

Meeting of the JOIDES Executive Committee

June 9 -10, 1997,
IFREMER, Brest, France

DRAFT MINUTES

Executive Committee - EXCOM

Helmut Beiersdorf	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Hannover, Germany
James Briden	Dept. of Earth Sciences, Oxford University, United Kingdom
Chris Harrison	Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami
Brent Dalrymple	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University
Robert Detrick (Chair)	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Robert Duce	College of Geosciences & Maritime Studies, Texas A&M University
Olav Eldholm	University of Oslo, European Science Foundation (Consortium for Ocean Drilling)
David Feary	Australian Geological Survey Organisation, Australia - Canada-Chinese Taipei - Korea Consortium
Margaret Leinen	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island
Catherine Mével	Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris
John Mutter	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University
Arthur Nowell	School of Oceanography, University of Washington
John Orcutt	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California
Paul Stoffa	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin
Kiyoshi Suyehiro	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)
Susan Humphris	SCICOM Chair, JOIDES Office, WHOI

Guests and Observers

Pamela Baker-Masson	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
J. Paul Dauphin	US National Science Foundation
Michele Fratta	European Science Foundation, Strasbourg, France
Hajimu Kinoshita	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Kazuhiro Kitazawa	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Shigeo Kuriki	Ministry of Education (Japan)
François Madelain	IFREMER, Issy-les-Moulieaux, France
Bruce Malfait	US National Science Foundation
Dietrich Maronde	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Germany
Tsuyoshi Maruyama	STA (Japan)
Larry Mayer	University of New Brunswick, Australia - Canada-Chines Taipei - Korea Consortium
Eigo Miyazaki	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Kenji Ohkuma	STA (Japan)
David Prior	Texas A&M University
Michael Purdy	US National Science Foundation
David Scholl	USGS, Menlo Park
Jorn Tiede	GEOMAR, Germany
Akira Ueda	STA (Japan)

JOIDES Office

Kathy Ellins	Science Coordinator
Maria Mutti	International Liaison

Motions of the JOIDES Executive Committee

EXCOM Motion 97-2-1

EXCOM approves the Agenda for the JOIDES EXCOM Meeting.

Proposed by Beiersdorf; seconded by Harrison.

Unanimous.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-2

EXCOM approves the Minutes of the February 1997 Washington DC Meeting as a true record.

Proposed by Orcutt; seconded by Eldholm.

Two abstentions (Mével and Taylor, who were not present at the February Meeting).

EXCOM Motion 97-2-3

EXCOM approves the FY 98 Annual Program Plan for Legs 176 to 181.

Proposed by Orcutt; seconded by Beiersdorf.

13 in favor; 3 abstentions (conflicted members - Feary, Mutter, Taylor)

Nowell noted minor mistakes in the Leg numbers for FY 98 and 99 in the Agenda Book. These will be corrected.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-4

EXCOM approves SCICOM Motion 97-1-18: The general area of drilling will remain in the Indian Ocean and western Pacific through FY 2000.

Proposed by Duce; seconded by Feary.

14

in favor; two abstentions (conflicted members - Suyehiro and Orcutt).

EXCOM Motion 97-2-5

EXCOM approves the new mail review/proposal submission procedures

Proposed by Briden; seconded by Leinen

Unanimous

EXCOM Motion 97-2-6

The EXCOM recognizes that the Publications of ODP are an important mechanism by which the principal legacy of the program, its scientific findings, are conveyed to the scientific community, and by which an additional legacy, the scientific samples, are described to the community. We appreciate the concern of the SCICOM for the importance of this communication mechanism. We also appreciate the work that the Publications Committee has done to poll our community about its capability and its continuing commitment to advise us about the access and format of our publications.

The severe fiscal constraints imposed by member contributions anticipated for Phase III of ODP require that we exercise great care in balancing priorities for the ODP activities. First and foremost among those are to foster technological innovation and make progress toward implementing our science plan. Budget projections from our operators indicate that it would be impossible to do so if we accept the extra costs associated with the recommendation of the JOI Publications Steering Committee to continue traditional paper publication of the Initial Reports (IR) for several years.

As a result, the EXCOM reconfirms its 1996 schedule for introducing electronic and CD-ROM publication of the IR and SR volumes and phasing out paper publication. We agree to cap the volume publication budget at the levels indicated in the JOI model for FY 99 and beyond.

We have asked JOI to explore outsourcing publications as an additional option and have also asked that they check obligations for publications in the MOUs and seek relaxation of these obligations if necessary.

Proposed by Leinen; seconded by Briden.

14 in favor. One abstention (Duce); one absent (Mével).

EXCOM Motion 97-2-7

EXCOM asks JOI to provide advice on outsourcing all or part of ODP Publications. This advice should include electronic publications options and consider legal and financial issues. JOI should report their findings at the January 1998 EXCOM Meeting.

Proposed by Stoffa; seconded by Harrison.

14 in favor. One abstention (Duce); one absent (Mével).

EXCOM Motion 97-2-8

EXCOM requests that JOI explore all opportunities for industry partnership in the development of major new ODP technologies with a view to cost-sharing these developments. As an initial step, TEDCOM should be consulted on the likely potential for such joint technology projects from an industry stand point.

Proposed by Mutter; seconded by Harrison.

15 in favor. One absent (Mével).

EXCOM Motion 97-2-9

EXCOM welcomes the progress made by the Nansen Arctic Drilling Program as evidenced by the Science Plan and Implementation Plan. ODP looks forward to the development of collaborative efforts with NAD. EXCOM requests SCICOM to consider the appropriate mechanism for a formal liaison with NAD.

Proposed by Eldholm; seconded by Taylor.
15 in favor. One absent (Mével).

EXCOM motion 97-2-10.

The June 1997 EXCOM Meeting is adjourned.

Proposed by Orcutt ; seconded by Nowell.

**JOIDES EXCOM Meeting
June 9 - 10, 1997**

MONDAY (June 9) AM 9:00 AM

1. Welcome & Introductions

1.1 Introduction of EXCOM Members, Liaisons, Guests

Detrick welcomed new EXCOM members, Mével and Feary, and noted that Suyehiro was standing in for K. Taira, the new Japanese member. Duce's will be replaced by Prior, who was present as an observer, at the next EXCOM meeting.

1.2 Meeting Logistics

EXCOM participants were invited to visit L'Atalante (IFREMER) and the semisubmersible drilling rig, the SEDCO 707 (Schlumberger).

1.3 Approval of Agenda

Detrick explained the organization of the agenda.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-1 EXCOM approves the Agenda for the JOIDES EXCOM Meeting.
--

Proposed by Beiersdorf; seconded by Harrison.

Unanimous.

2. Minutes and Matters Arising

2.1 Approval of February 1997 EXCOM Minutes

TAB 1

No corrections were made to the February 1997 EXCOM minutes.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-2 EXCOM approves the Minutes of the February 1997 Washington DC Meeting as a true record.
--

Proposed by Orcutt; seconded by Eldholm.

Two abstentions (Mével and Taylor, who were not present at the February Meeting).

3. Status of Phase III Renewal

3.1 NSF Report

TAB 2

Heinrichs reported that all current partners are prepared to commit for 1998 to 2003 (ODP Phase III). Consequently, NSF's basic planning is proceeding on this premise. NSF does not have formal letters of commitment from ODP members at present, but these commitments in writing will be requested at the ODP Council Meeting later in the week. NSF is optimistic about associate membership and candidacy. The delay in being able to offer candidate membership to China is nearing resolution; the matter is in the final stages.

The Brest EXCOM is another stage in the evolution of how EXCOM and ODP Council interact. Council members were invited to attend the EXCOM Meeting as observers in order to avoid the overlap in reporting. Humphris (SCICOM Chair) and Detrick (EXCOM Chair) will attend Council as JOIDES liaisons and to deliver their respective reports. In the past, there were joint sessions because the MOUs require ODP Council to be consultative to EXCOM.

3.2 ODP Council Response to ODP Strategic Implementation Plan

TAB 3

The ODP Strategic Implementation Plan was finalized after the February 1997 Meeting and sent to the ODP Council. NSF has not received any comments via council to this plan and thus have assumed that the plan met the needs of the partner countries.

3.3 Country Reports - Updates on Phase III Renewal

TAB 4

3.3.1 Australia-Canada- Chinese Taipei-Korea (PAC RIM Consortium)

Feary expressed surprise that NSF had not received formal positive indication regarding renewal as he had understood that the formal letters of commitment had been submitted. The consortium is happy to announce the commitment to Phase IV and look forward to the full integration of the new partners. Funding arrangements are fundamentally more complex. With ship heading towards the western Pacific, there is a greater level of awareness regarding ODP science among the PAC RIM members.

3.3.2 ECOD

ECOD hopes to renew as a full member. Renewal has been agreed to by all the Nordic countries (50% of the ECOD partnership). There is uncertainty about the Italy's level of contribution. Turkey's continued involvement is shaky. Portugal has joined as a new member.

3.3.3 France

Mével reported that France's position regarding renewal is positive. Pierre David, Director of IFREMER, is awaiting formal governmental approval. Following recent elections in May, France has a new government. Consequently, there may be a delay in this process.

In response to Detrick's request, Mével clarified the statement in the French Country Report that "the mechanisms to strengthen the links with major programs are not fully

settled yet". The French perception was that the mandates of the PPGs did not go far enough in naming other global geoscience programs. Mével elaborated on other French concerns. France wants to see a discussion of funding for alternate platforms in Phase III, even in the context of a flat budget, because the use of alternate platforms is stated in the ODP LRP. France is not equally interested in the science of all the programs, and would like to see more flexibility in the staffing of the ship to reflect this uneven interest. Fox responded that ODP-TAMU needs to know far in advance (i.e. at the time of the Program Plan development, and not just within the one to two month window of staffing) if a country wants to be more heavily represented on a particular Leg in order to ensure flexibility and stability. Briden noted that the diversity among the interests of UK scientists had been reflected by different levels of shipboard representation on ODP Legs to the great satisfaction of the UK. Detrick concluded that since TAMU has been made aware, they will be able to work with the member countries to ensure flexibility in staffing.

3.3.4 Germany

Germany confirmed its commitment to ODP through 2003, but Maronde indicated that they were awaiting the discussion on the ODP Publication Policy to see if there would be any impact on the MOU.

To assure the future of ODP, Germany is convinced that a close cooperation of scientific drilling, involving an integrated program between ocean and continental drilling, is required. The first step is the liaison relationship between the ICDP and ODP. The ODP SCICOM liaison attended the ICDP Executive Committee Meeting in Potsdam.

3.3.5 Japan

Suyehiro reported that Japan's intent to renew for Phase III will be expressed on June 27. More time will be required to secure the funding, after which, formal approval will be given. Heinrichs said that NSF did not expect formal letters by this EXCOM Meeting, but wanted to get on record the intent of the ODP partners to renew for Phase III.

3.3.6 UK

Briden reported that NERC had approved, in principle, funding for Phase III. The UK is pleased because this follows a period when the UK looked critically at the evolution of the Program. The UK has a new government with a new budget, and it is unclear whether the budgetary restructuring underway is for the next fiscal year or the current one. Approval in principal is one thing, but renewal is not guaranteed until the MOU is signed. Briden noted the key factors underpinning the UK decision to renew - the science plan, the degree of promise in the new advisory structure, efficiency and effectiveness, financial realism influencing EXCOM, the Strategic Implementation Plan, and the move forward in the Publications Policy. The UK will continue to look at the degree to which the financial realism stay in place and whether the Publications Policy remains as forward-looking as they thought it would be. NERC has reserved funding in a constant budget line for the UK ODP.

3.3.7 USA

Malfait noted the "clearance issue" with respect to China's membership. NSF is firmly committed in principle to renewal for Phase III. Like the UK, the USA must also go through a number of technical steps to secure funding. NSF is not anticipating problems.

All members have indicated that they will renew for Phase III although they have not all signed on the dotted line. This is good news ensuring that ODP will continue beyond 1998 with 6 full partners. Detrick recognized the efforts of EXCOM and the National Committees in working towards this goal, and congratulated all who worked towards renewal.

4. Action Items

4.1 Approval of FY 1998 Annual Program Plan

TAB 5

The FY 98 Annual Program Plan is embodied in the Five Year ODP Program Plan, which was distributed separately to all EXCOM members by JOI. The FY 98 budget is outlined in detail in the Five Year Plan. Only very minor changes have been made to the FY 1998 budget that EXCOM reviewed in February. These minor modifications, on the order of tens of thousands of dollars, represent the revised costs of X-base items and also reflect some internal adjustments at TAMU.

Orcutt asked for clarification about the actual cost of an ice support vessel for Leg 178, included in the figure for Ship Operations (\$869,534). Fox responded that this figure is the sum of two numbers - \$176 K represents the amount spent on modifications to the JR to meet the new environmental standards of operating in the Antarctic (Antarctic Treaty), and \$700 K was allocated to operate an ice vessel (although the exact cost is not yet known). The RFP for an ice vessel has been issued. TAMU recently surveyed a ship in Chile that may meet the needs of the Program and will cost less than \$700 K. Unfortunately, the ship may be sold. TAMU prefers a source in the Southern Hemisphere as it will be more expensive to procure an ice ship from the Northern Hemisphere. TAMU originally requested \$1 million to cover the cost of the ice boat.

EXCOM Motion 97-23

EXCOM approves the FY 98 Annual Program Plan for Legs 176 to 181.

Proposed by Orcutt; seconded by Beiersdorf.

13 in favour; 3 abstentions (conflicted members - Feary, Mutter, Taylor)

Nowell noted minor mistakes in the Leg numbers for FY 98 and 99 in the Agenda Book. These will be corrected.

4.2 Approval of Four-Year Ship Track

TAB 6

Humphris reviewed the factors considered by PCOM in scheduling beyond FY 98 (Legs 176 - 181) into FY 99 (Legs 182 and 183). In determining the Four-Year Ship Track, SCICOM

considered (1) pressure from high priority science in that part of the world, and the (2) required dry dock, which will likely be in Singapore. As there is sufficient high priority science to be done in the Indian Ocean and western Pacific (many proposals in the JOIDES system in this geographic region are ready to be drilled), SCICOM agreed that the ship should stay within the area through FY 2000.

In response to a query from Harrision about the ship track diagram, Humphris explained that the map is a long-term projection over phase III, showing the ship moving into the eastern Pacific post-2003 and then possibly back into the Atlantic. Briden questioned whether this map should be publicized. Humphris said that the map was part of the Five Year Program Plan and pointed out the multiple arrows, representing possible tracks. She emphasized that SCICOM does not want to pre-guess where the ship is going.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-4 EXCOM approves SCICOM Motion 97-1-18: The general area of drilling will remain in the Indian Ocean and western Pacific through FY 2000.

Proposed by Duce; seconded by Feary.

14 in favour; two abstentions (conflicted members - Suyehiro and Orcutt).

4.3 External Mail Evaluation/Proposal Submission Procedures

TAB 7

The mail review/proposal submission procedures were initially formulated by the JOIDES Office with input from PCOM, SCICOM, EXCOM, NSF, and JOI. They were reviewed and commented on by EXCOM at the February EXCOM Meeting, subsequently revised, and endorsed by SCICOM at their April meeting (SCICOM Motion 97-1-10). In his review of issues surrounding this item, Detrick noted, in particular, EXCOM's recommendation regarding the inclusion of proponents' CVs in the proposal package.

In April, SCICOM endorsed a two step system of proposal submission, involving Preliminary and Full Proposals, which permits rejection at an early stage (if warranted) thereby preventing proposals from remaining in the ODP system *ad infinitum*.

SCICOM made three changes to the procedures considered by EXCOM in February:

1. Inclusion of the option for a Full Proposal to be submitted for new ideas without going through the Preliminary Proposal stage in exceptional cases when opportunities exist.

2. The matter of the submission of CVs with proposals was a controversial issue. It was decided that information on scientific background could be useful in some instances (i.e., with respect to proponent groups and communities unknown to members of the JOIDES Advisory Structure at present), and also in providing TAMU with recommendations for the selection of Co-chiefs. One of the requirements for the submission of Full Proposals will be the submission of CVs, limited to no more than 4 proponents (because of large number of proponents on individual proposals), or a two page summary of the background of the group of proponents. External evaluators will be asked

to comment on the competence of proponents if it is deemed relevant to the science being proposed.

3. Issue of **anonymity of reviewer**. SCICOM agreed with EXCOM and recommended that the identity of external evaluators be removed by JOI and this information kept confidential by JOI.

Discussion:

Mutter indicated surprise regarding the controversy surrounding CVs. Humphris explained that the feeling was that a proposal should be judged on scientific merit because the people who carry out the scientific program may or may not be proponents of the original proposal. Once a proposal is scheduled, it becomes ODP science and the shipboard party includes many more and different people than those who proposed the science initially. There was concern at SCICOM that consideration of CVs could potentially bias a proposal.

Detrick inquired about the recent SSEPs meeting. Humphris said that for the first time the panels had both external evaluations, and the proponents' responses. Consequently, the panels were able to discuss issues in greater depth than in the past. In addition, some matters not previously discussed emerged during the joint session of the SSEPs. Proposals that had been subjected to external evaluation were not ranked but prioritized into five categories on the basis of scientific merit and relevance to ODP's Long Range Plan objectives. Proposals that should not be developed further were assigned to the fifth category. SCICOM needs this type of prioritization in order to recommend to OPCOM proposals for scheduling in August.

Taylor commended the JOIDES Office, the Site Survey Data Bank, and PPSP on the new site summary forms. He said, "They are great!" He questioned, however, the page limits for Preliminary and Full Proposals. This is to encourage proponents to express their ideas in a succinct manner and to accommodate the External Evaluation process. Mével said that 25 pages is good for reviewers as it is not too long. Taylor was concerned about the limit of 15 pages for Preliminary Proposals. Humphris said the idea is to get new ideas to the system with a rapid response to proponents indicating, "Yes, let's work on it via an iterative process", or "No, don't bother. The SSEPs will need to be active in nurturing the proposals.

Mével asked why the global geoscience programs were not considered as sources of preliminary proposals. Humphris said that the word "groups" is meant to encompass global programs. She agreed to change "groups" to "programs".

EXCOM Motion 97-2-5 EXCOM approves the new mail review/proposal submission procedures.

Proposed by Briden; seconded by Leinen
Unanimous

COFFEE BREAK10:15 - 10:35 AM

5. ODP Publications

5.1 Review of Current ODP Publications Strategy and Background TAB 8

TAMU's revised report on Publications was distributed to EXCOM members at the meeting. Some members noted that they had not received the CD ROM for Leg 165. This should have accompanied TAMU's earlier report which had been mailed to members.

Falvey reviewed the current Publications Policy, approved by EXCOM in Oslo in June 1996, in which a strategy for moving towards electronic publication was laid out. EXCOM established the process, and the path to follow, but not the timetable. JOI set up a Publication Steering Committee (PUBCOM) for this purpose.

5.2 Recommendations of the JOI Publications Steering Committee TAB 9

Dave Scholl, Chair of the JOI Publications Steering Committee, reported to EXCOM on the recommendations of PUBCOM, developed at their meeting on April 3-4, 1997.

Scholl noted that PUBCOM was set up to think through how best to handle the transition from printed to electronic publications in this dynamic time, when things are constantly changing. As part of their general mandate, PUBCOM was set up to provide on-going evaluation of the publications strategy, and make recommendations to JOI on any changes that should be made to the policy on the basis of what was learned. PUBCOM understood that they had a serious function, and the shift to electronic publications would proceed "only if JOI received a positive recommendation from PUBCOM" (PUBCOM draft mandate, EXCOM Agenda Book, February 97, TAB 13, pages 4-5).

Scholl reported that PUBCOM embarked on a two phased approach. The first, or alpha phase (current) is the people phase. PUBCOM sought to find out from the producers of the data and user community whether the user community could actually use the data. The second phase is intended to ensure that the strategy is in step with the direction of the scientific publications in general.

The PUBCOM Report, which Scholl presented to EXCOM, deals only with alpha phase. At the April meeting PUBCOM considered 25 pieces of information representing area and discipline views, including 13 separate reports from alpha committee members, 3 of which were commissioned. Jim Smith of the USGS presented the pitfalls of electronic publication. Smith's most important point was that things are changing so fast that it is advisable to remain in a flexible mode and not to over-commit. The risk is that if you proceed too quickly, then you may under or overshoot, leading to isolation. PUBCOM also benefited from the experience and perspectives of members whose organizations have embarked upon electronic publications - AGU and the USGS, for example, as well as the *Paleontological Journal*, which is published only in electronic format. Information from Elsevier and Springer-Verlag was also available. PUBCOM found that some authors are hesitant about submitting to electronic journals.

ODP-TAMU reported to PUBCOM on the history, evolution, and future envisaged for ODP publications. This report made it clear that ODP is actually leading the field of electronic publications. ODP-TAMU already generates CDs (the IR and SR are already on CD ROMs). Scholl noted, however, that without a good printer and software, ODP's CD ROMS are not very useful. ODP is fully electronic as far as CD ROM goes. Scholl said that the next step is to go to the Internet. The questions to be addressed are: How do we get there? What is the process? And how do we keep everybody satisfied?

Scholl presented the three initial **PUBCOM recommendations** related to the SR, IR and obtaining more information. These were based on information evaluated by PUBCOM and the personal experience of the members, not on a robust canvassing of the community.

1. **The present strategy for the implementation of the electronic publication of the SR is properly conceived.** The SR volume should become a very powerful Internet source of information. However, the SR volume, as it is envisioned for the future, with papers going into competitive journals will serve to disperse ODP publications. This present model will fragment awareness of the Leg science as only the residual of science papers will end up in the SR Volume. Since Leg syntheses are not required, the good papers will end up in special synthesis volumes, or as journal science papers, which are not published by ODP. Traditionally, the SR volume has been the one central source for knowledge about a Leg. There is the possibility that Leg syntheses could be printed by another journal. The function of the former SR model (paper and CD ROM product) was the thematic focusing of mature leg science papers into a contextual framework. These gray Leg science papers were not intended to compete with Journal articles. Thus, PUBCOM feels that the SR should be brought back into a cohesive format. PUBCOM would like to see leg synthesis by Co-Chiefs a stated requirement. PUBCOM (Appendix 1) envisions an evolving model with transition to the Internet over a five year time frame. The concept of the future, if ODP follows the stated strategy, refocuses the SR volume to enhance electronic publications, data linkages, and may even improve marketability. The SR is conceived, as paper drops off, to be a strictly electronic publication. Journal science papers would be reprinted electronically, hotlinked, or in the case of a copyright problem, referenced. The Internet SR of the future can be hotlinked to other leg science results and the JANUS data base. Size, space and graphics will not be an issue; whatever is accepted by the ODP editorial board as a contribution can be included. PUBCOM recommends starting this transition now.

2. PUBCOM believes that the present IR strategy is moving too fast. **PUBCOM recommends continuing to offer the fully printed IR volume for 3-5 years to ensure that the primary product is used.** At present, people cannot easily view ODP files, which are very large. It is the opinion of PUBCOM that ODP will get too far ahead of the user community and risk losing 30 to 40% of the user community unless the transition is slowed. One option is to consider permitting the printed version to be marketed commercially. Highware Press in Stanford, for example, helps medical journals go electronic. As a consequence of reaching a wider readership through electronic publication, the number of subscriptions has increased for paper copies of journals. In essence, the product was advertised on the WWW, producing an unexpected financial benefit.

3). PUBCOM will circulate a questionnaire to discover where the user community really is. This questionnaire has already been posted on the web page and returns are coming in. The questionnaire asks about how equipment is handled, whether CD ROM and the internet are used. The questionnaire will be distributed next by email and then by surface mail to solicit responses from the entire community. On the basis of the few responses received thus far, it appears that most users do not have screens that are big enough to view the information properly, and most are only occasionally getting information from the Internet. PUBCOM will evaluate the returns and modify the questionnaire as required. An interim report will be available in October. The questionnaire will be released into the community every 18 months to 2 years to keep abreast of developments within the user community. ODP needs to provide services, and to do this they need to know how to help the users utilize the material.

In conclusion, Scholl noted that there are financial consequences that are different from the JOI model. Scholl warned ODP not to dig themselves into a pit out from which the Program could not climb. He added that ODP should stay poised and balanced to move into the future.

Discussion:

Suyehiro asked about hotlinks. The information given by the hotlinks will provide users with the capability to access, import, and then download original data. Although speed is now a problem and it is currently painful to download information, this will change in the near future. T2 links and mirror sites will be required. Scholl cautioned, however, that if ODP proceeds too quickly, it may "turn the lights off" in the user community. Mével noted that the discussion of hotlinks was connected to the Internet, and not information contained on CD or the paper copy. Scholl replied that the CD ROM can be part of the hotlinks. Mével questioned the maintenance of mirror sites, noting that an expenditure of funds will be required to keep these up, and added her concern that the fate of ODP in five years time is unclear. The idea is to go forward planning for the future with the expectation that the Program will continue. Questions regarding the use of the data must be addressed. In addition, the user must be able to print hard copy to facilitate rapid perusal, which always requires a paper copy. At present, an ODP CD takes 18 hours to print and requires a lot of paper. The advantage of the CD is that you can take it anywhere. Another advantage of electronic publication is that it facilitates sophisticated data manipulation, which cannot be done with paper, and which will be essential to ODP in the future.

Beiersdorf inquired how the material would be archived for the future. Scholl said that this is a critical issue, with respect to the IR in particular, as it will be available only on CD. Taylor pointed out that paper is the absolute archive and also provides user facility. Electronic medium will augment paper. A CD is not a stable medium. Thus, ODP must be responsible for bringing data forward onto a new medium as technology progresses. Another option is to keep data on the Internet and then it will remain on a web site and/or the hard disk of a computer. Springer Verlag has a application called LINKS. Their view is that they will continue to publish in paper as a means of archiving - they will, in effect, become their own libraries. At the same time, they are providing information on CD and

Internet, and will also provide the way back to the users by migrating the data for their users/customers. Smith has also produced a report on the future role of the libraries. In the ensuing discussion regarding archival costs, Orcutt noted that AGU sets aside 3 dollars per page for this purpose. Mével said that assurances are needed that there is a mechanism in place that saves ODP data to the Internet. There is a possibility that there will not be a Program beyond 2003.

Detrick asked Humphris to summarize the SCICOM response regarding endorsement of PUBCOM recommendations and then Fox to present the updated cost information.

5.3 SCICOM Recommendations on Publications/Budgetary Implications TAB 10

SCICOM motion 97-1-12 accepts of the recommendations of the JOI ODP Publications Steering Committee to slow the transition to electronic publications, with the understanding that previously anticipated cost savings will not be realized. Humphris explained that SCICOM favors electronic publication, but agrees with PUBCOM that the user community is not ready and feels that it is important to slow this transition down so as not to lose them. SCICOM did not determine what needed to be cut to pay for this. The key factors considered were community readiness and the legacy of program. PCOM approved the ODP Publication Strategy last year, on the condition that implementation of the policy would proceed as necessary.

Discussion:

Publications Costs. Publications costs amount to 4 % of the total Program. Fox referred to the critical tables (revised page 8 was distributed at the meeting) in Fox's TAMU Report. He noted that the budget for the first two years is well constrained (FY 98 and 99). This is not the case for the out years as a science plan does not yet exist for these years. Fox added that the cost of accepting PUBCOM's recommendations has been built into the out years of the five program plan as ODP/TAMU was advised by JOI to do this.

There was discussion, led by Detrick, concerning the PUBCOM budget projections. It was noted that the cost of producing an IR volume up to the point of either printing or generating a CD is the same. The cost differential is based on whether ODP produces a printed volume, or a CD ROM (except in FY98), or both. Fox explained that the discrepancies in the earlier budget figures presented by TAMU were based on the type of science that was under consideration for the out years. It was also noted that the first column of Table 7 in TAB 8 (JOI Model) is not based on a full book, but rather just the site chapters. Thus, the core photos etc. are not included. This is an option available to ODP. PUBCOM does not recommend this, but understands that there are financial considerations. Savings will be greater if it is decided not to deliver an IR or SR. Leinen said that most people opt for the cheaper solution. The inherent difficulty is that we have not populated the community with a vehicle that allows the community user to choose the cheaper medium, but it is happening. To that extent, this is an issue that needs to be highlighted to out-funding sources. And, to the extent that ODP does not wish to

underwrite the more expensive alternate, there must be some trade-offs in what can be afforded by ODP.

Mutter said that he was struck by the fact the program is making trade-offs in their consideration of this issue. New money is not coming in and the Program is spending the science dollars on publications - Science is being traded off to support something that is not innovative. To drive home this point, Fox was asked to recount what TAMU had done to accommodate the budgetary requirements of NSF in the Five Year Program Plan. Fox explained that a set of generic legs for the out years was considered, which were based on a reduced science program. Technology development was reduced by a factor of two, and staff training, which is one of the highest retention factors at TAMU, was radically reduced. Little or no upgrades in the science lab or replacement of equipment were included. With respect to electronic publications, the turnover rate of equipment needed was cut, and the ice boat (which would be required if Prydz Bay is scheduled) was cut. Thus, this cost of one million dollars is not in the budget.

Duce asked Humphris if SCICOM had considered where cost savings would come from in order to support SCICOM Motion 97-1-12. Humphris indicated that SCICOM had not. She added, however, that there are some items in the budget that SCICOM could delay, allowing the implementation of the PUBCOM recommendation to slow the transition to electronic publications in order to keep current community with us. Although there is the need to look at full range of programs to see what is being done and what can be cut, a potential example is the Data Migration Project.

User Costs. Mutter asks what it would cost an individual scientist to be able to use ODP electronic publications as in the JOI model. Scholl explained that there are two parts: 1) hardware (including color monitor and printer), and 2) software. If one was to start from scratch, it would cost \$10,000 - \$12,000 for the hardware. For the minimum amount of hardware required, the cost would be about \$5000. Scholl noted that some software, like ACROBAT reader, is freeware. There are also printing costs. Photos are in color on the CD, but to print them a color printer is required. Printing out pictures of cores, for examples, costs \$5 per page. Orcutt pointed out that one may not even want to print the color image; it would be a waste considering the lower resolution of a printer with few pixels. Mével said that while it is true that it is expensive to buy new equipment, this applies to anything that is done in science; consequently, people have to purchase the requisite equipment. Dalrymple stressed that this equipment is not necessarily needed at every scientist's desk. What the scientists need is access to it.

Taylor said that the new Publications Policy was seen as a way of minimizing the budget and getting away from paper. But what he is hearing is that getting away from paper means getting away from rapid perusal and archival, and off-loads the cost to the user.

Beiersdorf expressed concern that scientists who currently lack the capability to read and use ODP electronic publications will request funds from ODP German budget to get up to speed.

Leinen wondered whether there may be opportunities for ODP to approach foundations, other than the national science funding agencies, such as those interested in global education and science in developing countries, to assist with the transition to electronic publications by helping to equip needy users.

Mutter noted the difference of \$1.8 million dollars, some of which, he suggested, could go towards providing the equipment needed to bring 100 user sites up to speed. In this way, ODP could help scientists who do not have the equipment to go on line, provided cost-sharing was assumed by the member countries.

Heinrichs announced that NSF has a \$100 million major new Science Initiatives called Knowledge and Distributive Intelligence. NSF will invest \$100 million next year (foundation-wide) into a range of things, including digital data libraries, of which ODP electronic publications is a small slice. NSF expects that another 100 million dollars will be available for a second year. Heinrichs observed, however, that ODP is embedded in a much more complex process - the matter is not just about hardware, but represents a culture problem as well - and he questioned whether a magic solution would be achieved by just buying equipment. ODP needs a solution that satisfies its community. Heinrich's perception is that the transition to electronic media is slower in Japan and Europe than in the US. If this is the case, then ODP must determine the appropriate level at which to proceed.

Other User Issues. Eldholm questioned whether the reluctance in going electronic reflected the opinions of the old fogies who are holding back the transition process, and not those of post-docs and graduate students, who will soon be using these data. Scholl reiterated that ODP is on the cutting edge and going in the right direction, but stressed that you do not want to leave people behind. Mével noted that the French community is not now prepared to go to an entirely electronic medium. Their consensus is to continue printing for up to three years.

Commercialization of ODP publications. The possibility of a commercial vendor producing and marketing ODP publications was raised by Stoffa who admitted that it was not possible to make any recommendations on the matter at this point in time. Fox reminded EXCOM that ODP is bound to supply a number of copies to partners free of charge. Taylor inquired whether the number of obligated copies was a negotiable point. Heinrichs said that this is possible with respect to France and Japan, since their MOUs will be renegotiated. The MOUs with the other partners did not need to be renegotiated for 10 years and, thus, could be extended to 2003. The wording of the MOUs specifies that "100 units" must be supplied to the partners as "the product" of ODP. EXCOM questioned whether a CD could be regarded as the "product". The MOU also gives partners the "right to reproduce", which may pose problems regarding copyright issues and commercial publication.

Program Renewal. Briden said that he felt that ODP Council needed to be properly apprised about events surrounding the Publications Policy as the issue had a bearing on renewal considerations. He expressed his disturbance that this issue had come forth in the

very negative mode of a delay. ODP, he said, must surely take the lead and cannot allow the pace to be set by the slowest. He said that he hoped that when action was taken, the committee would consider innovation. Advertising the main decision as a slowing down is not right and ODP must emphasize the innovation associated with the new product that will be brought on line. Mével emphasized that ODP has determined the direction in which it wants to go. She said that it is a new world and ODP must adapt.

In summary,

- While the user community is not quite ready for electronic publications, they will be in the future.
- For stability of the Program post-1998, a conceptual master plan for publications for the next five years must be agreed upon and set now.

LUNCH 12:00 - 1:30 PM

MONDAY PM

5.4 Discussion of Options

EXCOM examined the current ODP Publication Strategy, approved by EXCOM in Oslo in 1996, together with the recommendations of the JOI Publication Steering Committee, their budgetary implications, and SCICOM Motion 97-1-12. In summarizing the previous discussions, Detrick stated that ODP publications are one of the main products of the Program. He acknowledged the complexity of issues surrounding the Publication Policy and noted the diversity of views expressed by EXCOM members. Detrick suggested that EXCOM move forward by spending another thirty minutes to continue to explore aspects of this issue and then to meet in executive working session, permitting a frank discussion and allowing EXCOM to come to a consensus on how to proceed. Falvey reminded EXCOM of the cost implications of the PUBCOM recommendations.

Detrick asked to what extent NSF's Knowledge and Distributive Intelligence initiative could provide ODP an opportunity to gain funds for the transition to electronic publications. Dauphin, the ODP/Ocean Science representative to this initiative, has attended several workshops aimed at defining the process by which funds will be distributed. He said that it was unclear at this point whether there will be a call for proposals or a competition for funds to enhance existing facilities; whether this will be an individual investigator program or a larger initiative. Since the full set of rules have not yet been defined, it is uncertain whether proposals may or may not come from ODP.

Further discussion of ODP's Publication Policy and PUBCOM's recommendations took place in an EXECUTIVE Session on Monday Afternoon. Following these deliberations, EXCOM Motion 97-2-6 was introduced by Leinen on Tuesday .

EXCOM Motion 97-2-6

The EXCOM recognizes that the Publications of ODP are an important mechanism by which the principal legacy of the program, its scientific findings, are conveyed to the scientific community, and by which an additional legacy, the scientific samples, are described to the community. We appreciate the concern of the SCICOM for the importance of this communication mechanism. We also appreciate the work that the Publications Committee has done to poll our community about its capability and its continuing commitment to advise us about the access and format of our publications.

The severe fiscal constraints imposed by member contributions anticipated for Phase III of ODP require that we exercise great care in balancing priorities for the ODP activities. First and foremost among those are to foster technological innovation and make progress toward implementing our science plan. Budget projections from our operators indicate that it would be impossible to do so if we accept the extra costs associated with the recommendation of the JOI Publications Steering Committee to continue traditional paper publication of the Initial Reports (IR) for several years.

As a result, the EXCOM reconfirms its 1996 schedule for introducing electronic and CD-ROM publication of the IR and SR volumes and phasing out paper publication. We agree to cap the volume publication budget at the levels indicated in the JOI model for FY 99 and beyond.

We have asked JOI to explore outsourcing publications as an additional option and have also asked that they check obligations for publications in the MOUs and seek relaxation of these obligations if necessary.

Proposed by Leinen; seconded by Briden.

14 in favour. One abstention (Duce); one absent (Mével).

In discussion of EXCOM Motion 97-2-6, the JOI budget model (TAB 8, page 4) was discussed again and whether, within the constraints of that model, ODP could produce a paper version of the IR volume for the next three years. Briden reiterated that he hoped that the schedule for the introduction of electronic publication would be maintained. Leinen stressed that EXCOM should follow the JOI budget model, not the penciled in volume number shown on the overhead presented by Falvey.

In discussion of the wording of EXCOM Motion 97-2-6, Fox said he appreciated the intent of the EXCOM motion, but stressed that the wording of the motion must take a firm stance to prevent the dithering back and forth that has held the ODP/TAMU Publications Office on a string for four years. Dalrymple pointed out that Fox was asking EXCOM to set a path that would allow him get on with business. Duce concurred. Falvey suggested that the intent is to proceed down the path as the policy was set out prior to the SCICOM Meeting. Muter enquired if Fox was satisfied with the wording of the motion. Fox said that he was.

Falvey explained that the original concept of the Publications Policy went way beyond the notion of just saving money. It was a new concept in accessing information, and in providing users with innovative ways of manipulating data, which they couldn't do from just a book. It represented a broader vision. At the same time, the policy was intended to curtail the cost of printing and paper, the price of which was escalating. For these reasons, a move to electronic publication sooner than later is intended to serve a broader community better.

Coincidentally, at time of the PUBCOM report, an unsolicited proposal was received by JOI from Elsevier. The matter was not pursued by JOI because of the nature of the proposal. Falvey outlined the proposal (Appendix XXX). Elsevier proposed to print and publish the IR and SR on a CD Rom, and operate an Internet service as well. Elsevier would aggressively market these products. They believe that there is a market beyond the 1400 copies currently produced. Elsevier is prepared to market the volumes at the current market price, which is more than \$60 per copy. Elsevier is aware that ODP would have to purchase a certain number of copies of the IR and SR to meet the free distribution requirements of the MOUs. Whether Elsevier would take over the editorial aspects as well as assembly of the product was not addressed. The current proposal is incomplete and monetary issues were not discussed. JOI pursued no further communication until the matter was raised with EXCOM. Falvey suggested pursuing the matter on a commercial basis by engaging first in confidential discussions with Elsevier, in accordance with the rules that govern contracting and acquisition. An RFP would be required, however, to ensure a competitive process. The RFP would specify conditions to reflect agreements contained within the MOUs. Falvey said that he found the marketing aspect attractive, but noted that a contract with a commercial publisher would require many constraints. For example, there are copyright issues. At present, any member may distribute without copyright constraint at present and this will have to be considered.

Discussion:

EXCOM considered the following points in their discussion on whether JOI should investigate placing ODP Publication of the IR and the SR wholly in commercial hands.

The format of the SR.

Dalrymple asked if the Elsevier proposal was in reference to the SR as it currently exists, or as envisioned for the future. Falvey said that it is expected that the IR and SR will merge with time. The IR CD will contain the very high volume data sets - photographs, core barrels descriptions, logging data, etc. - this will not change. The web version will be something that evolves.

The editorial review process. Several members questioned whether Elsevier proposed merely republishing what they were handed by ODP, or editing the volumes. Mével stated that there is a difference as to whether they take what they are given or do more. Falvey said that the line to be drawn was not indicated. The Elsevier proposal, however, indicated that they wished an electronic file, which seemed to suggest that Elsevier would

want something "in progress". Mutter noted that Elsevier publishes scholarly journals, which are peer reviewed. Elsevier has its own editors, and like AGU, editorial control is a major issue. Thus, if Elsevier does not need editorial control, it makes one wonder. Harrison asked if Elsevier proposed paying ODP. Falvey responded that nothing was said about this.

Property rights/ownership

Guidance is required on what property ODP wants to retain. To prevent ODP from being disenfranchised, any contract would require clear ownership of the material to be spelled out, and the contents of the product to be detailed. Mutter said that ODP needs to be certain that it does not lose control of the product; that if Elsevier markets ODP material, it does not become theirs. Orcutt asked if it was envisioned that the copyright would stay with TAMU. Falvey set the record straight stating that there is no copyright. If a publisher "reprocesses" material passed on by TAMU to create "a value added" product, however, then they will retain the copyright. The basic information, analogous to what is in the books now, will remain copyright free. Heinrichs says NSF is currently facing a situation, also involving NASA and NOAA, where a "value added product" is being marketed and the publisher wishes to shut off the flow of raw data on the web because they contend that it is in competition with their product. The matter is expected to drag on for some time before it is resolved.

Timing

Many EXCOM members expressed the desire to have JOI explore commercialization of ODP Publications further. Heinrichs said that he was nervous about the lead time required for the exploration for the commercialization of publications at this stage since there are only a few years before the Program ends. Exploring the commercialization of publications could mean another two years of turmoil which will drag out the underlying issues related to the publications policy for a significant time. ODP needs to develop a strong vision on how to get to 2003. Leinien said that the process will drag on anyway because the area is evolving rapidly, and the potential trade-offs of the costs of publications versus science are difficult and troublesome for the Program to resolve.

Cost issues

\$30 K is generated per year through the sale of ODP volumes (about 500 copies per year), which are traditionally purchased by libraries. Sometimes ODP volumes are provided gratis to non-member countries like China and Brazil. Orcutt pointed out that a commercial publishing house will sell ODP publications to libraries, which will cost universities, and expressed concern that this was an inappropriate area from which to be taking money. The point was made that if ODP saves money, the cost will be transferred elsewhere - to libraries, for example, and this is not a good place to put that cost.

The value of ODP publications.

Mutter noted that Elsevier was approaching academic communities having made the decision to aggressively market the idea of electronic publication. They appear to be planning to move well beyond just electronic publications. Mutter noted that Elsevier had obviously done more research than indicated in the written report and sees an opportunity

here in marketing ODP publications. The whole discussion would be usefully informed by the perspective of a large publisher that produces academic journals and makes money out of it. They have done the market research and looked in to the issues. They may have a many solutions that haven't been thought of by ODP.

Conclusions

Dalrymple said that commercialization of ODP publications must be opened up to more than just Elsevier and an RFP issued. The general feeling was that since ODP has not defined the product, it is premature to engage in discussions with publishers. Dalrymple felt that Falvey should not talk further with Elsevier because the scope of the proposed service is not known. Falvey disagreed, saying that the nature of the product is defined, but not the timetable for establishing the two different primary products. Dalrymple said that the concept of the SR has changed from what was previously discussed. Again, Falvey disagreed and said that the SR is no different from what was discussed in Oslo. Detrick suggested that once the product is defined, the approach should be to address the possibilities with a range of publishers. Elsevier should not be given the preference merely because they submitted an unsolicited proposal. Falvey said ODP should be in the position to ask Elsevier more about their proposed product and the cost. Harrison said that he wanted other organizations to be able to enter at the second bullet level. It was determined that TAMU could also respond to an RFP. Several members expressed the need to have more information in order for ODP to proceed on this matter.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-7

EXCOM asks JOI to provide advice on outsourcing all or part of ODP Publications. This advice should include electronic publications options and consider legal and financial issues. JOI should report their findings at the January 1998 EXCOM Meeting.

Proposed by Stoffa; seconded by Harrison.

14 in favour. One abstention (Duce); one absent (Mével).

6. Phase III Implementation Issues

6.1 Phase III Financial Projections (Falvey)

TAB 12

EXCOM was asked to review the financial projections for Phase III prepared by JOI, following input from EXCOM at the February 1997 Meeting.

Falvey reminded EXCOM that they had endorsed the LRP plan option of the Strategic Implementation Plan. He referred to the table (page 2, TAB 12), showing the financial projections for Phase III. Detrick asked how NSF's advice to proceed on the basis of a 1.5% projected increase in comparison with 2% compound on the FY 1998 base affected the budget for the out years. Falvey referred EXCOM to the difference at bottom, which, he added would be affected by the PUBCOM recommendations, if they are accepted, and the potential increase in the day rate of the ship. TAMU has an MOU with ODL regarding the day rate. The problem is that commercial rates have increased and are currently in excess of \$ 150 K per day. Consequently, stockholders are putting pressure on the ship's current owners to increase the day rate. An increase of \$10,000 a day amounts to \$3.5

million a year over the current annual cost of leasing the ship. Thus, it will be a significant cost item. Negotiations for the day rate and will take place over the next few months and take effect at the beginning of FY 1999. Further discussion of the ship's day rate was halted as this is an issue involving ODL and TAMU.

There are three major differences in terms of funds available in the future - difference in the inflation factor, the publications factor and the day rate factor - which may put the LRP option (EXCOM'S preferred option) out of reach. Within the base budget there is a provision for the X-Base which includes Leg enhancements, technological development, alternative platforms, ice support vessels, etc.. In a fixed budget situation, it will be impossible to keep the X-Base at the desired level to maintain innovation in the Program, and to provide the necessary Leg enhancements to meet the goals of the LRP. Detrick said that in preparing the Five Year Program Plan, ODP had gone through an exercise of trying to live within the 1.5% increase. The net outcome is a substantially reduced X-base budget, affecting both LDEO/WLS and TAMU. Trade-offs and decisions will have to be made against basic leg operating costs. Falvey reminded EXCOM that the LRP option included scope for innovation, advanced technology development, and some provision for trying to get second platform operations. The projections that he showed do not mean that ODP cannot carry out the program, but the scope for technical innovation, Leg enhancements and additional platforms will be undermined.

Fox added that in formulating thier budget in the out years, TAMU chose a very restrictive minimalist generic science program. TAMU has essentially halted development and replacement of the shipboard science laboratories, cut training and technical development to the minimum level, reduced the drilling inventory to a minimum and taken a lot of extra risks in inventory so that the replacement cost of items like the BHA assembly, or drill string losses have not been projected, strung out the replacement of computer hardware in a time of crucial computing development (i.e. JANUS, increasing links and search engines, etc.) which requires TAMU to remain on the cutting edge, and reduced funds of engineering deveoplment identified in the LRP from by a factor of two to \$500 K, although this will means that LRP vision will be constrained.

Goldberg said that the approach taken by LDEO/WLS was like pulling a Band-Aid off a fresh cut - always best to do it quickly. He added that the FY98 target budget was only reached by removing back-up velocity tool (APS) and the gamma ray tool (HNGS) from the ship, thereby increasing the operational risk. These two tools are the least risky in that they can be covered scientifically and technically by other tools, if necessary, but it is an uncomfortable position for LDEO. Back-up tools will not be replaced, special projects and any tool deployments of LWD, GHMT, and VSP (except for one) will be eliminated and no auxiliary special tools beyond standard tools will be included in order to meet the FY99 to 2002 projected budgets (EXCOM is referred to the last table of the Five Year Plan). Consequently, the ability of LDEO/WLS to provide logging service will be seriously compromised, and the goals of LRP will not be realized.

Detrick emphasized the need for a framework within which the JOIDES science advisory committees can make the decisions, which must ultimately be made on the basis of

priorities - in the X-Base budget, technology development, alternate platforms, and the basic Leg-by-Leg programs - related to planning for FY99 and beyond. There is a big gap between what ODP wants to do and will be able to do. A first step may be to ask SCICOM and OPCOM to consider a new way of looking at the linkages between technology development and basic leg planning. EXCOM has already tasked SCICOM with examining the priorities of technology development and JOI with innovative strategies for looking outside of the traditional ODP structure to fund some technology development. Beginning with FY 99, science planning should integrate Leg-by-Leg priorities versus new technologies or alternate platforms. Humphris reminded EXCOM that since the scheduling of the ship is now slated for August, instead of December, a mechanism is in place to do planning and make choices on a Leg-by-Leg basis. OPCOM will also examine technology and innovation. Planning will be an iterative process through the fall, involving JOI, the JOIDES Office, LDEO and TAMU.

Taylor registered his alarm/distress/concern that ODP has not apprised the community at large that our hands are tied, and also accepted an LRP with goals that cannot be realized and against which the Program will be judged. What makes the Program new and exciting is in danger of going away. Leinen said that when the LRP was written, it was intended to galvanize the funding agencies to up the ante for exciting science. EXCOM only got this message regarding the budget after the LRP was published. Detrick concluded that not all innovative things will be eliminated, but choices will have to be made regarding which things ODP wants to carry out as they cannot all be done. Taylor asked Humphris what message she planned to convey to the community and proponents following the EXCOM Meeting. He asked if there was going to be some vision for the decision tree in terms of the LRP. He said the community will learn very fast that the things they are planning cannot be done. Humphris said that she had no good answer on the appropriate message to send to the community at this point. She questioned, however, whether it would be useful to dissuade the community from suggesting exciting science, deep holes, alternative platforms, etc. **Decisions regarding the selection/scheduling of high priority science and any trade-offs should rest with SCICOM/OPCOM.**

6.2 SCICOM Response to EXCOM Motion 97-1-17 Regarding Scientific Objectives to Test the Full Drilling Capability of JOIDES Resolution TAB 13

An important objective for Phase III is to understand what the two proposed drill ships will do in Phase IV. This requires knowledge of the full deep drilling capability of the *JOIDES Resolution*. At its February 1997 meeting, EXCOM tasked SCICOM with the identification of high priority science that requires deep drilling (EXCOM Motion 97-1-17) in order to test the capabilities of the *JOIDES Resolution*. As background, Humphris reviewed the development of the DRIL QUIP system (Agenda Book, TAB 13) and explained the combination of factors involved in successfully drilling deep targets. Achievements related to deep drilling and the use of the DRIL-QUIP system were noted.

SCICOM responded to EXCOM Motion 97-1-17 by considering all deep target sites (1900 m was selected as a cutoff point) associated with all active proposals and scheduled Legs. In addition, SCICOM developed a list of possible objectives for deep holes (EXCOM

Agenda Book, SCICOM Minutes - TAB 16, Page 42). The issue was also raised at the SSEPS Meeting and there was discussion of two deep holes at Mariana Izu (Proposal 372) and Ontong Java (448). Scheduled Legs 176 and 180 also contain deep targets. SCICOM was concerned that the previous thematic review process and attitudes may have discouraged proponents from proposing deep holes. To address this, the JOIDES Office will contact proponents of all active proposals to inform them of the opportunity to submit proposals for deep holes. In addition, the JOIDES Office will solicit proposals for drilling deep holes by advertising.

Mutter asked if proponents of currently active proposals will get preferential treatment. Humphris answered, no, but explained that the difference is that the advisory system will consider them seriously. Feary noted that they will not be preferentially mistreated. The table in the Agenda Book (TAB 13, pages 6-8) was developed prior to SCICOM, although one proposal was inadvertently omitted. Mutter asked if there were concerns regarding catastrophic loss. Fox answered that TAMU is excited to test the capabilities of the ship and emphasized the importance of drilling a deep hole correctly by using the full capability of the DRILL-Quip casing system to create a proper hole environment. This will reduce the chances of losing the full drill string as a result of hole collapse. Humphris noted that a hole already started cannot be reentered because it was started at a smaller diameter (the DRIL-Quip System enables a four stage stepping down casing procedure with respect to diameter). Falvey pointed out that a deep hole cannot be drilled by the JR on continental margins because of the hydrocarbon risk, and added that this may even be the case in deep water.

6.3 Major Technology Development Strategies in ODP Phase III

6.3.1 SCICOM Response to EXCOM Motion 97-1-20 on required technology development to support the Long Range Plan **TAB 14**

- **Prioritization of Technological Development**
- **Mechanisms for the Development of this Technology**

SCICOM carried out a prioritization of the technical requirements identified in the Strategic Implementation Plan and mechanisms for the development of this technology at the April SCICOM in response to EXCOM in Motion 97-1-20. TEDCOM Chair, Alister Skinner, attended the meeting to assist SCICOM in the prioritization of technology development. SCICOM developed two primary categories for technology developments: "technology under development, which should be competed" (included are the Active Heave Compensation system and Hammer Drill System); and "future technology developments outlined in the Strategic Implementation Plan. The following criteria were used to prioritize future technology developments into three groups: (1) how critical to the aims of the LRP; (2) amount of ODP effort and/or collaboration required (i.e. can be purchased off-the-shelf, therefore no ODP effort, joint ODP-industry collaboration required, of interest only to ODP, therefore maximum effort); and (3) the relative costs in relation to its scientific value. (Agenda Book, TAB 14). These groupings will allow SCICOM to select the highest priority technological developments that can be accomplished.

Stoffa noted that LWD is not on the list for the FY98 logging report. Detrick asked if SCICOM's prioritization of these innovations and developments was included in the Five Year Program Plan. Falvey said that it was not because of insufficient funds. He noted that there is a gap between the LRP option and the Program Plan budget, which is constrained by NSF's projection. The gap is widening with a remote probability of filling it. The house of cards is still there, he added, waiting for a puff!

COFFEE/TEA BREAK 3:00 - 3:30 PM

6.3.2 JOI Strategy for Implementing Partnerships with Industry - Response to EXCOM Motion 97-1-19 TAB 15

At the February EXCOM meeting, EXCOM showed a clear preference for the LRP budget option presented in the Strategic Implementation Plan, which had been developed to facilitate the renewal process. In light of uncertain funding and the realities of ODP's budget that emerged at that meeting, however, EXCOM asked JOI to develop a strategy for implementing partnerships with industry to support innovation (EXCOM Motion 97-1-19). Eight major development needs were identified (Agenda Book, TAB 15, Pages 2 and 3). The estimated cost for these developments is \$20.7 million.

Falvey presented three models to EXCOM to illustrate how technological innovations could be pursued. The first is a simple extension of third party development as now exists in the program permitting any partner to submit a project proposal. The benefit is enhanced cooperation among partners (i.e. European partners). ODP would work through each national office to promote this approach. If project funds became available, LDEO and TAMU would become involved as appropriate. A second option is the establishment of a Special Technology Development Fund. This separate fund, distinct from the subscriptions, is envisaged to underwrite special projects within the framework of the Program. as the base subscription rate is unlikely to rise over the period to FY 2002. The third option calls for Cooperative Technology Development Projects with industry (i.e. the CONOCO-Hydriil joint venture). The same model could be applied with respect to other technology developments. The extension of the current hammer drilling system to a 20 inch diameter system serves as an example of a potential cooperative technology development project and ODP/TAMU is currently contacting industry to see if there is any interest. Some resources for these types of projects would need to come from the subcontractors (ODP/TAMU and LDEO).

Indicative budget scenarios for the three conceptual models showing high, medium and low levels of investment were presented. Falvey explained that this exercise was carried out to see if the approach was practical and had any prospect of being successful. These budget scenarios demonstrated how money (more than \$20 million over five years) could be found to achieve the desired technology development, and indicated that it would be cheaper than doing it in-house. The conclusion is that, in the context of the present budget, third party tool development projects would be practical. A JIP would not be an option, however, because some level of ODP investment would be required. Given the spread of projects

that ODP wishes to carry out to achieve the goals of the LRP, ODP would have to be willing to pursue all three of these options/scenarios.

To move forward, it will be necessary to have an increased awareness of the broader needs of the ODP community in order to market the needs of the Program, and to proactively pass on the message, particularly to industry. This could be achieved by meetings and focused presentations. Recently, TAMU gave a presentation at the Meeting of the Drilling Engineering Association in Houston, which served as a forum for exchanging interest in technology. Participants were representatives of industry and petroleum companies. In particular, TAMU promoted the 20 inch hammer drilling case. Falvey stated that this kind of presentation will need to go beyond Houston, to Paris, Tokyo, and Perth, which are the major centers for petroleum exploration and engineering. Scientists from both operators would need to be active in making presentations at conferences, such as the Off-Shore Technology Conference, and this will require time and money. Taylor said that he liked what JOI had done because it showed where you need to go to fund these projects, but added that he was not entirely happy with the recommendations. He questioned, in particular, the efficiency and wisdom of the expenditure of time and money by TAMU and LDEO scientists in making presentations at conferences.

The matter of contractual arrangements involved with an RFP, which Falvey stated was almost a contradiction in terms for JIPs, was discussed. ODP was able to avoid going to an RFP in the case of the CONOCO-Hydril JIP because ODP responded to an unsolicited proposal. (Appendix 2 - Overhead showing the guidelines/requirements for JIPs). Mutter asked for clarification regarding the terms of the MOUs on intellectual property rights and why this issue was inhibiting in 1995. The MOUs state that any technology developed with Program funds is shared with the signatories. ODP could not advertise for an industry partner if ODP was going to give away their intellectual property rights to all the Program partners. The Multi Sensor Track (MST) and the Pressure Core Sampler (PCS) are examples. Mutter expressed concern that efforts to pursue joint industry partnerships are thwarted by a technicality related to the MOUs. He added that there must be a way around it. Falvey explained that the unsolicited proposal mechanism was one way around the issue because the conditions that apply to the intellectual property rights are spelled out at the start. He detailed the terms of agreement with CONOCO-Hydril, noting that the confidentiality agreement for three years did not violate the MOUs. Mutter questioned whether the Conco-Hydril JIP is the correct model.

Briden suggested that over the next five years ODP must embark on a twin track approach: 1) planning through flat funding, and 2) planning to avoid the flat funding level. ODP needs to be alert to JIP opportunities and thus should have an optimistic prospectus to promote. The Five Year Program Plan is not an optimistic prospectus and the Long Range Plan is too idealistic. The only thing currently available to ODP is the Strategic Implementation Plan, which is dated. Falvey said that if ODP follows this line, then all (committee members) must be involved in its promotion and the operator must expand the description in a two page portfolio for each project development (the i.e. slim line riser for the JR). He said that it was better to articulate the project so as not to preempt the solution. The portfolio should be available to everyone to promote, and specific missions to industry service

centers should be carried out, as was just done in Houston. Detrick said that the approach should not be restricted to industry, but also aimed at specific potential funding sources in partner countries or groups of countries (i.e. Europe) with particular interests (platform, tool) and science centers in partner countries where support of advanced technology for a specific project on Leg-by-Leg might be available. Falvey appealed for help from the operators in writing up projects for this portfolio. Falvey said more flexibility is needed to carry out this approach. Detrick asked if EXCOM wanted to adopt this approach. It was generally agreed that the National Committees should pursue the matter. Beiersdorf said that Germany would be more comfortable with the 2% increase in the subscription rate to the Program. Germany had agreed to this increase previously, but has withdrawn this offer because the other partners will not increase their contributions.

Beiersdorf asked about the role envisioned for TEDCOM. Traditionally, TEDCOM has not been proactive but has operated in a responsive mode to technology put forward by TAMU and LDEO. Goldberg noted that the role of TEDCOM had been changing recently. Detrick stated that TEDCOM can operate differently in the future. Falvey noted that ODP was fortunate to benefit from the time and expertise of the caliber of individuals who are on TEDCOM. Mutter said that just the fact that these individuals are volunteers is a business decision indicating that their companies see value in their serving on ODP TEDCOM as they bring information back to the company. Detrick said that they could identify those developments that could be fruitful for JOI and ODP to pursue. TEDCOM has the expertise to provide this type of guidance. Taylor said that TEDCOM had provided valuable advice by recommending when to go ahead or not on particular projects, and when informed about the need for particular technology development. The TEDCOM chair was invited to SCICOM, Humphris added, thus the table of prioritization was based on some input from TEDCOM.

The matter of hiring a consultant to look at the value of ODP technology was raised. Mutter said it might be worth spending some money to determine the "value of ODP products. He indicated, for example, that he never thought that Elsevier would try to assess value to ODP Publications. ODP's own assessment should not be the only yardstick by which the value of ODP products are determined.

Detrick concluded that there was a consensus that JOI and operators should pursue opportunities for joint industry operations.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-8

EXCOM requests that JOI explore all opportunities for industry partnership in the development of major new ODP technologies with a view to cost-sharing these developments. As an initial step, TEDCOM should be consulted on the likely potential for such joint technology projects from an industry stand point.

Proposed by Mutter; seconded by Harrison.
15 in favour. One absent (Mévell).

TUESDAY (June 10) AM

7. SCICOM Report (Humphris)

TAB 16

7.1 Implementation of the New JOIDES Advisory Structure (OPCOM, SSEPs, & PPGs) (Humphris)

TAB 17

Humphris reviewed progress in the implementation of the New JOIDES Advisory Structure. By end of June, all the new committees (except OPCOM) will have met at least once. By November, the new Advisory Structure will be commencing a new annual schedule.

- SCICOM's first meeting took place in April.
- the two SSEPs met for the first time in early June - jointly to consider cross-disciplinary proposals, and separately to consider proposals relevant to Interior or Environment thematic objectives.
- OPCOM membership was established at the SCICOM meeting.
- OPCOM will meet in August, following SCICOM. Their primary function at this meeting will be to establish a drilling schedule based on SCICOM's ranking of proposals.
- SSP and PPSP continue on from the old structure. SSP will meet in July to look at site survey readiness of proposals sent forward by the SSEPs.
- the new SCIMP met in Nova Scotia the week following EXCOM. One of their most important tasks was a visit to the ship to provide input to SCICOM on the science facilities for their preparation of dry-dock recommendations.
- TEDCOM met in early June.

Program Planning Groups. PPGs have been designed to work on themes or drilling strategies that need to be better developed in order to achieve objectives in the Long Range Plan. PCOM set up two in December of 1996, the Deep Biosphere and Long Term Observatories PPGs. John Parkes will chair the Biosphere PPG, which will have 14 members representing disciplines ranging from genetics to chemistry. ODP's biosphere goals need a lot of effort because of the Program's lack of experience in tackling the objectives related to this theme. The Observatory PPG, which will be jointly Chaired by Kiyoshi Suyheiro and Keir Becker, is necessary to focus on the details of conducting experiments in boreholes. Membership will include 12 or 13 individuals representing OSN and other groups with a general interest in seafloor observatories. The first meeting will take place on the 8 of July in MBARI. JOIDES solicited nominations for PPG membership from relevant global geoscience initiatives and national committees. Proportional representation is not a requirement for the membership of PPGs. These PPGs will exist for three years, with regular reporting to, and annual review by SCICOM in order to monitor their progress in accomplishing their mandates. Both PPGs will provide SCICOM with an interim report in August.

In April, SCICOM examined the tables of all active proposals in the ODP system (EXCOM Agenda Book, TAB 25), noted how they corresponded to the aims of the Long Range Plan and their relationship to other geoscience programs, and established four PPGs (Extreme Climates, Architecture of Oceanic Lithosphere, Shallow Water Reefs, and Climate

and Tectonics). Additional PPGs will be set up in the next year, more than 6 to avoid connection with Legs per year, but 10 or less. All PPGs are derivative of the LRP.

Mével applauded the relationship between other geoscience programs and ODP, which is expressed in the mandates of the PPGs, but observed that the mandates are not consistent in spelling out this interaction. Humphris explained that the mandates were written by groups of SCICOM members and agreed to revise them to make them consistent. Harrison asked how input was obtained from the US community. Humphris replied that this was through the SCICOM members but said USSAC will become more involved in the near future. USSAC supported a workshop in the Spring of 1997 which provided names for the Biosphere PPG. Harrison noted that there are five JOI institutions not represented on SCICOM. Dalrymple requested that panel membership information be placed in the Agenda Book. This is currently available at the JOIDES Office web site, and will also be incorporated in a revised version of the *Guide to the Ocean Drilling Program*, which will be available both on the internet and in printed form in the future. Detrick commended the JOIDES Office for overseeing a smooth transition to the new JOIDES Advisory Structure.

7.2 SciMP's Role in Formulating Recommendations on Dry-Dock Requirements

TAB 18

In April, SCICOM requested that SCIMP determine a list of improvements for the science facilities onboard the *JOIDES Resolution*. In particular, SCIMP was asked to look at modifications for lab, meeting facilities, and accommodations (noted in the PEC IV Report), giving consideration to science goals, and to provide SCICOM with a prioritized list. This list will be evaluated by SCICOM in August in order to make informed recommendations to JOI to be passed to TAMU for implementation, depending upon the level of funds available. Orcutt noted that the funds available will be mostly for dry-dock, not necessarily for the scientific modifications. Humphris indicated that SCICOM had apprised SCIMP of the potential availability of zero dollars since the money for modification of the science facilities will need to come from elsewhere.

Fox said that TAMU and ODL have generated a list that focuses on items distinct from the lab stack which are regarded as "value-added" by the ship's owners. They are, however, trying to address some habitability issues. Any improvements to the scientific facilities will have come from commingled funds. TAMU has estimated that \$1 to \$1.5 million could be spent in the lab stack alone. Detrick asked if there has been any supplement to the \$ 6 million committed by NSF for the dry-dock. Heinrichs said that this is a Program management issue and that the \$ 6 million is a commitment from NSF related to the renewal effort, which NSF will meet. For this reason, this issue will not be raised in the Council Meeting. Taylor suggested this could be an area for a special fund; TAMU and JOI could determine what should be done and ask for money.

7.3 ODP Achievements for Legs in FY 96-97

Humphris reported on these Leg achievements.

8. Management and Operations Reports

8.1 JOI (Falvey)

TAB 19

8.1.1 Selection process for the 1999-2000 non-US JOIDES Office (EXCOM Motion 97-1-9)

The RFP for the next JOIDES Office, which incorporates the recommendations made at the February EXCOM Meeting, was issued on May 8. The RFP will be open for 60 days. A technical evaluation board will be established following the EXCOM Meeting (June) to evaluate the bids and their decision is expected in mid-August. NSF will be notified by JOI on or about September 1, 1997 to facilitate NSF making an award on or about October 1. Feary asked if this time period could be extended. Falvey will determine what the correct process is in order to respond to a request for an extension from a bidding party.

The role of the current Joides Office Head/SCICOM Chair in evaluating bids was discussed. Mével suggested it would be a good idea to have input from the current SCICOM Chair. Falvey explained that the matter was a contractual issue, not a JOIDES matter, therefore the current JOIDES Office Head/SCICOM Chair may or may not be involved - this has not yet been determined. Leinen suggested that in view of the substantial changes made in the structure and the short time involved, it would be wise to include the SCICOM Chair in the process. She said that she supported Mével's recommendation and added that EXCOM is still familiar with the functioning of the PCOM Chair, but not yet with SCICOM Chair issues. Falvey said that a previous SCICOM Chair could be considered to provide input. It was noted that there is none; Humphris is the first SCICOM Chair. Briden recommended that references to US law be removed as these were confusing to the UK when they bid for the JOIDES Office and could not be explained by JOI. When asked whether the next US JOIDES Office will be restricted to JOI institutions or opened up to non-JOI institutions, Dalrymple (JOI BoG Chair) declined to comment, saying that this item was on the Agenda for JOI BoG the next day.

8.1.2 Internationalization Update

To supplement the report in the Agenda Book, Falvey reported that JOI has a new contact in Argentina and indicated that he will try to visit Indonesia and India after the CONCORD Meeting.

Following the NAD presentation (Agenda Item 9.1), Eldholm asked Jorn Thiede about the Russian participation in ODP. Thiede said that Russia cannot pay the full membership, but may be able to work with a step-wise approach. ODP has 1/12 of a membership currently open and this may provide an opportunity for the Russians.

8.1.3 Implementation/Management & Oversight

JANUS. Falvey reported that first phase of JANUS is in operation on board the ship. Since installation, all major details have been resolved and TAMU is working towards the successful conclusion of the project with input from the JANUS Steering Committee. The shipboard parties have expressed their satisfaction with JANUS.

Discussion:

Briden raised the issue of project management and communication problems involving TAMU-TAMRF, TRACOR and the JOI JANUS Steering Committee. Detrick queried whether the problems that had developed were specific to JANUS or inherent to the JOI Steering Committee model. Falvey said that he thought the problems were a matter of communication connected to the early stages of project management, which is new way of doing business for ODP. One of the main responsibilities for project managers is external communications. The extent to which this needs to be improved within the organization requires ongoing training to ensure that communication is effective. Fox has become involved since April as the project manager and functions at the interface between TAMU, TRACOR, and the Steering Committee to resolve any communication problems that arise.

The revised **ODP Sample Distribution Policy** was approved by NSF on May 8.

TAMU is currently evaluating responses for the **Data Migration Project**.

8.1.4 Public Affairs Subcommittee Report

Orcutt reported that the EXCOM Public Affairs Subcommittee met on Sunday June 8. JOI and TAMU, which also has a budget devoted to PR activities, are proceeding with a number of Public Affairs activities. Orcutt praised Pamela Baker-Masson for her excellent job as Public Affairs Director.

Port Calls. EXCOM's attention was called to the success of the recent port calls. In Charleston, the ship was visited by Senator Fritz Hollings who gave a talk about the importance of ODP. The Lisbon port call, which included a tribute to the former President of Portugal, Mario Suarez, and Professor Eugene Siebold(?), was the critical factor in getting Portugal to Join ECOD. Six ambassadors to Portugal from ODP member countries visited the ship. The Halifax port call will be a lower key event than the past few port calls in Canada. Monster activity is planned for the New York port call with VIPs visiting the ship by helicopter, a major dinner on board the *Intrepid*, and several key science speakers. In part, port call events are funded by Schlumberger. Following, New York, the next port call will be in Cape Town. As South Africa is not a member of ODP, the ship's visit will provide an opportunity to inform people about the Program. Contacts will need to be established in South Africa because there are no local JOIDES representatives there. Local Universities and/or country offices have contributed to the success of these port calls by working closely with Pamela Baker Masson (JOI).

Core Displays. A core collected on Leg 169 (touted as the “hydrothermal system missing link”) was transported to Canada for a meeting of the Prospectors and Developers Association. This type of activity, which does not jeopardize the preservation and the integrity of the core which, was a major success and represents a new public relations tool for ODP. A Smithsonian exhibition entitled, “A Blast from the Past”, will also utilize K/T cores from Leg 171B, providing additional PR opportunities as more than a million and a half people are expected to visit the exhibition.

Budget. The budget for PR activities is \$75,000, excluding salaries, which is split between JOI and TAMU. Additional funds are needed to support PR activities and members are encouraged to consider ways to support these efforts.

EXPO 98. Among the unbudgeted projects is ODP participation at EXPO 98. Canada may invite ODP to share their pavilion at a cost of \$25 K.

Receptions and VIP Events. \$18 K is allocated for these and ODP would like to be in a position to sponsor more of them. On occasion, supplemental funding has been provided by JOI members.

News. ODP has benefited from frequent media coverage. A file of clippings is available to ODP members. Maronde noted that the German three day meeting in March, at which some of the of the German ODP work on the K/T was presented, was successful from the point of PR, with good press coverage.

8.2 ODP/TAMU Management Report

TAB 20

Fox reported that the 1999 dry-dock requirements (page 8 of the TAMU Report, TAB 20) list replacement of the Automatic Station Keeping (ASK) system as a priority, allowing space for either extra berths or a conference center. Recommendation for the use of this space will come from SCIMP making recommendations to SCICOM which would make recommendations to TAMU through JOI. Conference space is limited and inhibits some of the interaction and exchange among the science party. Space for scientific participation is also limited at a time when the partnerships are becoming more complex and desiring to put more scientists on board. The number of bunks is a big issue, especially in international waters where national observers may sail on Legs.

8.2.1 Data Migration (status of RFP for Phase I)

ODP-TAMU is currently evaluating responses to the legacy **Data Migration Project**. The deadline for responses is June 15. The Data Migration Project is funded with allocations in FY 97 and FY 98. Detrick asked if the project will need to continue beyond FY 98. Falvey replied that it will be a multi-year project beyond FY 98 if ODP is to get an adequate body of migrated data.

Discussion:

Detrick noted that the annual level of funding for the project (\$200 to 300 K) amounts to about \$ 1 million to \$1.5 million over a five year period. He expressed his opinion that, in view of the previous day's discussions regarding the need to use dollars to carry out the science of the Program, the Data Migration Project needed to be prioritized by the JOIDES Advisory Structure against the other requirements of the Program, especially in the crunch years of FY 99 and beyond. Falvey reminded EXCOM that this project emerged as a recommendation from the PEC IV Report and was endorsed two years ago by EXCOM. Detrick pointed out that the entire budgetary situation had changed over the last two years. Orcutt noted, and Humphris confirmed, that SCICOM's Program plan for FY98 included the Data Migration Project as a priority. Detrick asked about the out-year commitments to the Data Migration Project and whether ODP (SCICOM) will have the choice of prioritizing it on a year-by-year basis. Falvey responded that, as a practical matter, there are no commitments. Fox noted that this would influence how a contract is negotiated with the successful candidate with respect to the out years. Detrick reiterated his view that a conscious effort be made to prioritize the Data Migration Project against other science. ODP may not want to commit to the out years until a prioritization has been done.

Taylor proposed a motion calling for a flexible contract for the Data Migration Project. Mutter expressed concern about the motion because he said you cannot indicate to a contractor that the rug may be pulled out from under them. Dalrymple and Falvey both noted that, in reality, ODP cannot make contractual commitments beyond the fiscal years under consideration. Orcutt said that it didn't make sense to undertake the Data Migration Project if ODP is not committed in the long term. Taylor said that he wanted what EXCOM sees as potential budget pitfalls in the future and what they mean for prioritization recorded in the Minutes. Briden said that it was not possible to go back to produce what Taylor wanted. Taylor's motion, which was not seconded, was withdrawn.

8.2.2 Update on Joint Ventures (e.g. CONOCO/Hydril)

The final design for the CONOCO-Hydril riserless drilling system will not be easily accommodated on the JR because of the scale and complexity of the design. Nonetheless, the effort was productive because TAMU established new contacts and learned a great deal about deep water riser systems, which will enrich ODP when the Program considers a mini-riser drill rig.

At the recent Drilling Engineering Association Meeting, TAMU spoke with 30 entities regarding the large diameter Hammer-Drill system. In addition, TAMU has advertised their needs on their web page.

8.3 Wireline Logging Service Report

TAB 20

Goldberg highlighted the technical items that have emerged since the written Wireline Logging Service Report was submitted (Appendix 3). It has been a banner year with respect to LWD accomplishments, especially from the Barbados program (Leg 171A). For the past year and a half, logging data has been submitted from the ship back to shore. Recently,

LDEO/WLS updated to a new satellite system which will be kept (on loan) through Leg 174 or until the TAMU and LDEO satellite systems are upgraded. Data from Legs is currently available on-line to the shipboard science party one week after the scientists return and then available without restriction after the one year moratorium. Logging data for 190 holes has been migrated and is available on the Internet. The LDEO/WLS web page shows 1000 hits per month.

9. Relationships with other International Programs

9.1 NAD Science Implementation Plan and Joint NAD/ODP Interests TAB 22

Dr. Jorn Thiede presented the *NAD Science Implementation Plan* (EXCOM Agenda Book, TAB 22) to EXCOM meeting with the aim furthering collaborations between ODP and NAD.

NAD wants to use much of ODP's structure, policies, and facilities (such as ODP repositories for archiving core) as possible through cost sharing arrangements because they do not want to reinvent the wheel. NAD proposals go through the same proposal evaluation and safety review as is normal for ODP proposals. Thiede stated that NAD would find it helpful to have a formal liaison between ODP and NAD. The NAD Secretariat, located at JOI, could help promote the connection. NAD would also like to see ODP establish either a DPG or Arctic Polar PPG, with which NAD could interact while retaining autonomy.

Discussion:

Detrick agreed that the best way to promote a relationship between ODP and NAD is through a liaison and suggested that the appropriate level should be at SCICOM level. TAMU supports the desire for coordination between ODP and NAD. In addition, Fox endorsed the notion of a liaison, saying that this will facilitate proper planning and provide the requisite lead time to ensure the selection and identification of resources for interactions between ODP and NAD. Fox explained that TAMU had received an invitation for an engineer to participate in an Arctic Drilling Workshop was declined because TAMU was unable to identify the resources to send someone. Detrick referred the matter of a liaison and any decision regarding establishment of an Arctic Polar PPG to SCICOM.

Eldholm said that it was his impression that ECOD could contribute funds to joint NAD/ODP drilling on a case-by-case basis without disturbing the consortium's ODP contribution. Briden said that, while he had no hard evidence, he believed there may be some sources of funds in the UK for joint drilling. Detrick asked about the possibility of matching funds from ODP for joint drilling projects. Heinrichs said that NSF's Ocean Sciences Division, which administers ODP, is not trying to ignore the Arctic, but it is not within their realm. NSF's Arctic Drilling Program, administered by Tom Pyle, has the control of the budget for polar programs.

NAD should be developed separately from ODP as this is important in a bureaucratic mode.

EXCOM Motion 97-2-9

EXCOM welcomes the progress made by the Nansen Arctic Drilling Program as evidenced by the Science Plan and Implementation Plan. ODP looks forward to the development of collaborative efforts with NAD. EXCOM requests SCICOM to consider the appropriate mechanism for a formal liaison with NAD.

Proposed by Eldholm; seconded by Taylor.
15 in favour. One absent (Mével).

9.2 International Continental Drilling Program (ICDP) Liaison Reports TAB 23

The EXCOM liaisons to the ICDP Assembly of Governors (AOG) are John Mutter and Helmut Beiersdorf. The meeting the ICDP Assembly of Governors (AOG) was canceled. The SCICOM liaison to the Executive Committee of the ICDP, Roger Larson, attended EC in Potsdam, Germany in March of 1997. Humphris reported on his behalf. The next AOG meeting will be in September; Mutter will attend if it is in the US, otherwise Beiersdorf will go. The date and place are not yet firm.

9.3 Relationship between PPGs and other JOIDES Panels/Committees with Global Geoscience Programs TAB 24

9.4 Discussion of Mechanisms to Foster Stronger Ties to International Programs

This item was addressed previously under Agenda Book Item 7.1. Humphris also reported that the JOIDES Office prepared tables of all active proposals in the ODP system by LRP theme (EXCOM Agenda Book, TAB 25). These tables attempted to link proposals to international geoscience programs with interests related to ODP. The links were intended to show SCICOM with which programs ODP could potentially collaborate.

Mével asked if it would be possible to strengthen the relationship to InterRIDGE by soliciting comments on ODP proposals with overlapping interests from InterRIDGE. Humphris said this was not possible because ODP proposals are confidential. Humphris said that she had not thought through how best to establish links or foster ties to other geoscience programs, aside from the mechanism provided by the establishment of PPGs.

Taylor noted that the connections between ODP and other geoscience initiatives is fine at the SCICOM level.

10. Phase IV Planning for IODP

10.1 Update on the 1997 CONCORD Meeting ()

Suyehiro reported that the second CONCORD steering committee meeting took place in Copenhagen in April. Six different working groups, including one on drilling and tool technology development, are planned. The venue is National Olympic Center in Shinjuku, Tokyo. The general Schedule will include three field trips, commencing on the July 18. The Actual Meeting starts on the 22 July. There will be about 130 attendees, many more

than originally anticipated. The goal of the CONCORD Meeting is to identify important key objectives to be met by riser technology (Appendix 4). By the end of the meeting 10 - 15 pages of working group reports, will be compiled by the co-chairs. Immediately after the meeting, the Japanese organizers will compose a brief report for STA to be used to try to secure budgeting for the construction of the Japanese riser ship.

10.3 IODP Planning

10.3.1 Update on recent NSF/JAMSTEC/JOIDES discussions

EXCOM endorsed the establishment of a standing "Joint STA/JAMSTEC-JOI-MONBUSHO Management Committee to continue work on outstanding issues, and to facilitate continued communications and consultation between these three key organizations involved in developing an integrated management and structure for a scientific ocean drilling program beyond 2003 (EXCOM Consensus 97-1-23). Heinrichs reported that in following EXCOM's advice, several important joint meetings involving NSF, JAMSTEC, JOIDES and European partners have taken place to integrate Japanese planning for the OD -21 program with ODP long range planning. To facilitate discussions, reference to a single **Integrated Ocean Drilling program (IODP)**, instead of OD-21 or ODP Phase IV planning, has been adopted. IODP will have international scientific planning, international scientific operations, joint management of facilities and operations, and, in a parallel model to ODP, international funding of program costs. A conceptual version of the structure was presented on an overhead (Appendix 5), showing an IODP operations and management unit, a riser vessel management unit, a JR-type vessel management unit, and Japanese and NSF Program Offices. Missing from the diagram is an entity to integrate common program management. In science planning terms, a single science planning structure to consider science planning and science objectives for both vessels is envisioned and some sort of a council/sponsor organization, similar to the present ODP Council. The basic time frame (Appendix 6) recognizes that ODP Phase III ends in 2003. Some period of time for refitting the *JOIDES Resolution* for operations is required. The OD-21 riser ship is expected to come on line in 2003 and start with experimental test operations in the western Pacific. Initially, operations would primarily address problems of interest to Japan, although international components will be included. This is because of Japan's investment in the riser ship and their need to "shake-down" systems to ensure successful ship operations. The majority of the funding for these experimental operations will be provided by Japan. Conversion to fully international riser vessel operations will occur in phase B.

Heinrichs reported on the *ad hoc* **meeting in Leiden** on the 29th of April involving senior science officials from other ODP member countries (potential sponsors of an IODP) to discuss post 2003 ocean drilling and the IODP. At the Leiden Meeting the need for planning to cut across both ODP and OD-21 planning was identified. This led to the establishment of a formal international working group to take IODP planning forward. This working group met immediately after the ODP Council Meeting to discuss draft terms of reference, mandates and schedules. At the Leiden meeting, it was determined that programmatic commitments to an IODP would occur in three phases: 1) Letter of Interest

(summer 1997); 2) more formal commitments to an IODP related to the construction of the riser ship; and 3) signing of MOUs in about 2003. As a starting principle, a trilateral partnership arrangement is envisaged, involving STA (Japan) and NSF (US) with co-equal shares, and a third partner at some level of funding.

A meeting between NSF, JOIDES, and JAMSTEC also took place in Hawaii, following the April SCICOM meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to review budgeting for the operation of the OD-21 riser vessel.

10.2 OD-21 Status Report (Maruyama)

Maruyama reviewed the schedule for OD-21 planning and implementation (Appendix 7). August 1997 is important because it is when the budget request for construction of the riser vessel must be submitted to the Finance Ministry. STA recognized that international discussion prior to submission of a budget request were needed. To this end, Japan participated in the Leiden meeting and has organized the CONCORD meeting. The budget proposal will be reviewed by the financial authority and the outcome will be decided by the end of December. STA is doing their best to secure the funds for OD 21 to proceed to the next phase. The Japanese economic situation is stagnant, however, therefore the government has placed stringent constraints on budget requests.

11. Future Meetings and Other Business

Detrick acknowledged the service of the two EXCOM members for whom this was their last meeting. Bob Duce, who served on EXCOM for more than a decade, will be missed on the committee for his wisdom. EXCOM wished him well in his return to science and welcomed his replacement, David Prior. Larry Mayer, who was replaced by David Feary, may no longer attend as an observer.

The next EXCOM Meeting will be at Biosphere II in Arizona on January 19 and 20, 1998. The Summer 1998 EXCOM Meeting will be hosted by Germany. Nuremberg (KTB site) and Bonn (easy access) are possible venues. The dates are tentatively set as June 23, and 24 for EXCOM, and 25 June for the ODP Council. In terms of venues, Dalrymple voiced his preference for ease of access.

Detrick thanked EXCOM member Catherine Mével and Bernadette Metayer of IFREMER for their fine efforts in organizing this meeting.

EXCOM motion 97-2-10.

The June 1997 EXCOM Meeting is adjourned.

Proposed by Orcutt ; seconded by Nowell.