

iSAS interim Planning Committee

3rd Meeting, 27-29 August 2002

Het Pand
University of Ghent
Ghent, Belgium

interim Planning Committee - iPC

Jamie Austin	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Sherman Bloomer ^a	Department of Geosciences, Oregon State University, USA
Hans Brumsack ^b	Institut für Chemie und Biologie des Meeres, Universität Oldenburg, Germany
Steven D'Hondt ^c	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
Andrew Fisher	Department of Earth Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
Peter Herzig*	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
Chris MacLeod	Department of Earth Sciences, University of Wales, United Kingdom
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
Philippe Pezard	Laboratoire de Tectonophysique, ISTEEM, Université Montpellier II, France
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, China

^aAlternate for Jamie Austin during review and ranking of mission-specific-platform proposals.

^bAlternate for Peter Herzig.

^cAlternate for Larry Mayer during review and ranking of mission-specific-platform proposals.

*Unable to attend.

Liaisons

Jamie Allan (iSciMP)	Department of Geology, Appalachian State University, USA
Tim Byrne (iSSEP)	Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Connecticut, USA
Gilbert Camoin (iESSEP)	CEREGE-CNRS, France
Harry Doust (iILP)	Faculty of Earth Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, The Netherlands
André Droxler (iSSP)	Department of Earth Science, Rice University, USA
Barry J. Katz (iPPSP)	ChevronTexaco, Energy, Research and Technology Company, USA
Shinichi Kuramoto (iSSP)	Geological Survey of Japan
Hitoshi Mikada (iSSEP)	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Kathryn Moran (iTAP)	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA

Guests

Keir Becker (SCICOM)	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Steve Bohlen	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Brad Clement	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Paul Dauphin	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
John Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
Patricia Fryer (SCICOM)	Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawaii, USA
Kathryn Gillis	School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Canada
Jean-Pierre Henriët (Host)	Renard Centre of Marine Geology, Universiteit Gent, Belgium
Teruaki Ishii (SCICOM)	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Aleksandra Janik (JOIDES)	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Jörn Lauterjung (ICDP)	GeoForschungsZentrum Potsdam, Germany

John Ludden (JEODI)	Centre de Recherches Pétrographiques et Géochimiques, CNRS-Nancy, France
Yoshiro Miki	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Tomohisa Nawate (OD21)	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Nicklas G. Pias	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (JOI), USA
David Rea (SCICOM)	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
Joanne Reuss	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
William Sager (SCICOM)	Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, USA
Alistair Skinner (TEDCOM)	British Geological Survey, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Kiyoshi Suyehiro	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Elsbeth Urquhart (JOIDES)	Rosenstiel School of Marine & Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Bob Whitmarsh (InterMARGINS)	Southampton Oceanography Center, United Kingdom
Yasuo Yamada (OD21)	Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan

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

iSAS interim Planning Committee

3rd Meeting, 27-29 August 2002

**Het Pand
University of Ghent
Ghent, Belgium**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

iPC Consensus 3-1: The iPC approves the revised agenda for its third meeting on 27-29 August 2003 in Ghent, Belgium.

iPC Motion 3-2: The iPC approves the minutes from its second meeting on 20-22 March 2002 in Yokohama, Japan.

Mayer moved, Salisbury seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Brumsack).

iPC Consensus 3-3: the iPC approves the iSSP plan to form a working group for developing the procedures and requirements for an IODP databank. The working group should prepare a report for the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

iPC Consensus 3-4: the iPC recommends that IWG develop a set of environmental principles for addressing potential public concerns about the impact of IODP activities, for raising the awareness of all IODP participants toward such concerns, and for providing clear and consistent operating guidelines for all IODP contractors.

iPC Consensus 3-5: the iPC receives iSciMP Recommendations 02-1-1 and 02-1-2 on the archiving of core images, iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-3 on the hard-rock working group report, iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-4 on shipboard reference collections, and iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-5 on the OD21 core description and database visualization system. We hereby forward these recommendations to IODP.

iPC Consensus 3-6: the iPC appoints Rick Murray to replace Jamie Allan as a co-chair of the interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP).

iPC Consensus 3-7: the iTAP may send liaisons to iSSEPs meetings, as recommended in the iTAP mandate. The iTAP should report any identified technological gaps in the program science to the iPC.

iPC Consensus 3-8: the iTAP and iSciMP co-chairs should meet to discuss the overlapping mandates and complementary roles of the two panels and report their recommendations at the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

iPC Consensus 3-9: the iPC appoints Yoshihiro Masuda as co-chair of the interim Technology Advice Panel (iTAP).

iPC Motion 3-10: the iTAP co-chairs may seek new candidates for iTAP membership by advertising in appropriate media and should submit all resulting nominations to the iPC for approval.

Austin moved, Salisbury seconded; 10 in favor, 3 opposed (Ito, Kato, Tatsumi), 2 abstained (Kinoshita, Tada).

iPC Motion 3-11: the iPC approves the full membership of the interim Industrial Liaison Panel (iILP) as recommended by the iILP co-chairs.

Mayer moved, Pezard seconded; 15 in favor.

iPC Consensus 3-12: the iPC ranks the following five mission-specific platform proposals in order of scientific priority and forwards them to the IWG for further consideration.

Rank	Proposal	Title	Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	533-Full3	Arctic-Lomonosov Ridge	1.5	1.2
2.	519-Full2	South Pacific Sea Level	2.4	0.9
3.	564-Full	New Jersey Shallow Shelf	3.1	0.8
4.	548-Full2	Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater	3.3	1.3
5.	581-Full2	Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks	4.6	0.7

iPC Consensus 3-13: the iPC groups the following seven full proposals according to the main scientific themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan and assesses the readiness of each proposal for future ranking.

Deep Biosphere and Subseafloor Ocean

553-Full	Cascadia Margin Hydrates	not ready for ranking
557-Full2	Storegga Slide	ready for ranking
573-Full2	Porcupine Basin Carbonate Mounds	ready for ranking
584-Full2	TAG II Hydrothermal	ready for ranking
589-Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	ready for ranking

Environmental Change, Processes, and Effects

543-Full2	CORK in Hole 642E	ready for ranking
572-Full3	North Atlantic Late Neogene	ready for ranking

iPC Motion 3-14: the iPC recommends that IODP adopt the following principles of scientific investigation.

1. The Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) is an international scientific research program that investigates important questions in the study of the Earth.
2. Science plans for IODP will be formulated and developed by the international scientific ocean drilling community through the IODP science advisory structure.
3. IODP investigations will be based on unsolicited proposals that address objectives of the IODP Science Plan or other outstanding new research ideas.
4. The IODP science advisory structure, composed of internationally representative committees, panels and working groups, will provide science advice to IODP

management through a planning committee and policy advice through the executive authority.

5. The executive authority of the science advisory structure will be the lead policy-making body of IODP and will establish science committees and panels as needed.
6. All panels and working groups providing scientific and technical advice to IODP will report through a lead science planning committee to the executive authority.
7. The lead science planning committee will provide scientific and technical advice to IODP, guidance to proponents, and evaluation of proposals to conduct future drilling projects. The lead science planning committee may recommend policy changes to the executive authority.
8. The IODP science advisory structure will evaluate proposals for scientific ocean drilling in a fair and unbiased manner that avoids conflicts of interests.
9. The IODP science advisory structure will provide advice to IODP management regarding scientific priorities of proposed drilling and of technical needs.
10. IODP policies and procedures and the recommendations of the IODP advisory panels and committees will be openly available to the public.
11. IODP scientific ocean drilling projects will be undertaken by teams of scientists selected by IODP. IODP management and the platform operators in consultation with the science advisory structure will make decisions concerning the scheduling and staffing of drilling projects.
12. IODP will provide open access to all samples and data collected and produced during a drilling project once the members of the scientific party have had a reasonable opportunity to complete their initial studies.

Mayer moved, Brumsack seconded; 15 in favor.

iPC Motion 3-15: the iPC accepts the sample and data distribution policy from iSciMP as a working draft. We remind the iSciMP that the IWG has requested a report from the iPC on the final draft policy in January 2003.

Fisher moved, Tatsumi seconded; 15 in favor.

iPC Consensus 3-16: the iPC establishes an *ad hoc* working group to develop a mandate for an operations committee in the future IODP advisory structure. The working group will consist of Keir Becker, Hisao Ito, Philippe Pezard, Nick Piasias, Alister Skinner, and Asahiko Taira, and they will report their recommendations at the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

iPC Consensus 3-17: the iPC requests that iSciMP form a microbiology working group to examine issues related to the conditions and duration of sample storage, to make recommendations about the importance of patent rights, to formulate requirements for data reporting and publications, and to identify ways to attract more microbiologists to the program.

iSAS interim Planning Committee

3rd Meeting, 27-29 August 2002

Het Pand
University of Ghent
Ghent, Belgium

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

Tuesday

27 August 2002

8:30-17:00

1. Introduction

1a. Welcome and meeting logistics

Ted Moore and Hajimu Kinoshita welcomed everyone to the meeting, and the participants introduced themselves. The host, Jean-Pierre Henriët, had explained the logistics the day before at the opening of the SCICOM meeting.

1b. Approve meeting agenda

Moore and Kinoshita added Agendum 7d on recommending potential co-chief scientists after ranking the five mission-specific platform (MSP) proposals and Agendum 11a on developing an operations committee mandate. They also added Agendum 11b on patent issues related to microbiological sampling, as requested by Kato, and Agendum 11c on the transition from the interim period to the start of IODP, as suggested by Austin. The former Agendum 11 on future meetings shifted to Agendum 12. The committee then approved the revised agenda by consensus.

iPC Consensus 3-1: The iPC approves the revised agenda for its third meeting on 27-29 August 2003 in Ghent, Belgium.

1c. Approve minutes from previous meeting

Moore asked for corrections to the minutes from the previous iPC meeting, as included in the agenda book. No one suggested any changes and Moore then called for approval of the minutes.

iPC Motion 3-2: The iPC approves the minutes from its second meeting on 20-22 March 2002 in Yokohama, Japan.

Mayer moved, Salisbury seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Brumsack).

2. International Working Group (IWG) Report

Moore showed a diagram of the IODP science program planning structure and outlined the proposed tasks and responsibilities of the executive authority, the characteristics, functions, tasks, and responsibilities of the central management organization (CMO), and the tasks, responsibilities, and structure of the IODP Council. He distributed the corresponding background documents from the previous IWG meeting and asked the committee to review those documents in detail before returning to a discussion later in the agenda (see Agendum 9 below). Moore also noted that the science program planning structure includes an operations committee, and he proposed forming a working group to develop a draft mandate for that committee (see Agendum 11a below).

3. Reports on IODP Planning Efforts

3a. Japan

Yoshiro Miki reported on the progress of talks between NSF and MEXT. He showed the latest photos of riser ship construction and announced that the contract for operating the *Chikyu* went to Global Ocean Development, Inc. (GODI). Miki also announced the upcoming establishment in October of the Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX) at JAMSTEC, a new unit for science operations on the riser ship, headed by Asahiko Taira. In addition, groundbreaking will occur in early September for the Kochi Core Research Center, with completion scheduled for next summer. Miki reported that a group of Japanese universities and research institutions had established a national IODP science consortium that would operate under the Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (AESTO). He expected the consortium to maintain good communication with the international science community. Miki outlined several other IODP promotional activities by Japan and described an improving budget picture for JAMSTEC, citing the actual FY'02 budget of 6.7 billion yen (\$57 million) and the requested FY'03 budget of 11.8 billion yen (\$100 million).

3b. U.S.A.

John Farrell reported that IODP planning efforts in the U.S. have focused on preparing the U.S. scientific community for participating successfully in IODP, ensuring a smooth transition from ODP, and anticipating, embracing, and getting ready for new opportunities. The recent Conference on U.S. Participation (CUSP) sought to formulate the characteristics, elements, and tasks, describe the optimal structure, and identify the necessary resources of the U.S. program. Farrell said that a mature draft of the CUSP report had already gone to USSAC members and it would soon receive broader distribution. He expected that a final list of nineteen specific recommendations on program development, pre-platform activities, platform participation, post-expedition activities, publication of results, and education and outreach activities would go to NSF in early November.

Farrell presented a schedule of planning workshops related to riser drilling projects. The USSSP co-sponsored NanTroSEIZE workshop in July 2002, led by Gaku Kimura and Harold Tobin, succeeded in attracting new people to help develop a science plan for the Nankai drilling project. Future workshops include the Costa Rica subduction zone in December 2002, led by Kevin Brown and Roland von Huene, the Indian Ocean Fan in early 2003, led by Peter Clift and Peter Molnar, and the IODP GeoSCAN workshop in January 2003 for general geophysical planning, led by Nathan Bangs and Carolyn Ruppel. Farrell also mentioned other planned or proposed workshops related to IODP proposals on the deep biosphere in September 2003, led by Martin Fisk, on the Black, Marmara, and Aegean Seas, led by Liviu Giosan and Roger Flood, and on climate-tectonic links in Alaska and the NE Pacific, led by John Jaeger and Sean Gulick.

Farrell mentioned various education and outreach activities in the U.S., including a visit to Capitol Hill by Steve Bohlen of JOI, a proposed education workshop in early 2003 led by Al Hine and Ellen Thomas, and the continuing series of town meetings held at the annual GSA and AGU conventions. Farrell also mentioned several ODP legacy related activities such as the bibliographic database at TAMU and a series of results symposia planned for 2002 and 2003 led by various U.S. scientists.

Paul Dauphin reported that NSF and MEXT have come close to having a memorandum ready to sign. He noted that NSF hopes to release the request for proposals for supplying the non-riser vessel by late November and has John Walter working on it now. Dauphin mentioned the

possibility of a substantial increase in the NSF budget over the next several years and said that this would certainly make it much easier to fund IODP.

3c. Europe

Jeroen Kenter reported that IODP planning efforts in Europe continued moving forward. The ECORD interim Council last met in June, just prior to the IWG meeting, and they decided upon having a single representative for the next IWG meeting. Kenter expected to see an MOU officially establishing ECORD by December 2002, as well as the naming of a European Science Operator (ESO) and designated European Management Agency (EMA). He added that the Netherlands has made a positive commitment and that JEODI had submitted a proposal for continued funding through the European Sixth Framework program.

John Ludden added to the European report on Thursday. He noted the approaching deadline of 10 September 2002 for responding to the call for expressions of interest in managing and operating the European contribution to IODP. Ludden confirmed that the European Science Foundation should decide on the ESO and EMA before the next IWG meeting in January 2003. He announced that the European Commission would hold a media event related to the prospects of ocean drilling on 25 October in Bremerhaven, Germany. He also announced a workshop on the "Perspective of future deep drilling in the Arctic Ocean and the question of site survey investigations" on 13-14 January 2003 in Copenhagen, Denmark. Ludden expects Europe to have \$15-25 million committed to IODP by early 2004, depending on the contribution from the European Community. He mentioned a well-received letter of intent to the EC and said that the EC must now issue a call for a full bid by November, with the outcome expected by mid 2003. Ludden closed by saying that he fully expects Europe to join IODP in October 2003 and conduct the Arctic drilling project in 2004.

3d. Canada

Matt Salisbury reported that Canadian efforts focused most of last year on submitting a proposal for full membership in IODP to the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI). The review committee made very favorable remarks, but much to the surprise and disappointment of everyone involved, the competition committee ultimately rejected the proposal in favor of other projects. The Canadian planners have now refocused their efforts and last week submitted a letter of intent to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) for a new major facilities access proposal to fund the first year of IODP membership, with a network proposal for subsequent years.

3e. China

Zuyi Zhou could not attend the meeting and did not submit a report.

3f. Chinese Taipei / Korea

Moore summarized a brief written report from Chinese Taipei that arrived too late for including in the agenda book. In the report, Chao-Shing Lee, chair of the ODP consortium, outlined the ongoing efforts between Chinese Taipei, Korea, and Japan to establish an Asian IODP Consortium. The report noted several future planning meetings scheduled for September 2002, February 2003, and beyond, and it also mentioned efforts to promote the concept of the Asian IODP Consortium among other science communities in the western Pacific region, including Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines.

4. iSAS Office Report

Minoru Yamakawa gave an update on the iSAS panels, meetings and proposals. He showed a diagram of the current iSAS panel structure and listed the schedule of past and future iSAS panel meetings. Yamakawa noted that iSAS now had 85 active proposals in the system, with

more than half already reviewed by the iSSEPs and one-fifth already forwarded to the iPC. He illustrated the distribution of proposals by themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan, by geographic location, and by the national affiliations of the lead proponents.

5. iSAS Panel Reports

5a. iSSEPs

Tim Byrne gave a general summary of the second iSSEP meeting in June, noting that the panel heard reports from NSF and MEXT, the IWG, iPC, iSSP, iSAS, and ICDP. He noted that the iSSP agreed with the iSSEPs request to begin reviewing proposals at an earlier stage of development. Byrne said that the iSSEPs formed working groups to discuss PPG reports, complex drilling projects, and legacy issues. He also reported that the iSSEPs decided for their next meeting in November to review proposals of common interest in joint sessions rather than separately.

Gilbert Camoin presented a list of the iSSEPs recommendations on the proposals reviewed at the June meeting. He noted the distribution of proposals by scientific theme and identified those sent forward to the iPC, those sent back for revision, one ready for external review, and one for deactivation. Byrne then explained the iSSEPs procedure for grouping the proposals forwarded to the iPC as either high priority or exceptionally high priority and showed the overall results for each proposal.

Austin expressed concern about having a mechanism for monitoring the continued activity of a proposal once the iPC has judged it as ready for ranking. He suggested that the watchdogs should follow through in contacting proponents. Fisher noted that those proposals would receive another review when the time comes for ranking them in IODP. Piasis emphasized that someone would have to make decisions next year to produce a program plan for FY'05. Moran saw a value in having a longer lead-time of perhaps three years instead of two for making program plans. Moore suggested that the program could simply ask for an update as the time approaches for developing a program plan. Austin worried that proponents might think they have plenty of time.

b. iSSP

Andre Droxler reported that the iSSP reviewed twenty-one full proposals at their recent meeting. They also made an advance review of nine pre-proposals recommended by the iSSEPs for development into full proposals. The iSSP proposes to form working groups for certain proposals with members of iPPSP and the proponents. Droxler explained the iSSP classification scheme for site-survey readiness. He then referred to the iSSP reviews just distributed to iPC members at the meeting and described the specific readiness status of the five MSP proposals and seven other proposals now up for review by the iPC.

Kenter asked if the MSP proposals had different requirements for the readiness classification. Droxler confirmed that some differences exist between platforms, and iSSP plans to post the general requirements on the SSDB Web site so that proponents can have access. Fisher asked how to consider the iSSP reviews in ranking the MSP proposals. Austin asserted that the iPC should rank exclusively on science, but he wondered if they could still group a proposal as ready for ranking if it lacked site-survey readiness. Moore said that the iSSP reviews should not constrain the ranking or grouping of proposals. Kuramoto characterized the iSSP report as mostly just for informational purposes. Oppo asked how site-survey and safety issues would enter into considerations for 2004 drilling in the absence of an operations committee. Moore identified the safety review as the most important step before committing to final scheduling and letting a contract for a platform.

Droxler presented the iSSP response to iPC Consensus 2-4 concerning requirements and responsibilities for obtaining site-survey data for riser drilling. He reported that iSSP plans to establish a cross-panel working group to develop the procedures and requirements for an IODP databank. The working group will include Roger Scrutton (chair), Tetsuro Tsuru, and Kirk McIntosh, together with David Divins (iSciMP), Joel Watkins (iPPSP), Dan Quoidbach (SSDB), and Nobu Eguchi (iSAS Office), and they will prepare a report for the March 2003 iPC meeting. Kenter wondered if the working group should include someone with MSP experience. Moore and Droxler saw the task as more generic rather than involving platform-specific issues.

iPC Consensus 3-3: the iPC approves the iSSP plan to form a working group for developing the procedures and requirements for an IODP databank. The working group should prepare a report for the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

5c. iPPSP

Barry Katz reported on the first iPPSP meeting in June. The panel familiarized itself with IODP and the safety review process, examined its role and responsibilities and its relationship with other panels and operators, developed guidelines on safety review requirements and a timeline for the review process, and reviewed the safety manual to include riser and MSP projects. Katz explained that the panel developed a new safety-ranking scheme for low-, moderate-, and high-risk sites. He associated low risk with young oceanic crust or thin sedimentary cover outside of hydrothermal regions, moderate risk with the types of sites normally drilled in ODP, and high risk with thick sedimentary sequences, a risk of hydrogen sulfide, an expectation of subsurface flow, a potential for thermally mature source rock or a stratigraphic or structural trap, regions of high heat flow, and any drilling in known petroleum producing provinces regardless of depth.

Katz explained that the panel will assign a watchdog to each project to guide it through the safety review process, and the watchdog will make the preliminary risk assessment. The panel will then review low-risk proposals by e-mail and handle those of moderate risk the same way as in ODP. High-risk proposals would require a preview and would normally follow the guidelines for the riser ship. The proposed riser review process would begin with planning workshops between the proponents, a subset of the iPPSP, the operators, and others, followed by a preview among the full iPPSP membership and finally a full project review. Katz noted that the whole riser review process requires up to three years, plus an additional year for material procurement. He added that the iPPSP plans to continue meeting regularly in June and December, with strict deadlines in March and September for e-mail review packages and in May and November for safety packages, including any carryovers from the e-mail review process.

Katz stated that iPPSP would require liaisons from the iPC, iSSP, and the operators on a permanent basis, from the iSciMP during initial planning phases for guidance on hydrocarbon monitoring, and from iILP for leg-specific issues. Other important issues for the iPPSP include the rapid approach of day one for the riser review process, who reviews post-cruise monitoring and well completion, cuttings disposal, shallow geophysical surveys, hydrocarbon occurrences, panel terms, panel membership and the lack of shipboard operational experience, and mission-specific platforms. Katz listed several topics for the next meeting, including previews of the proposals ranked by iPC, tools available to the program, wellhead requirements, well kicks, and required updates to the safety manual.

Ito asked when the iPPSP would assign the watchdog for a proposal. Katz said as soon as the panel receives a proposal from the iPC. Austin expressed concern about when the co-chief scientists would take over from the proponents. Moore noted that one of the proponents usually becomes a co-chief.

Moore wondered if having riser capabilities would ease some of the safety concerns for drilling into certain geological structures. Doust replied that IODP would have increased concerns about environmental and pollution risks. Austin emphasized that environmental concerns would undoubtedly also arise for MSP drilling in coastal and territorial waters. Skinner stated that many IODP projects would almost certainly require environmental impact statements to get clearance, and each platform would have to follow a specific policy. Katz added that the requirements and limits would also vary regionally. Moore suggested adopting the most stringent limits as a program standard. Katz replied that that would mean always bringing everything back to shore. Katz said that iPPSP does not have sufficient expertise to consider all environmental issues. Moore stated that permitting and clearance issues would fall to the CMO and operators. Mayer felt reluctant to absolve iPPSP of all responsibilities for assessing environmental risks.

Katz noted that the iPPSP also had concerns about monitoring the long-term effects of borehole experiments, particularly in areas of fluid flow. Yamada suggested that the program might want to abandon some riser boreholes after drilling. Ito expressed concern about hydrothermal drilling. MacLeod asked about the impact of the previous TAG leg. Becker replied that Canada required an environmental impact study for Leg 139 and the operator assumed responsibility for it. Moran recalled that ODP had to submit a general environmental impact statement at the beginning of the program. Doust stressed the importance of having a clear environmental policy for IODP, especially for operating in the Arctic. Brumsack strongly supported this idea and emphasized the importance of environmental concerns for Arctic drilling, particularly in terms of public perception. Fisher agreed that the program should define the terms and issues before someone else does it for us and uses terms with unfortunate negative connotations. Pezard suggested changing the name of the iPPSP to environmental impact and safety panel.

Later in the meeting, Doust proposed that IODP should develop a set of principles governing its policy with respect to the environmental impact of its activities. He identified the purposes of 1) providing clarity to all interested parties about the precise principles and objectives under which IODP will operate, for example in coastal and offshore areas under the jurisdiction or interest of national maritime authorities, fishing industries, non-governmental organizations, etc., 2) raising the awareness of environmental issues and sensitivities within the IODP scientific community and ensuring that all participants know about and follow these principles, and 3) providing a consistent and unambiguous framework within which all contractors must operate.

<p>iPC Consensus 3-4: the iPC recommends that IWG develop a set of environmental principles for addressing potential public concerns about the impact of IODP activities, for raising the awareness of all IODP participants toward such concerns, and for providing clear and consistent operating guidelines for all IODP contractors.</p>

5d. iSciMP

Jamie Allan presented the following recommendations from the iSciMP meeting in June 2002. He explained that the first three recommendations refer to the report of the SciMP hard-rock working group (HRWG), and the last recommendation follows on the heels of that report.

iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-1: iSciMP notes that archived, accurate color renditions of core are essential for IODP science and legacy. iSciMP recommends that this is most effectively accomplished by the current ODP methods of a color film archive with color accuracy obtained by scanning and digital correction.

iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-2: Digitally acquired core images may serve as the core image archive when CCD brightness, dynamic range, and size of color space equals or exceeds that of color film.

iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-3: iSciMP endorses the principles and goals articulated by the SciMP Hard Rock Working Group report (May 2002) and recommends that these goals be realized for all rock and sediment types.

iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-4: To improve the stratigraphic quality and consistency of shipboard biostratigraphy in IODP, iSciMP recommends that shipboard reference collections of Mesozoic and Cenozoic microfossils as well as digital image atlases and stratigraphic databases are needed and should be available for all IODP platforms and laboratories.

iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-5: iSciMP applauds the progress made in developing the OD21 integrated core description and data visualization system. iSciMP recognizes the value of a common core description and data visualization system for the IODP, and that the OD21 integrated system could become the common system used by all IODP platforms and laboratories.

Allan summarized the HRWG report, noting that SciMP and iSciMP had endorsed all of its recommendations and that iSciMP recommended extending the protocol to all sediment and rock types. He also mentioned the shortcomings of the previous hard-rock description system and outlined the proposed new system, stressing the need to obtain images of the archive and working core halves and cautioning that digital imaging methods have not yet advanced far enough for archival purposes. Allan praised the ongoing development of the OD21 core description and data visualization system because it already addresses many of the points raised in the HRWG report.

Skinner suggested looking at the ICDP database system, which even includes a capability for movies. Ishii suggested splitting cores into three pieces to obtain a flat, central slab for non-destructive analyses and imaging. Allan recognized the advantages of having slab samples but saw it as difficult to achieve for many types of cores and samples. Ishii also raised the issue of making better use of archived cores, and Sager agreed. MacLeod asked about the flexibility for obtaining different sized cores with MSP projects and suggested having workstations available in the core-processing lab. Tada also advocated the need for a flexible system to preserve core quality for as long as possible. Kinoshita recognized the concerns about archiving cores and suggested that individuals should relay their concerns to iSciMP.

iPC Consensus 3-5: the iPC receives iSciMP Recommendations 02-1-1 and 02-1-2 on the archiving of core images, iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-3 on the hard-rock working group report, iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-4 on shipboard reference collections, and iSciMP Recommendation 02-1-5 on the OD21 core description and database visualization system. We hereby forward these recommendations to IODP.

Allan reported that iSciMP has identified a set of minimum requirements for MSP laboratories involving the deployment of five standard 20-ft container vans on the drilling platforms or drilling support sites. MacLeod suggested saying ideal rather than minimum requirements because some platforms might not have enough room for so many containers. Kenter commended the efforts of iSciMP. He stated that JEODI had also investigated these issues through some of its work packages and reached a similar conclusion of needing five standard container vans. Kenter offered to transmit the results of that study to iSciMP and asked to have a liaison from JEODI to iSciMP. Lauterjung proposed that ICDP could also offer valuable insight on many of the iSciMP issues if invited to join the discussion.

Allen previewed several issues for the upcoming iSciMP meetings and voiced a strong desire for meeting together with iTAP because of the considerable overlap in the mandates of the two panels. He also expressed concern about having publications included in the iSciMP mandate because this subject requires a very different type of expertise from that needed for scientific measurements.

Allan announced that he would soon take a new position with NSF and therefore must resign from iSciMP. He recommended iSciMP member Rick Murray to replace him as co-chair. MacLeod and Fisher offered supporting comments. Ito asked for more background information on the nominee before deciding. After obtaining the appropriate material, the committee returned to this matter later in the meeting and reached a consensus.

iPC Consensus 3-6: the iPC appoints Rick Murray to replace Jamie Allan as a co-chair of the interim Scientific Measurements Panel (iSciMP).

5e. iTAP

Kate Moran reviewed the activities described in the iTAP mandate and explained how the panel interpreted those activities at its first meeting. They decided that the iTAP mandate should include the additional activity of advising the scientific constituents of IODP on the technologies available to meet specific science targets. Moore understood the point but saw it as a matter of policy planning. Austin asked about the necessity of officially codifying the proposed change in the iTAP mandate. Moore believed that the existing mandate provided enough flexibility to address such issues. He preferred to wait until the end of iSAS for recommending any further changes to panel mandates at the beginning of IODP.

Moran then presented an abbreviated version of iTAP Recommendation 02-02 concerning liaisons to and from the panel (see below). She advocated having a strong link with the iSSEPs so that iTAP could identify technological needs early in the proposal process. Moran proposed that the co-chairs of iTAP and iSciMP should meet soon to discuss the mandates and roles of the two panels and that an iSciMP liaison should attend iTAP meetings. She also called for liaisons from the operators and CMO, as already specified in the iTAP mandate.

iTAP Recommendation 02-02:

- iTAP should have a strong link with the iSSEPs so that the panel can identify technological gaps early in the proposal cycle process.
- iTAP co-chairs should meet with iSciMP co-chairs.
- iSciMP would provide a liaison to iTAP.
- IODP IOs and the CMO would provide appropriate liaisons to iTAP.

Moran noted that iTAP expects to cover a wide spectrum of research and development. She outlined a series of technical challenges and characterized them as either proposal driven or programmatic across platforms and disciplines. In explaining how to address those challenges, Moran proposed that iTAP should review the technological readiness of highly ranked proposals. In addition, the iTAP co-chairs should attend iSSEPs meetings to identify new proposals that involve technological challenges, and then iTAP members would receive those proposals for review. Moran said that the typical length of the proposal review process meshed with the 2-5 year period specified in the iTAP mandate.

Kato suggested that iTAP should only get involved in reviewing proposals if requested by the iSSEPs. Mikada noted that the iSSEPs have already reviewed one proposal that needs new technology, and he agreed that they could identify proposals that should go to iTAP rather than having a permanent iTAP liaison. Gillis saw no harm in having an iTAP liaison attend the iSSEPs meetings as a way to get familiar with the science of the program. Austin cautioned against depending too much on liaisons because they often lose interest or cannot commit the time.

Fisher recognized the benefit of conducting technical reviews but worried about the possible influence of such reviews on the iSSEPs review procedure. He also objected to the idea of iTAP participating selectively in the formal review process because every proposal should receive the same treatment. Fisher advised that any comments from iTAP should therefore remain informal and separate from the rest of the review process. Austin suggested that the first assessment could come as a request from the iSSEPs for additional input on technical issues without identifying specific proposals. Mayer agreed that iTAP should look at broader issues because proposals sometimes suffer from a limited awareness of existing technology.

Kinoshita suggested that this complicated issue could wait until after establishing the CMO and the implementing organizations. He wondered who, for example, would tell OD21 to develop riser technology to 4000 m. Moran replied that iTAP understood that the operators would develop new technology. Moore summarized that iTAP should only consider proposals in a programmatic sense and report their recommendations to the iPC.

iPC Consensus 3-7: the iTAP may send liaisons to iSSEPs meetings, as recommended in the iTAP mandate. The iTAP should report any identified technological gaps in the program science to the iPC.

Allan noted that all of the technical challenges identified by the iTAP fall within the purview of iSciMP. He said that iSciMP recognized a considerable overlap between the mandates of the two panels and had therefore already expressed a strong desire to hold joint meetings with iTAP, as permitted in the iSciMP mandate. Moore asked for a consensus approval of the requested meeting between the iTAP and iSciMP co-chairs and to have an iSciMP liaison attend iTAP meetings. No one objected.

iPC Consensus 3-8: the iTAP and iSciMP co-chairs should meet to discuss the overlapping mandates and complementary roles of the two panels and report their recommendations at the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

Moran presented an abbreviated version of iTAP Recommendation 02-03 concerning further membership on the panel (see below). She proposed having a two-tier membership status with regular and associate panel members. The associate members would participate through email and conference calls when necessary and attend at least one iTAP meeting per year, preferably in conjunction with the annual drilling conference of the Society of Petroleum Engineers. Moran said that she would bring nominations for associate members to the iPC for approval.

iTAP Recommendation 02-03: iTAP recommends that membership be described in two groups.

- Panel member: serve a three-year term and attend all meetings, including liaison duties.
- Associate panel member: participate through email and conference call on an as-needed basis and would attend at least one panel meeting per year, typically at the iTAP meeting held in conjunction with SPE's Drilling Engineers Annual Conference.

Tatsumi stated that the iPC should first approve the previously nominated second co-chair for iTAP. The committee agreed by consensus to appoint the nominee.

iPC Consensus 3-9: the iPC appoints Yoshihiro Masuda as co-chair of the interim Technology Advice Panel (iTAP).

Kato asked about the difference between having associate members and setting up working groups. Moran explained that working groups would focus on specific tasks or projects, whereas associates would help guide the path. Skinner said that TEDCOM rarely had its full membership at every meeting, and some iTAP members have to take leave from their company to attend the meetings. He suggested that IODP would need to have more people involved for giving technological advice, but industry representatives often cannot take the time to attend two or more meetings per year. Moore saw the advantage of having people identified and committed to service. Ito proposed to complete the full panel of fifteen or sixteen regular members first and then focus on adding associate members if necessary. Austin viewed expertise as a more important factor than national balance in selecting iTAP members. Moran requested permission to advertise for additional members to identify nominees and come back to iPC for approval.

iPC Motion 3-10: the iTAP co-chairs may seek new candidates for iTAP membership by advertising in appropriate media and should submit all resulting nominations to the iPC for approval.

Austin moved, Salisbury seconded; 10 in favor, 3 opposed (Ito, Kato, Tatsumi), 2 abstained (Kinoshita, Tada).

5f. iILP

Harry Doust reviewed the mission and objectives of the new interim Industrial Liaison Panel (iILP) and described its current status concerning the approved co-chairs and the nomination of additional members. He believed that IODP could benefit from industry experience in drilling and sampling techniques, organization and logistics, and from widespread coverage of relevant data. Doust cited the common objectives of climate variability and source rock development, fluid flow in sedimentary basins, extensional basin models, and one-off holes to

answer persistent questions. He also identified several urgent issues for iILP, such as how to formulate industry objectives to link with the scientific objectives of IODP, how to address time concerns from proposal to execution, how to streamline the evaluation procedure to provide earlier acceptance or rejection, and how to provide the most effective continuity in support of proposals.

Sager had concerns about industry academic cooperation on seismic data, but thought that industry might share data more willingly if IODP could ensure that it would remain proprietary. Doust thought that the confidentiality issue would diminish with improved communication and once industry realizes that IODP needs only the shallow portion of data and not complete sections. Austin recalled that the former Industry Liaison Working Group (ILWG) had identified a group of industry champions, and he wondered whether they fit with the plans of the iILP. Doust said that the champions contributed very much to the workshops leading up to the formation of the iILP, and the panel would explore how to foster that approach. Austin asked about the status of the ILWG brochure. Farrell expected to have the printed version ready for distribution in the next few weeks.

The committee returned to the issue of selecting the iILP membership later in the meeting. Doust then described three options for choosing the panel membership from the list of nominees shown in the agenda book. He indicated the option preferred by the iILP co-chairs for its breadth of expertise, ratio of industry and academic members, and balance among international participants and requested its approval.

iPC Motion 3-11: the iPC approves the full membership of the interim Industrial Liaison Panel (iILP) as recommended by the iILP co-chairs.

Mayer moved, Pezard seconded; 15 in favor.

6. Reports from other scientific programs

6a. International Continental Scientific Drilling Program (ICDP)

Jörn Lauterjung described the five main scientific themes of interest to ICDP and identified the ten current and ten prospective members. He described the funding strategies and emphasized that the limited program resources go toward project development and drilling-related expenses but not for science support. The program structure includes an assembly of governors, an executive committee, a science advisory group, an operations support group, and individual project teams. Lauterjung characterized ICDP as essentially a science-driven program that provides flexible, low-cost drilling capabilities in support of scientific teams who submit unsolicited proposals.

Lauterjung briefly described the currently active or approved projects within each theme of ICDP. These included the Corinth Rift Geodynamic Laboratory, the Chinese Continental Drilling Project near Donghai, the San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth (SAFOD), the already completed Hawaii Scientific Drilling Project, the upcoming Unzen Drilling Project in Japan, the Iceland Drilling Project, the recently completed Chicxulub Scientific Drilling Project, future drilling at Lake El'gygytgyn in Northeast Siberia, the Dead Sea, and Lake Malawi, and the already completed Mallik gas hydrate research well in the Mackenzie delta. Lauterjung also described the main functions and infrastructure of the ICDP operational support group and the inventory of ICDP equipment such as the GLAD 800 global lake drilling facility, slimhole sondes, core scanners, core loggers, and the data management system.

Lauterjung recommended enhancing future cooperation with IODP through increased information exchange, participation at panel meetings, training and education, equipment sharing, joint research projects, and discussion of future research activities. He suggested that the two programs should make the abstracts of proposals available to the panels of both programs, enhance the compatibility of official proposal forms and evaluation procedures, and exchange reviews of common and relevant proposals. Lauterjung noted that ICDP has already taken a first step by adopting proposal submission forms almost identical to those now used by IODP.

6b. InterMARGINS

Bob Whitmarsh explained the mission of InterMARGINS, outlined its past and current schedule of committee meetings, and described the three types of membership for principal, associate, and industry contributors. He identified Japan, the U.S., and the U.K. as current full members, with Norway, Germany, and China expected to join this year, while France, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the ESF currently have observer status. Whitmarsh noted that the Japan InterMARGINS program lacks its own research funding, but most marine scientists in Japan essentially do InterMARGINS research, and he listed several recent workshops and research cruises that have received Japanese funding. The U.K. Ocean Margins LINK Program, funded by NERC, Industry, and DTI through 2006, maintains a strong bias towards areas of interest in the North Atlantic. It focuses on processes of rifting, deep structures, sediment movement, slope stability, and fluid flow, and has awarded funding to eleven specific projects in the first two rounds. The U.S. MARGINS Program, funded by NSF since 1998, focuses on the initiatives of rupturing continental lithosphere, source to sink, seismogenic zone, and subduction factory, with two focus study areas for each initiative. Whitmarsh also highlighted a few InterMARGINS activities in some of the non-member countries and reported that the Southampton Oceanography Center has hosted the InterMARGINS Office and Web site since late 2001. He concluded by identifying the principal challenges and objectives of increasing national membership, producing a regular newsletter, expanding the circulation list and Web site, sponsoring workshops, conference symposia, and travel, and collaborating with other international programs such as IODP.

Moore thanked Whitmarsh for his presentation and remarked on the many mutual scientific interests of InterMARGINS and IODP. He hoped that the two programs would continue working toward greater cooperation through such exchanges.

6c. IMAGES

Ryuji Tada presented background information on the mission, strategy, and activities of IMAGES, the marine component of IGBP PAGES. He then reviewed a recent IMAGES position document on a strategy for merging its interests with IODP. Tada examined nine specific statements of the IMAGES document and offered comments from an iPC and IODP perspective. He concluded that IMAGES seeks to cooperate with IODP but clearly does not understand the procedures of IODP. Tada believed that IODP could benefit from incorporating certain elements of IMAGES-type research. He suggested that IMAGES needs much more guidance on how best to integrate with the IODP system.

Moore noted that IODP should definitely try to cooperate with other programs but could not subsume or take over the goals of a group like IMAGES. He added that IMAGES would have to compete with proposals like everyone else. Bloomer thought that IMAGES wanted to establish ongoing logistical support rather than a one-time use of an MSP. Pezard replied that IMAGES seeks support for operating a platform dedicated to so-called giant piston coring for

only two to three months per year, not full time. He agreed with Tada that IMAGES should have learned more about the IODP system before asking to join it. Pezard also noted a concern in France about not having enough scientists to fill all of the science positions on IMAGES and IODP projects, and he said that it could jeopardize the funding for both programs.

Wednesday

28 August 2002

8:30-17:00

7. Presentation and Ranking of MSP Proposals

7a. Review of ranking procedure

Moore explained the philosophy of the proposal review and ranking procedure, stating that the committee should judge each proposal on scientific merit alone but should also consider the balance of risk versus pay-off. He also explained the process of reviewing all five proposals first and then ranking them in order from highest to lowest (1-5) scientific priority. Moore strongly encouraged the committee members to express their concerns and opinions during the review process.

Those attendees who stayed out of the room for the review and ranking of all MSP proposals because of recognized conflicts of interests included Camoin (519), Mayer and Moran (533), Austin (564), and Droxler and Sager (581). Bloomer and D'Hondt stepped in temporarily as alternate committee members for Mayer and Austin. Pezard disclosed that he had formerly served as a proponent on Proposal 519-Full2, originally submitted in March 1999, but had since dropped off when it clearly became an MSP proposal. Moore decided that this no longer represented a conflict of interests, and Pezard participated in the entire review and ranking procedure.

7b. MSP proposal presentation

Proposal: 519-Full2 South Pacific Sea Level

Watchdogs: Tada, Salisbury, Oppo

Conflict-of-interests: Camoin as lead proponent.

Recommendation: forward to IWG

Proposal: 533-Full3 Arctic-Lomonosov Ridge

Watchdogs: Oppo, D'Hondt, Tada

Conflict-of-interests: Mayer and Moran as proponents.

Recommendation: forward to IWG

Proposal: 548-Full2 Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater

Watchdogs: Ito, D'Hondt, Bloomer

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: forward to IWG

Proposal: 564-Full New Jersey Shallow Shelf

Watchdogs: Bloomer, Kenter, Brumsack

Conflict-of-interests: Austin as proponent

Recommendation: forward to IWG

Proposal: 581-Full2 Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks

Watchdogs: Kenter, D'Hondt, Salisbury

Conflict-of-interests: Droxler and Sager as proponents

Recommendation: forward to IWG

7c. MSP proposal ranking

Each committee member ranked the proposals on a signed ballot in order from highest to lowest (1-5) scientific priority. The iSAS Office staff tallied the votes, calculated the mean score and standard deviation for each proposal, and then presented the results before the committee as shown below. Tatsumi asked what would happen next. Moore said that the proposal rankings and co-chief scientist nominations would now go forward to the IWG, but further action would require a proposal from one of the IWG members to supply the necessary funding for operating mission-specific platforms.

iPC Consensus 3-12: the iPC ranks the following five mission-specific platform proposals in order of scientific priority and forwards them to the IWG for further consideration.

Rank	Proposal	Title	Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	533-Full3	Arctic-Lomonosov Ridge	1.5	1.2
2.	519-Full2	South Pacific Sea Level	2.4	0.9
3.	564-Full	New Jersey Shallow Shelf	3.1	0.8
4.	548-Full2	Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater	3.3	1.3
5.	581-Full2	Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks	4.6	0.7

7d. Co-chief nominations

Moore emphasized the need to begin preparing for the possibility of conducting MSP projects in 2004, and he asked the committee to identify potential co-chief scientists. The iPC members nominated five or six candidates for each of the ranked projects, and the co-chairs promised to forward these nominations to the IWG for future reference.

8. Presentation and Grouping of Other Proposals

8a. Review of grouping procedure

The committee agreed to follow the procedure established at the previous iPC meeting and group each proposal, through a show of hands, as either ready or not ready for ranking. Keir Becker, a proponent of Proposal 553-Full, left the room during the review of that proposal. Oppo, MacLeod, and Tatsumi acknowledged institutional relationships with some of the proponents of Proposal 584-Full2. Moore decided that none of those relationships posed a serious conflict of interests, and all three remained in the room during the review of that proposal.

8b. Deep Biosphere and Subseafloor Ocean

Proposal: 553-Full Cascadia Margin Hydrates

Watchdogs: Brumsack, Fisher, Kato

Conflict-of-interests: Becker as a proponent.

Recommendation: not ready for ranking

Proposal: 557-Full2 Storegga Slide

Watchdogs: Tatsumi, Austin, Salisbury, Ito

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

Proposal: 573-Full2 Porcupine Basin Carbonate Mounds

Watchdogs: Kenter, Kato, Austin

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

Proposal: 584-Full2 TAG II Hydrothermal

Watchdogs: Kato, MacLeod, Pezard

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

Proposal: 589-Full3 Gulf of Mexico Overpressures

Watchdogs: Fisher, Tatsumi, Brumsack

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

8c. Environmental Change, Processes, and Effects

Proposal: 543-Full2 CORK in Hole 642E

Watchdogs: Fisher, Ito

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

Proposal: 572-Full3 North Atlantic Late Neogene

Watchdogs: Oppo, Tada, Pezard

Conflict-of-interests: none

Recommendation: ready for ranking

8d. Proposal grouping

The following consensus summarizes the outcome of the proposal review and grouping procedure.

iPC Consensus 3-13: the iPC groups the following seven full proposals according to the main scientific themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan and assesses the readiness of each proposal for future ranking.

Deep Biosphere and Subseafloor Ocean

553-Full	Cascadia Margin Hydrates	not ready for ranking
557-Full2	Storegga Slide	ready for ranking
573-Full2	Porcupine Basin Carbonate Mounds	ready for ranking
584-Full2	TAG II Hydrothermal	ready for ranking
589-Full3	Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	ready for ranking

Environmental Change, Processes, and Effects

543-Full2	CORK in Hole 642E	ready for ranking
572-Full3	North Atlantic Late Neogene	ready for ranking

Thursday

29 August 2002

8:30-17:00

9. IODP Management Structure

The committee reviewed the details of the proposed tasks, responsibilities, and functions of the executive authority, the central management organization (CMO), and the IODP Council, as developed by the IWG and outlined earlier by Moore (see Item 2 above). They noted that the tasks and responsibilities of the executive authority essentially duplicate those of the JOIDES EXCOM mandate except for two additional items relating to liaisons and program promotion. Doust asked about the reporting pathways of the executive authority. Moore referred to the structure diagram showing the executive authority reporting to the CMO and through the CMO to the IODP Council. Dauphin noted that CMO reports to the lead agencies and not to the IODP Council as implied in the structure diagram.

Moore mentioned that the many of the CMO functions under science and program operations would work through subcontracts and that the science planning support function would reside permanently in Japan. He also noted the new CMO task of supporting site surveys for safety. MacLeod wondered about the extent of funding and commitment for safety surveys. Austin recalled that the program principles define such a commitment. He also suggested that the list of CMO tasks and responsibilities should mention other potential lead agencies besides NSF and MEXT under executing contracts. Mayer noted a discrepancy between the CMO functions and the tasks and responsibilities in terms of data management. Kato asked about the oversight of complex drilling projects. Moore suggested returning to that topic shortly in the upcoming discussion.

10. IODP Science Planning Discussions

10a. Scientific principles of IODP

Moore and Kinoshita presented a revised draft of the IODP Science Principles that differed substantially from the preliminary version in the agenda book. The committee discussed the exact wording of each principle and debated several points in detail, such as the link between the executive authority and advisory structure, the role of the operations committee, the definition of a scientific party, and how best to identify the general program science in the most inclusive way. After a short break for more discussion and editing, Moore presented the revised set of scientific principles and asked for approval, with the understanding that further minor editing would occur to smooth out some of the new changes and eliminate certain redundancies.

iPC Motion 3-14: the iPC recommends that IODP adopt the following principles of scientific investigation.

1. The Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) is an international scientific research program that investigates important questions in the study of the Earth.
2. Science plans for IODP will be formulated and developed by the international scientific ocean drilling community through the IODP science advisory structure.
3. IODP investigations will be based on unsolicited proposals that address objectives of the IODP Science Plan or other outstanding new research ideas.
4. The IODP science advisory structure, composed of internationally representative committees, panels and working groups, will provide science advice to IODP management through a planning committee and policy advice through the executive authority.
5. The executive authority of the science advisory structure will be the lead policy-making body of IODP and will establish science committees and panels as needed.
6. All panels and working groups providing scientific and technical advice to IODP will report through a lead science planning committee to the executive authority.
7. The lead science planning committee will provide scientific and technical advice to IODP, guidance to proponents, and evaluation of proposals to conduct future drilling projects. The lead science planning committee may recommend policy changes to the executive authority.
8. The IODP science advisory structure will evaluate proposals for scientific ocean drilling in a fair and unbiased manner that avoids conflicts of interests.

9. The IODP science advisory structure will provide advice to IODP management regarding scientific priorities of proposed drilling and of technical needs.
10. IODP policies and procedures and the recommendations of the IODP advisory panels and committees will be openly available to the public.
11. IODP scientific ocean drilling projects will be undertaken by teams of scientists selected by IODP. IODP management and the platform operators in consultation with the science advisory structure will make decisions concerning the scheduling and staffing of drilling projects.
12. IODP will provide open access to all samples and data collected and produced during a drilling project once the members of the scientific party have had a reasonable opportunity to complete their initial studies.

Mayer moved, Brumsack seconded; 15 in favor.

10b. Guide to IODP and Complex Drilling Projects in IODP

Jamie Austin reported on the development of a new Guide to IODP. He described the existing Guide to ODP as a good starting framework and then presented a draft outline of the new guide, listing important questions that it should address. Austin explained that he decided to focus first on the proposal submission guidelines. He presented a timeline for producing the entire guide and proposed forming a working group to assist. Fisher and MacLeod volunteered to work on editing the proposal submission guidelines by the next iPC meeting.

Kiyoshi Suyehiro explained the concept of complex drilling projects (CDPs) and distinguished four realms of involvement, including the broad science community, proponents and the project team, the science advisory structure, and the project management system. He said that the program must first define what constitutes a CDP. Suyehiro suggested that in identifying a particular proposal as a CDP, the program should consider the pathway taken to achieve the objectives and not just whether it calls for multiple platforms or a multi-phased approach. In terms of writing a CDP proposal, he believed that it should begin with an overarching proposal that would fully describe the ultimate goal and show the need for a phased approach, followed by a series of individual proposals representing the reasonably short-term steps towards that goal. Suyehiro also outlined the overall process of developing a CDP. First a group of proponents must submit a proposal, the SSEPs would mentor it and stamp it as a CDP, and the science planning committee would endorse it and recommend a pathway for proceeding, then an appropriate body would manage the CDP and another body would decide the scheduling.

Tim Byrne reported that the iSSEPs envisioned a CDP as beginning with an umbrella pre-proposal together with a series of related pre-proposals for the individual pieces. They recognized that certain incremental CDPs might require data from the initial phases to write the proposals for the later phases. The most important questions for the iSSEPs thus center on determining when to send the various parts of a CDP out for external review and when to forward the parts or the whole package to the next stage of review within the advisory structure.

Mayer wondered if the program could solicit an umbrella proposal for a group of related proposals that might come in independently. Austin cautioned against publicizing the opportunity for CDPs in such a way that proponents would start packaging proposals related to a global theme as opposed to a coherent, unified project. Katz characterized riser drilling as requiring several legs for pilot holes, with some of them perhaps recommended by the

advisory structure. Moore asserted that every piece of a CDP would not necessarily have to stand alone on its own merits, and he imagined that the program might have to make an initial commitment to a CDP before the proponents fully developed all of its pieces. Moore cautioned, however, that the program could not commit to too many CDPs because of limited resources and the need to preserve flexibility.

10c. NanTroSEIZE Workshop report (a CDP case study)

Kiyoshi Suyehiro gave a preliminary report on the recent NanTroSEIZE Workshop for planning a complex drilling project (CDP). He explained the schedule and objectives of the workshop and showed a list of the seventy-seven participants from seven countries. The participants divided into six working groups and reached a consensus on several items, including the phased objectives of the overall project, the prioritization of candidate drilling regions, and the structure and format of the planned series of drilling proposals. Suyehiro expected to see the full umbrella proposal, a full proposal for Phase 1A, and perhaps a preliminary proposal for Phase 1B all submitted by the next proposal deadline of 1 October 2002.

The committee then discussed the procedures for reviewing these proposals and the timing for making a commitment of program resources. Austin recommended defining an exit strategy. Allan wondered at what point a project manager would take over the responsibilities from the advisory structure. Dauphin asked when the first draft of the workshop report would come out. Suyehiro said that it should come out very soon, but he could not say exactly when. Mikada thought that one of the workshop organizers might have already posted it on his website.

10d. Sample and data distribution policy

Jamie Allan presented a draft sample and data distribution policy from iSciMP and explained that the panel still intends to shorten the document considerably by eliminating many operational and procedural aspects and focusing on policy. Mayer cautioned against shortening the document too much and adding ambiguity. Allan described the original ODP policy as a slim document that the operators later augmented with detailed procedural matter. MacLeod suggested retaining the detailed procedures in a separate instructional document, and Austin agreed.

Allan noted that the new draft policy includes logging as just another type of data, but it does not specifically address certain important concerns for microbiology, such as core sampling, transport and storage. Moore asked if microbiology archiving represents a program or policy concern. Allan replied that this issue poses more of a concern in terms of policy because appropriate archive facilities for microbiology already exist at various places in the world.

Farrell wondered about the definition of the auxiliary science party and their responsibilities in contributing to project results. Allan responded that the draft policy refers only generically to initial, openly shared data because the publications policy remains unclear. Austin wanted to preserve a link with publications. Kato recommended defining a moratorium period in advance and forming a working group to discuss patent issues. Moran suggested that each project prospectus should include a scientific measurements plan. Kenter supported that idea.

<p>iPC Motion 3-15: The iPC accepts the sample and data distribution policy from iSciMP as a working draft. We remind the iSciMP that the IWG expects a report from the iPC on the final draft policy in January 2003.</p>

Fisher moved, Tatsumi seconded; 15 in favor.

11. Other Business

11a. Establish working group for OPCOM mandate

Moore presented a diagram of the IODP management and science planning structure, showing an operations committee positioned between the science committee and the executive authority. He characterized the operations committee as having a more complicated task in IODP and proposed establishing a working group to develop its draft mandate. Moore suggested that the working group should define the process for developing annual program plans for multi-platform operations, the longer-term responsibilities of the committee, the pathway and procedures for reporting its recommendations, and the general membership requirements. He also suggested that the working group should consist of two Americans, two Japanese, and at least one European member, and they should report their recommendations at the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

Moran suggested getting input on operations from the industry members of the iTAP and iILP. Mayer asked whether the structure diagram showed a fixed reporting pathway and whether the operations committee belonged to the science advisory structure or management organization. Tatsumi also wondered about the relationship between the operations committee, the science advisory structure, and the CMO. Moore replied that all of those questions remained open for discussion by the working group. The committee then nominated the membership of the working group and agreed to establish it by consensus.

iPC Consensus 3-16: the iPC establishes an *ad hoc* working group to develop a mandate for an operations committee in the future IODP advisory structure. The working group will consist of Keir Becker, Hisao Ito, Philippe Pezard, Nick Pias, Alister Skinner, and Asahiko Taira, and they will report their recommendations at the next iPC meeting in March 2003.

11b. Microbiological sampling and patent rights

Kato raised the issue of patent rights in IODP, particularly with respect to microbiology. He described a scenario wherein scientists could take samples after the moratorium, but without a contract the program would have no oversight on the outcome of the research. He also worried about the resources necessary to preserve biological samples indefinitely. Kato proposed forming a working group to examine specific cases and review the protocols on a continuous basis.

Moore clarified the charge of the working group as determining who could acquire samples and for how long could the program preserve samples under the proper conditions for biological sampling. Allan noted that the sample and data distribution policy already defines who can get samples. He added that iSciMP had discussed the idea of requiring participating scientists to place any biological discoveries in an international databank. Brumsack wondered how to get some return from those who obtain profit from IODP samples. Mayer recognized the importance of the patent issue but thought that the iPC did not have the proper expertise to address it. Skinner stressed that samples and data remain open to scientists only until someone obtains a patent. Dauphin explained that MEXT and NSF had discussed this matter and decided to make the least-restrictive policy as possible because treaties differ from country to country. He added that samples would always belong to the program, whereas products or procedures would belong to those who develop them.

Moore recalled from a previous meeting that most individual researchers have agreements with their home institutions governing patents. He summarized that the working group should study sampling issues related to the conditions and duration of storage, but only make

recommendations about the importance of patent rights. Austin suggested adding the charge of how to recommend appropriate outreach mechanisms for attracting more microbiologists to the program. He also suggested that the working group should identify appropriate data reporting and publication requirements. The committee then agreed by consensus to establish the working group under the iSciMP.

iPC Consensus 3-17: the iPC requests that iSciMP form a microbiology working group to examine issues related to the conditions and duration of sample storage, to make recommendations about the importance of patent rights, to formulate requirements for data reporting and publications, and to identify ways to attract more microbiologists to the program.

11c. Transition from iSAS to SAS

Moore defined the goal of making the transition without too many changes. He hoped that it would mostly involve just dropping the interim from the advisory panel names, perhaps with a slight change in membership to reflect the eventual balance of financial commitments. Moore noted that the functions of the iSAS Office would remain permanently in Japan, though perhaps at a different location, and the IWG must still establish the CMO. He also announced that the successor to the iPC would have new co-chairs. The committee recognized that many unknown aspects of the transition depend on forthcoming decisions at a higher level, so they decided to return to this issue at the next meeting.

12. Future Meetings

a. 4th iPC Meeting, 17-20 March 2003, University of Texas, Austin

Jamie Austin reviewed the arrangements for the next iPC meeting in Austin, Texas, as described in a handout distributed at the meeting.

b. 5th iPC Meeting, August 2003

Hajimu Kinoshita offered for Japan to host the 5th iPC meeting in August 2003, with details on the exact dates and location determined later.

Meeting adjourned 15:00