

Ridge 2000, Portland, OR
Steering Committee Meeting, Nov. 1, 2010
Meeting Notes taken by Stace Beaulieu

(N.B. - some notes added 26-Nov for context based on post-meeting discussions and emails)

Meeting Notes

0830-0930 Discuss the results & working group summaries from the community meeting. Assess which topics/groups are in good shape for producing I&S papers in a reasonable time frame. Discuss who will take the lead on an Eos summary of the meeting.

Bill L – Counted 16 papers in the plenary yesterday. There seems to be some unevenness in how far along these groups are. Some ready very soon, some have quite a lot more work to do.

Some papers conceived for other members of the ridge community and others are considering broader science community and public.

Dan F – Consider how we as StCom can take some responsibility and coordinate paper-writing activities of the various groups.

Barbara R – Mentioned special volume of Oceanography. NSF has supported efforts like that on the order of \$50K. *(Note that in subsequent discussions with Ellen Kappel it seems like the final cost of the Oceanography ‘Seamounts’ issue was about \$85k)*

Laurent M – People in his group (Mantle Melt) are waiting for R2K StCom to tell them where/when to write something for a more general audience.

Dan F – We as StCom could propose a Table of Contents for an Oceanography issue focusing on Ridge 2000 integrated research.

Milene C – Her sense was that each group wants to do a paper for scientific audience first. Maybe next year to do papers for more broad audience.

Deb K – Recommends Scientific American articles. While Oceanography is a good idea, we might want to approach Earth and Planetary Science reviews. Could be a very significant contribution if there was a review for each ISS. Would be better than Ridge Theoretical Institute volumes.

George L – Another example is Annual Reviews of Marine Science. This is available online.

Deb K – The “research channel” (<http://www.researchchannel.org/>) reaches 30 million households now – could develop vent program via NSF proposal *(note that Debbie emailed around additional outreach organizations/venues)*

Dan F – Has that channel done any programs on R2K-related science recently?

Barbara – There is some funding in Informal Ed at NSF

(http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=nsf10565&org=NSF) for programs such as NOVA, and this sort of effort may be a possibility.

Dan F – There is no question that we need to re-invent ourselves to reach out to the public to promote our science.

Deb K – There’s a YouTube just for education that is not blocked out of schools (<http://www.youtube.com/education?b=400>).

Dan F – We haven’t done - as an office - as best we could to link outreach material related to ridge science, partly because we don’t have the staff to accomplish this.

Vicki F – MediaBank does get a relatively high amount of traffic online. Overall she thought the meeting went very well. Sensors WG is ready-to-go with their paper. Should they wait for a special issue of Oceanography? What is our audience?

George – L&O: Methods?

Dan – Sea Technology?

Deb – Would like to see sensors paper in same special issue with R2K science.

Dan – Agrees.

Vicki – Alternative scenario is to put the broad paper out right now and then do targeted tech papers for the special volume of Oceanography. Some comments about how the StCom should guide community to what resources to use online, e.g. Encyclopedia of Earth.

Deb – Link as much as possible to Ocean Literacy Principles

(http://oceanliteracy.wp.coexploration.org/?page_id=164).

Dan – We need help with this as an office. We don't have any subcontract with E&O for next year. Are there proposals we should be submitting to NSF as an office or as StCom to enhance these outreach efforts? NSF Informal Ed?

Jim H – I wish we had this meeting a year ago. I think this meeting worked well. Biogeochem Processes WG went very well with young researchers “fired up” and involved and committed to writing these reviews. He was also part of the Endeavour ISS WG, and they are making real progress in some areas, but perhaps not in the mantle-to-microbe synthesis.

Dan – Is this due to modeling? Access to data?

Jim H – Do the Oceanography issues reach the general public? Can it be hit online by undergrads? How do we reach the 15-25 yr age group?

Deb – Maybe we as R2K program could put in a proposal with museum / aquarium / exportable exhibit. E.g., American Museum of Natural History?

Dan – This should be a multi-institutional proposal.

Barbara – COSEEs are linked to aquariums. In her experience they are looking for content.

Laurent – Smithsonian Ocean Portal online.

<http://ocean.si.edu/ocean-science/deep-ocean-exploration/research-and-exploration/>

Dan – No shortage of “entry points”. StCom please send “favorite” links for outreach efforts to R2K office. (*Note: Deb sent some but other StCom members should follow up on this and make suggestions*)

Barbara – Overall good impressions of meeting. It will be interesting to see 12-18 mos from now what actually gets out.

George – We have a lot of young people who are ready to jump in. Very pleased with discussions at Lau, really think there's a mantle-to-microbe paper there. Time frame for publication of papers from this meeting is really 2012, depending on how fast the papers can be written for review process. We need to keep the momentum going. R2K office needs to support these writing efforts by helping communication, e.g., teleconferences.

Dan – Are there ways in which the StCom can effectively “prod” the production of these papers?

Ken R – Overall - happy with the collaborative nature and energy of the meeting. Still feels like there is “fuzziness” in people's understanding of reviews vs. non peer-reviewed, public legacy information. The more people you reach – the more important it is to get the information right. We need to be very strategic. We need an E&O proposal. We don't want people going off on their own and doing this. Many of the groups did not do anything before this meeting. It takes constant prodding. These papers won't happen unless we make an effort as StCom. We need

the R2K office to keep track of how these paper-writing efforts are going. His main point is that the coordination cannot stop, or the energy will diffuse away.

Barbara – Can we use the wiki site to monitor this? Maybe the office could set deadlines for WGs to input to wiki.

Vicki – There was more wiki use this year than last year.

Ken – By the 3rd day of the meeting, some people still could not edit a wiki page.

Vicki – Talked about upgrading to Drupal 6.

Bill – Likes the idea of encouraging all groups to move forward in unison. Having a page with timelines marked as met (or not met), could be effective to use peer pressure.

Note: current wiki page for post-meeting follow-ups:

<http://ridge2000.marine-geo.org/community-meetings/october-2010/post-meeting-follow-ups>

Jim – Wiki-phobia. Often due to having to learn a new software every time.

Rick C – Carlson’s rule: Make sure people know what to do. Make sure it’s painless.

Ken – Aspects of the Wiki that are static should be on the regular R2K website.

Dan F – How do we as a committee push these WG papers? Do we push for telecon with WG Leaders every couple months?

Vicki – The “wiki” is set up as a “collaboratory” not as material to provide to the outside world.

Ken – We need to get our collective knowledge codified.

Barbara – Maybe the R2K Office could ask the WG Leaders by Thanksgiving – submit in one page a summary of the science of what you are doing. This could be a one-page summary of state-of-knowledge for people to log onto the wiki to see.

Vicki – Points out item “8” (abstract) on the list that all WGs were asked to provide at end of meeting.

Ken – Should be more links between wiki and R2K Data Portal.

Denny – He thinks the meeting was very successful in producing output from participants.

Ultimate syntheses of Lau and JdF need geophysical data that will be processed in a year or two. He disagrees with Ken - Wikipedia is what gets the most hits. StCom needs to instruct the Office on what their activities should be. Certainly one activity should be coordinating the papers from this meeting. Another effort should be greater levels of outreach through the web. Third was that he was surprised that there was not really a vision for the future. We need to come up with a new vision for 15 yrs down the road. This is incumbent on the StCom. Needs to be some serious visioning. This can be aided by the Office. At least try to instill the organic development of these ideas.

Barbara – There is some funding at NSF for these visionary activities, e.g. RCN, previous workshops like FUMAGES.

Dan F – RCNs (http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=11691). Groups within the R2K community can organize.

Ken – But if we want a different perspective, then it makes sense not to have this done by the R2K office. Our future lies beyond the MOR level. Should not limit this to the future that we can conceive of.

Dan – C-DEBI program had roots in R2K and ridge science. We should stimulate more of these organic spin-offs.

Rick – Really impressed with the meeting in several ways – esp. participation. Number of participants, a lot of students and postdocs. WGs that he visited seemed more active than last year’s meeting. Ridge science is worth an investment in a coordination office. He doubts it’ll be another program with a capital “P” but should have some coordination with a lowercase

“p”. Important to have a “nerve center”, some kind of focal organ to coordinate activities and foster communication. Also a way for senior people to mentor junior folks.

Bill – Comment on publication output from this meeting – each group saw their “charge” in a different way. We should be appreciative of the diversity of reviews that will come out of this meeting. Do we need to go back to the WGs and let them know that we’d welcome other publication types?

Dan – Consensus that a lot was accomplished during the meeting, and that it is highly variable among groups. It will take a little bit of time to digest what was produced and then formulate a response. A week or two for folks to populate the wiki site.

ACTION ITEM Dan will send out message to WG Leaders at end of this week. Timeline: before AGU for some organized info to the wiki.

DAN WILL REMIND ABOUT R2K TELECON ReadyTalk accounts.

Each StCom member should go thru the wiki content for a specific WG and “see” what progress was made. He did not see much cross-TWG interaction, except for mantle and crustal folks cross-fertilization. (This was seconded later by Laurent.)

Ken – We should not evaluate our own groups (for those StCom members who are WG Leaders).

There was some discussion of an R2K Facebook page during break.

After break – continued discussion of Wikipedia as potential outreach.

Dan – I need to know if this is an effort that we’d like to go forward with? We could, as a StCom, promote this in the community, and/or the Office could start doing something on this as a priority.

Vicki – Could do a chron that crawls the Wikipedia page and checks the phrase or link to notify MGDS folks if it disappears.

Dan / Jim – could this be an undergraduate project?

Jim – Would it be worthwhile to talk to people at NOAA Ocean Exploration office to see how they do online outreach?

Barbara – She says she will do this as an action item – to find out information from NOAA about whether they have Wikipedia-savvy folks.

DAN WILL EMAIL TO THE GROUP SPECIFICS ABOUT WHAT HE WANTS REPORTED ON – INCLUDING identify “nuggets” that could be promoted as NSF best hits highlights.

Dan – Let’s revisit which group(s) individual StCom members will “take on”.

Task is to review what each WG has on the wiki, assess what’s there, what’s missing.

TASK ASSIGNMENTS FOR STCOM MEMBERS:

Biogeochem WG (including all 3 subgroups) – George L.

Biogeogr/Adaptn WG – Jim H.

Chem/heat fluxes – Bill L.

Crustal controls – Dennis G.

Education/outreach – Deb K.

Events/responses – Milene C.

Mantle melt – Ken R.

Sensors/tech – Deb K.

EPR ISS – Laurent M.

Lau ISS – Vicki F.

JdF Endeavour ISS – Dan F.

DAN ACTION ITEM to ask Eos about submitting a report for this meeting.

(Note: Dan and Ken have discussed post-meeting several times and are developing a draft of an Eos article. Similarly, the 3 E&O WG leaders are also considering submitting an Eos article on R2K E&O activities)

Ken – All papers that come out of this meeting should have acknowledgments as specified in the working group protocols (a PDF pertaining to this was sent out before the Meeting, and is posted on the wiki site).

0930-1130 Discussion about ‘end of program’ documentation. Most important aspects of this are to ensure both the legacy of RIDGE and Ridge 2000 research, provide well compiled syntheses of multidisciplinary research for future researchers and students, and provide well written and illustrated lay articles that showcase how important these focused programs have been to our development of ideas about MOR science and its relevance to broad earth/ocean research.

Laurent – MARGINS program upon closing collected white papers that were distributed to the whole community, an efficient way of showing what the program achieved. R2K should collect “nuggets” to show what the program achieved. This may be through an Oceanography issue.

Jim – Do we have to submit any end-of-program documentation to NSF?

Barbara – NO. You could do summaries of 500 hundred words or less with image and catchy title (imagination-driving) can be posted to NSF website for NSF greatest hits. Could have a few of these for different key topics and cross disciplinary problems.

Laurent – StCom could identify some people to target for these sorts of contributions.

Stace– We should also put this request out to the community IN AN R2K E-NEWS, with example of previous NSF press release.

Dan – Is there a need for a “mid-ocean ridge” website? Probably better to link existing content.

Ken – Need to show up better in search engines. Need to insert more links to high profile websites, e.g. NSF.

Dan – In terms of legacy, we sent out an email to the community about references to include in the R2K refs database. Right now there is not an automatic way to get refs into the R2K database.

Vicki – We have harvested what was on R2K webpage, and then Stace sent lists of refs extracted from wiki. Vicki gave a short online demonstration of refs input content type on Drupal site.

Dan – Could we put R2K DLS ppts on R2K website or on MediaBank?

Deb – Watermarking the ppts with R2K and/or NSF logos would be important. Original Ridge planning meeting on Queen Mary – those talks used to be on the website. These should be on the R2K website; they used to be online. **THIS SHOULD BE AN ACTION ITEM FOR THE R2K OFFICE IN 2010-2011**

Database discussion, which leads into discussion of data products from NDSF

Dan – Part of the legacy has to do with the database and R2K Data Portal.

Vicki – Gave a brief report on latest MGDS activities.

Dennis – Last year the number one issue for StCom was data compliance. Was there improvement in this over the past year?

Vicki/Dan – Yes, cultural shift is well underway.

Some discussion of metadata and data available from R2K Data Portal.

Dan – How can we feed modeling into the database?

Bill – His models are publically available but, each is tailored to a particular application. Would need a “metadescription” and a contact point if models were made available on a database.

Laurent – Variety of models is as big as the variety of datasets.

Some more discussion of how to incorporate models (Bill’s types and Laurent’s types) into database.

Dan – Asks NSF Program managers for their perspective.

Barbara – IEDA database facility cooperative agreement. MGDS is being incorporated into this facility that is NSF-sponsored. Point source data, e.g. water chemistry, is far behind.

Dan – Last StCom Mtg had discussion about data from NDSF vehicles. R2K still has one field program that will use NDSF vehicles next year (Johnson/Tivey – MEF heat flow experiment). Making sure that we as a community can keep proposal pressure up so that we keep the NDSF moving forward with strong schedules and technology development as appropriate.

THERE WAS A REQUEST TO ADD A DISCUSSION ABOUT NDSF VEHICLE DATA BY THE STCOM – DAN INDICATED HE WOULD RECUSE HIMSELF BECAUSE HE IS FROM WHOI WITH NDSF LINKS – STACE REMAINED TO TAKE NOTES – NOTES BELOW ARE CRYPTIC IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE MEMO FROM R2K STCOM TO DESSC TO BE DEVELOPED AND DISCUSSED – NO ATTRIBUTIONS ARE MADE FOR THIS PORTION OF THE STCOM DISCUSSION:.

Probably the most important issue right now is renavigation & improved navigation products to associate samples collected on different cruises.

Question asked - who needs to have the pressure put on them. How can we fix this problem?

Discussion about of Alvin and Jason navigation, user interface for Virtual Van, procedures by which scientists obtain data during the cruise.

Question asked about whether there is a need for more human resources to help improve NDSF data quality and provision.

Problems suggest that there needs to be more direction from the NDSF management and WHOI to prioritize NDSF data products delivered to science and the MGDS.

Discussion of drafting a letter from R2K StCom to DESSC to say this is an absolute priority to provide best data products, especially with pressure from NSF for data management and products.

A letter from R2K StCom will be sent to DESSC prior to the December DESSC Meeting at AGU.

(Note: this letter was drafted by StCom and sent to DESSC by the R2K Office, this issue is on the DESSC agenda for the Dec. Meeting).

1130-1230 Discussion about future R2K related meetings. How to stimulate the community; discuss any action items from the Day-2 afternoon plenary where we tried to solicit ideas and champions for future meetings.

George – Types of meetings could be RTIs, Chapman Conference, Gordon Conference, small meetings. Would NSF be interested in student support to attend Gordon Conf on a bi-annual basis? Gordon Conf tends to give money for the speakers. Encourage international participation, too. *Email from George post-meeting: Gordon Conference proposal deadline June 1, 2011 (<http://www.grc.org/proposals.aspx>).*

Deb – Proposals for Gordon conferences are due in June, so wouldn't meet until 2012 if proposal successful. Should try for a venue in the shorter-term.

Rick – NSF will not be able to fund a meeting next year thru the R2K Office. There is an option of a workshop proposal for \$50K without peer review.

Stace emailed post-meeting: If you go to the -new- Jan. 2011 NSF guidelines, Chapter II:

http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappguide/nsf11001/gpg_2.jsp

Scroll down to section D. Special Guidelines, and go to 8. Proposals for Conferences, Symposia and Workshops

Email reply from Barbara: not tied to regular program target dates, but you need to ask permission and get guidance from the program prior to submitting

George – Aim for this type of proposal to be submitted by early 2011, for meeting in late summer 2011?

Dennis – Ideal world would be small meetings to follow-up on what was done here. StCom can make this recommendation to NSF. A large ridge results meeting might not be appropriate or as valuable right now.

Dan – Agrees that we don't need another big meeting in next 8 mos. How do we help smaller groups get together in the next several mos?

Jim/Laurent – What do we want in 2011? We don't need a "wind down" meeting. We need a future directions meeting. If the program is over in 2012, then we need this in 2011.

Vicki – A future directions meeting sounds like it might need a workshop to submit proposal for.

Ken – This should be strategic and not arise directly from R2K StCom.

Dennis – Should communicate to the community that the StCom will not generate proposal for "futures" workshop.

[Note: Later, Laurent says that he wants the StCom to take some initiative on this. And it's not too early now. Ken – Suggests a sentence on the email to meeting participants about how this was a capstone meeting.]

Lunch discussion focused on whether there was any way for NSF to support salary and/or for travel for I&S activities?

Rick – He will go back to NSF with the idea of supplemental support for interdisciplinary implications outside the scope of original proposals.

Dan – Should R2K StCom submit memo to NSF Program Managers to state the problem?

Rick – Yes, we need statement of the problem. Second, there must be a statement that this is a mechanism that would be fruitful.

Barbara – Does not think this needs to be submitted in writing. She thinks she and Rick need to go back and talk with program management at NSF to explore options for potential solutions to this difficulty in integration and synthesis. That is how this was left.

(Note: About a week or so after the StCom, Barbara reported that she and Rick had discussed this within OCE management and they were not receptive to allowing supplements for additional small meetings or support for I&S activities, OUTSIDE the normal proposal

mechanism. So – PIs needed additional support for I&S activities (e.g., small meetings, salaries, travel, etc.) must submit via the NSF proposal process).

Dan – presented R2K Office activities and budget summary. NSF is providing some support directly to MGDS (not as R2K sub-contract), which includes the R2K Data Portal. Appears to be a small amount (~\$20k) of funding left in the FY 2009-2010 budget. The question was asked as to whether we can use this for the StCom to meet once next year?

George – Example would be an additional day with DESSC meeting in Woods Hole.

Jim – But the E&O part of budget was cut out.

Laurent – Thinks that the R2K community can be represented by an outreach effort from R2K Office.

Dan – Specifically asked NSF Program Managers if he and Stace were lead PIs (from R2K office) on an outreach proposal focused on R2K if it would it be a problem?

Barbara – It might actually be more powerful to come from the R2K office.

(Note: Stace emailed Dan copy of proposal submitted earlier this year for hydrothermal vents on “Science-on-a-Sphere”; the R2K office will pursue these ideas with others in the community).

1330-1530 Future of MOR science. How do we energize the MOR community and deep-submergence research communities and NSF to ensure that multidisciplinary science continues to be nurtured and supported?
Brief NSF commentary on recent events re: the R2K Program Solicitation.

Dan – Mentioned he has had some conversations with Pete Girguis, Chair of DESSC. The R2K community has some members on DESSC.

George – Sees this meeting as re-energizing proposals for use of deep-submergence vehicles. Some discussion with NSF program managers about limited funding for field research.

Dan – What can the R2K StCom do to help?

Ken – Worried about distracting people from doing the scientific papers that will be the legacy of the program.

Rick – It is probably a good idea in the near future for someone to come forward and submit a workshop proposal for a “futures” workshop, but clarifies not to propose a new program.

Barbara – Not in full agreement, b/c of the move away from segregated pots of money restricted to certain programs.

Some discussion of MOU between NSF and NASA / Astrobiology and whether these multi-agency programs can be helpful. It was noted that there have been some successful science/field programs outside of R2K focused on global MOR and hydrothermal vent exploration between NSF, NASA and NOAA, but these are usually single programs and hard to get funded.

Further discussion of whether R2K StCom should put effort into vision for future of MOR science.

Jim – As it is a winding down of R2K, it is also a ramping up for what comes next.

Bill – There is a responsibility to facilitate the R2K network, as maintained by the R2K Office.

Barbara – What is the fear? That if R2K goes away – that you will lose the cross-disciplinary communication? Clarifies that an inter-disciplinary proposal is not hard to fund, but rather hard to review. Requires more work ahead of time, with program managers. The point was made that Biological Oceanography program at NSF appeared to be progressively disconnected from

R2K science, and Chemical Oceanography has only funded a few R2K programs. R2K scientists need to work on engagement of programs other than MGG.

Deb – We need to look outside NSF to foundations, for example Sloan Foundation's Deep Carbon program. Our program is ending right when we can ask some of the most sophisticated questions. There is no way to do an inter-disciplinary project for less than a million dollars.

1530-1630 R2K Steering Committee Membership – discuss possible rotations, size of committee and role(s) that each member is willing to take on during the last 12-18 months of the Program.

Dan – Does anyone feel that they need to rotate off? Ken, Milene, and Spahr have been on the longest at this point.

Dennis – Might not need to bring a new person on at the end of the program.

Deb – What about bringing on a real young person?

Milene – What about two new young people as members? We could meet at AGU Fall Mtg.

(Note: It was agreed that the R2K Office would send around a calendar to see who among the StCom members would be at AGU and available to meet).

Laurent – What do we mean by young?

Dennis – Early career means pre-tenure.

Ken – What about taking on specific roles?

Laurent/Deb – Young people could be integrated into futures discussion, maybe looking into social networking mechanisms.

Jim – Would want to protect these persons too, to not burden them with too much administrative work prior to tenure.

Bill – We should not ask for letters of interest or resumes from these folks.

1630-1700 R2K Data Portal – Status of data compliance and References Database.

(Note: This was discussed earlier in the meeting in the lead up to the additional agenda item relating to NDSF data policies).

E&O activities – Stace mentioned expansion of DLS mailing list using various other lists at WHOI education and elsewhere. (E&O was also discussed earlier in the meeting).

Meeting ended at 1600.