IGCP Project No.: <u>559</u>



## IGCP Scientific Board Scientific Review of NEW Project Proposals

## SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT: Crustal Architecture and Images

Project Leader(s) (and	The proposal lists 15 members of the Working Group, and it is not
their Countries)	clear who, apart from proposer Bruce Goleby, Australia, and Project
	Business Manager D.M. Finlayson, Australia, will be Project Leaders.
Proposed Duration of	5 years
Project	
<b>IGCP Funding Requested</b>	15.000 \$USD
<b>Proposed External Funds</b>	\$USD
<b>Project Theme Category</b>	Geoscience and Water
(select only one category)	Geohazards
	Earth Resources
	Global Change and the Evolution of Life
	x Deep Earth
	Other topic
EVALUATION SCORE	1 = Poor - Strongly Disagree
LEGEND TO BE USED	2 = Low - Disagree
AS APPROPRIATE	3 = Average - Neutral
BELOW:	4 = High - Agree
BELOW.	5 = Excellent - Strongly Agree
Scientific Achievements:	Comments: The project seeks to understand the influence of crustal
The project will clearly	architecture and tectonic processes on landscapes, surface geology
generate new and/or	and natural hazards, mainly based on seismic imaging techniques. It
exciting scientific	is extremely broad in that it seeks to understand major geological
achievements, results,	processes in the outer 50-70 km of the Earth.
scientific ideas, and/or data.	
Evaluation Score:	$\square$ 1 $\square$ 2 $\square$ 3 $\times$ $\square$ 4 $\square$ 5
Project Objectives: The	Comments: The scientific objectives are extremely broad and are
-	therefore aligned with IGCP, UNESCO and IUGS. This is a
scientific objectives are	
aligned with IGCP,	successor project to IGCP 474.
UNESCO and IUGS, and	
they provide a basis for	
future research?	
Esselvania e Ca	
Evaluation Score:	

	Comments: Most Working Group members come from developed
proposal identifies the	countries such as Australia, USA, Canada, Spain, Netherlands,
number, the geographic	Russia, Japan, New Zealand, Finland, and only one definite member
distribution and types of	from China is listed.
scientific disciplines that	
will contribute meeting	
IGCP standards. (e.g.	
participation of developing	
countries)	
Evaluation Score:	
Project Meetings: The	Comments: The project will organize and sponsor deep seismic
proposal identifies future	profiling meetings at IUGG 2008 (Norway) and 2011 (Australia) and
meetings, workshops,	at IGC 2012 (Australia). Seismic imaging specialist technical
conferences, short courses	meetings will also be arranged. These meeting s appear to focus on
and other capacity building.	seismic imaging and are not really multidisciplinary.
Evaluation Score:	$\square$ 1 $\square$ 2 $\square$ 3 $\square$ 4 $\square$ 5
Project Collaboration: The	Comments: This is a successor project to IGCP 474, but no
proposal identifies plans for	collaboration with other IGCP Projects.
collaboration with other	condociation with other rocer riojects.
IGCP projects.	
roer projects.	
Evolvetion Cooper	$\square$ 1 $\square$ 2 $\square$ 2 $\square$ 3 $\square$ 4 $\square$ 5
Evaluation Score:	
Project Work Plan: The	Comments: The work plan is excellent and the development of a web
work plan and schedule for	site is the main target of the project. The symposia appear to be too
the next year is appropriate and feasible.	narrow in focus (only seismic profiling and imaging) and are not truly
and leasible.	multidisciplinary.
Evaluation Score:	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
Project Communication:	Comments: Project communication will be at a very high level with
The proposal identifies	this group. The communication is by meeting of the working group at
plans for future scientific	geophysical conferences. Publication will presumably be in
	1
publications (e.g. peer-	conference volumes and internet, journals.
reviewed journals), informal	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts,	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs,	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for	1
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).	conference volumes and internet, journals.
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:	conference volumes and internet, journals.
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:  Project Website: The	conference volumes and internet, journals.  1 2 3 4 x 5  Comments: Development of a website is the main purpose of the
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:  Project Website: The proposal provides a clear	conference volumes and internet, journals.  1 2 3 4 x 5  Comments: Development of a website is the main purpose of the project, and the proposal provides a clear and convincing plan for the
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:  Project Website: The proposal provides a clear plan for the project website	conference volumes and internet, journals.  1 2 3 4 x 5  Comments: Development of a website is the main purpose of the
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:  Project Website: The proposal provides a clear plan for the project website including ongoing	conference volumes and internet, journals.  1 2 3 4 x 5  Comments: Development of a website is the main purpose of the project, and the proposal provides a clear and convincing plan for the
reviewed journals), informal publications (e.g. abstracts, guidebooks, textbooks) and others (e.g. internet access to data bases, TV programs, exhibits, public briefings for decision makers)).  Evaluation Score:  Project Website: The proposal provides a clear plan for the project website	conference volumes and internet, journals.  1 2 3 4 x 5  Comments: Development of a website is the main purpose of the project, and the proposal provides a clear and convincing plan for the

IGCP Funding: The	Comments: The money requested is quite high relative to other IGCP
requested funding is	projects. Website development is part of the research activities
appropriate and adequately	and should be funded from external sources.
justified.	
Evaluation Score:	□1 □2 x □3 □4 □ 5
<b>External Funds</b> : The extent	Comments: No information is provided on external funding. It is noted
of external funding is	that Geoscience Australia will host and maintain the website.
appropriate and sufficient?	
Evaluation Score:	1  2  x  3  4  5
Societal Relevance: The	Comments: The proposed database will provide an excellent point from
benefits to society are clear,	which to launch many possible projects of society benefit. For
well-founded and justified.	example, in the mining industry, in geological risk, or in land use
J	assessment.
<b>Evaluation Score:</b>	$\square$ 1 $\square$ 2 $\square$ 3 x $\square$ 4 $\square$ 5
RECOMMENDAT	TIONS ON THE BASIS OF THE ABOVE ASSESSMENT:
RECOMMENDAT	TIONS ON THE BASIS OF THE ABOVE ASSESSMENT:
	]2
Overall Score: 1	] 2
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia)	] 2
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted)	2
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted)	2 3 x 4 5  ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below)
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support	2 3 x 4 5  ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) ted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically
Overall Score: 1  Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the project of the pro	2 3 x 4 5  ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:  There is no plan to show how	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding in next year based on comments (see below) ted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given by these data are to be integrated into tectonic models;
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:  There is no plan to show how There is almost no participat	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given to these data are to be integrated into tectonic models; ion of scientists from developing countries;
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:  There is no plan to show how There is almost no participat	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding in next year based on comments (see below) ted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given by these data are to be integrated into tectonic models;
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:  There is no plan to show how There is almost no participat It is not made specifically cleans.	ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given to these data are to be integrated into tectonic models; ion of scientists from developing countries; ear what the advances for science will be by having these database
Project should be (select on x Accepted and Financia Provisionally be accepted Revised and resubmitted Rejected and not support Comments/Conditions: This highly distinguished, the proby reviewers:  There is no plan to show how There is almost no participat It is not made specifically cleans.	ally one): ally one): ally Supported ed for one year without funding d next year based on comments (see below) rted s is an excellent proposal, and the working Group is scientifically ject has extremely broad aims. However, some suggestions are given by these data are to be integrated into tectonic models; ion of scientists from developing countries;