France to the ESCOD report.

4d. Germany
Bill Hay stated that Germany fully supports the ESCOD plan. He noted that, among all scientific endeavors, this plan leads the way in uniting European interests.

4e. United Kingdom
Alastair Robertson stated that according to the national funding agency the U.K. would participate in IODP only as part of a broader European effort. He expressed optimism that the funding agency would approve the final science plan document by sometime in late 2001.

4f. Japan
Yoshiro Miki explained that the federal budget in Japan has tightened recently. Nonetheless, the construction phase for the riser ship has proceeded on schedule since last April. Actual construction of the hull blocks began two weeks ago and the launching ceremony remains scheduled for late January 2002. In July, a committee headed by Nori Nasu decided to name the new riser ship *Chikyu*, meaning the Earth. Miki diagrammed the organizational structure in Japan showing the relationship between JAMSTEC, the OD21 Science Advisory Committee, and the iSAS Office. The OD21 Science Advisory Committee meets every two to three months. They have started planning for the seismic surveys required for the shakedown cruises of the riser ship, and they have started considering the establishment of shore-based facilities for operations, core storage, *etc*. Miki also briefly described the development of the new Institute for Frontier Research on Earth Evolution (IFREE) at JAMSTEC and the plans to recruit more foreign scientists.

4g. Canada
Matt Salisbury reported that the geoscience community in Canada has received encouragement from two national agencies to seek funding for full membership in IODP. The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) funded an IODP drilling proposal workshop last fall in Calgary, hosted by Pan Canadian Petroleum and attended by approximately sixty participants from academia, industry, and government. In addition, the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) recently announced the creation of an international fund to support Canadian participation in international projects such as IODP. Late last spring, the Atlantic Canada Petroleum Institute won a competition to submit a proposal to the CFI on behalf of the Canadian geoscience community. They have already submitted a preliminary proposal, drafted by Kate Moran and others, outlining the objectives of IODP, the funding levels required to support Canadian membership, infrastructure, and research in IODP (~$11.5M CDN/yr), and the benefits to Canada. Salisbury expected the CFI to announce by late September or early October whether it accepts the preliminary proposal. If so they would most likely invite a full proposal and reach a decision in early 2002.

4h. U.S.A.
Bruce Malfait reported that U.S. plans for delivering a non-riser vessel by early 2005 remain on schedule. Meanwhile, the U.S. continues to work hard on crafting a bilateral agreement with Japan. Malfait presented a scenario for ramping up the funding of IODP and noted that NSF has asked for comments from the Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education (CORE) on several existing models for creating a central management structure. He also mentioned an ongoing effort to define the costs of phasing out ODP during 2004-2007.

5. IODP Planning Subcommittee (IPSC) Report
5a. IODP Initial Science Plan
Moore noted that the IODP Initial Science Plan (ISP) had received an extremely favorable review from an international panel of distinguished scientists. He said that he would like to see copies of the ISP distributed as widely as possible, especially in the likely event of a second printing.

5b. Recommendations for iSAS
Suyehiro noted that the iPC must now lead the IODP planning efforts and begin to think about how to manage much larger projects than in the past. He imagined that under the IODP umbrella, certain proposals would come directly to IODP, some would go to national programs, and some might go to other international entities. Suyehiro cited ION as an example of a program that involved itself directly in ODP while maintaining much of its infrastructure outside of ODP. Moore acknowledged the difficulty of setting the bounds of IODP and finding an effective and productive way of dealing with outside programs. He also recognized the need for committing to projects lasting longer than two months and cited ANTOSTRAT and ION as examples of different approaches that worked within ODP. Robertson agreed that IODP needs a flexible system for planning and scheduling multiple drilling projects, but he cautioned against adopting a top-down structure rather than the current proposal-driven approach. Ludden thought that ODP had failed to involve itself closely with other international science programs. He believed that IODP should try to get the best scientists involved, on land and at sea. Kato remarked on the rapid progress of microbiology in ODP and conceded that biologists do not necessarily need to participate on every project. Kinoshita accepted the idea of organizing a network of international programs, but saw it as premature to undertake such an effort.

5c. Goals and tasks for iPC
Moore outlined the goals for the rest of the meeting concerning the makeup of other interim advisory panels, the scheme for categorizing proposals, and the sample and data distribution policy.

5d. Industrial Liaison Working Group Report
Kate Moran reported on the accomplishments of the Industrial Liaison Working Group (ILWG) established by IPSC. She explained that the ILWG sought to expand the IODP constituency within industry and develop strong links for sharing technology and data. The ILWG also explored ways to partner with industry on technological challenges that might require funding beyond the means of IODP alone. Moran recommended that IODP should improve the environment within its science advisory structure for industry participants as well as increase their overall number. She also proposed to facilitate communication with industry management by identifying individual corporate champions and briefing them at annual forums and workshops. Moran noted that the ILWG had

organized a series of such meetings targeted specifically at industry scientists and management leaders, and she announced an upcoming industry-academia forum scheduled for September 2001 at the British Petroleum headquarters in Sunbury, England. Moran also presented a draft ILWG document meant to accompany the IODP Initial Science Plan within industry circles. She characterized the document as ready to use today and asked for approval from the iPC to proceed with the final editing and printing.

Kenter stated that he could not approve the ILWG document as a representative of ECOD. He said that many of the ECOD countries have strong concerns about expanding the role of industry in IODP and its science advisory structure, and he expressed uncertainty about exactly how it would happen. Moore noted that many industry representatives had participated in the JOIDES science advisory structure, particularly on SCICOM, TEDCOM, and PPSP, but he felt that the SSEPs for example could have benefited from industry expertise to help evaluate certain proposals on fluid flow or gas hydrates. Lundberg and Morris agreed. Moore added that he could think of many examples of what bright industry scientists could do if they had an opportunity to use the drilling ship. Claypool recalled that industry became involved with the Benguela Current leg, but only at a late stage after ODP had already scheduled the leg and PPSP had held its safety meeting.

Ludden disagreed with the claim that IPSC established the ILWG in response to a request from Europe. He said that European countries actually feel very uncomfortable about proceeding so quickly with the industry initiative. Ludden suggested that the ILWG document should at least clarify up front that it refers only to the oil industry, but he would prefer to see its scope broadened to include other industries such as engineering and biotechnology. Kato stressed that such initiatives should definitely encompass the biotechnology industry and not just the oil industry. Kinoshita also expressed disappointment that the ILWG document focused exclusively on the oil industry. Moore explained that IPSC had shied away from biotechnology issues because of the complicated legal aspects. Fisher suggested that the ILWG could try to achieve a broader balance of interests in the companion document without necessarily revising it completely.

Hay said that the ILWG document could potentially harm the IODP planning efforts in Germany. He explained that they have made good progress so far by presenting IODP as a program of basic scientific research, whereas the ILWG document could force them to seek funding from the agency that supports applied research. Hay feared that the German funding agencies would start perceiving IODP more as a program that serves industry rather than one that conducts research of interest to industry. Fisher agreed that the ILWG document should distinguish clearly between cooperative research and providing services to industry. Moore characterized the ILWG document as only a tool for convincing industry scientists about the benefits of participating in the program, and he found it difficult to draw a sharp line between participation and service. Hay noted that ODP has enjoyed excellent relations with industry in Germany, but the situation differs from country to country. Salisbury added that ODP also has strong relations with industry in Canada, and he stressed the importance of such relations for funding purposes. Hay suggested that it might prove more effective for IODP to deal with industry relations on a regional basis. He also wondered how to handle the fact that many experts have migrated from within industry to outside consultancies. Moore replied that these independent consultants do not usually conduct research, but they could still advise IODP.

Robertson worried that the ILWG document could have a negative effect on public awareness of IODP, and he wanted to define better the limits of linking with industry before going any further. Fisher also worried that the ILWG document could create the wrong public image of the role played by industry in IODP. He cautioned that IODP could lose public support very quickly, particularly for drilling in the Arctic, if it associates too closely with the oil industry. Skinner agreed, recalling the difficulty he once had trying to convince public officials that a scientific drilling project near the Great Barrier Reef had nothing to do with oil. Mayer insisted that IODP could and should seek to benefit a broader community, without compromising on science. He could not imagine any nation that would not support such a mission.

Moore asked for volunteers to form a small working group for reviewing the ILWG document. Fisher, Hay, Ito, and Ludden volunteered. Moore asked Hay to chair the working group. Ludden asked whether they should try to finish reviewing the ILWG document before the industry forum at BP in September. Moore sensed that the committee did not feel comfortable with proceeding so quickly. He suggested asking a few of the participants at the BP workshop to review the ILWG report and offer comments. Kenter doubted that the industry participants would take the time to read the report or offer any comments. The working group gathered for its first review session immediately after the iPC adjourned its meeting.

6. IODP interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS)
6a. Approve chairs of iESSEP, iISSEP, and iSSP

Moore called on the committee to approve the general practice of selecting the chairs of other iSAS panels by simply accepting the chairs of the corresponding JOIDES panels. With essentially no debate, the committee passed the following motion.

iPC Motion 1-02: The interim Planning Committee will accept the chairs of the panels in the JOIDES science advisory structure as the chairs of the corresponding panels in the interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS).

Mayer moved, Robertson seconded; 13 in favor, none opposed.

Tatsumi requested the following day to reopen the discussion about iSAS panel chairs. Moore thought that the IPC had already agreed to accept the JOIDES panel chairs as iSAS panel chairs. He suggested that whenever the term of a JOIDES panel chair ends, perhaps the iPC could decide on a new iSAS panel chair. After Malfait confirmed that the iPC has the authority to approve iSAS panel chairs, Moore consented to revisit the issue.

Mayer expressed concern about establishing a principle of always having co-chairs for every iSAS panel. Fisher said that it could prove helpful to always have co-chairs, especially considering the heavy workload of proposals. Robertson favored the idea of having co-chairs and suggested that it would improve the chances of balancing the representation of panel chairs among all of the international program members. Ludden noted that JOIDES had always maintained such a principle.

Tatsumi nominated Kozo Takahashi as a co-chair for the iESSEP and offered supporting comments. Ludden nominated Gilbert Camoin as the other co-chair and offered supporting comments. Moore noted that JOIDES had already nominated Tim Byrne for the chair of ISSEP, but Becker said that SCICOM had not yet approved him. Tatsumi nominated Hitoshi Mikada for a co-chair of the iISSEP. Becker offered supporting comments for Mikada, and Robertson did so for Byrne. Becker confirmed that the current

SSP chair has only one more meeting, with no one nominated yet to replace him. Kato nominated Kuramoto as an iSSP co-chair, and Robertson nominated Roger Scrutton. The committee approved the nominations for the iSAS panel co-chairs by consensus.

iPC Consensus 1-03: The interim Planning Committee approves the following nominees to serve as co-chairs of the interim Science Steering and Evaluation Panel for the Environment (iESSEP), the interim Science Steering and Evaluation Panel for the Interior (iISSEP), and the interim Site Survey Panel (iSSP).

iESSEP: Gilbert Camoin and Kozo Takahashi
iISSEP: Tim Byrne and Hitoshi Mikada
iSSP: Shinichi Kuramoto and Roger Scrutton

6b. Nominate memberships and chairs of iSciMP and iPPSP

Malfait explained that since iSAS represents a joint working group of JOIDES and OD21, those groups should nominate the members of iSAS panels. Moore asked JOIDES and OD21 to nominate members for iPPSP and iSciMP by 1 December 2001. Kikawa asked for an earlier deadline so that iSciMP could hold its first meeting in December with SciMP. Moore pushed the nomination deadline ahead to 15 October. Hay stressed the importance of getting experienced members for iPPSP and noted that the membership of this panel had not rotated in the past under JOIDES.

6c. Establish mandates for new advisory panels

6c.i. Interim Industry Liaison Panel (iILP)

Moore described the academic and industry communities as disconnected from each other, even in terms of language, and he called for the committee to approve the establishment of an industry liaison panel in iSAS. Moore emphasized the importance to IODP of getting the endorsement of the offshore oil industry and eventually gaining access to their supply of high-quality seismic data.

Kenter accepted the importance of establishing such a panel. Hay requested to strike the word offshore from the name of the panel so that the abbreviated name would not contain the word oil. Ludden suggested that it would create a more favorable public image to call it a natural resources panel rather than an industrial liaison panel. Fisher wanted to proceed with caution and ensure that the panel would include a wide range of expertise, perhaps starting with the oil industry plus a few token other representatives and expanding later. Salisbury wanted to include more than just token members from the mining and biotechnology industries. Moore said that the panel would also need members from the academic community, but it should remain a manageable size.

iPC Motion 1-04: The interim Planning Committee moves to establish an interim panel to facilitate exchange of scientific information and advice between scientific and industrial communities.

Fisher moved, Salisbury seconded; 10 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstained (Kato, Kinoshita, Tada).

6c.ii. Interim Technical Advice Panel (iTAP)

Moore noted that the Technical Advice Working Group established by IPSC would soon deliver its final report, and he presented a model for establishing a new interim Technical Advice Panel in iSAS. As reflected below, the committee debated several aspects of the issue, including limits of authority, third-party tools, and links with scientific panels, but ultimately did not make a final decision concerning the establishment of an iTAP.

Suyehiro expressed serious concern about bringing in outside engineering advice for IODP efforts. Kinoshita explained that the OD21 engineering and shipbuilding group would prefer to handle such matters itself. Moore said that if IODP money goes toward engineering development then IODP should have some say over that development. Kinoshita believed that JAMSTEC would pay for engineering and technical developments associated with the riser drill ship because such expenses could not come from commingled funds for science operations. Skinner encouraged JAMSTEC to remain open to outside technical advice and then decide what to do.

Fisher wondered to whom iTAP would report and where its boundary of authority would lie, especially for major engineering initiatives and third-party tool developments. Kinoshita also expressed concern about iTAP authority over daily engineering activities and shipboard operations. Moore replied that the iTAP would report through the iPC to the Central Management Office. He also wondered about the best way to evaluate the development of third-party tools and ensure that they work on all platforms. Suyehiro thought that IODP could evaluate third-party tools most effectively by talking directly to the science operators and engineers. Kikawa suggested that iSciMP should evaluate third-party tools. Fisher proposed that iSciMP, together with iTAP if necessary, should develop a set of guidelines for third-party tools. Moore suggested that iTAP and iSCIMP could hold joint meetings. Hay argued that the developer of a third-party tool should bear the burden of making sure that it works. Kinoshita noted that a third-party tool developer could attend an iSciMP meeting and get approval without any investment of money from IODP. Skinner remarked that straight tool development without data gathering would not have to go through iSciMP. He would prefer it if the appropriate operator received guidance from an iTAP.

Moore wondered how to improve the link between the technical and scientific panels in iSAS. He suggested that the technical panels could assign watchdogs to mature drilling proposals or else send liaisons to the scientific panel meetings. Hay said that TEDCOM thought that they could provide better advice if they knew far enough in advance about the science plans. Morris suggested that iTAP and iSciMP could review the drilling proposals that go for external review. Fisher thought that the iTAP should review only the most mature proposals. Mayer suggested that the iTAP could also review the annual science plan.

7. iSAS Proposal Process

7a. Guidelines for proponents

Nobuhisa Eguchi described the official requirements for submitting a proposal to iSAS and outlined the various steps of the proposal review process, adopted mostly from JOIDES.

Tada requested to move one of the semi-annual proposal deadlines from March 15 to April 1 because the earlier date conflicts directly with the academic calendar in Japan. The iSAS Office confirmed that the later deadline would still leave enough time to process and distribute the proposals to panel members in advance of the May iSSEPs meeting. The committee agreed to shift the deadline. Several committee members suggested other ways to modify the proposal guidelines, such as providing standardized forms for proponents CVs, having separate page limits for text and figures, and allowing the possibility of keeping a proposal at the iSSEPs level after it has undergone external review. None of these suggested changes received any support from other committee members.

The committee debated whether or not to accept ancillary project letters during the interim period. Moore read the arguments for and against the idea as they appeared in the agenda

book. Hay saw a need for stricter guidelines defining the limits of ancillary projects, though he noted that ODP had scheduled only three such projects during its entire existence. Morris wanted to ensure that ancillary project letters would arrive early enough in the proposal review process and perhaps require that they go through an external review. Fisher argued against accepting ancillary project letters in iSAS altogether. Tada suggested that proponents could still submit a regular proposal for a short project. The committee agreed by consensus that iSAS should not accept ancillary project letters, and the proponents of such letters still active with JOIDES could submit regular proposals if they wished.

iPC Consensus 1-05: The interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS) will not accept or evaluate ancillary project letters. Proponents of JOIDES ancillary project letters may submit preliminary proposals to iSAS.

7b. Review of proposals intended for IODP

7bi. Categorizing proposals

Moore proposed that the iPC could categorize drilling proposals under thematic groups or just discuss them in themes and then categorize them on a global basis. He wondered how many categories to use either way. Tada said that the number of categories required to adequately distinguish the proposals would depend on the overall number of proposals. Fisher suggested categorizing each proposal as either highly important, potentially highly important, or unlikely to achieve high importance. He also suggested checking off as many themes as appropriate for a particular proposal rather than assigning it to one specific theme. Robertson predicted that some proposals would cover more than one theme, whereas some themes could end up with few proposals, and he wanted to provide some means for informing proponents that their proposal would never reach a high enough level of maturity or priority. Hay suggested ranking only within groups rather than globally because individuals tend to rank their own specialty the highest. Kato preferred to use the word "grouping" instead of "ranking." Ludden suggested having an open voting procedure. Fisher said that he would not object to an intermediate step as long as the committee ultimately evaluates proposals as an overall group. Mayer wanted to categorize globally only the top-ranked proposals from each theme.

Kato asked if the iPC would categorize all types of proposals on an equal basis. He noted that IODP could not possibly drill a large number of riser proposals, whereas some types of proposals, such as those concerning the biosphere, develop more rapidly than others. Suyehiro asked whether proponents would receive a clear message about any operational limits concerning non-riser proposals. Mayer wondered about how to categorize proposals for technical feasibility. Moore replied that the iPC should not worry yet about categorizing proposals by platform or technical feasibility because the capabilities of the non-riser ship and the availability of mission-specific platforms would remain unknown for at least another year. He added that most proposals typically include more sites than necessary, but all proposals would receive equal treatment in the review process.

Moore reviewed the scheme for categorizing proposals. He proposed to do the initial grouping by scientific theme, then categorize the proposals in each main thematic thrust as I, II, or III based on level of maturity, and finally take all proposals in Category I and identify them as A, B, or C based on scientific priority. Moore expected that the iPC would receive mostly Category I and Category II proposals and very few from Category III. However, he expressed concern about the possibility of forwarding an extremely large number of

proposals to the IODP Planning Committee at the end of the interim period. Moore asserted that IODP and the proponents would benefit if the iPC could somehow limit the number of proposals that the eventual Planning Committee would initially have to consider.

Ludden suggested that the iPC might not need to look at every active proposal. Kato agreed with the idea of limiting the number of proposals, but he still wanted to simplify the scheme for categorizing them. Tada wanted to clarify the task of the iPC before adopting a particular scheme for categorizing proposals. He would rather create good proposals than limit their number. Tada argued that since the Planning Committee would ultimately decide what proposals to schedule, the iPC did not really need more than two categories in the second stage of grouping. Tatsumi also objected to the scheme as still too complicated, especially for advising proponents how to revise or strengthen their proposals. He preferred having only three categories and one stage of grouping, without a global stage.

Fisher also questioned the need for a global grouping. He viewed the main concern for the iPC as how best to sell the program internationally and said that the U.S., for example, required a large number of proposals. Herzig thought that the iPC should worry about identifying the best science, not how to sell the program. Mayer agreed that one stage of grouping should suffice to identify good proposals, but without doing a global grouping the iPC would have no input on the eventual schedule devised by the Planning Committee. Fisher proposed that the iPC should adopt a two-year cycle for reviewing proposals, initially doing only the first stage with perhaps a global grouping within one category, and waiting until the end of iSAS to do the full second stage. Several committee members agreed with this compromise. Moore concluded that the committee agreed to have three categories in the first stage and then only give stars to the exceptional proposals in a global grouping stage.

7bii. Watchdog assignments

Moore stated that iSAS could receive more than seventy proposals forwarded from JOIDES, plus any new proposals submitted by proponents. He suggested that iPC members should consult the list of proposal abstracts posted on the JOIDES web site and volunteer to serve as a watchdog for up to fifteen proposals. Ludden asked if the iSAS Office could remind the iPC members to do this.

7biii. iSSEPs proposal review process

Ludden proposed that the iSSEPs should handle the ranking of proposals instead of the iPC. Suyehiro agreed and suggested that the task of reviewing proposals could place an unnecessary burden on the iPC. Moore noted that the IWG has already approved the iPC mandate, but they could change it if requested. Morris agreed that the idea held merit, if not during the interim then perhaps in IODP, and she mentioned the unresolved difficulty of how to handle proposals for multi-leg projects. Suyehiro suggested that the iSSEPs should use more categories for grouping proposals because all of those used previously by the JOIDES SSEPs reflect different degrees of positive rating. Camoin agreed that the iSSEPs should group proposals over a wider range of categories. Moore recommended that the iSSEPs should formulate their own scheme for evaluating and reviewing proposals.

8. Policy and Procedure Recommendations

8a. Site-survey data

The committee did not raise any issues concerning site-survey data.

8b. Sample and data distribution policy

Moore raised the question of whether IODP should continue the general ODP policy on distributing samples and data. He mentioned a tendency in ODP toward more liberal distribution and a shorter moratorium. Robertson hoped that the moratorium period would not get any shorter because it might take longer than it does now to get samples from the riser ship and from mission-specific platforms. Ludden wanted to keep the distribution policy as open as possible and improve the procedures for shore-based sampling.

Kato suggested that IODP must establish a new policy concerning biological samples. He emphasized that the chance to profit from biological samples poses a big problem, and biological sampling also involves special curatorial issues, often with very expensive requirements. Kinoshita added that Japan plans to build a new facility for core storage.

Moore asked whether the U.S. has a federal policy on making public the results of federally funded research. Malfait replied that NSF turns over all rights to the investigator, but other countries have different policies. Coffin noted that some countries might require keeping an archive half of any core samples acquired from their waters, and he suggested that ICDP probably had some experience with that matter. Lauterjung confirmed that ICDP had negotiated such agreements, for example with Mexico and Russia, and they could offer advice on these matters if requested. He also explained that ICDP assigns its samples as part of each project, *i.e.*, the samples belong to individual projects and not to the program as a whole.

Fisher recognized the possible need to modify the sampling policy relative to specific platforms. He proposed to approve the existing policy as a starting point and ask iSciMP, or a working group of iSciMP, to review the details and recommend changes. Fisher also suggested asking an ICDP representative to join the effort with iSciMP. Kinoshita suggested that the iPC should send a liaison to iSciMP meetings to discuss the sample and data distribution policy.

iPC Motion 1-06: The interim Planning Committee recommends that IODP adopt a sample and data distribution policy based largely on current ODP policy. The interim Planning Committee requests the interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP) to review the current ODP sample and data distribution policy, as a panel and through a working group if necessary, and report to the interim Planning Committee with a revised policy for review, discussion, and possible adoption.

Fisher moved, Salisbury seconded; 13 in favor, none opposed.

8c. Interaction with other scientific programs

Jörn Lauterjung outlined the membership, history, and objectives of the International Continental Scientific Drilling Program (ICDP). He characterized ICDP as a science-driven program, with a science advisory structure similar to JOIDES for reviewing proposals. Lauterjung explained that ICDP operates around a small budget for project development and drilling, whereas the science costs must come from other sources on a project-by-project basis. ICDP has some infrastructure available, including drilling rigs, logging tools, and core scanners, and they incorporate a training program as an essential component. Lauterjung described various planned or completed ICDP scientific projects and identified several topics of common interest to ICDP and IODP, including continental margins and rifting, volcanism and hydrothermal systems, impact structures, Earth's Climate, gas hydrates, and the deep biosphere. He called for an increased exchange of advice, information, and training, as well as sharing of equipment and instruments and the

development of joint research projects. In closing, Lauterjung envisioned a future program of earth drilling instead of separate programs for continental and ocean drilling.

Moore suggested that iPC could move ahead by inviting ICDP liaisons to attend iSSEP meetings. Herzig said that iPC should also still maintain direct contact with ICDP. Robertson noted that ICDP has reported many times before to JOIDES, and now iSAS, but nothing has really come of it. He spoke of an underlying tension between the land and marine drilling communities because the marine community gets a larger share of the funding. As one way to help alleviate the tension and introduce a broader community of earth scientists to IODP, Robertson wanted to encourage the development of joint drilling proposals involving a direct link between the continents and ocean. He identified land-sea transects as a natural starting place for such joint proposals. Mayer suggested revising the call for proposals to encourage links with continental drilling. The committee agreed but did not define a course of action.

Moore asked about other scientific programs. Tada mentioned IMAGES. Mayer noted that he serves as SCICOM liaison to IMAGES and said that the IMAGES structure would willingly subsume itself into IODP if circumstances allowed. Hay said that IMAGES has received criticism in the past for its practices in curating core samples. Mayer agreed, but added that the problem would disappear if IMAGES folded into IODP.

9. Other Business

Bill Hay read some remarks prepared by Terry Edgar, former chief scientist of DSDP and now at the USGS, calling for a fresh approach to scientific ocean drilling. Hay and John Armentrout then presented a proposal by Edgar to establish a new interim Program Planning Group (iPPG) for tropical epeiric seas, citing the South China and Sulu Seas and the Gulf of Carpintaria as excellent examples, and describing the entire system as a modern analog for the Paleozoic record of North America. Hay presented a proposed mandate for the new iPPG and argued that the overall effort could serve as a model for other projects in IODP. He noted that the plan called for development of a data management scheme for integrating the entire data stream, and it could conceivably involve all three types of platforms described in the Initial Science Plan.

Moore outlined the philosophy behind the development of PPGs in JOIDES and stated that this idea did not fit the definition of a PPG. He worried that it would give special attention to one particular group of proposals. Tada suggested postponing the idea until iSAS receives an actual drilling proposal. Robertson spoke in favor of the general idea, but had reservations about linking to a specific geographic area rather than a global scientific theme. Kinoshita characterized this particular region as very delicate and dangerous in political and economic terms, and he urged caution in proceeding with this idea. Mayer liked the idea because it represented a non-standard-length drilling proposal, but he worried about focusing too soon on such a specific topic without first getting an actual drilling proposal. Fisher agreed that the idea did not seem mature enough to establish an iPPG, but he would still like to see it nurtured. He suggested that the iPC should at least determine if this topic reflects a gap in the Initial Science Plan. Moore concluded that the committee would like to move ahead with this idea by encouraging the proponents to submit a drilling proposal.

10. Future Meetings

Yamakawa extended an offer to hold the second iPC meeting in Yokohama, Japan beginning sometime shortly after 20 March 2002. He promised to propose an exact date soon. Moore said that he had received an offer from one U.S. member to host the third iPC

meeting in August 2002. Herzig proposed instead to hold the third iPC meeting in Brussels to help promote the European efforts. The committee agreed by consensus.

Meeting adjourned