

**IODP Forum Meeting #1**  
**27-28 May 2014, Busan, Korea**  
**Draft Minutes v4 16 July**

Note: Throughout these minutes, “IODP” is used specifically as the acronym for the new International Ocean Discovery Program. When referring to the 2003-2013 Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, the shorthand “old IODP” is used. There is one exception to this convention: a few references to the central management organization for the “old IODP,” i.e., IODP-MI standing for Integrated Ocean Drilling Program Management International.

**Introductory Agenda Items**

After the Chair called the meeting to order, host Dr. Gil Young Kim described meeting logistics including plans for the meeting Korean-style dinner evening of May 27. Meeting participants introduced themselves and an updated roster is included as appendix 1.

The Chair then summarized the agenda, which included three main focus items:

- 1) A detailed review of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the IODP Forum, both to update its wording and to lay the groundwork for actually fulfilling the Forum mandate.
- 2) An initial assessment of early IODP progress towards addressing the themes and challenges of the new Science Plan, based primarily on the portfolio of IODP programs already scheduled and proposal pressure at facility boards (FB’s) and the Science Evaluation Panel (SEP).
- 3) A review of mid-term renewal efforts that will be required in most IODP countries, with an aim to establishing how, what, and when the Forum could contribute to those efforts.

Becker then briefly reviewed procedures he would use in chairing the meeting, including a few important basic principles from Robert’s Rules of Order, even though the ToR does not state that Robert’s Rules should be used. He noted that the ToR stated that Forum decisions are to be reached by consensus, described what is meant by consensus and how potential consensus statements would be presented and verified, and confirmed that every meeting participant would count in terms of reaching consensus.

**Agenda Item B: Forum Terms of Reference**

The review of the ToR spanned both days of the meeting and revealed several aspects that needed to be updated plus some minor grammatical matters. Most important were: (1) the recent combination of Site Characterization Panel and Proposal Evaluation Panel to form the SEP, (2) addition of FB chairs to the participant list, (3) simplifying the description of participants to eliminate any distinction between “members” and other attendees, and (4) updating the procedure for naming the next chair for 2015-2017. The third item was resolved by using the wording “participant” instead of “member.” Discussion of the fourth item is summarized below under Agenda Item P: Selection of Next Chair. By the end of the second day, the Forum had agreed on new wording for its ToR that is included as Appendix 2:

**Forum Consensus 2014-1:** The IODP Forum approves updates to its Terms of Reference to reflect evolution in IODP structure since 2012, a simplified description of its participants, and that it will choose its future chair.

**Agenda Items C/M: Progress Toward Addressing Science Plan (also incorporates discussion under Agenda Item I/Mandate #5 Workshops)**

Probably the most important aspect of the general purpose and mandate of the IODP Forum is to assess program-wide IODP progress towards addressing the themes and challenges of the new Science Plan. Accordingly, the agenda was designed to allow thorough discussion of this item on both days of the meeting. On the first day the subject was introduced by the chair with his own initial assessment of the distribution of scheduled IODP expeditions and full proposal pressure currently at SEP. This was followed by a presentation by SEP co-chair D. Kroon of the full and pre-proposal pool at SEP for its coming June meeting. Then three updates on scheduling and operations for Mission Specific Platforms (MSP), Chikyu, and JOIDES Resolution (JR) were presented by the respective FB chairs: K. Gohl for ECORD FB (EFB), G. Kimura for Chikyu IODP Board (CIB), and S. Humphris for the JR FB (JRFB).

An extensive discussion ensued over two days. The Forum chair's initial assessment indicated reasonably good coverage of the SP themes and challenges, especially for so early in the program. In particular, he noted that there was relatively good coverage for the four challenges identified at a 2012 US workshop as the top-priority US challenges for JR IODP operations within the four main SP themes. He also noted that the JR schedule in the Indian Ocean promised the equivalent of a virtual monsoon "mission" to fulfill SP challenge #3 (regional control of precipitation patterns). On the other hand, some specific weaknesses in coverage of the science plan were noted by the SEP co-chair and FB chairs, as follows:

- SEP co-chair D. Kroon noted a very strong preponderance of recent proposal pressure in the Climate and Ocean Change theme, to the point that (a) proposal submission in the other themes might need to be stimulated and (b) a shift in distribution of scientific expertise among SEP members might be required. He also noted that SEP might need to increase the proportion of members with site survey data expertise in addition to their scientific expertise. As membership of the SEP is formally under authority of the JRFB, the Forum did not register a formal consensus, but the sense of discussion was that Forum participants thought it would be acceptable to make appropriate adjustments to the expertise balance of SEP membership.
- Kroon and EFB Chair K. Gohl both noted a relative lack of recent Arctic proposal submissions, especially in light of the March EFB consensus to schedule an (expensive) Arctic expedition in the first five years of IODP.
- Kroon and JRFB chair S. Humphris both noted a lack of dedicated biosphere proposals, although there are biosphere components in many current proposals and planned expeditions.
- Kroon and others also noted the relative lack of dedicated proposal pressure in (a) Challenge #4 of the Climate and Ocean Change theme relating to ocean response to chemical perturbation and (b) the submarine landslide aspect of the geohazards Challenge #12 in the Earth in Motion theme.

SEP co-chair Kroon raised a few other points in the discussion. He noted that the most recent proposal submissions were dominated by JR proposals and wondered if there might now be too many JR proposals and too few MSP and Chikyu proposals. The three FB chairs did not

see this as an immediate issue, but it could be discussed further at the respective FB meetings. Kroon also noted that a few proposals that date back to previous programs don't fit well into current challenges, and the sense of the discussion was that they should be evaluated on their scientific merits. Finally, he also wondered about dealing with proposals that are clearly not going to be drilled, but this should probably be considered by the three FB's because they might have different criteria depending on platform.

The Forum mandate includes the right to recommend workshops (even though the Forum itself controls no workshop funding). Thus, discussion included consideration of whether the Forum should recommend workshops to stimulate activity in any of these under-represented topics. It was noted that there are already scheduled or proposed workshops relating to biosphere drilling and a particular landslide proposal, and the Arctic community might need another proposal submission deadline to respond to the March 2014 EFB consensus about scheduling an Arctic program. It was also noted that (a) the assessment at this inaugural Forum meeting might not be complete enough to warrant recommending specific workshops yet, and (b) before the next Forum meeting there would be two more proposal submission deadlines and three more SEP meetings in which some of the imbalances might be addressed.

In addition, discussion about the mid-term renewal efforts required in most IODP countries (next section of minutes) indicated there would not be a requirement to address every one of the Science Plan challenges in the first five years of IODP. In the end, the sense of the Forum was not to immediately recommend specific workshops. Instead, it was to conduct a more thorough review of proposal pressure and IODP progress on the Science Plan at the 2015 Forum meeting when there will also be available some initial results of IODP expeditions. This was reflected in the following consensus/action plan:

**Forum Consensus 2014-2:** The initial Forum review of scheduled expeditions and current proposal pressure shows mostly good coverage across the themes and challenges of the Science Plan. Weaknesses in proposal pressure were noted for the Arctic, dedicated biosphere programs, the submarine landslide aspect of Challenge #12 in the Earth in Motion theme, and Challenge #4 in the Climate and Ocean Change theme relating to ocean response to chemical perturbation. The Forum chair should continue monitoring progress and proposal pressure at Facility Board and SEP meetings during the next year, and work with the SEP to stimulate proposal development in under-represented challenges. This will be in preparation for a more extensive review at the 2015 Forum meeting that will also include initial results of IODP drilling since the beginning of the new Program.

**Action Item:** Full reports about any efforts to stimulate proposal pressure in under-represented challenges should be included in agenda materials for the next Forum meeting, for any proposal stimulation mechanism that might be utilized, e.g., working groups, workshops, etc.

#### **Agenda Item E/N: Mid-Term Renewal**

Given that mid-term renewal efforts seem likely in most IODP countries, it is important for the Forum to understand the timelines and any special considerations for these efforts. The Forum chair asked representatives of IODP agencies to briefly describe the timelines, requirements, and evaluation criteria for their mid-term renewal efforts. Below is a summary of responses, in the order that they were presented during the meeting. Common themes

seemed to be (a) that the renewal criteria would involve a mix of cost-effective operations and good science outcomes, and (b) that will not be considered necessary to have addressed each and every challenge in the first five years of IODP.

US/NSF (T. Janecek): The current USF funding commitment is for five years (FY14-18) as recommended by the National Science Board (NSB). Renewal for an additional five years will also require evaluation and approval by the NSB. NSF envisions an external review of JOIDES Resolution science outcomes and operations during years 3-4 of the current five-year funding commitment. Criteria for evaluation will probably include:

- good science outcomes, but no expectation of addressing all the challenges of the Science Plan;
- cost-effectiveness of operations (i.e., new JR “business model” in IODP);
- stability of international funding partnerships; and
- the record of obtaining additional outside funding in support of JR operations, by the Complementary Project Proposal (CPP) mechanism and/or non-IODP work.

The outcome of this review would be part of a package presented to NSB in support of five-year renewal. A Forum assessment of IODP progress toward achieving the Science Plan could also be part of the package sent to NSB.

For additional context, the Decadal Survey of Ocean Sciences report is due May 2015. That survey will include an evaluation JOIDES Resolution operations amongst the wide suite of other facilities that NSF supports in ocean sciences. The period for public input into the survey has already passed. There are no indications yet specifically how continuation of JR operations is being rated in that survey, but this will be known by the time of the second Forum meeting in July 2015.

ECORD (G. Camoin): Twelve of the 19 ECORD countries having funding commitments through FY18, five through FY16, and the other two are uncertain. An external review of ECORD is anticipated in early 2017. There will probably be four main criteria in evaluation of renewal efforts within ECORD:

- effectiveness of management and delivery of MSP operations;
- significance of scientific outcomes of all IODP operations (MSP, Chikyu, and JR);
- to what degree the goal of at least one MSP operation per year is reached, including an Arctic program and a range of technological drilling/coring approaches;
- the record of ECORD collaboration with other programs.

JAPAN/MEXT (Y. Kimura): In approximately 2018, there will be a five-year technical review of Chikyu operations, in both domestic and international contexts. This will include review of management and delivery of both IODP work and non-IODP work. It will also include an evaluation of MEXT/JAMSTEC support of IODP scientists.

India (B. Bansal): Current funding of India’s partnership in JR operations is good through March 2019. Clearly, for India, US renewal of IODP operations is very important; however, funding beyond 2019 will be decided in the last year of the current phase, i.e., 2018-2019.

ANZIC (N. Exon): Current ANZIC funding for IODP is set only through the end of 2015. Thus, efforts to assure continued funding will begin early in 2015. Given that the JR will be drilling several expeditions in the region in 2016-2017, there is reason for optimism about

continued funding. Given the short timeline and importance of ANZIC renewal to IODP, the Forum indicated its support with the following consensus statement:

**Forum Consensus 2014-3:** The IODP Forum recognizes the importance of 2015 IODP renewal effort in the ANZIC consortium, and will support those renewal efforts in any way possible.

Korea (Y.J. Lee): Current funding of the Korean partnership in JR operations is set for 2011-2018. Korea is interested in at least one JR CPP expedition in that time frame and in pursuing partnerships with Chikyu and ECORD.

China (P. Wang, not actually representing MoST): The current Chinese funding level is secure, and Chinese scientists are working to increase the level of IODP funding in the future. IODP-China is active in using the CPP mechanism for JR expeditions, and interested in becoming an additional IODP Platform Provider after 2018.

#### **Agenda Item G: Coordination among Facility Boards and Platform Providers**

There was a discussion about possibilities for enhancing cooperation among IODP countries in funding site surveys, given that site survey scheduling can be a limiting factor in proposal development. It was noted that there are recent examples of bilateral cooperation in funding specific surveys, and there are open avenues of communication about such cooperation among IODP agencies. It was also noted that, in some IODP countries like the U.S., there are no dedicated funds for IODP-specific site surveys but instead site survey proposals are evaluated on their scientific merit in competition with all other proposals. An idea to form a larger consortium of IODP agencies to support site survey capabilities (e.g., multi-channel seismic vessels) was floated; this would require considerable further discussions among IODP agencies.

#### **Agenda Item H: Effectiveness of IODP web site**

No specific needs for improvement of the IODP web site were noted. In fact, several members commented on its generally fine quality, so the Forum registered the following consensus.

**Forum Consensus 2014-4:** The Forum appreciates the effectiveness of the IODP web site, and applauds the Science Support Office for transitioning the site so successfully from IODP-MI.

#### **Agenda Item I: Collaboration with ICDP**

J. Mori, chair of the ICDP Science Advisory Group, reported on ICDP activities and committed to bringing any feedback from the Forum to the ICDP Executive Committee meeting scheduled in early June 2014. There was extensive discussion of how to improve cooperation between IODP and ICDP, particularly in light of a recommendation from the November 2013 ICDP planning workshop that proposals for scientific drilling projects that cross the shoreline should be encouraged and evaluated in a coordinated way by the two programs. Two specific examples were cited, one successful (New Jersey sea level), the other still pending with uneven reviews by the two programs (Chicxulub Impact Crater). It was also noted that general recommendations for better coordination between the two programs had been made in the past without much progress, so to make real progress more specific mechanisms need to be set up. After discussion of several kinds of potential



mechanisms (e.g., workshops, joint working group, special call for proposals), the Forum agreed on the following:

**Forum Consensus 2014-5:** The IODP Forum recommends that the calls for proposals by IODP and ICDP encourage projects that include both offshore and onshore boreholes to achieve common scientific goals of the two programs. The Forum recommends that a joint IODP/ICDP group be formed that would clarify procedures for coordinated reviews of joint proposals. Also, the group should discuss ways to encourage submission of proposals that combine IODP and ICDP capabilities.

J. Schuffert introduced the prospect of conducting a joint IODP-ICDP scientific drilling Town Hall at the Fall 2014 AGU meeting. In the new Program, USSSP has assumed the primary planning role for the IODP Town Halls at meetings such as AGU, GSA, etc. A number of important advantages were noted, ranging from scientific to financial to social. It was also noted that other scientific drilling/coring programs could join this Town Hall. Therefore, the Forum registered the following consensus:

**Forum Consensus 2014-6:** The Forum endorses the concept for a joint IODP-ICDP Town Hall at the Fall 2014 AGU Meeting.

**Action Item:** Both of these consensus items will be presented at the June 2014 ICDP Executive Committee (EC). If the EC also endorses them, then: (a) the IODP Forum chair will work with the ICDP SAG and EC chairs to set up the joint working group, and (b) Schuffert will work with T. Wiersberg of ICDP and other appropriate individuals to organize the joint town hall.

#### **Agenda Item K: Overarching Public Relations and Educational Activities**

In the new Program structure, public relations and educational activities are mainly conducted and funded within individual IODP countries or consortia. The Forum mandate includes “stimulating overarching public relations and educational activities,” but no control of any funding for these activities. The Forum agreed that fulfilling this aspect of its mandate would first require a thorough review of the education and outreach activities within IODP countries and consortia, but we were not prepared to conduct such a review at this initial Forum meeting. G. Camoin pointed out that the ECORD education and outreach task force had invited US and Japanese education and outreach representatives to its September 2014 meeting, so that meeting could lay the groundwork for developing any overarching aspects to program-wide education and outreach. The Forum agreed to conduct a thorough review at its next meeting, based partly on input from the ECORD task force meeting and partly on direct input from education and outreach staff from IODP countries.

**Action Item:** Review of education and outreach activities across IODP will be a special focus of the second meeting of the Forum.

The Forum discussed the idea of preparing a simple summary brochure of the IODP proposal process. This had been suggested originally by G. Camoin at the August 2013 JRFB meeting, and the JRFB had decided to forward the suggestion to the Forum for its first meeting. The Forum chair noted that the Forum has no financial or personnel resources to produce a printed brochure nor any authority over any details of the proposal process. He also noted that the task might seem to fall to the Science Support Office, but they too do not have any dedicated resources or mandate for such activities in their contract. G. Camoin

suggested that the concept be discussed at the September 2014 meeting of the ECORD Education and Outreach Task Force, and that they would provide a suggested course of action at the next Forum meeting as part of the review of program-wide E & O activities.

**Action Item:** ECORD E & O Task Force to discuss the concept of a simple IODP proposal brochure at its September 2014 meeting and provide a suggested course of action at the July 2015 Forum meeting.

#### **Agenda Item L: Interactions with Industry**

ECORD had asked for a discussion as to whether there should be an IODP-wide policy on interactions with industry, and ESO was especially interested with respect to potential industry cooperation in MSP drilling in environmentally sensitive regions like the Arctic. It was pointed out that the Forum Terms of Reference do not give the Forum any policy-setting authority, by design of the IWG+, and the three IODP Platform Providers already interact with industry in their own ways. Equally important, there is an IODP-wide statement of environmental principles ratified by the three Facility Boards (<http://www.iodp.org/program-documents>). This was thought to provide sufficient program-wide guidance to govern any decisions by respective Facility Boards/Platform Providers/Funding Agencies on specific cases of their potential interactions with industry.

#### **Agenda Item P: Selection of Next Chair**

The Forum agreed that its next chair, whose term will begin 1 October 2015, should be chosen in time to attend the second Forum meeting in July 2015. The call for nominations for the initial Forum chair was open to individuals from any IODP country, and the Forum agreed this should be the case for future chairs (i.e., there should be no prescribed rotation of the chairmanship among IODP countries). The current IODP structure does not allow for any commingled funding to support the chair, so the financial support for the chair must come from his/her country or consortia. The original Forum Terms of Reference specified that the chair should be selected by a “panel of experts” in an “open process.” For the selection of the first chair, this was coordinated by IODP-MI, but there is no equivalent central management organization in the new Program. After some discussion, the Forum decided that it would name its own “panel of experts,” avoiding any conflict of interest among Forum participants and excluding all program member office representatives, as they would have to separately endorse any nominee(s) from their countries. It might be possible for the Science Support Office to coordinate the call for nominations and collection of any nomination packages to pass on to the selection panel, but that needs to be verified first.

**Action Item:** Forum to name panel of experts to select its next chair in time for July 2015 meeting.

**Action Item:** T. Janecek to contact H. Given as to whether Science Support Office could coordinate call for nominations for next Forum chair and collection of nomination packages to be forwarded to panel of experts.

#### **Agenda Item Q: Future Meetings**

As noted earlier, two special focus themes were identified for the 2015 Forum meeting: a thorough assessment of IODP progress towards meeting the new Science Plan, and a review of educational and outreach activities across the program. A third special purpose was suggested and agreed to: essentially the equivalent of the agendas for the half- or one-day joint Program Member Office meetings that had been held periodically in the old IODP in association with major panel meetings. The Forum agreed that a three-day meeting would be required to accomplish all the objectives of the 2015 meeting. N. Exon had previously offered to host the 2015 meeting in Canberra during the late June to late July timeframe. The Forum converged on the dates of July 8-10 to avoid a number of potential conflicts with other meetings.

**Action Item:** The second Forum meeting to be a three-day meeting July 8-10 hosted by Neville Exon at ANU in Canberra.

The revisions to the Forum Terms of Reference approved at this meeting allow for the possibility that there could be more potential participants at the 2015 meeting than at the inaugural Forum meeting. Thus, it will be important for planning purposes to distribute an initial draft agenda as early as possible.

**Action Item:** The Forum chair to develop an initial draft agenda for the July 2015 Forum meeting for distribution to potential participants no later than the end of 2014.

The Chair suggested that, beginning with the 2016 Forum meeting, the usual time for Forum meetings should be moved to the early fall time period to be better sequenced with the SEP and FB meetings that will normally occur in the first half of the year. He also noted that, since the FB and SEP meetings have been and probably will continue to be held mostly in the US, Japan, and ECORD, Forum meetings represent the best opportunities for partner countries to host major IODP meetings. P. Wang and B. Bansal expressed potential interest on the part of China and India, respectively, and it is possible that Brazil (not represented at the 2014 meeting) might also be interested.

**Action Item:** Partner countries interested in hosting the 2016 Forum meeting should bring their expressions of interest to the 2015 meeting, where the 2016 venue and dates will be selected with input from the next Forum chair.

#### **Agenda Item R: Final Consensus Items**

As the IODP Forum is the only venue for all IODP stakeholders, A. Ishiwatari suggested that it would be appropriate for the Forum to recognize IODP-MI as the central management organization of the previous Program. He also noted that IODP-MI has left an important financial legacy for the new Program in the form of the Asahiko Taira International Scientific Ocean Drilling Prize, established with residual IODP-MI corporate funds. It is planned that this prize be administered by AGU, although it had not yet received final approval from AGU as of the Forum meeting dates. After updates about the status of this Prize, the Forum registered the following consensus:

**Consensus 2014-7.** The IODP Forum recognizes the efforts of the President and staff of IODP-MI that resulted in the successful closeout of the corporation at the end of



March, 2014. The IODP Forum especially welcomes establishment of the new Asahiko Taira International Scientific Ocean Drilling Prize, to be administered by AGU, for young researchers based on the legacy of IODP-MI.

Finally, to acknowledge the efforts of our gracious hosts from KIGAM and K-IODP, the Forum registered two consensuses of appreciation for the field trip and meeting itself.

**Forum Consensus 2014-8:** The IODP Forum thanks Drs. Moon Son, Jae-Ho Oh, and Jin-Seep Kim, as well as our Tourist Guide Bonita Sim, for organizing a wonderful field trip on the day before the Forum meeting. Blessed by good weather, we marveled at the many geological features of the Busan National Geopark, the Gamcheon Culture Village, and an especially fulfilling multi-course Korean lunch.

**Forum Consensus 2014-9:** The IODP Forum thanks our gracious hosts from KIGAM and K-IODP for outstanding organization of a memorable inaugural Forum meeting. The venue in Busan was excellent, the field trip was very stimulating, and our Korean-style meeting dinner was superb. Our sincere thanks go to Drs. Gil Young Kim, Se Won Chang, Young Joo Lee, Jae-ho Oh, Senay Horozal, and graduate students Yongmi Kim and Buyanbat Narantsetseg.