

# PANCH'98 REPORT

29 August 1998  
Durham, United Kingdom

## PANCH'98 Participants

### Members

---

Susan Humphris	WHOI (SCICOM/OPCOM Chair)
Thomas Janecek (Chair)	Florida State University (SCIMP Chair)
Shiri Srivastava	Geological Survey of Canada Atlantic (SSP Chair)
John Tarduno	University of Rochester (ISSEP Chair)

### Guests and Observers

---

Warner Brueckmann	University of Kiel, Germany
John Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
Jeff Fox	Ocean Drilling Program (TAMU)
Dave Goldberg	Borehole Research Group (ODP-LDEO)
Bill Hay	University of Kiel, Germany
Kate Moran	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.

### Apologies

---

Mahlon Ball	US Geological Survey, Denver (PPSP Chair)
Ted Moore	University of Michigan (ESSEP Chair)
Alister Skinner	British Geological Survey (TEDCOM Chair)

# PANCH'98 REPORT

## **A. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting started on Thursday, Aug 29th, 1998 at 8:30 am and ended at 2:00 p.m. The Chairman welcomed the attendees to the meeting, presented a brief overview of the Agenda, and asked if there were any other Agenda items that anyone would like to add. None were suggested.

## **B. New Advisory Structure**

The Panel Chairs were asked to comment on the overall effectiveness of the Advisory Structure (i.e., is it working properly). The general feeling among the Panel Chairs was that the new JOIDES advisory structure, which is about one-year old, is working well. In particular, the panel chairs felt that SCICOM/OPCOM, the SSEPs, SSP, and PPSP were responding well to the needs of the community. Two of the panels, SCIMP and TEDCOM, were seen as less effective. Throughout its first two meetings, SCIMP was felt to be too diverse, overloaded, and unsure of its mandate. The Panel needed to change from a reactive, detail-oriented panel to one that deals more with policy, as well as proactively pursues new technologies that will benefit ODP in obtaining the goals laid out in the Long Range Plan. Recent changes within SCIMP appear to have given the panel a clearer direction. These changes include:

- A more proactive agenda, especially in developing policy for implementation by ODP-TAMU.
- New interactions with SCIMP watchdogs and TAMU lab working groups.
- Regular updates on laboratory status.
- Invitations to experts outside the panel to increase expertise.
- Greater communication among SCIMP members via electronic message boards.

PANCH members also had specific concerns about TEDCOM. Industry attendance record is generally poor and a new mixture of industry/academics is needed. Little advice has been given on a timely manner for engineering development -- a very large aspect of the ODP budget. The Panel Chairs felt TEDCOM needed to be much more proactive in order for it to be effective in helping ODP achieve the goals of the Long Range Plan. PANCH was informed that the JOIDES office is planning a change in the structure of TEDCOM this fall (1998) that should begin address the concerns of the Panel Chairs.

The Borehole Research Group felt that, overall, the new Advisory Structure was providing them with the advice through JOI that they needed to conduct their operations

in an effective manner. They expressed some concerns about potential overlap between TEDCOM and SCIMP providing advice/policy regarding tool and technical developments (and perhaps issues falling through the cracks as a result). The Borehole Research Group feels that review of proposals by the SSEPs is working well, and that BRG is receiving timely information about potential wireline operations as a result.

### **C. Interaction between JOIDES Panels**

PANCH members discussed the interaction (or lack thereof, in some cases) between Panels and between Panels and Operators. Overall, interaction and communication was generally seen as good. However, some concern was expressed that the SSEPs are not as educated about logging and wireline operations as other Panels, and were not receiving the logging information they needed, especially when evaluating proposals. A proactive wireline/logging liaison to the SSEPs was seen as essential.

Several other problems regarding inter-Panel communication need to be addressed. First, the number of liaisons has grown to be quite large. In addition, there are too many liaisons from the U.S., which has both financial and political considerations. To keep the number of liaisons in check, and to ensure a good mix of representatives from member countries, the Panel Chairs are to send requests for liaisons to the JOIDES Office. The JOIDES Office will then contact the appropriate ODP Member offices for their input regarding the selection and potential funding for liaison travel.

### **D. New Proposal Process**

The change to the new pre-proposal/full proposal process was seen by the Panel Chairs as an overall success. Some issues still need attention, however. First, several Panel Chairs felt that the process is still not yet fully understood by the community as too many full proposals are being submitted initially. This issue is one of education and advertisement by the JOIDES office and should diminish in the future. Second, SCIMP is out of the loop on the evaluation process. Although, SCIMP does not comment directly on the science of a proposal, equipment and laboratory space needs may be severely impacted by the scheduling of certain legs. It is important that SCIMP evaluate new proposals put into the system to provide advance planning and address equipment and space issues. Third, the SSEPs may inadvertently lead proponents on, and then group the proposal as a low priority because concerns/issues were not properly addressed by the proponents. The use of active liaisons/watchdogs to contact proponents about problems, especially at the pre-proposal stage, should help address this problem/perception and provide adequate nurturing of pre-proposals to the full-proposal stage.

- External evaluations

External evaluations were seen by the Panel Chairs as very useful to the Program because they bring in the outside community. The perception by the wider scientific community is that the new proposal process has gone a long way to eliminate the

impression of an “insider” club and a lack of rigor in review of ODP science. The Borehole Research Group also indicated that external reviews were helpful in focusing logging needs. They felt the process could be further improved by asking SCIMP for potential reviewers.

Concern was expressed over the workload on reviewers, especially if four reviewers are utilized. A wider list of potential reviewer names is needed. PANCH members agreed that there needs to be some form of follow-up to let reviewers know that their time was well spent and their input appreciated.

- Multi-leg proposals

Multi-leg proposals require unique handling by the SSEPs, especially for planning the second leg. Often the science changes for the second leg (based upon outcome of the first leg). Several questions arose regarding how to deal with these types of proposals. First, what steps can be taken by the SSEPs to provide for a more rigorous review of a second leg? What is the best mechanism to advise proponents they need two legs or that two legs should be compressed into one leg? The Panel Chairs felt the SSEPs are the best Panel/Group to make judgments about the need for more than one leg or to compress two legs into one. The Panel Chairs also felt that it is necessary to have a full review of the second leg proposal before proceeding with scheduling. The JOIDES Office will add a proviso regarding multi-leg proposals to the Proposal Guidelines that will say something like:

“For multi-leg proposals, a review will be conducted after each leg to ensure that subsequent legs are furthering achievement of the overall scientific objectives. The review will be carried out by the SSEPs who will then advise SCICOM on the continuation of the program”..

- Duration of proposals within system

PANCH members discussed the problem of a proposal’s duration within the system. In particular, proposals submitted well before the ship visits a particular geographic area may begin to move down the rankings. In essence, regional rankings begin to take precedence over the global rankings. A potential solution is for the JOIDES Office to only look at what could be addressed/scheduled within a two-year time frame. The Panel Chairs felt this problem of “regional creep” needs to be addressed by SCICOM.

## **E. PPG concept**

The Panel Chairs agreed that the PPGs are very useful concept, but see no sense of urgency among the leaders of these groups. In some respects, the scientific fate of the Program is largely in their hands, with 2003 just around the corner. Unfortunately, few substantial reports (and no proposals) have come forth. There is an urgent need to get new proposals into the system now to get them drilled by 2003. PANCH members felt the JOIDES Office/SCICOM needs to get this point across to the PPGs as soon as possible. In addition, there is a need to communicate to the PPGs that they need to plan beyond 2003, as well as looking at the short term.

PANCH noted that there seems to be some confusion about the reporting structure of the PPGs. PPGs report to the SSEPs. The SCICOM Chair (Humphris) will remind PPG Chairs of this reporting structure. A suggestion was made to change the PPG evaluations by SCICOM from the Spring meetings to the Fall meetings. After some discussion, the decision was made to leave the PPG evaluation at the Spring SCICOM meeting.

The Panel Chairs also discussed the number of liaisons needed for the PPGs. The various Panels had different requirements. For example, SCIMP felt it needed liaisons for the Deep Biosphere and LTO PPGs because there are specific equipment, logistical, and policy needs that a liaison could help address in a timely manner. With other PPGs, SCIMP would simply appoint watchdogs. Similarly, the SSEPs also felt that full-time liaisons were not necessary and they would only need them for specific issues. The SSEPs also felt that SCICOM liaisons to the PPGs were inadvertently subverting the reporting process. Again, there is need to reiterate that the PPGs report to the SSEPs, not to SCICOM members. The SCICOM Chair agreed that SCICOM members would be watchdogs rather than liaisons, which would be the responsibility of the SSEPs. Humphris encouraged the use of watchdogs where possible rather than liaisons in order to reduce costs to the Program.

## **F. Panel Chair Support from JOI**

The Panel Chairs were queried to determine their funding support requirements. The levels of required support varied significantly between the Panels (e.g., no support for SCIMP to larger support needs for the SSEPs, mostly related to copying and mailing costs). Discussion ensued on how to allocate funding without the need for cumbersome reporting. Kate Moran recommended that Panel Chairs send an estimate of their needs to JOI.

## **G. Commitment of Panel Members**

Several Panel Chairs expressed concern over the commitment of members. The Panels need people who are willing to spend the time necessary to attend the meetings and do the necessary pre- and post- meeting work as their prime duty outside the commitments at their home institution. Panel Chairs also need to make sure a few "old timers" who both remember what has happened before and how things get done (corporate memory), remain on the Panels.

Two suggestions were made to impress upon JOIDES Panel Members the level of commitment that is required when they accept positions on a Panel. The first recommendation is that the JOIDES Office send a letter to the ODP Member Office of

the proposed new member that would outline the level of commitment required beyond each regularly scheduled meeting. The second recommendation is that any member missing two meetings in a row will be removed from the panel. The Panel Chairs were urged to notify the JOIDES office of any problems with current panel membership attendance.

## **H. Terms of Service for Panel Chairs**

Terms of service for Panel Chairs are three years. The JOIDES Office requested a listing from each Panel Chair that details the beginning and ending dates of service of each their Panel members.

## **I. Other: Post 2003**

A short discussion was held by PANCH members concerning the work load associated with post-2003 planning . It was noted that many members of the current JOIDES Panels/Groups are actively involved in post-2003 planning. This effort is an additional task (perhaps somewhat unplanned) that must be taken on in addition to the normal Panel tasks. An individual active within ODP but not currently on a Panel is needed to spearhead this effort.