

Draft of Minutes of the 30th TEDCOM Meeting held at the Embarcadero Centre, San Francisco, USA on the 8th July 2002

TEDCOM Intimations to SCICOM

- 1. Regarding the OPCOM Motion 01-02-06 agreeing to limited and specific Engineering Development field trials for short periods within scientific legs, subject to co-chief consultation and approval: TEDCOM note that such an opportunity for the ADCB may be possible on upcoming legs 206 and 209 and for the HRRS on Leg 209. The pre-cruise meetings should be utilised for consultation with co-Chiefs and TAMU on this.**
- 2. This TEDCOM meeting is the last formal one to be held under ODP. The Panel will remain intact and available for consultation until the end of ODP. This will most likely be done using e-mail with the chairs of SCICOM and TEDCOM maintaining contact to effect this as required.**

Those present:

Members:

Hugh Elkins (USA)	Marvin Gearhart (USA)	Masanori Kyo (Japan)
Frank Schuh (USA)	Howard Shatto (USA)	Alister Skinner (UK, Chair)
Axel Sperber (Germany)		
Apologies from:		
Joe Castleberry (USA)	Carole Fleming (USA)	Earl Shanks (USA)
Sigmund Stokka (ESF)	Walter Svendsen (USA)	Brian Taylor (Pacrim)

Guests/Liaisons:

Bruce Ahrendsen (Fugro, standing in for Joe Castleberry)	Jamie Austin (iPC)
Keir Becker (SCICOM Chair)	John Farrell (JOI) Eiichi Kikawa (SCIMP)
Kamata Masahiro (Schlumberger Japan)	Kate Moran (iTAP chair)
Brian Jonasson (ODP-TAMU)	Jeff Schuffert (iSAS Office)
Shinichi Takagawa (OD21)	Arai Yusei (JAPEX)
Apologies from:	
Dave Goldberg (LDEO)	Greg Myers (LDEO) Ted Moore (iPC)

A draft Agenda was issued and adopted for the meeting excepting Item 7 (LDEO Activities) as no one was present from LDEO. The agenda is contained in **Annex 1**.

1. Opening Remarks:

Alister Skinner opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and outlining the timing for this meeting which would be immediately followed by a joint session with the new interim technical panel for IODP, iTAP. This meeting, which will be the last formal meeting planned for TEDCOM under ODP will close off business or hand ongoing items to iTAP.

Self-introduction of all present followed and contact details are contained in **Annex 1**.

2. Apologies for Absence

Alister Skinner intimated that he had received apologies from Members and Liaisons as shown above. Some members had to cancel at the last minutes due to commitments in their own work schedule and this further serves to emphasise that it can be difficult to service the panels.

3. Approval of Final Draft of 29th TEDCOM Minutes

The final draft minutes of the 29th TEDCOM Meeting held at BGS in Nottingham, UK were approved as mailed.

4. Report from JOI

John Farrell outlined the activities currently underway at JOI as the ODP programme winds down. They have prepared a phase out plan for ODP, which will cover a period of five years commencing in FY03. The status of the funding for this plan will be known soon and it is anticipated that there will be no serious difficulties.

JOI will also be responding to NSF regarding the RFP for a non-riser vessel for IODP. There will be an internal competition between 16 academic institutions for the non-riser vessel management. Initial request for letters of interest will be followed by a 90-day response time for the call. It is anticipated that the RFP will be issued in October- November 2002.

Following this there will be a successor programme to support IODP infrastructure and the announcement of opportunity for this is anticipated to come from NSF in early 2003.

The financial support provided by JOI for Arctic Drilling Logistics evaluation under a contract with the Swedish Polar Secretariat will continue to completion of the current contract. JOI is also looking at ways to extend this assistance into an implementation phase in FY03, in conjunction with the European JEODI programme.

The current JOI/USSAC newsletter details the background to the US approach for IODP and more information can be gained from this.

Finally John stressed that the IWG of IODP need to be told that the Arctic Drilling is important and that endorsement and support from IODP for the operations to undertake Lomonosov Ridge Drilling is given as a matter of urgency.

5. Report from Spring SCICOM/OPCOM Meeting

Keir Becker remarked that there was not a lot of work to do at the spring meeting and that most panels were now in the winding-down phase. The table below shows the current panel status.

The TEDCOM recommendation that time be devoted to engineering aspects during a scientific leg was well received and would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as suggested by them.

The TEDCOM concern regarding the demobilization of the JR on completion of ODP was also aired and noted for future discussions on this matter. Keir also stated that there was going to be a meeting on board the vessel during the Victoria Portcall to discuss possible use of the JR immediately after the completion of the ODP contract and possibly before any demobilization. The message to TEDCOM is that the concerns voiced were noted, options are being looked into and the ODP contract can be changed/altered if appropriate.

A replacement non-riser vessel for IODP will not be available before 2005. Brian Jonasson and Kate Moran both said that there is other ship capability available for the new programme. Little

more will be known until an RFP is issued based on the work carried out by the Conceptual Design Committee which, Jamie Austin pointed out, itself highlighted a number of viable options for a new non-riser vessel, including an upgraded Joides Resolution. However the CDC only defined what the scientists wished. It is not, and was not intended to be, an RFP but the basis on which one would be modeled.

The ODP Tool Legacy documents are now on the web. It is not known at this stage whether hard copy is available. There is no information on the LDEO subset.

The phasing out of panel meetings will continue but the panels themselves will continue to exist until the end of ODP and will correspond/convene as necessary. It was not possible to hold the joint TEDCOM/SCIMP meeting planned.

PHASING OUT JOIDES PANEL MEETINGS, 2002-2003

<u>PANEL</u>	<u>MEETINGS IN 2002</u>	<u>MEETINGS IN 2003</u>
EXCOM	2 — Jan and June	1—July
SCICOM	2 — March and Aug	1-2? — March and Aug?
OPCOM	joint with SCICOM	joint with SCICOM
SSEPs	None — iSSEPs only	None
TEDCOM	1 — summer with iTAP	None
SCIMP	1 – June	None
PPSP	1 — June with iPPSP	None
SSP	None — iSSP only	None
PPG's/DPG's	None	None

6. Report on Activities at ODP-TAMU and Shipboard

Brian Jonasson summarized the ODP Tamu Shipboard activities and his PowerPoint presentation is included as Annex 2. All of the legs were very successful.

There were the usual problems with chert on Leg 199, Leg 200 was beset by very bad weather, Leg 201 ran the PCS 17 times and the FPC 6 times, both had some success.

Leg 202 core was not fully processed until Leg 203 there was so much of it. On Leg 203 there was the usual basalt and casing problems associated with any fast-spreading ridge. Leg 204 will have about three times the quantity of special tools of any other leg to date.

Leg 205 continues the activity of instrumenting boreholes by installing osmo-samplers. Leg 206 using a new style of bit will set casing to basement in fast spreading crust by opening out the previously drilled hole of 18 ½” to 20” and emplacing a 16” casing. Axel Sperber asked for more details on the bits as he thought that a bi-centre bit would not allow for reaming of the hole to any great extent. Brian said that these were specially made to do this. Leg 209 will use similar RBI bits to that used on Leg 203 where good bit life was obtained with them.

Kate Moran asked about overcoring to free the APC and John Farrell asked if the AHC improved this operation. Brian confirmed that the AHC gave much better control and enabled more use to be made of advancing with the APC, even if the formation was so stiff that the corer had to be ‘cut out’ by overdrilling.

Alister Skinner asked if Leg 209 could be a candidate for the HRRS as it involves bare rock spud-in. Brian thought that it could be. The TEDCOM recommendation was to try prototype tools when justified and that this could be a case. Brian also felt that there could be a case for the ADCB on Legs 206 and 209. Eiichi Kikawa said that there had been discussion within SCIMP on the use of these tools and that further discussion will take place at the pre-planning meetings. Keir Becker said that if there was not a consensus at those meetings and something needed resolution afterwards then OPCOM could reconvene to resolve the matter. Brian mentioned that although there are cost implications the ADCB, which is owned by ODP, could be put aboard at little cost. The HRRS is more expensive as it involves renting hammers but can be sorted out given time.

Brian then mentioned the plans for demobilisation, which will be in Galveston after a trip from St. John's. Currently the rig cannot function without equipment supplied by NSF. The ship also has to have a full certification by mid 2004 so there is a lot of discussion to take place but there may well be a holding scenario before any demobilisation or reconfiguration.

The AHC Weight on bit filter may be operational on leg 204. There were software problems on Leg 202 but data collection and analysis took place on Leg 203.

The APC methane tool is now operational and may be extended in use to the PCS and HYACE tools. The drilling Sensor Sub is now ready for manufacture. The PCS and HYACE tools now have an autoclave system designed for shipboard use and this will be tested on Leg 204. There are possible extensions to the use of these tools and this is referred to iTAP as ongoing for IODP.

Comment was made on the use of the AHC and how it has improved rotary coring and overdrilling. Alister Skinner asked if the simulation studies intended to aid prediction of performance and setting of the AHC in 'unknown situations' would now ever be done in ODP. Sadly the answer, for a number of reasons, was that it would not be done.

7. Report on Activities at BRG (LDEO) and Shipboard

No report was available for the meeting from LDEO and this agenda item was not discussed.

8. Report on OD21 Activities

Shinichi Takagawa updated the committee with further details of the riser-drilling vessel **CHIKYU**. The vessel was launched in January 2002 and a short video of the launch ceremony for the vessel was shown. None of the drilling infrastructure is yet fitted but work is underway on this with equipment being built in Japan, Norway and USA for this. **Annex 3** has detail provided by Shinichi for the meeting and some detail on this is being taken up by iTAP.

9. TEDCOM to end of ODP

Alister Skinner stated that this was the last planned formal meeting of TEDCOM and Keir Becker confirmed that the committee would remain intact and correspond by e-mail, or be convened if required, up until the last leg of ODP in September 2003.

10. iTAP The interim Technical Committee for IODP

Alister Skinner then asked all round the table to make a comment on TEDCOM and what should or should not be carried forward by iTAP to the future IODP.

Jamie Austin said that TEDCOM had shown what to do and what not to do within a programme and that iTAP should therefore work to take the best forward.

Alister Skinner felt that the new programme should make more use of all available technology than did the existing ODP.

Frank Schuh felt that the programme had gone well and that one needed to be able to take risks and obtain the benefits. ODP were very clever in doing things on Legs or essentially fixed projects.

Although that may not be the most efficient way to do things it was readily adaptable to the situation and the available money. As options came in there was science and engineering trade off and new tools were used where there was a risk but a reasonable chance of success. However with IODP there are going to be 'site specific super ventures' where a lot more homework will be required, there will have to be well designs made and drilling design parameters erected.

The reality of where we are going is very different to where we have been. The science slots were an excellent concept and it is always good to phase stages of success rather than have 'all or nothing'. Howard Shatto was keen to ensure that any new vessel for the programme had good characteristics and that the programme used those to best effect. He felt that the AHC had to be used and further developed and he would strongly advocate that ***simulation studies be used in order that the programme could expect the unexpected in new terrains.***

Alister Skinner endorsed that view and mentioned the valuable work that Hugh Elkins and Peter Heinrichs had put into TEDCOM to ensure that the Passive Compensation was as best it could be before introducing the AHC. This requirement was also brought out by early simulation studies for the DCS and is one of the reasons why TEDCOM have been so insistent that these studies continue to be both essential and useful for the future. Axel Sperber endorsed the use of the AHC and thought that maybe even a secondary system could be needed in the future.

Hugh Elkins explained why Bumper Subs can not be used for compensation and why the industry quickly stopped using them – they are not appropriate for ODP coring either. Industry uses AHC only when required for soft landing so it will never become commonplace on all rigs but has proven to be good for the type of coring done on ODP. He then made comment on the amount of work which will have to be done prior to the drilling of a riser borehole which will need lots of resources whether in-house or not. In most cases a non-riser hole will have to be drilled first. He would like to know where all of this manpower is coming from and how it is to be managed (contracts/in house/mixture?).

Marvin Gearhart was concerned about the finance and whether the structure would allow operation of a cost-effective system. He cited the work being done on coal bed methane which is big business at present but is governed at all times by the need to keep costs down. His observations on ODP were that the financial part does not always make sense but if locked in to various contracts then it is difficult to do other than what was done.

Brian Jonasson felt that there will always be a need for adaptation of technologies and that therefore there will always be a need for an operations planning group. Alister Skinner felt that there was a need to use all available technology and Frank Schuh added that we must learn from the past and the existing technology. Kate Moran said that the new iTAP will not do engineering and therefore would not hesitate to look at what is available across a spectrum of industries to see what is on offer.

Kate then closed this section by commenting on the perceived need for change and could see that there was already progress in restructuring towards iTAP, which would continue.

11. AOB

Keir Becker thanked TEDCOM for their services to ODP and mentioned that both they and PPSP often did not receive the recognition they deserved within the achievements of ODP as they work so much behind the scenes. TEDCOM members appreciated Keir's comments and there being no further business the meeting was closed with the request that members re-convene to a joint inaugural iTAP meeting following a lunch break.

Annex 1

Contact List - Attendees Agenda for Meeting

Contact List - Attendees

Members

Hugh Elkins
Marvin Gearhart
Masanori Kyo
Frank J. Schuh
Howard L. Shatto
Alister C. Skinner
Axel Sperber

E-Mail

helkins@hou.varco.com
mgearhart@rbi-gearhart.com
kyom@jamstec.org
fjschuh@gte.net
hlshatto@cs.com
acsk@bgs.ac.uk
axelsperber@t-online.de

Liaisons/Guests

Yusei Arai yu-ari@japex-net.com
Bruce Ahrendsen BAhrendsen@fugro.com
Jamie Austin jamie@utig.ig.utexas.edu
Kier Becker kbecker@rsmas.miami.edu
John Farrell jfarrell@joiscience.org
Brian Jonasson jonasson@odpemail.tamu.edu
Eiichi Kikawa kikawa@jamstec.org
Kamata Masahiro kamata@fuchinobe.oilfield.slb.com
Kate Moran kate.moran@uri.edu
Jeff Schuffert isasoffice@jamstec.go.jp
Shinichi Takagawa Takagawa@jamstec.go.jp

Draft Agenda for Meeting

ODP TEDCOM 30th Meeting – San Francisco

Draft Agenda – Monday 8th July 2002 am only.

1. Opening remarks (Skinner) 0845hrs
2. Apologies for Absence (Skinner) 0850hrs
3. Approval of Final draft 29th TEDCOM Minutes (Skinner) 0855hrs
4. Report from JOI/NSF 0900hrs
5. Report of OPCOM/SCICOM Spring Meeting (Becker) 0915hrs
6. Report on Activities at TAMU and shipboard (TAMU) 0930hrs
 - Summary of technical highlights of Legs since December 2001 meeting
 - Shipboard developments/progress/requirements for final ODP legs
 - Modifications or revisions to Development plan – to end ODP in 2003
7. Report on Activities at BRG (LDEO) and shipboard (LDEO) 1000hrs
 - Summary of technical highlights of Legs since December 2001 meeting
 - Shipboard developments/progress/requirements for final ODP legs
 - Update on Data monitoring shipboard and downhole
8. Report on OD21 Activities (Masanori) 1030hrs
 - Progress with Vessel and Equipment
11. TEDCOM to end of ODP – mechanism for continuing to provide any necessary technical advice, as required, but without formal meetings. (Skinner/Becker) 1050hrs
12. iTAP – the technical committee for the future (Skinner/Moran) 1110hrs
13. A.O.B. and close of TEDCOM. 1140hrs

The TEDCOM meeting should plan to close by 1200hrs to allow iTAP a full afternoon on the same day.

Annex 2

Information from ODP TAMU (Power Point Presentation)

Annex 3

OD21 Project Information (Power Point Presentation)