

**JOIDES Executive Committee**  
**Oslo, Norway 24 - 25 June, 1996**  
**Draft Minutes**

**JOIDES Executive Committee - Meeting Participants**  
**Oslo, Norway 24 - 25 June, 1996**

**Executive Committee - EXCOM**

---

Helmut Beiersdorf	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Hannover, Germany
James Briden (Chair)	Dept. of Earth Sciences, Oxford University, United Kingdom
Otis Brown	Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami
Brent Dalrymple	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University
Robert Detrick	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Robert Duce	College of Geosciences & Maritime Studies, Texas A&M University
Olav Eldholm	European Science Foundation (Consortium for Ocean Drilling)
Margaret Leinen	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island
John Ludden	Centre de Recherches Petrographiques et Geochimiques (CRPG-CNRS), France
Larry Mayer	University of New Brunswick, Australia - Canada Consortium
John Mutter	Columbia University, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
Arthur Nowell	School of Oceanography, University of Washington
John Orcutt	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego
Paul Stoffa	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin
Asahiko Taira	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Brian Taylor	School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii

**EXCOM Liaisons**

---

David Falvey	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
Jeff Fox	Science Operator (ODP-TAMU)
David Goldberg	Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO)
Donald Heinrichs	National Science Foundation (United States)
Alan Mix	Oregon State University (PCOM Liaison)

**Guests and Observers**

---

Pamela Baker-Masson	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
J Paul Dauphin	US National Science Foundation
Ross Heath	Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, California
Hajimu Kinoshita	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Kazuhiro Kitazawa	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Shigeo Kuriki	MONBUSHO (Japan)
Tom Loutit	Australian Geological Survey Organisation, Canberra
Bruce Malfait	US National Science Foundation
Dietrich Maronde	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn (Germany)
Julian Pearce	University of Durham, U.K., (PCOM Chair)
Takeo Tanaka	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Akira Ueda	STA (Japan)

**JOIDES Office**

---

Kathy Ellins  
Julie Harris  
Colin Jacobs

Executive Assistant and US Liaison  
Office Manager  
Executive Assistant and Science Co-ordinator

## EXCOM MOTIONS AND CONSENSUS STATEMENTS

**EXCOM Motion 96-2-1**

EXCOM approves the minutes of the last meeting as a true record.

*Proposed: Nowell, Seconded: Orcutt*

*Unanimous (1 Absentee)*

**EXCOM Motion 96-2-2**

EXCOM approves the FY97 Science Plan.

*Proposed: Orcutt, Seconded: Nowell*

*Unanimous*

**EXCOM Motion 96-2-3**

1. The EXCOM endorses the concept of a 3-tier planning structure for ODP that includes:
  - a) long and short-term science, technology and operations planning;
  - b) detailed development of themes and thematic review of proposals; and
  - c) programmatic proposal planning (working groups).
2. The EXCOM endorses the concept of separating long-term strategic planning from shorter-term operations strategy by:
  - a) the formation of a Science Advice Committee (SCICOM) that will be responsible for long-term strategic science, technology and budget planning and for accountability of the ODP to the Long Range Plan. This committee should have proportional representation, but EXCOM urges PCOM to develop a consultative mechanism with the ODP members to maintain a thematic balance;
  - b) the formation of an Operational Advice Committee (OPCOM) that will interact with SCICOM and be responsible for the shorter-term scientific, technical and operational planning necessary to develop each year's scientific drilling.
3. The EXCOM endorses the concept of establishing two thematic review panels (Earth's Environment, Earth's Interior) responsible for:
  - a) advising and interacting with SCICOM on thematic development within ODP;
  - b) obtaining reviews of drilling proposals, and evaluating and synthesizing those reviews for SCICOM;
  - c) communicating and interacting with programmatic planning groups (a.k.a. working groups).
4. The EXCOM endorses the concept of having SCICOM establish programmatic planning groups of finite lifetime. These planning groups will use unsolicited, solicited, and self-developed proposals to develop or contribute to mature drilling proposals.

Programmatic Planning Groups will be established based on: SCICOM perception of need and/or recommendations of other JOIDES committees and/or requests from global programs and/or recommendations of other individuals in JOIDES.

*Proposed: Leinen, Seconded: Beiersdorf*

*Unanimous*

**EXCOM Consensus 96-2-4**

EXCOM requests that PCOM consider the following issues with respect to the new structure and committees proposed for ODP.

**SCICOM:**

Which service panels/committees have a role in guiding the long term strategic planning of ODP and how will SCICOM receive input from them?

**OPCOM:**

- a) To whom should this committee report?
- b) Who should chair this committee given the strong leadership role that we have identified for the SCICOM chair?
- c) How many members should be on this committee and how should they be chosen?
- d) Which panels/committees have a role in guiding the yearly operational program of drilling and how will OPCOM receive input from them?
- e) Should this committee be a subcommittee of SCICOM?

**Thematic Review Panels:**

- a) How will these panels deal with thematic issues that cut across both panels?
- b) Is one meeting sufficient?

**Working Groups:**

Name and number?

**EXCOM Motion 96-2-5**

EXCOM undertakes to work with the ODP national member committees and funding agencies to seek the necessary increased funding to carry out the objectives of the LRP.

EXCOM requests JOI to develop a strategic plan to secure funding for FY98 renewal and Phase IV operations and report on this to the next EXCOM meeting in February.

*Proposed: Taylor, Seconded: Brown*

*Unanimous*

**EXCOM Consensus 96-2-6**

EXCOM endorses the new ODP Publication Strategy proposed by JOI in response to the NSF Inspector General's Report with the aim of enhancing the usefulness and visibility of products of ODP science.

**EXCOM Consensus 96-2-7**

EXCOM advises JOI to maximise the scope for innovation in evaluation of bids for contracts for service delivery for Phase III. It therefore recommends that the RFPs should be framed in terms of a) a minimum core service; b) maximum innovation.

**EXCOM Consensus 96-2-8**

EXCOM endorses the proposed changes to the JOI policy manual so that the relevant sections read as follows:

**1.04 The JOIDES Organisation - The Planning Committee (PCOM)**

**1.04.10 (a)** The following four-step voting procedure is recommended to avoid potential problems arising from conflict of interest situations involving the special case of proposal ranking and determination of a recommended annual or long term science plan.

**Step 1:** Choice of proposals to retain for purposes of global ranking: PCOM has two options for this step:

**Option 1:** Panel consensus on recommendation of Chair.

**Option 2:** Show-of-hands vote on each candidate drilling proposal, with a vote of at least 50% in favour being sufficient to retain a proposal for ranking. Conflicted members of PCOM will abstain from voting.

**Step 2: Ranking of proposals based on scientific quality:** Given X proposals retained from Step 1, unconflicted PCOM members will rank programs from 1 to X on a signed paper ballot. After voting, written ranks of each program by each voter will be tabulated and reported (in PCOM minutes) in a matrix, along with a calculation of mean ranking of each program. A draft science plan will be constructed of top-ranked proposals. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 2 in its entirety.

**Step 3:** In a case of statistical ties in rankings that affect the choice of proposals to drop from the draft science plan, PCOM will choose between closely ranked proposals on this boundary based on a one-on-one vote using signed paper ballots. A majority vote will choose the program to retain in the draft science plan and the draft science plan from Step 2 will be adjusted accordingly. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 3 in its entirety.

**Step 4:** After assembling the top ranked proposals from Steps 1-3 into a draft recommended science plan, PCOM will consider the logistics, costs, and quality of the proposed plan as a whole. PCOM will vote with a show of hands to accept or reject the draft recommended science plan in its entirety, based on a simple majority of votes cast. Rejection of the draft science plan at this stage dictates a return to Step 1 in the voting procedure. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 4 in its entirety(New).

#### 11.0 Conflict of Interest - General Ocean Drilling Program

11.04. If any JOIDES panel or committee member, or any individual or institution related to such member, has any interest that might be affected by, or might reasonably be perceived to be affected by, any action under consideration by the panel or committee on which he or she is serving, such member is required to declare the existence of such interest to the Chair. Such interests include (1) being a proponent of a pending drilling proposal, and (2) being proposed as a co-chief scientist. The possible existence of such interest may also be proposed to the Chair by a member or liaison other than the member having the interest.

All declared or proposed possible conflicts of interest, and the actions taken, will be recorded in the Minutes of the meeting at which the interest was considered. With respect to any such declared interest, or proposed possible interest, the Chair will make an initial determination regarding whether the circumstances constitute a direct conflict of interest.

In determining whether the circumstances constitute a direct conflict of interest, the Chair may, at his/her discretion, consult with other members of the panel or committee. The Chair's decision will be subject to review in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

(a) Panel or committee members who are determined by the Chair to have a direct conflict of interest with respect to a drilling proposal will not be present during any/that part of a panel or committee meeting when proposals affected by such direct conflict of interest are subject to deliberation, review and ranking. However, a conflicted panel or committee member may be permitted to participate in general discussions that do not lead directly to voting, regarding proposals in general, including discussion of his or her own proposal. Such members must restrict their comments and discussion to the scientific objectives of proposals being discussed and will refrain from making comparisons with their own proposals.

(b) PCOM members determined to have a direct conflict of interest will not be present during deliberations leading directly to a vote and will not vote with respect to the inclusion in, or exclusion from, the upcoming recommended science plan of a proposal affected by such direct conflict of interest.

- (c) During panel or committee discussions that do not lead directly to a vote, or that do not involve competitive ranking of proposals (e.g., determination of the long-term ship track at PCOM), all members may participate in general discussions, in order to provide a full range of expertise to the decision-making process. A member having an active proposal that may form part of the long-term track of the drillship will abstain from final deliberations and voting relating to the long-term track.
- (d) Panel or committee members who are determined to have a direct conflict of interest will not be present during deliberations leading directly to a vote and will not vote with respect to any other matters affected by such direct conflict of interest. (New).

**EXCOM Motion by Acclamation**

EXCOM thanks Jim Briden, along with Kathy Ellins and Colin Jacobs of the JOIDES Office, for all their efforts and hard work over the past two years.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES, AGENDA APPROVAL

Briden welcomed all to the meeting and Arthur Nowell paid tribute to the late PCOM Chair, Professor Robert B Kidd.

Rob loved his work and was immensely proud to be PCOM Chair. But, above all, he loved his family. And those of you who have had the privilege of knowing Rosalie and their sons will realise and understand that his family was his greatest achievement. Rob will be sorely missed by us all. Rob asked for the following passage to be read at his funeral:

### *What is dying?*

*A ship sails and I stand watching till she fades on the horizon and someone at my side says, "She is gone." Gone where? Gone from my sight, that is all; she is just as large as when I saw her. The diminished size, and total loss of sight is in me, not in her, and just at the moment when someone at my side says "She is gone," there are others who are watching her coming, and other voices take up a glad shout, "There she comes!" and that is dying.*

Bishop Brent.

Robert Kidd, Professor of Marine Geology in the University of Wales, Cardiff.

Rob's first degree was obtained at Kingston Polytechnic, from where he moved to the University of Southampton to study the sediments forming the floor of the Tyrrhenian Sea. For his PhD. Rob joined the Institute of Oceanographic Sciences in the summer of 1973 and almost immediately he was seconded to the Deep Sea Drilling Project based at Scripps as a staff scientist. Returning to IOS, he worked on combining the data from sediment cores, including those he had studied for his PhD, with the imagery being obtained from the GLORIA side-scan sonar technology then being developed in the Institute. Later he applied the sonar instrumentation to studies of the deep ocean floor as a candidate repository for radioactive waste.

In 1983 Rob Kidd was appointed Head of Science Operations for the Ocean Drilling Program, as a professor at Texas A&M University. The position demanded a combination of profound scientific knowledge and imagination with organisational skills. Rob's success opened the way for him to return to the University College of Wales in Swansea in 1987 as Professor of Geology. Having been raised in west Wales it was a source of pride and joy to him to return there as a professor. He oversaw the merger of the Geology and Oceanography Departments in Swansea before moving to Cardiff as a result of the merger of Departments in a national restructuring of academic earth sciences. There he built a thriving marine geology research group.

Rob was one of the strongest proponents of marine geological research in the UK. He saw the ocean drilling programmes as making crucial contributions to marine geological research that could only be done by integrated international effort, and he worked tirelessly to promote their activities. He sailed on five such cruises, three as chief scientist. When the opportunity arose for the UK to bid to lead the scientific planning of the programme from outside the United States, Rob Kidd was by general acclaim the person to turn to for the crucial role of PCOM Chair. He had the respect of the community, a clear vision of where the program should go, and an understanding of what was practical and politically possible. Through his energy and determination, the geoscience community around the world developed a new vision of

the role of ocean drilling in future scientific advance, which has been widely endorsed and has brought ODP to the threshold of renewal into the next century.

Rob had borne stoically for many years the pains and uncertainties associated with heart problems. He was struck down at the very moment of receiving the accolade of his peers in British earth sciences by the award of the Major Edward Coke Medal of the Geological Society, at Burlington House on 4th June. The citation for this award records the wide acclamation that his research in palaeoceanography, sediment drifts and high resolution stratigraphy have received.

The ODP Long Range Plan may change over the coming years, but we all shall remember as we work with it, Rob Kidd and his commitment. Let the record state that EXCOM will miss his scientific and organisational skills and his forceful arguments. We will remember with affection a true Welsh scholar.

EXCOM held a period of silence in respect.

Briden welcomed Taylor as the new member from Hawaii, and Ludden as the alternate from France. He also welcomed, on behalf of EXCOM, Julian Pearce who has taken over as PCOM Chair, and Alan Mix who is the official PCOM liaison at this meeting. Briden then welcomed Kurika from MONBUSHO, Pamela Baker-Masson from JOI, and Julie Harris from Cardiff. Briden said that Watkins has sent his apologies.

Briden announced that the new format of this meeting was due to EXCOM's decision to maximise the time available for discussion and that all meeting papers will be taken as read and will not be presented. He said that in particular, the management reports have changed drastically, and this will allow the contracotors to play a more constructive role in debates.

Briden then moved to the agenda, and said that he has made modifications since the compilation of the agenda book in light of the complex issues of the Phase III planning. He said that EXCOM will probably need more time for this than he originally thought. He proposed to move the Management Reports and Program Plan to Tuesday. He said that the review of today's business should be executive session, but that the EXCOM decisions item would not. EXCOM agreed to the new agenda.

## **2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING**

### **A) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Briden asked EXCOM for any comments. There were none and Nowell proposed a motion accepting the minutes as a true record.

EXCOM Motion 96-2-1

EXCOM approves the minutes of the last meeting as a true record.

*Proposed: Nowell, Seconded: Orcutt*

*Unanimous (1 Absentee)*

Eldholm raised the question of the format and length of the minutes. He asked if there will be an opportunity to discuss this. Briden said that EXCOM could deal with this now. Nowell said that the EXCOM minutes are also looked at by PCOM and that it does help to give an idea of the thought processes behind some of the decisions. Mayer said that he too thought that it was important. Eldholm said that he would be happy with a summary of discussions and decisions. He said that he looked for about 10 pages. Mutter said that he had sympathy with Eldholm though Nowell had a valid point. He said that a summary of discussion would be helpful. Brown commented that with the new meeting format, the minutes may become shorter anyway, and he liked the full version of minutes as they help the subsidiary committees. Briden said that for this meeting, the current procedure will be followed and that Briden would then distil this into an

action record so that EXCOM could have a comparison. Orcutt said that the time taken to produce the minutes is substantial and that the head of the JOIDES Office must look at this side of things.

#### **B) ACTION ON MOTIONS**

There were no comments on this item.

#### **C) JOIDES INTERIM RESPONSE TO ODP MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT**

Briden said that EXCOM must consider what definitive response is expected by Council and how that should be compiled. Heinrichs said that Council was looking for the fleshing out of a number of items, especially the implementation of Phase III and the focusing of the Program. He said that the financial matters are of interest, as is value for money, and also where the Program fits in the field of geosciences in general. He said that they are looking for JOIDES to work with the contractors to produce a report. Briden said that was what he anticipated, and that a comprehensive response would be forthcoming. Heinrichs said that the timing also has to be considered. He said that Council have requested JOI to provide a 5-year planning report, and this will be looked at by Council as they look to renewal. He said that Council will expect a progress report following this meeting. They will be looking at the issues of leadership, partnerships, implementation and economies. The progress report should be made available well before the next EXCOM meeting so that it can be passed to Council that they can then pass their views on to EXCOM. Briden said that EXCOM should expect to go forward with the JOIDES Office to work with JOI on this document, though EXCOM could, if it wishes, re-visit this issue later.

### **3. PHASE III PLANNING**

Briden said that this follows from the LRP, the international review report, and ODP Council's consideration of that report. He said that since then a draft implementation plan has been developed. He called upon Mix to present this item.

#### **A. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Mix began by saying that PCOM explored a large number of options before the basis of this plan was reached. PCOM felt that it strikes the right balance between top-down management and bottom-up input by the community. He then reviewed the goals of the re-organisation: to clarify the scientific leadership; links to the LRP; and partnerships with global Programs. He said that the things that work and that must not be lost are that the Program is open to all proposals; that proposals are nurtured to maturity; that the best science will always come out on top. He said that the items that need improvement include the fact that PCOM is often diverted from science planning; there is insufficient interdisciplinary ranking and the thematic panels are too insular; and that liaisons to other global programs are unstructured. He said that the thematic panels have been asked to do too many things and that is why they have become somewhat insular.

Mix then outlined the areas he would like EXCOM to consider at this meeting: endorse the basic framework of PCOM Motion 96-1-16; endorse the concept of thematic balance on SCICOM; task PCOM with additional mandate development for new structure; timing - endorse a start date of 1/97 (or later?); and to consider the financial implications of workings groups (JOIDES relative to other global programs, and the question of whether all WG's must be JOIDES WG's?). He said that PCOM are confident that a start date of 1/97 is possible.

Mix reviewed SCICOM. He said that it would grow out of PCOM and divest itself of operational issues though retaining its position as the lead scientific committee. He said that the Chair would be head of the JOIDES Office, there would be representational membership and the committee would be thematically balanced. SCICOM would be the guardian of the LRP, would form the WG's, DPG's and Review Panels, and would be the ranking panel that selected the programs to be drilled. It would be the scientific leader of the Program. He said the discussion item was how to maintain thematic balance.

He then outlined OPCOM. It would have the same chair as SCICOM, with key service panel liaisons and a non-proportional representation chosen for their expertise. It would focus on the ship track, operational and logistic advice, the application of technology, and be responsible for the service panels. Discussion items here will be membership and how it should pass advice to JOI (through SCICOM or directly?).

Moving to the Thematic review panels, Mix said that these would be linked to the LRP with membership on a proportional representation basis selected by SCICOM and independent of the WG's. The panels would focus on advising SCICOM on the themes; manage relevant WG's; handle proposals that lack WG's; and managing and advising on internal and external review of proposals. The discussion item is who handles the external mail review, JOI or JOIDES ?

He said the JOIDES WG's would be small groups with a focused expertise-based membership, with a finite lifetime. Representatives of global programs could be members, but not SCICOM or the Review panel members. These would nurture proposals to maturity. The discussion items are how many WG's ?; shall ODP recognise non-JOIDES WG's; and to be aware of conflict of interest issues. He said that non-JOIDES WG's could be confusing and that it may be better to look upon these as proponent groups.

As regards service panels, Mix said that TEDCOM, PPSP and SSP would be unchanged. A Measurements Panel would combine SMP, DMP and IHP, but this is still under discussion in PCOM, and DMP may remain due to the importance of borehole experiments. Reporting and advice would go to OPCOM, with the service panel chairs being permanent liaison. Discussion items include the merger of SMP, IHP, and DMP; and should the MP be part of JOIDES or JOI?

Mix then reviewed the benefits of this proposed structure: it clarifies scientific leadership; it is more accountable to LRP; it enfranchises a wider community; the science is competitive at three levels (preserves proposal responsive system, preserves proposal nurturing, removes perception of panel entitlement, true interdisciplinary ranking, external peer review strengthened science and reaches a broader community); WG's are key to give flexibility; it improves operational advice to JOI; and it streamlines the JOIDES panels (from 12 down to 9).

Briden thanked Mix for that presentation and reviewed the reasons for this exercise. He said that EXCOM should be looking for the best science to always come out on top, and he would first like EXCOM to address the "big" framework, and consider if this transformation is required in total or in part. Leinen commented that she wanted to send a strong message to PCOM that it has been very responsive, and she is impressed with the innovation that PCOM has shown in looking forward rather than backward. She said that PCOM have taken into account the comments of the Greve Report, ODP Council and EXCOM, and that EXCOM should send this strong message of appreciation to PCOM for its efforts, especially considering some of the possible sensitivities. Orcutt said that he agreed with Leinen and that this dramatic change will ensure the LRP is followed. He said that one issue was scientific leadership, and he asked how SCICOM would focus on scientific issues when PCOM was tasked with that and it never quite happened. Mix said that by SCICOM not concerning itself with operational issues it will allow SCICOM to spend much more time on science planning. He said that PCOM considers it appropriate that SCICOM be the scientific leadership. He said that other models had been considered but were thought to be too far from the community. Orcutt said that the proposed structure seems to imply the SCICOM/OPCOM chair will be busier than at present. Mix said that this was still under discussion but that PCOM felt that there must be clear links at a high level between the science and implementation structures. He said that at a personal level there was discussion of deputies for the PCOM chair to spread the load. Taira said that to liberate SCICOM to focus on science is good, but he said that PCOM had science, operations, and budgetary matters to consider and that it would be difficult to plan effectively if these functions are separated. Mix said that BCOM would still be involved, and that a lot of the discussion of budget issues will be done at OPCOM level, he said that many of the financial issues should be dealt with by JOI as SCICOM do not wish to be bogged down by details. He said the overlapping membership of OPCOM/SCICOM would ensure

that there is a smooth information flow. Briden said that the JOIDES Office have prepared a paper detailing the workload of the office and this will be tabled. Briden said that EXCOM should not worry too much at this time about the reporting routes that have been discussed here, he said that all advice should go to JOI via EXCOM. He said that in practice, advice goes direct to JOI from PCOM, but that EXCOM usually meets shortly after PCOM to keep a check.

Beiersdorf said that he considers that this is a revolution, not evolution. He said that the SCICOM would direct everything, the review panels would have no power at all, and that the WG's are too far removed from any planning. He said that ODP would become unattractive to many people if they are not allowed any say in the planning process and that if the Program neglects the people working for it they will move elsewhere, regardless of the expertise of SCICOM. He said that there will not be any depth to the community. He also commented that the review panel would not be attractive for any scientists to join as it is just a passive body. He said that this looks like an antique model and does not reflect the complexity of the science. He said that there are some good elements that should be retained such as separation of long term planning and operational issues. Mix responded by saying that they are legitimate points though individual perceptions may be different. He said that PCOM was worried about too much control from SCICOM and wanted to retain a top-down - bottom-up balance. He said that the review panels and WG's may not be so passive. He said that in his personal opinion, there is a range of opinion on PCOM on the strengths of the review panels from abolishment to thematic panel power. He said that the middle ground was that they do the review process, but they also provide scientific advice to SCICOM. He said that they would serve like a science foundation panel, independently reviewing the proposals themselves and passing on comments. Beiersdorf asked who would be doing long and mid-range planning, he has only seen SCICOM as having that role. Mix said that his view was that the scientific review panels would provide input to SCICOM on these issues.

Briden said that EXCOM has to remember that it is committed to following the LRP and that previously the Program has not been so focused. He said that in the light of this he did not know what white papers would be required in the future.

Mayer said that he was very sceptical when the exercise began, but that what he has seen from PCOM is an elegant attempt to maintain the grass-roots involvement whilst take account of the accountability issue as raised by reviews. He said that this is a workable model but that there are gaps that have to be filled. He said that he strongly endorses what has been put forward. Brown said that PCOM has taken a brave approach to the issue of science vs. operational planning. He said that PCOM should be applauded, but his concern is in the details, and that implementation must be done carefully. He said that there are not enough specifics known to simply change the structure and that it must be implemented in stages. He continued, saying that at present it does look very much a top-down structure and there must be some clearer definition of the role of the review panels to dispel any misconceptions.

Detrick said that it is obvious many details must be fleshed out, but that in general terms, he is very supportive of the proposal, especially in addressing perceptions of things that were not working in the structure. It also divorces the proposal development from the proposal ranking. The concept of WG's will reach a broader community and will not as suggested earlier disenfranchise anyone. He said that overall it is a very positive step forward, but the details will need addressing.

Eldholm said that he is very impressed with PCOM's work and he wanted to endorse this plan. His consortia could easily fit into this structure. Mutter said that in respect of leadership, it was not just where the leadership lies, but the leadership itself has to have a goal. He asked Mix if the purpose of the leadership is to implement the LRP or broader than that. Mix said that it was broader, it was also about communicating the LRP to the community. Mutter said that he felt the Greve committee asked for more. Mix said that PCOM felt that an individual as a spokesperson for ODP would not have the broad community input, and would be somewhat detached from a wide spectrum of the community. He said that PCOM tried to address the Greve report, but in a

different manner. Briden said that at the moment ODP is personifying "leadership" as SCICOM and the SCICOM Chair.

Taylor said that this plan has 4 levels, and he only saw external peer review as a new and good idea. He saw OPCOM and SCICOM as the same as PCOM. He said that there is not a good description of how the science review panels would work, although he was happy to see the divorce of proposal generation and nurturing from ranking. He said that unless the thematic review panel is fleshed out to help the community there will be serious problems. Leinen said that the primary criticism of the Program was a lack on the ability of the structure to fulfil a LRP that had a specific direction as opposed to one that included everything. She said that means that difficult decisions will have to be made to ensure that the LRP will be followed and that this proposed structure will have a much better opportunity to make such decisions. She said that the structure needs the details to be fleshed out, but that it is the right direction and the right way in which to move forward.

Briden said that many criticisms seem to allude from the lack of feedback to the science review panels from peer review. He said that many of the criticisms may be fixed by wording changes or omissions and EXCOM should consider whether it has serious concerns of substantive matters or whether it is merely interpretations.

Coffee..... 10:30 - 11:00

Ludden said that in general France was happy with what came out of PCOM, though they wanted global programs to drive the science of the drill ship. He said that JOIDES should not have control of all of the WG's, he believed that the science leadership should come from the WG's as that was where the science would originate, that the review panels look weak in this plan and that they should be either strengthened or abolished.

Briden said that there is a proposal for a three-level structure with ideas fed in from the bottom which have to fit with the LRP template. He asked that the discussion should begin with Working Groups and then move on up to the next level an so on.

### **Working Groups**

Mix reminded EXCOM of the proposal for WG's. These will be an interface with the community and will also act as areas where the LRP initiatives can be targeted. He said that these will be proponent groups. Detrick said that there will be a difference in the concept of present WG's and those as proposed. He said that present WG's were to address various issues raised by thematic panels. In the proposed structure they would have a broader, though specific mandate relevant to the LRP. Mix said that they would interface with the community, be advocates for their science and bring proposals to maturity. Detrick said that the number of WG's is important as if the number is too small then some of the community may be disenfranchised. Orcutt said that from the PCOM minutes it was not very clear as to how many there should be and what they would do. Mix said that initially EXCOM should envision four WG's each tied to a LRP initiative and the Pilot Program. He said that WG's could also be set up under the broader themes of the LRP, for example sea level change. Mix said that as an example of the benefits of the WG system, there was a very successful DPG on Antarctic proposals recently. Falvey commented that of the 10 subject areas in the old LRP, two had not been addressed at all and that if the WG's are set up properly that will never happen again. Mayer said that this new system will provide scientific accountability to the LRP. Falvey said that the WG's will not rank their proposals but will have to prioritise or put forward a set of options for SCICOM. Orcutt asked if the SCICOM would have the relevant expertise, for example, would they have Antarctic expertise. Mix said that SCICOM wanted thematic expertise, and that regional expertise would probably be found in the WG's. Mayer said that if NAD had a representative on SCICOM then they would be excluded from decisions and it would be counter-productive for them. Taylor asked if the WG's are the place where the partnership with global Programs will occur. Mix said that it was. Taylor said that the

global Programs would want to see such working groups as standing groups and that it would be global Programs not associated with WG's who would be an exception.

Briden said that EXCOM has to consider whether the process of fitting the science to the LRP actually begins with these WG's. He said that there are currently 4 JOIDES initiatives in the LRP and so ODP has a case for setting up four WG's. He said that JOIDES working groups are only for areas that are not getting enough proposals and that the other global Programs will probably be formulating their own plans. He said that non-JOIDES WG's must be ensured access and ODP must guarantee that all proposals that come from WG's are judged on an even footing. EXCOM must also try to decide on the linkages there are for the non-JOIDES WG's. Mix said that workshops have not yet been discussed and that this is yet another avenue for targeting groups to produce proposals. He referred EXCOM to the list in the PCOM papers. Brown asked if there would be a natural tension between the WG's in JOIDES and those that are not. He said that the Program has to ensure that is being very fair to all proposals. He continued, saying that the international Programs could look at the JOIDES structure as a service function, and EXCOM has to consider how it deals with these service demands. Mayer said that was a valid point, but, he said, many of the other Programs have things other than drilling that they want to do. They could submit a submission to get a WG formed on the goals of their Program. Taylor said that international Programs tend to evolve and that their objectives change with time. Detrick commented that the 3-year time limit is not necessarily be interpreted as being a finite life, but that the WG's must justify to SCICOM why it should continue to exist. He also said that it would look bad if JOIDES WG's are only centred around the LRP themes, and he thinks that WG's should be formed in cooperation with global Programs, so that the other Programs feel they are participating. Taylor said that the LRP themes are operationally based as well as being thematic. Ludden said that at the Woods Hole meeting, there was a feeling that the WG's should be a part of the international Programs, and that the LIPs group consider the drill ship as a tool. Ludden commented that there will be a number of WG's arising from the Woods Hole meeting.

Taylor said that the current structure has breadth but not much depth, and that in reality the present thematic panel reviews are only the views of one or two people, whereas the views from WG's would have a lot of depth. However, he said, for this new system to work there must be a lot of WG's and that has big financial implications. Detrick said that with the reduction in the number of thematic panels the finance may not be a problem. Beiersdorf said that it was important for Germany to have representation on all the panels for feedback. Detrick said that if a particular country did not have a great interest then it may not need representatives on all the groups. Briden asked if all members should have the right to membership of WG's, but it would be up to them if they then attended? Heinrichs said that EXCOM must keep an eye on the expertise in depth requirement which is the justification for the WG in the first place. Mix said that PCOM felt that if topics were important then members would pay for participants and in this way the proliferation would have a natural ceiling. As for membership, SCICOM would like to have a say on expertise. Ludden said that it could be possible to rotate the expertise of national members. Mayer said that this is analogous with how the vessel is currently staffed, and so it is possible to evolve a system to ensure representation over the long term. Eldholm said that if SCICOM has the authority to nominate members then it would work quite easily in his consortia.

Briden said that it seemed that EXCOM is warming to the idea of the WG layer. He said that membership issues will have to be dealt with - normally the ultimate right lies with the member and not with JOIDES. He said that this must be a consultative process. Beiersdorf said that he would like to see wider consultations for the WG's. Detrick said that the number of WG's is very important and must give representation. Briden said that the Program will have to "feel its way" in the early days. He asked if EXCOM should give SCICOM authority to set up X WG's. Dalrymple said that the more WG's the better as it will show that there is a lot of interest in the Program. Falvey said that it was his understanding that WG's would interact with global Programs, and that EXCOM must be sure that the option is still there for individuals to put forward science proposals. Leinen said that WG's are to develop drilling strategies, but that the Program has moved on and

they could be used to develop links with other Programs, or for example, to flesh out strategies for borehole utilisation. Mix said that PCOM saw the big advantage as they would be very flexible. Fox said that one criticism is that science has been vulcanised into legs that may not address larger questions, and that WG's will serve as a focusing lens that will create an integrated strategy to address the fundamental questions in the LRP.

Taira commented that earthquake processes and observatories have been mandated in the LRP, and he asked if SCICOM would be able to set up WG's if there are no existing global Programs. Briden said that was so. Beiersdorf commented that the new WG's are stronger and more powerful than previous WG's and they should be more visible. He said that the name should be a little stronger than WG to draw people to them.

### **Thematic Review Panels**

Taylor asked if the thematic review panels could deal with proposals from individual proponents as well as WG's. This was confirmed. He then asked if the WG's then recommend to the Thematic Review Panel when proposals were mature and should go forward. Mix said that there was still uncertainty as to whether they were an active part of the science review process and synthesise the proposals and reviews. His personal opinion was that they should have that level of power. Detrick said that it is critical that EXCOM define whether it is strictly a review process at this level or whether they have some planning and advice function. Heinrichs asked where the boundary between the WG's and Thematic Review Panels was. Mix said that this was still under discussion by PCOM. Briden said that advice was a "clean" focus, as was handling proposals and internal panel review. He said that managing and interacting with the WG was where there could be potential conflicts. Mix said that the Thematic Review Panels would not rank proposals but they would synthesise the reviews to guide the science committee. Briden said that external review should not really grade but it essential that it does provide comment.

Ludden said that he didn't see why proponents couldn't forward proposals to WG's and then a sub-set of SCICOM could look at the reviews. That way the Thematic Review Panels could be disbanded. Mix said that there was a majority view on PCOM to retain this level. Beiersdorf said that if there were no proponents at Thematic Review Panel level then why does ODP need to have peer review. Mix said that anyone can be a proponent and can be on a committee, but they would be bound by the conflict of interest rules. He said that his statement of "the separation of church and state" meant that WG members could not be members of the Thematic Review Panel or SCICOM. Falvey said that Thematic Review Panels will not rank proposals, but they will determine their maturity. Mix said that in DPG's, the discussions continue until the group reaches consensus. Fox said that the WG's will, by definition, rank their proposals, hopefully with a consensus basis. He said that perhaps it should be called prioritisation, or integration of a drilling plan.

Leinen said that the external review is a mechanism to demonstrate to the community that there is no conflict of interest. Nowell questioned whether he could submit a proposal whilst sitting as a member of a review panel. He said that he presumed that if he submitted a proposal that went through a Working Group then he would be a member of that working group. Mix said that was not the case. He said that it was similar to (in the US) sitting on an NSF Marine Geology and Geophysics panel.

Briden said that there seems to be some agreement that a three layer structure would work in principal and he wanted EXCOM to consider what aspects of this new structure it could accept and what needs to be refined. He said that EXCOM must also consider how this is to be implemented, and he suggested that perhaps a staged implementation would be appropriate in consideration of current proposals in the system.

Lunch..... 12:20 -13:25

**SCICOM/OPCOM**

Briden said that EXCOM is asked to approve the principle of the three-tiered structure. He suggested that EXCOM has agreed that the top science planning level is better done in two committees rather than in one. He said that there was no problem with the proportional representational model of membership of SCICOM. Mayer commented that this would be expertise based. Briden said that the members would have the right of nomination but selection would be based on negotiation between the members and JOIDES.

Briden then turned to OPCOM and said that apart from concerns about demarcation of JOI and JOIDES responsibilities, there were not many problems with the breadth of the mandate. The membership has not been discussed at this meeting, but there are a range of views. He asked if, for the moment, the OPCOM membership issue could be left until later. Heinrichs and Detrick raised the issue of reporting lines from OPCOM. Briden said that EXCOM will debate this issue also. Orcutt said that he viewed OPCOM and SCICOM as being strategic panels, but he said that SCICOM cannot be divorced from the budget considerations. Briden said that if BCOM continues then careful thought needs to be given to its membership. He asked if Orcutt would be happy if whatever group takes on the BCOM role would have SCICOM membership. Orcutt said that he didn't want to go into that detail, but he would like SCICOM to have budgetary considerations in their mandate. Leinen said that SCICOM should look at budget strategy and OPCOM should look at operational budgets. Orcutt said that there may have to be hard choices made and that should be done at SCICOM level. Beiersdorf said that ODP must be careful not to out-source its advice without any responsibility left with JOIDES Institutions. He said that these committees will be responsible for the spending of funds and are in agreement with the MOU's. Briden said that for non-US members the nominations could be made as a number of alternatives to maintain the scientific balance. Beiersdorf said that there may still be a problem, in that the outgoing expertise may have to be replaced by that same expertise. Falvey said that the bottom line was that it was up to the member to make the nominations. Briden asked if Beiersdorf was concerned about US members. Beiersdorf said that so long as the US were happy then that was fine with him. Briden said that there were indications that the US may change the way it chooses its PCOM-level members, but it was not for him to comment. Mix said that from a PCOM perspective it wants endorsement of the concept of thematic balance. He said that in reality several members rotate off PCOM at the same time, and, through informal consultations, the balance could be preserved.

### **General Discussion**

Briden then moved again to the Working Groups. He said that he heard a general endorsement of WG's, especially once it was clear they would be strong, significant pro-active bodies. He said that the actual numbers of WG's still required discussion, but the most contentious issue was JOIDES and "other" WG's. He said that the simplest way may be to have only one kind of WG's, and they should be JOIDES WG's. SCICOM will identify the areas for formation of WG's. It could do this on its own initiative, on recommendation of other parts of JOIDES, and on recommendation or request of other Programs or individuals. Beiersdorf said that he was happy so long as Germany had the right to propose members. Briden said that was fine, but it would be good if there could be a consultative process. Briden said that the actual constitution of working groups was another matter, and the membership should be an issue for consultation and agreement between JOIDES and the other party. In answer to Mutter, Briden said that WG's will always be established by SCICOM. Detrick said that InterRidge and IAVCEI will be formulating proposals for WG's and that once this process is widely known other groups will follow and SCICOM will then determine which avenue it wishes to pursue.

Briden then asked EXCOM to turn to the Thematic Review Panel's. He said that there was a demarcation between the proponents at this level, and these would be evaluation committees. They pass proposals of clear merit up to SCICOM along with broader judgements. They will act as in similar vein to an NSF review panel and have the responsibility for the external review of mature proposals. Briden said that on the question as to who is responsible for the external review (JOI or JOIDES), he believed it was on the JOIDES side (science advice), but who actually handled it (JOI office) was a secondary issue. Beiersdorf said that he felt the present SGPP may be neglected by

splitting expertise between two separate groups. Mix said that issue was considered by PCOM and that was one reason why the Thematic Review Panels will not rank, but review. He said they will evaluate the overall quality of the proposal with a broad-based review (external) and that PCOM is comfortable that things would not "fall through the cracks". Leinen said that she was concerned by topics that could not really be considered by either review group. Mix said that the two panels would be mandated to meet at the same time and place to judge their own issues separately and joint issues together. Taylor said that for some issues the review panels would report back jointly to WG's. Taira commented that with a standing WG within the mandate of the LRP, and with an external peer review, he was still unsure of the key element of the review panels, or why they are needed. Ludden said that if the thematic panel is SCICOM, all that is missing is the external review, which could be handled by a sub-committee of SCICOM. He said that from a French perspective he would rather have people in WG's than on review panels. Taylor said that PCOM want the middle layer as a help to lessen the workload.

Briden asked for a defence of the proposal and said that the sheer volume of proposals was one argument. Mix said that this same debate was played out at PCOM. He said that the reason for two panels was to improve interdisciplinary co-ordination and control, not going to zero at this level would enable SCICOM to focus on its long range planning mission, and thirdly because PCOM consider that the review level is a very important link to the outside, integrating the reviews of the proposals, and providing thematic advice. Beiersdorf said that there may need to be more than one meeting per year.

Heinrichs said that in the structure there was provision for amalgamation of proposals. Mayer said that this extra level is needed as this is where, on an iterative basis, the proposals will be nurtured to maturity.

Briden said that EXCOM will have to return to this issue later during the review of the day, and that EXCOM should strive for a consensus on this issue. He said that there is still more definition required and that maybe a joint EXCOM/PCOM sub-committee should meet to address this before the August PCOM. Briden said that EXCOM will have to decide at this meeting what it wants implemented immediately (or from 1 January 1997) and what can be deferred to the next EXCOM. Leinen suggested a sub-group form and bring suggestions back to EXCOM. Mutter said that EXCOM have yet to discuss the flow of operational advice to and from OPCOM. Mix said that PCOM were still in discussion over this issue. Taylor said that one of the ways to deal with the concerns expressed about the shrinking of the service panels was to involve that expertise in WG's.

Mayer said that EXCOM just has to identify what it is uncomfortable with and direct them to change before EXCOM will approve this plan. Fox said that PEC IV recommended amalgamating the service panels. He said that from the operators' point of view they would like to see SMP and IHP brought together. Leinen said that EXCOM should provide words of consensus that deal with the concepts of the PCOM plan and that other details can be passed on to the EXCOM/PCOM sub-group. Loutit commented that a similar amount of effort needs to be put into the philosophy of the whole structure and it's reporting lines to ensure that the new structure would actually work. He said that if EXCOM respond to PCOM it must stress that the timelines and linkages must be fully fleshed out.

## **B. INNOVATIONS AND ECONOMIES**

Falvey outlined the innovations identified within the JOIDES structure. First he addressed the issue of a publications strategy. He said that the NSF Inspector General had looked at ODP publications and he referred EXCOM to the report, saying that he will report back to Mike Purdy with the views of EXCOM and PCOM. He referred EXCOM to the proposed new publications strategy included in the agenda book. He said that if the broad strategy is acceptable to EXCOM, he would propose to steer it over the next 5 years using a steering committee of experts vis-a-vis JANUS, with JOI reporting to PCOM and EXCOM throughout the implementation phase.

Detrick asked what the projected cost savings were. Falvey said that it would be \$750K by the time of implementation. He said that the *Scientific Results* are seen as a critical part of the Program that should not be lost, and he said that the aim was to form an interactive link between publications on the internet and JANUS and that as part of this there will also be the formulation of a better product. Fox said that ODP-TAMU will save \$330K in FY98 by following this model and moving to CD-ROM publication of the *Initial Reports*. Mayer asked about internet publication. Falvey said that the publications sub-group had looked at EPSL (Earth and Planetary Science Letters) on line and were very impressed. Mutter said that one objective should be to address the criticisms that not enough publications were in the outside literature, and he still sees no compelling reason for retention of the *Scientific Results* in whatever form. Falvey said that it is now possible for individuals to publish in the open literature at 12 months post-cruise, and that this would also fulfil the shipboard scientists publication obligation. Heinrichs asked about the Editorial Review Board, and Falvey said that was to ensure that individuals were not being unethical. Beiersdorf said that it would reduce the quality of the *Scientific Results*. Falvey said that he considered that with the links from the publication to the database, then it would actually approve very attractive. Beiersdorf said that the *Scientific Results* is the Program's greatest legacy, and that if quality is diminished then it would not help the Program at all. Falvey said that outside publications would not be collected and bound, but the locations of all articles would be stored. Orcutt commented that links to AGU journals would not be a problem.

Briden said the biology laboratory, the borehole utilisation, and the 3-D seismics parts of the written report should be noted by EXCOM and they should be commended to the advisory structure for prioritisation. EXCOM consented to this.

#### **C. FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS**

Falvey referred EXCOM to the agenda papers, and commented that the figures are a response to a request from the ODP Council. Briden said that EXCOM must come to terms with how it will address the issue of the funding required for Phase IV, though not necessarily at this point in time. Briden said this is an information item. Taira said that the figures have a very large Japanese supply and he is concerned that these figures are not taken out of context, or be thought realistic. Heinrichs asked if these figures would be part of the Council report. Briden said that they are only for information and there were several caveats on the cover pages. He said that the important items are how EXCOM will look to fund Phase IV and when the Japanese will come forward with some concrete figures for OD21. Heinrichs said that Council will be looking to JOIDES for information on the 1998-2003 fiscal requirements and implementation plan. Falvey said that Phase III was the most important as Phase IV was too far in the future.

#### **D. 1998-2003 RFPs**

Falvey reported first on the provision of Wireline Logging Services. He said that there would be no major changes in the technical scope of work, but there will be minor changes in the constitution of the standard logging suite. As regards the SSDB there would be no major changes in the technical scope of work, and JOI will encourage innovative use of electronic data storage and access. Mutter said that he was disappointed that there was no innovation. Falvey confirmed that the RFP would be worded to allow for innovation. EXCOM confirmed its support for the RFP's to be worded in this way, and were hopeful that the maximum amount of innovation would be forthcoming.

Falvey then moved on to the RFP for the next non-US JOIDES Office. It was proposed to return to this item after discussion of the Scientific Leadership and possibly also the timelines for the PCOM Phase III implementation plan. Briden suggested that EXCOM accept the proposal as it is, and then implement it as soon as the implementation of Phase III and its implications are determined.

Coffee ..... 15:30 - 15:50

## **E. SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP**

Brown reported on this issue and referred EXCOM to the agenda papers after acknowledging the input from members of the community. He said that he had based his report on the allusions made in the Greve report and in looking at the role of PCOM over the past decade or so. He said that PCOM had better leadership characteristics 10 years ago than it did now and he had looked to see how this could be reversed. He reviewed the leadership principles as set out in the agenda papers and then turned to the conclusions and recommendations of his report. He said that where he refers to ODP he actually meant JOIDES institutions. In terms of the logistics function, he suggested that this could be fulfilled by an OPCOM. He said that there has been leadership but the PCOM Chair has been saddled with too many duties. The PCOM Chair is the natural science leader and that person should be allowed to fulfil the role properly.

Briden thanked Brown for his report and said that he agreed the PCOM Chair personified the scientific leadership although perhaps SCICOM should be the scientific leadership rather than the individual who chairs that committee. He said that the OPCOM chair role would need significant discussion, but at this moment he wanted EXCOM to look at the question of the best PCOM chair, what it means in the US and whether this has implications for the US - non-US JOIDES Office rotation.

Orcutt said that the evaluation of achievements is an important aspect and it should be an explicit charge of the SCICOM. He said that this may also act as a spring board for publicity for the Program. Nowell said that the leadership (according to Greve) was shared between JOIDES, EXCOM, Texas A&M and that many of the Brown recommendations focus on the PCOM chair. He said that EXCOM must recognise that each of the relevant areas does have an important role to play and EXCOM must keep an eye on this balance. Ludden said that he agreed with Nowell, and that to some extent the leadership may also come from the WG's. Mutter said that leadership and management are spread around, and the Greve report, as he reads it, suggests that leadership should be more focused. He said that one of the problems is not so much planning, but implementing the plans and reaching its goals. Leinen said that a shared scientific leadership may not be appropriate. She said that ODP is working toward a structure that will identify leadership areas in many tasks such as scientific planning, implementation and management. She said that by EXCOM's instance on its review in terms of the LRP, she believes that ODP is working towards the kind of leadership that Greve was alluding to. Taylor said that the JOIDES Office and PCOM Chair is the one arm that is paid for by commingled funds in the advisory structure. He said that is why, rightly, Brown focused on the PCOM chair. He said the implementation happens through that office and EXCOM must look at how that implementation occurs to achieve the kind of leadership it wants to see. He said that it is that office that is the science planning structure at its most visible. Taira said that leadership of ODP in terms of competing with other science at a high level should be addressed, for example in relation to experiments and facilities like HUBBLE. He said that was lacking in this report. Heinrichs said that he thought that Taira was exactly correct, and that he felt it was leadership at this level was required. He said that the Greve committee felt that actually the scientific leadership within ODP was very strong, but it was at a high level that there was a void. They wanted to see an advocate with vision at a very high level.

Brown commented that he agreed with Heinrichs, and that person has to be the SCICOM Chair. He said that secondly EXCOM has to look at the functions of the SCICOM/PCOM chair, and that person should be doing only science planning and advocacy of the Program. Eldholm said that ODP focuses on the SCICOM/PCOM chair, but the leader needs a mandate and a secretariat to help that person perform. He said that the JOIDES Office also operates with a component that appears to somewhat on a limb. He said that the whole JOIDES Office system needs to be upgraded and the Chair should be full-time. He said that ODP needs the best person regardless of their country of origin. Falvey said that the JOIDES Office is a JOI sub-contract for 3 full-time staff at a cost of about \$400K, with a 75% salary for the PCOM Chair so that the chair can maintain some degree of science involvement. He said that the 75% time was intentional. Detrick

said that they should be 100% for the period of office with some payment after they leave the office. Falvey said that he did not object but there will have to be reductions elsewhere.

Briden said that he senses a consensus for a change to SCICOM and the Chair in particular with the scientific leadership role. He said that there are other operational leaders within the Program and that these are also advocates for the Program. He said that maybe it is the internal ODP networking that is at fault. He said that perhaps that network should be looked at, with national science committee chairs and operational leaders charged with advocacy of the Program. Briden said that another issue was the description of leadership in the Brown report that was appealing to EXCOM and perhaps EXCOM should look at that description and see how it could be applied. He asked if responsibility for short and long term planning could be incorporated within the implementation plan. Detrick commented that this is linked to the RFP for the JOIDES Office discussed earlier, the bidding, the term length, and a SCICOM Chair-elect to share responsibilities. Briden said that perhaps the easiest issue was that the PCOM Chair should be a full-time position, as this was the reality of the last ten years. He then asked if the US - non-US rotation should be disturbed. Mayer asked if EXCOM should be linked with the JOIDES Office. Nowell and Briden replied that it was essential. Loutit said that the "right" individual could always be moved to the office location. Nowell said that it would be far too impractical. Falvey said that at the moment the US is restricted to eight out of the ten JOIDES institutions. Briden said that at the moment within all other member countries, the "device" of the JOIDES member is undertaking the service, and at this present moment, 99% of the service is sub-contracted to Cardiff, not actually a JOIDES member. Nowell answered as an individual, and he said that the same option was available to all US institutions. Briden then asked if the rules should be changed so that any organisation of a member country was eligible so that any institution could bid without the use of subcontracts. Nowell replied that this needs discussion on the US side before answers could be given.

Briden then moved to the OPCOM chair situation. He said that if a deputy was used then the OPCOM chair may be in another country. Mutter said that he was in favour of this. Detrick said that PCOM had discussed this and there were potential problems, such as two committees at the same level need to be absolutely in concert and this may not be possible with different chairs. Mutter said that he still favoured the option of using a deputy to free up time for the SCICOM chair. Mix said that PCOM had yet to discuss that issue it was never raised.

Briden summed up by thanking Brown and he said that EXCOM need to analyse the leadership plan and how it fits with implementation, it also needs to analyse the position of SCICOM/PCOM chair and how it relates to the mandates of the other advisory committees. Briden said that the RFP for the next JOIDES Office also has to be decided, in terms of the 75% or 100% salary issue, and the rotation issue. EXCOM did not express enthusiasm for this. Detrick said that there was also the issue of the length of office period.

Taylor said that at the moment ODP still has no clear definition of who is the leader of the Program. Orcutt said that the Program has to compete more efficiently for funds and it needs a widely recognised leader at a high level. Mayer said that the key is to find the best PCOM Chair available as recommended by Brown. Orcutt said that the person he wanted would not have to be the same person as the PCOM Chair. Taylor said that by not suggesting a higher level committee, PCOM have actually perpetuated the leadership question. Detrick said that the best person should still be chosen as PCOM chair, and that maybe the way that the EXCOM chair is chosen should be so that he/she could be a high profile advocate.

Briden referred EXCOM to the commercial practices of Chairman and Chief Executive and asked if there was an analogy with what was in debate here. Mutter said that EXCOM is the top committee and normally the leader of the top committee would be the spokesperson. He said that perhaps EXCOM should take over the leadership role. Leinen suggested that a group could present some options on how EXCOM could move forward. Beiersdorf said that EXCOM should distinguish between functions, and one of those was the national issue of fund-raising, whilst the other was interaction with the earth science community.

Briden said that EXCOM have the elements of a general endorsement of the PCOM plan, but that could be varied in another way if EXCOM wished. Brown said that EXCOM is discussing things that would complement each other but not the role of the PCOM/SCICOM Chair. Mayer said that if EXCOM had approved a different structure then EXCOM would not be in this position. Dalrymple said that the structures really don't lend themselves to the role of "Chief Scientist", and that maybe EXCOM should not be so reactive to all of the Greve report suggestions. Taylor said that what EXCOM has agreed today will only deal with Phase III and something more is required for Phase IV.

Briden asked if further proposals should be brought forward. Detrick said that he favoured Leinen's idea of presenting a number of options. EXCOM agreed to this.

#### **4. CURRENT ISSUES**

##### **A. NSF REPORT**

Heinrichs reported and referred EXCOM to the agenda papers. He said that NSF is asking for a 5-year plan for review in 1997, for 1998-2003. He reported that the Peoples Republic of China membership will be delayed for an unknown period over an over-arching IPR agreement that needs to be re-negotiated. Heinrichs then reviewed the timeline figure for Phase III that was included in the agenda papers, and he reviewed the mid-life refit for the benefit of EXCOM. In answer to Fox, Heinrichs said that at the moment Taiwan has a problem in that it is not recognised as a country by either the USA or China. He said that the issue could be resolved, though he didn't know if it actually would.

EXCOM noted that JOI was required to produce the 5-year plan for NSF.

##### **B. JOIDES/PCOM**

###### **i) PCOM Business**

Mix raised the DCS issue and referred EXCOM to the agenda papers and said that PCOM believed the engineering reports that looked promising. He said that a further option, of slowing the project would probably kill it. Also PCOM considered the other spin-off benefits that are already manifest from the system.

###### **ii) Conflict of Interest**

Mix reported that this was dealt with by sub-committees and referred EXCOM to the agenda papers. He said that PCOM saw two separate issues: genuine conflict of interest; and inconsistency with PCOM voting procedures. He said that was why there were two motions. Mix said that the voting procedures motion was incorporated into the new draft JOI Policy manual section with virtually no changes, and the second motion had been changed in certain parts of the proposed new policy. Mix said that he would like clarification as to how this would affect WG's. He also suggested that some of the wording could be changed to a more simple text. He then said that he wanted a clear definition of "deliberation", especially in terms of discussion of proposed ship track.

Falvey responded and referred the meeting to his report in the agenda papers. He said that all individuals who serve on JOIDES committees or panels must be aware of these rules and what they actually mean. Falvey said that deliberations are any discussions that are leading to a vote, and that this should be made clear by the chair. Falvey said that the JOI corporate lawyers re-wrote section 11.04, and he suggested that EXCOM read this independently before making a decision.

Briden asked if it is the case that working groups and DPG's, as they are not ranking or prioritising by voting, that the conflict of interest was not applicable.

As regards the definition of "deliberations", Falvey quoted the following passage supplied by the JOI corporate lawyers:

The following is an outline of the advice received from JOI's corporate lawyers with respect to the duties of such members and the related conflict of interest duties.

- When an individual serves on either the JOI Board of Governors, PCOM, EXCOM, or the other panels and committees of the ODP science advisory structure, he or she is subject to the fiduciary duties of care and loyalty under applicable corporate law principles. These duties are owed by each such person to the Ocean Drilling Program and to the JOI corporate entity when performing his or her functions as a member of the JOI Board of Governors or as a member of the science advisory structure panels or committees.
- In general, compliance with the duty of care requires that one perform his or her functions (as a member of a board, committee or panel) in good faith and with that degree of diligence, care and skill which an ordinarily prudent person would exercise under similar circumstances in a like position. The duty of care generally requires making reasonable inquiries into the facts and circumstances surrounding matters upon which one will be voting. Frequently, necessity and efficiency require reliance upon the information and advice of others. Reliance of this sort will satisfy the duty of care provided the reliance is in good faith -- that is, one had no reason to believe that the information or advice was inaccurate, tainted or was otherwise unreliable. Accordingly, the duty of care is not subject to a bright line test, and it will require different actions and inquiries depending on the facts and circumstances.
- In general, compliance with the duty of loyalty requires that one act in a manner in accordance with the best interests of the Ocean Drilling Program and the JOI corporate entity when acting as a member of the JOI Board of Governors or as a member of the ODP science advisory structure panels or committees. Therefore, the duty of loyalty requires one to avoid improperly using his or her position to obtain, whether directly or indirectly, a benefit for oneself or for another organization in which one has an interest. Each person must be cognizant of the capacity in which he or she is serving at any one time and, at such times as he or she is acting as a member of the JOI Board or one of the ODP panels or committees, such acts are required to be carried out in good faith effort to advance the best interests of the Ocean Drilling Program and the JOI corporate entity in accordance with the purposes and goals of each.
- The issue of conflict of interest, which generally involves the duty of loyalty, is raised where a person has an interest that might be affected by any action under consideration by the board, committee or panel on which such person is serving. Where the person's interest is a direct conflict of interest, he or she must comply with the following procedures:
  - (1) Full disclosure to the board, committee or panel of the material facts of the conflict (for example, a financial, family relationship, professional or business affiliation);
  - (2) Abstaining from deliberations on the matter which will lead directly to a vote; and
  - (3) Abstaining from voting on the matter.
- Deliberations which will lead directly to a vote should be distinguished from general discussions. In general, the law does not prohibit involvement in general discussions about a matter which would directly affect a person's separate interest. In some cases, a person with a direct conflict of interest with respect to a matter before a board, panel or committee may be the most knowledgeable person in regard to that matter. Such person's contribution to a general discussion may be the best means of ensuring that the rest of the members are fully informed of the matter's relevant facts and issues. Nevertheless, once the general discussions give way to those deliberations which will lead directly to a vote the conflicted member must abstain from such deliberations and also abstain from subsequent voting on the matter.
- On the specific issue of a quorum, JOI Governors, or members of ODP committees or panels, with a direct conflict of interest on a particular issue, may still be counted in determining the presence of a quorum.

Briden said that this means the chair must construct the discussion very carefully and make all members aware when discussion ceases and deliberations begin. Falvey confirmed this. Mutter said that he was concerned that, for example, site survey readiness was actually opinion, not fact, as was the definition of proposal maturity. Falvey said that SSP advice is given in numerical form and should be taken as a fact from that committee.

## **REVIEW OF THE DAY - EXCOM MEMBERS AND LIAISONS**

Briden began by saying that EXCOM must prepare for the joint session, both what and who will present.

Detrick said that he was concerned about discussion of Phase III implementation, as many things were left hanging, though some people were tasked with motions. He thought that the make-up and membership of OPCOM should be discussed more fully. EXCOM felt that it wanted to re-examine the points of the implementation plan that PCOM had asked for advice on, and the "discussion items".

Mix reviewed his overhead requesting EXCOM advice. After round table discussion, EXCOM considered that it had comments in preparation for these, and it wanted to discuss the make-up and chairing of OPCOM. Briden suggested that EXCOM first address the reporting line. He referred EXCOM to the wiring diagrams in the agenda book. Taylor said that in terms of the operational year, the operational advice line is correct. Briden said that he thought so too, but that the SCICOM-OPCOM line should be a double-headed arrow. Detrick said that SCICOM must have an oversight of the schedule. Falvey said that OPCOM's key role would be building the science plan based on the ranking of SCICOM, and if it is sent back for a check then it would hold up the whole implementation process. Briden said that since OPCOM will operate within parameters defined by SCICOM, then OPCOM should be entrusted to do just that, and EXCOM will look at that in the following January. Mix said that the joint chair would address any questions regarding a mis-match of information flow. Taylor reminded EXCOM that each of the wiring diagrams was specific to the type of advice flow.

Fox commented that SCICOM/OPCOM could be perceived to be in conflict over financial issues. He said that SCICOM would be aware of the costs of each leg when they produce a ranking and that if there is not enough money in the budget for what SCICOM would like to schedule, OPCOM may change SCICOM's preferred plan. He said that if there is the possibility for feedback to the operators, they may come up with novel ways to help implement SCICOM's wishes.

Briden moved to OPCOM membership. He said that common membership with SCICOM and the Chairs of service panels was to ensure a small and effective committee, but there may be other options. Beiersdorf said that it is important to get the best people onto OPCOM as they will probably determine the success of each leg. Detrick said that a common membership would be an essential component. Briden said that he was pleased to see that EXCOM were very responsive to the need for OPCOM to be small and effective. Mix said that the intent of OPCOM membership was as an expertise-based representation that would be accomplished over time. Orcutt said that it looks like a sub-committee, even though it is actually a subset of SCICOM. Beiersdorf said that if it was a sub-committee of SCICOM then there may be problems of representation.

It was clarified for EXCOM that an initial plan was that OPCOM would not be a voting committee. Leinen said that may be a naive way of thinking. Beiersdorf said that if OPCOM is to be a voting committee then he would want national representation. Detrick said that SCICOM must be able to look at the OPCOM drilling plan. Taylor said that using Detrick's argument then EXCOM would simply re-create PCOM, with an August meeting dedicated to science planning. Stoffa said that he agreed and he commented that EXCOM seems to have come full circle and re-invented PCOM. Detrick said that it was an important step forward even so.

Briden asked EXCOM members to re-consider their deliberations later this evening and announced that the meeting would re-convene at 8am.

Adjourn ..... 18:30

**Tuesday, 25 June 1996**

**08:00**

### **C. JOI AND SUB-CONTRACTOR REPORTS**

#### **i) JOI**

Falvey referred EXCOM to the agenda papers, and he highlighted the fact that China has announced that it will join ODP. He said that Korea will be joining the Aus-Can consortia and is finalising matters next month. Moving to the PEC IV, Falvey reviewed the papers in the agenda book and said that the reviews of the Program should now wait until the new advisory system is in place. He said that aside from the reporting and the issue of the term of the JOIDES Office and PCOM Chair, all PEC IV items have been addressed. Falvey then briefly noted the state of progress in the JANUS project, as per the agenda papers.

Falvey then turned to Public Communications, introduced Pamela Baker-Masson and reviewed the new strategy for ODP Public Affairs as outlined in the meeting papers. Falvey said that there would be one public affairs strategy as opposed to several, and the focus of this would be the scientists themselves, for example during port-calls. Falvey outlined the six short-term objectives identified by JOI for activity over the coming months. He said that there have been no new items from the operators since submission of their reports for the agenda book.

Briden opened this item for discussion. Kitazawa reported that the IOC are still interested in developing a third-world consortia for ODP membership. Briden noted that Korea would be joining as a 1/12 partner in the first year, then moving to a 1/6 membership. Briden said that the post-cruise evaluation of performance against targets as identified by PEC IV would be an important issue that has yet to be addressed. Mix said that the thematic panels have been asked to help in this process by reporting on the success of the various legs. Falvey said that he would view the outcome of this meeting as determining the action on him in terms of the JOIDES Office. Briden said that the logging issue raised by PEC IV will be addressed by the RFP process. Briden asked how the communications strategy is developing in terms of ODP-TAMU. Fox replied that it is a little early to tell as Baker-Masson has only just started, but the work for the San Francisco port-call was seamless and went very well.

Briden then asked EXCOM for any comments on the operator reports. Taylor asked about the new shallow water guidelines. Fox replied that these guidelines exist, but ODP-TAMU are still having discussions with ODL. He said that a jointly-sponsored safety course will be undertaken by the relevant drilling personnel at the San Diego port-call. Fox said that the co-chiefs for the New Jersey leg are aware of the drilling parameters.

Orcutt raised the issue of "standard leg" costs, and Fox commented that the numbers as presented will change through time. Detrick asked what the \$300K would "buy" in terms of the JANUS data migration. Fox said the final cost would be a lot higher. He said that figure was identified by Falvey as appropriate seed money to begin the transition. He said that it seemed as though this project could be farmed out to a partner, and ODP-TAMU will be hosting a meeting of interested partners to define what the scope of the project would be and then define an RFP. Fox said that he felt it unlikely that all of that allocation would be spent in this fiscal year. Fox said that there may also be interest in this project from industry. Detrick said that it would be valuable for EXCOM to see an overview of the entire costs of this project. Fox said that determining such figures was not a simple job.

Briden said that EXCOM welcome the operator reports.

## **5. 1997 PROGRAM PLAN**

Briden commented that whilst he was looking at the MOU's he noticed that there is a requirement to present the Program Plan to Council, and this must be considered for the joint session. He said that the PCOM liaison will attend Council and present the past and future year's science plans.

### **A. BCOM REPORT**

Orcutt referred EXCOM to the written report. He said that one concern was the cost of an "average" leg and that ODP-TAMU had been working to develop these figures which were important in the situation of a declining budget. He said the budget was developed in a new way with fixed, basic service (A-base) and innovation (X-base) costs. He said that the X-base budget would be increased from \$3.5M to \$5M in FY98.

### **B. FINAL RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS**

Falvey reviewed the final BCOM allocations, as per the agenda papers. He said that subject to EXCOM approval, these will be presented to NSF next month.

### **C. FY97 PROGRAM PLAN**

Mix reviewed the FY97 legs and commented that the "A+B" legs were an encouraging sign of flexibility in scheduling legs on the part of the operator that PCOM was very pleased about. He said that there were some key changes, including the LWD on Leg 170 (Costa Rica) which involved some re-prioritisation of the FY97 budget (PCOM Motion 96-1-17). He said that if the hammer drill-in casing was not available on Leg 174B, then the time would be split between New Jersey (Leg 174A) and CORK refurbishment at Barbados. He reported that an extra hole (Site 7B) at 73m has now been approved on the New Jersey Leg. Mix said that a DPG was tasked with focusing a drilling plan for Leg 172 which proved very successful.

Mix reported that PCOM did re-affirm movement of the ship toward the Pacific. He said that there was an Antarctic DPG looking at the proposals around that continent, the results have yet to be reported officially although informally all participants were pleased with the outcome.

Dalrymple asked what part of the X-base budget will require ongoing expenses. Orcutt replied that the JANUS migration would be multi-year, but most things are one-off. Falvey said that each item in the X-base proposals were self-contained projects and included salary costs. He said that, for example, the DCS was also multi-year, and the figures shown were the FY97 part of that proposal. Detrick applauded the efforts to move resources to innovation, but he asked where the cost savings in the A-base budget would be to allow the X-base budget to grow. Falvey said that there is a commitment in the BCOM report that will allow the X-base to grow (to \$6.5M) until there is no more flexibility in the budgets. Fox said that ODP-TAMU has gone as far as possible in finding efficiencies in his organisation, and he is looking to see if ODP-TAMU is optimally configured to meet its requirements. He is looking for redundancies and further efficiencies in his organisational framework with an external consultant, and ODP-TAMU will then document that they have maximised their efficiency. Mayer asked if new partners will mitigate this situation. Falvey said that was not necessarily so, but the bottom line on the A-base will be determined and will not be cut beyond that point. Taylor said that many operational devices seem to be in the X-base, and asked if there was a standard logging suite within the A-base. Goldberg said that those items on the BCOM list are special tools that will be deployed in addition to the standard tools. Leinen asked about determination of the absolute baseline. She said that at present the Program is changing and evolving, and cited publications, and she said that it would be a difficult thing to identify whilst the evolution continues. Falvey said that the redefinition of baseline service delivery will continue to be looked at and he said that was exactly what happened with publications. He said that the advisory structure was perhaps a little conservative in its deliberations on the services required. Orcutt said that BCOM will have to keep asking what the A-base is, as the more conservative the Program stays, the more difficult it will be for innovation to move forward. Leinen

said that unless the community always looks at and question the routine services then there will be problems. Falvey said that there will not be very much else in terms of large order savings now that publications have been addressed, but management will continue to be vigilant.

EXCOM Motion 96-2-2

EXCOM approves the FY97 Science Plan.

Proposed: Orcutt, Seconded: Nowell

Unanimous

Briden asked if EXCOM was happy with the new format of the Program Plan. There was approval of the new style of presentation.

## **6. PHASE IV PLANNING**

### **A. SCIENTIFIC DEFINITION**

Briden said that EXCOM is aware of the meeting in Shonan, Japan in February and its outcome which was a proposal for another COSOD-type meeting.

Kitazawa reported on the Shonan meeting and he distributed an executive summary, referring EXCOM to this document. He said that there were some concerns expressed about the riser type and the potential high cost of the project. Kinoshita said that part of OD21 would focus on specific problems of interest to the Japanese that could be addressed by ocean drilling. He referred EXCOM to the draft organisational scheme as per the agenda book papers, and said that this will need refinement with JOIDES colleagues. He announced that an international meeting will be held in October in association with JOIDES TEDCOM, to discuss the technicalities of the OD21 riser system. He said that there will be a series of international committee meetings that will draft a white paper for OD21 prior to the COSOD-type workshop, currently planned for October 1997. He said that Japan consider it important that they have some indication of the magnitude and types of resources that the non-Japanese partners in OD21 will be contributing.

Detrick said the LRP outlines a two-ship plan with riser drilling as an important component. He asked if the proposed COSOD-R (riser) will focus exclusively on riser drilling or if it will have a broader focus. Kinoshita said that there is not a fixed idea as yet. He said that the engineering workshop in October will help to determine the type of riser for OD21 and so they cannot give a definite answer until they know what technology will be used. Detrick said that if ODP was to sponsor a COSOD meeting then it should be a very broad-based and not focused on riser drilling. Taira commented that participants at Shonan felt that such a meeting should focus on riser drilling as there had already been two broad-based COSOD-type meetings. Beiersdorf said that riserless drilling should be amalgamated with riser drilling in this conference. Mutter commented that a broad COSOD-II may re-invent the LRP, whereas riser-focused meeting would refine plans. Heinrichs said that his sense of Shonan was that a focus on riser drilling was required.

Fox asked for the dates of the October meeting. Kinoshita said that the dates of the workshop would be October 23-24, but that they may change depending upon the dates of the TEDCOM meeting.

Briden said that it seemed appropriate to refine scientific themes through a conference of the type proposed. To date the linkages with JOIDES in developing this conference have been good.

### **B. TECHNOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS**

Briden said that many outcomes for discussion here will depend upon the outcome of the joint TEDCOM/JAMSTEC meeting in October. Taira said that a major item of discussion will be the 2.5 km vs 4 km riser debate. Briden and Falvey raised the issue of riserless mud circulation and that it should also form part of the October meeting.

### **C. FINANCE, MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS**

Briden said that he is concerned that the funding consequences are not being brought out early enough for full discussion, and that the funding plans have to be developed in parallel with the science plans.

Falvey then continued, and referred EXCOM to the reports in the agenda papers. He said that there is still some distance between the OD21 and JOIDES management models, but there is convergence and it should be finalised by February 1997. Kinoshita commented that their fiscal process was slower than they would have liked for this year and that was why JAMSTEC have not presented a more detailed plan.

Briden said that EXCOM should record its encouragement to all involved to work towards an integrated structure for the management of Phase IV.

Detrick asked if there will be development of a timeline for Phase IV implementation or decision making. Heinrichs said that ODP Council need to make a decision for 1998-2003 first, although EXCOM will need to begin discussions now. He said that a decision on post-2003 will need to be made, but STA/JAMSTEC and ODP Council have different timelines, but the decisions will have to be made from mid-97 to mid-98. Heinrichs said that ODP Council will be building on the Grève report for decisions on Phase IV. Briden said that it seems that everyone is waiting for everyone else in terms of funding requirements and issues. He said that ODP Council may not be the appropriate body to take this issue forward and that maybe it will be explored in the joint session.

**7. EXECUTIVE SESSION: ACTIONS AND MOTIONS**

**ITEM 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING**

**a) Approval of the Minutes**

Already dealt with.

**b) JOIDES interim response to ODP mid-term review report**

EXCOM has endorsed the Chairs response already.

Coffee ..... 09:55 - 10:20

**ITEM 3. PHASE III PLANNING**

**a. Implementation plan**

EXCOM Motion 96-2-3

1. The EXCOM endorses the concept of a 3-tier planning structure for ODP that includes:
  - a) long and short-term science, technology and operations planning;
  - b) detailed development of themes and thematic review of proposals; and
  - c) programmatic proposal planning (working groups).
2. The EXCOM endorses the concept of separating long-term strategic planning from shorter-term operations strategy by:
  - a) the formation of a Science Advice Committee (SCICOM) that will be responsible for long-term strategic science, technology and budget planning and for accountability of the ODP to the Long Range Plan. This committee should have proportional representation, but EXCOM urges PCOM to develop a consultative mechanism with the ODP members to maintain a thematic balance;
  - b) the formation of an Operational Advice Committee (OPCOM) that will interact with SCICOM and be responsible for the shorter-term scientific, technical and operational planning necessary to develop each year's scientific drilling.
3. The EXCOM endorses the concept of establishing two thematic review panels (Earth's Environment, Earth's Interior) responsible for:
  - a) advising and interacting with SCICOM on thematic development within ODP;
  - b) obtaining reviews of drilling proposals, and evaluating and synthesizing those reviews for SCICOM;
  - c) communicating and interacting with programmatic planning groups (a.k.a. working groups).
4. The EXCOM endorses the concept of having SCICOM establish programmatic planning groups of finite lifetime. These planning groups will use unsolicited, solicited, and self-developed proposals to develop or contribute to mature drilling proposals.

Programmatic Planning Groups will be established based on: SCICOM perception of need and/or recommendations of other JOIDES committees and/or requests from global programs and/or recommendations of other individuals in JOIDES.

*Proposed: Leinen, Seconded: Beiersdorf*

*Unanimous*

Leinen proposed the motion and described its rationale for EXCOM. Orcutt asked if this is where the review of legs (performance against targets) should be addressed. Leinen and Mayer said that would be in part of the SCICOM mandate. Leinen said there would be another motion to request additional clarification of the role and membership of OPCOM. Brown said that he is concerned about the breadth of what EXCOM will be asking from SCICOM. Mix said that calendar details will be determined during the "fine tuning process". Mayer asked if EXCOM will ask PCOM

to establish mandates and mechanisms. Briden said that EXCOM can establish an ad-hoc group between EXCOM and PCOM to refine things before the August PCOM, as EXCOM will not have to ratify things until their next meeting. He said that it is likely that formal implementation can begin on 1 January with provisional mandates. Ludden commented that there is still some doubt in the second tier level and proposed just endorsing the concept of thematic review at the second tier level. Leinen said that she would accommodate that suggestion depending upon the feeling of the rest of EXCOM. Mayer said that EXCOM can only say that two panels are unacceptable and offer an alternative. Falvey said that the wording would have to change from national committees to "ODP member committees". Taira expressed a worry that it may be too prescriptive in terms of top-down management. Beiersdorf said that would not be the case as the review panels would be in the centre. Eldholm said that EXCOM could re-examine this issue if things did not go smoothly. Taylor called the question.

**EXCOM Consensus 96-2-4**

EXCOM requests that PCOM consider the following issues with respect to the new structure and committees proposed for ODP.

**SCICOM:**

Which service panels/committees have a role in guiding the long term strategic planning of ODP and how will SCICOM receive input from them?

**OPCOM:**

- a) To whom should this committee report?
- b) Who should chair this committee given the strong leadership role that we have identified for the SCICOM chair?
- c) How many members should be on this committee and how should they be chosen?
- d) Which panels/committees have a role in guiding the yearly operational program of drilling and how will OPCOM receive input from them?
- e) Should this committee be a subcommittee of SCICOM?

**Thematic Review Panels:**

- a) How will these panels deal with thematic issues that cut across both panels?
- b) Is one meeting sufficient?

**Working Groups:**

Name and number?

Orcutt asked about OPCOM being a sub-committee of SCICOM. Leinen said that there was a feeling that it should not be a formal subcommittee and so she has worded this to specifically ask that question. Orcutt said that with subcommittee status then the representation issue does not arise. Briden said that BCOM is a subcommittee of EXCOM and members have waived their right for representation, so a precedent has been set. Mix commented that this was a positive motion to send to PCOM. Briden said that OPCOM has an extremely important role and EXCOM should go for the optimum membership to achieve its tasks. Therefore any mechanism devised should not adversely affect this committee. Mayer said that was why he wanted it as a sub-committee, chaired by the SCICOM chair. Beiersdorf said that another question was if it was to be a voting committee. Eldholm said that EXCOM could ask PCOM to consider all the elements as proposed. Briden said that it was suggested that it would be useful for an EXCOM/PCOM dialogue, and that EXCOM should consider this idea. Detrick said that EXCOM did discuss the number of WG's, and he wanted the number of working groups to be another area for PCOM consideration. Mayer said that the WG's should all be JOIDES WG's. Detrick said that the actual operation of these should be considered as they will be different from previous JOIDES WG's.

Pearce was asked if a joint PCOM/EXCOM meeting was required before the August meeting. He said that it would greatly speed things up if a group was to meet, but it would have to be within

the next few weeks. Briden suggested that the group be formed and he asked EXCOM for nominations - Beiersdorf and Stoffa. Detrick asked that Humphris be kept in the information cycle even though she is at sea.

Briden moved to the issue of transition to another structure. Mix said that transition to the basic structure could be very fast - a few weeks. The mechanism would be, for an interim period, to change the current PCOM to SCICOM, the thematic panels would be split into proponents becoming interim WG's augmented by expertise as required, and the remainder of thematic panel members merge into the two new review panels, again filling expertise as needed. These could have a 1 year lifetime adjusting membership as needed. Dalrymple said that membership could be changed on the current rotation schedule to ensure corporate memory. This would avoid a precipitous change and would enable the ongoing duties to continue, it would also allow the "PCOM" function to continue via SCICOM until OPCOM is determined. Nowell said that this would enable EXCOM to look at the "new" mandates in February of next year. Taylor said that following the August meeting PCOM could forewarn the thematic panels as to this plan and the thematic panels could then plan their membership rotations accordingly. Beiersdorf agreed with this sentiment.

Briden asked that the minutes record that the transition be underway under the method outlined above. He said that a caveat would be representation, and that this will need to be looked at carefully. The review panels must be representative. Briden said that he was not happy that the conflicted panel members become WG's as it is too much "business as before" under a new guise. Dalrymple said that SCICOM would determine the WG's focus and the conflicted members could be used as a focus. Leinen said that she was not happy with this either. Taylor said that PCOM could give advance warning of what WG's it wants to create to the thematic panels and maybe to EXCOM. Mix said that SCICOM would set the topics and decide on the appropriate people who should make up those WG's.

Heinrichs said that EXCOM would have to establish SCICOM before it can come into existence. Briden said that EXCOM would now envisage that SCICOM would meet in April 97 and would have to constitute its review panels and WG's at that meeting. Detrick said that if there is a joint EXCOM/PCOM committee, can EXCOM delegate responsibility for approval? Briden said that he is nervous about setting up SCICOM on a provisional basis. Nowell said that the planning can continue, but EXCOM do not need to formalise the new system until February. Mix said that the problem would be in re-constituting the thematic panels into review panels and WG's. Nowell said that so long as the plan is sound, the plan can be presented and approved in February. Briden said that EXCOM is giving a limited amount of general advice - it is content for the current PCOM to form the transitional SCICOM for calendar year 1997, that EXCOM agrees with the sentiment for maintaining the maximum amount of corporate memory in the review groups and accept the merit of injecting some of that corporate memory into the WG's that SCICOM proposes to set up.

Briden then moved on to raise the issue of national and consortia committee consultation. he asked if any motion would be appropriate at this time ? EXCOM thought not.

Taylor then spoke to the following motion:

**EXCOM Motion 96-2-5**

**EXCOM undertakes to work with the ODP national member committees and funding agencies to seek the necessary increased funding to carry out the objectives of the LRP.**

**EXCOM requests JOI to develop a strategic plan to secure funding for FY98 renewal and Phase IV operations and report on this to the next EXCOM meeting in February.**

**Proposed: Taylor, Seconded: Brown**

**Unanimous**

He said that there seemed to be a lack of commitment to get extra funds for the Program, and so he wanted EXCOM to commit itself to work with appropriate groups to ensure that this

happens, especially given the timelines alluded to by Heinrichs. He said that the motion also identifies the team of individuals who should act as primary spokespersons for the Program on this issue. Mayer said that the problem is not addressed by this. He thinks the problem is an actual distributed leadership when others are looking for a focused leadership. He said that EXCOM needs to seek a mechanism to achieve the shortcomings identified in the Greve report. Brown said that it is a distributed organisation and the search for funds has to follow many routes depending upon the member concerned. It cannot fall onto the shoulders of one or two people. Mayer said that he takes this response as a non-acceptance of the Greve report in this respect. Nowell said that may be entirely appropriate as the Greve committee may have misunderstood the funding avenues of the Program. Leinen said that some here are discussing scientific leadership and others are looking at the funding issue. Loutit commented that the first part of the motion was key, to develop a strategic plan to secure funding. Brown said that in terms of scientific leadership, this has never been in place, ODP has always had a distributed advocacy. Mutter said that the Program grew in a very different funding environment and that maybe there is now a need for a focused advocate. Taira said that it would be a major step forward to produce a strategic plan for future funding. Nowell suggested that the identification on individuals was not appropriate but if that were removed he would support the motion. Briden suggested withdrawal of the first and second parts of the proposed motion. Taylor said that he was happy to drop the identification of individuals.

Mayer said that he wanted to look at the area of scientific leadership as it had not been dealt with properly. Detrick said that the issue of extending the term of the SCICOM chair or moving to a chair-elect was worth discussion. Falvey said that at the moment there was no change. Nowell said that the RFP would come back to EXCOM for review and so this issue can be discussed at the February meeting. Mayer and Brown said that there are a number of specific issues arising from the Brown report. Briden said that if the issue of US to non-US rotation was to be addressed JOI would need to know now as it may affect the wording of the RFP.

#### **b. Innovations and economies**

Briden moved on to the issue of Publications. Mayer withdrew from the discussion of this item. Orcutt said that perhaps the web publications should be considered as a journal to allow early publication. Falvey said that as soon as a post-12 months paper is approved by the Editorial Review Board it will be published on the web.

##### **EXCOM Consensus 96-2-6**

EXCOM endorses the new ODP Publication Strategy proposed by JOI in response to the NSF Inspector General's Report with the aim of enhancing the usefulness and visibility of products of ODP science.

Briden said that the other issues were to be referred back to the advisory structure for prioritisation.

#### **c. Financial projections**

EXCOM noted this item.

#### **d. Scientific Leadership**

Dealt with above.

#### **e. 1998-2003 RFPs**

Mutter withdrew from discussion of this item.

##### **EXCOM Consensus 96-2-7**

EXCOM advises JOI to maximise the scope for innovation in evaluation of bids for contracts for service delivery for Phase III. It therefore recommends that the RFPs should be framed in terms of a) a minimum core service; b) maximum innovation.

#### **ITEM 4. CURRENT ISSUES**

##### **a. NSF Report**

EXCOM noted this item.

##### **b. JOI and Sub-contractor reports**

EXCOM noted this item.

##### **c. JOIDES/PCOM**

EXCOM noted the PCOM report. Falvey presented the proposed new text of the JOI policy manual sections 11.01 and 11.04.

#### **EXCOM Consensus 96-2-8**

EXCOM endorses the proposed changes to the JOI policy manual so that the relevant sections read as follows:

#### **1.04 The JOIDES Organisation - The Planning Committee (PCOM)**

**1.04.10 (a)** The following four-step voting procedure is recommended to avoid potential problems arising from conflict of interest situations involving the special case of proposal ranking and determination of a recommended annual or long term science plan.

**Step 1:** Choice of proposals to retain for purposes of global ranking: PCOM has two options for this step:

**Option 1:** Panel consensus on recommendation of Chair.

**Option 2:** Show-of-hands vote on each candidate drilling proposal, with a vote of at least 50% in favour being sufficient to retain a proposal for ranking. Conflicted members of PCOM will abstain from voting.

**Step 2:** Ranking of proposals based on scientific quality: Given X proposals retained from Step 1, unconflicted PCOM members will rank programs from 1 to X on a signed paper ballot. After voting, written ranks of each program by each voter will be tabulated and reported (in PCOM minutes) in a matrix, along with a calculation of mean ranking of each program. A draft science plan will be constructed of top-ranked proposals. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 2 in its entirety.

**Step 3:** In a case of statistical ties in rankings that affect the choice of proposals to drop from the draft science plan, PCOM will choose between closely ranked proposals on this boundary based on a one-on-one vote using signed paper ballots. A majority vote will choose the program to retain in the draft science plan and the draft science plan from Step 2 will be adjusted accordingly. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 3 in its entirety.

**Step 4:** After assembling the top ranked proposals from Steps 1-3 into a draft recommended science plan, PCOM will consider the logistics, costs, and quality of the proposed plan as a whole. PCOM will vote with a show of hands to accept or reject the draft recommended science plan in its entirety, based on a simple majority of votes cast. Rejection of the draft science plan at this stage dictates a return to Step 1 in the voting procedure. Conflicted members of PCOM will be excluded from Step 4 in its entirety(New).

#### **11.0 Conflict of Interest - General Ocean Drilling Program**

**11.04.** If any JOIDES panel or committee member, or any individual or institution related to such member, has any interest that might be affected by, or might reasonably be perceived to be affected by, any action under consideration by the panel or committee

on which he or she is serving, such member is required to declare the existence of such interest to the Chair. Such interests include (1) being a proponent of a pending drilling proposal, and (2) being proposed as a co-chief scientist. The possible existence of such interest may also be proposed to the Chair by a member or liaison other than the member having the interest.

All declared or proposed possible conflicts of interest, and the actions taken, will be recorded in the Minutes of the meeting at which the interest was considered. With respect to any such declared interest, or proposed possible interest, the Chair will make an initial determination regarding whether the circumstances constitute a direct conflict of interest.

In determining whether the circumstances constitute a direct conflict of interest, the Chair may, at his/her discretion, consult with other members of the panel or committee. The Chair's decision will be subject to review in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

(a) Panel or committee members who are determined by the Chair to have a direct conflict of interest with respect to a drilling proposal will not be present during any/part of a panel or committee meeting when proposals affected by such direct conflict of interest are subject to deliberation, review and ranking. However, a conflicted panel or committee member may be permitted to participate in general discussions that do not lead directly to voting, regarding proposals in general, including discussion of his or her own proposal. Such members must restrict their comments and discussion to the scientific objectives of proposals being discussed and will refrain from making comparisons with their own proposals.

(b) PCOM members determined to have a direct conflict of interest will not be present during deliberations leading directly to a vote and will not vote with respect to the inclusion in, or exclusion from, the upcoming recommended science plan of a proposal affected by such direct conflict of interest.

(c) During panel or committee discussions that do not lead directly to a vote, or that do not involve competitive ranking of proposals (e.g., determination of the long-term ship track at PCOM), all members may participate in general discussions, in order to provide a full range of expertise to the decision-making process. A member having an active proposal that may form part of the long-term track of the drillship will abstain from final deliberations and voting relating to the long-term track.

(d) Panel or committee members who are determined to have a direct conflict of interest will not be present during deliberations leading directly to a vote and will not vote with respect to any other matters affected by such direct conflict of interest. (New).

Proposed: Stoffa, Seconded: Brown

Unanimous

**ITEM 5. 1997 PROGRAM PLAN**

**a. BCOM Report**

EXCOM noted this item.

**b. Final Resource Allocations**

EXCOM noted this item.

**c. FY97 Program Plan**

Loutit commented, and was supported by EXCOM, that the new presentation format of the Program Plan made things much clearer and should be used in future.

**ITEM 6. PHASE IV PLANNING**

**a. Scientific definition**

EXCOM noted the various reports and advice that has already been passed between PCOM and OD21.

**b. Technological implications**

Already done, see EXCOM Motion 96-1-15.

**c. Finance, management and operations**

Advice has been passed to JOI in discussion session. Taira asked for a statement of support for the COSOD type meeting. EXCOM urged PCOM to work closely with OD21 planners for a successful meeting in Japan.

Briden then reviewed the items to be presented to ODP Council in the joint session after lunch and who would be assigned to present the various items. Briden thanked the members, liaisons and guests for their help over the past two years.

EXCOM Motion by Acclamation  
EXCOM thanks Jim Briden, along with Kathy Ellins and Colin Jacobs of the JOIDES Office, for all their efforts and hard work over the past two years.

Lunch ..... 12:25 - 13:20

**EXCOM EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Issues were discussed and a conclusion reached.

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Next Meeting Start: Monday 10 February 1997, Washington D.C. (Probably to be held in the ANA Hotel). (Note : the site has been booked until Thursday 13 February 1997).

Mid 1997 To be held in IFREMER, Brest, possibly the last week in June (23 - 29).

Early 1998 Biosphere, Arizona. (Dates to be confirmed).

Adjourn ..... 14:30