

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JOIDES EXCOM Draft Minutes  
26-29 November, 1979--Moscow

<u>Page</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1	145	Introductory Remarks
2	146	Action Items
	147	Status of CHALLENGER Operations I. Current CHALLENGER Operations II. South Atlantic Program III. DSDP Staffing IV. CHALLENGER Performance V. Initial Reports
4	148	PCOM Report I. Safety Panel II. Paleoreference Centers III. South Atlantic Schedule IV. Ocean Crust Panel V. Ocean Paleoenvironment Panel VI. Organic Geochemistry Panel VII. Synthesis Volumes VIII. PCOM Chairmanship
6	149	NSF Report/Budget Review
	150	Status of EXPLORER Program I. Review-History/Current Status II. Preliminary Agreement/Budget Considerations III. Preliminary Agreement/Program Management IV. Preliminary Agreement/Other Areas V. EXPLORER Program Discussion

<u>Page</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>
11	151	1981-83 CHALLENGER Proposal I. NSF Introduction II. Response to Proposal III. Future of the Proposal A. Timing B. Funding C. Other Discussions
14	152	Other Business--South Atlantic Drilling
15	153	Future Meetings
	154	Closing Remarks

APPENDIX I      NSF Financial Status Report

ACTION ITEMS

JOIDES EXCOM Draft Minutes  
26-29 November, 1979--Moscow

<u>Page</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Subject</u>
4	148	II	Hay	Contact Sanders at Basel and see how PCOM resolution to increase the number of paleoreference centers from 5 to 8 affects his work
4	148	II	JOIDES Office	Investigate permanent/nonpermanent status of SIO paleoreference center
4	148	II	Riedel	Status of samples taken for paleoreference center, how will community be notified, and will catalog be prepared
5	148	V	PCOM/JOIDES Office	Clarify statement in minutes regarding punch core system and Mariana and Nauru Basin site survey
6	148	VII	PCOM	Investigate JOIDES role in producing and sanctioning synthesis volumes and the timeliness of producing these volumes
13	151	III, A	PCOM	Rewrite 1981-83 proposal
13	151	III, A	PCOM/DSDP	Prepare 10-20 page science abstract and submit it to NSF
13	151	III, B	IPOD countries	Send comments and suggestions about 1981-83 GLOMAR CHALLENGER proposal to JOIDES Office as soon as possible
13	151	III, B	DSDP	Initiate discussions with GMI about using GLOMAR CHALLENGER on a part time basis during 1981-83

JOIDES Office  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution  
Department of Geology and Geophysics  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

DRAFT MINUTES

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
26-29 November, 1979--Moscow

Present: Maxwell, A., Chairman (WHOI)  
Bogdanov, N. (USSR)  
Debyser, J. (France)  
Durbaum, H. (FRG)  
Gartner, S. (Texas A&M)  
Hay, W. (RSMAS)  
Helsley, C. (HIG)  
Merdinger, C. (SIO)  
Peterson, M. (DSDP)  
Schilling, J. (URI)  
Talwani, M. (LDGO)  
Twinn, P. (UK)

Brett, R. (NSF)  
Ewing, J. (PCOM Chairman, WHOI)  
O'Connell, S. (JOIDES Office)  
Wilkniss, P. (NSF)

Guests: Dmitriev, L. (Verradsky Inst. of Geochemistry)  
Pushcharovsky, Y. (Geol. Inst. of the Acad. of Sciences of  
the U.S.S.R.)  
Sidorenko, A. (Institute of Lithosphere)  
Timofeev, P. (Geol. Inst. of the Acad. of Sciences of the  
U.S.S.R.)

145 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Academician Sidorenko welcomed the Executive Committee to Moscow. The minutes from the August, 1979 EXCOM meeting were approved and an agenda for this meeting was adopted.

146 ACTION ITEMS

Item 136, II, B: In their deep drilling program in the Kola Peninsula, the USSR has developed a full suite of logging instruments. These instruments are physically and electrically compatible with the Soviet downhole magnetometer, that was successfully operated at Site 501. The Soviets will be ready by February or March to make this equipment available on the GLOMAR CHALLENGER. They would prefer that the equipment be unloaded at a port with Aeroflot connections. An effort will be made to equip the GLOMAR CHALLENGER with Soviet logging tools in Santos, Brazil, prior to Leg 73.

Item 137: The GLOMAR CHALLENGER schedule for drilling in the Atlantic has been adjusted. Any additional scheduling delays prior to the end of Leg 75 will be absorbed by the South Atlantic program.

Item 138, III: See Item 150.

Item 139: Costing out a hydraulic piston coring program for another vessel will depend upon the water depths the vessel will be operating in. It appears that a GLOMAR CHALLENGER class ship is required for HPC operation in normal deep oceanic areas. DSDP has not costed out a program. Some of the IPOD countries might be interested in looking at a smaller, more limited program, but couldn't really give any indication about how it would be received. The U.S.G.S. would like to use the GLOMAR CHALLENGER to hydraulic piston core 6-10 holes off the U.S. East Coast and is willing to pay for the time. These holes however would have to be drilled during the 1979-81 CHALLENGER extension. Several members suggested investigating the availability and cost of using the ALCOA SEAPROBE.

Item 140: The 1981-83 CHALLENGER proposal has been rewritten. See Item 151.

Item 141, II: See Item 148, II.

Item 144: Maxwell has written a letter to NSF endorsing the Icelandic drilling program, and Brett responded. Copies of these letters will be sent to the EXCOM members.

147 STATUS OF CHALLENGER  
OPERATIONS

I. CURRENT CHALLENGER OPERATIONS

The hydraulic piston coring leg (Leg 68/HPC) and Leg 69 in the Costa Rica Rift area went well. Towards the end of

Leg 69 there was a short circuit in the AC switchboard from the main bar to the cabinet. It is speculated that this short circuit migrated causing a surge of power to go through the dynamic positioning part of the computer. Upon shut down several components must have failed, and the dynamic positioning system refused to work. GMI sent 7 or 8 people to fix the computer. About a week's time was lost.

Leg 70 is proceeding well. A pinger has been placed on the drill string and is very useful in locating the exact position on the mounds.

## II. SOUTH ATLANTIC PROGRAM

The XRF will be removed at the end of Leg 70. An XRD in its own van will then be used.

D. Moore is staffing the legs through Leg 75. The co-chiefs have already been selected.

## III. DSDP STAFFING

D. Moore is resigning at the end of December. DSDP has interviewed candidates for his position. There were many excellent applicants.

S. White resigned in October. His position will be filled after the new chief scientist has been selected.

## IV. CHALLENGER PERFORMANCE

The CHALLENGER is structurally alright. Many ancillary parts have been replaced. It can reasonably expect a 20-year hull life, and 15-year mechanical life. Special refurbishments are being considered in the next (1981-83) proposal.

The GMI contract is performance oriented. If the ship is down for a few minutes and a hole is lost, GMI only pays for the actual down time. This can be considerably out of proportion to the science lost.

## V. INITIAL REPORTS

An index and errata sheet are being prepared for the pre-IPOD volumes (1-44). The index to volumes 1-35 has been

finished. The complete (1-44) index will be about 50 pages. DSDP was asked to send a letter to the co-chiefs asking for errata. This has already been done, but may be necessary again.

## 148 PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

### I. SAFETY PANEL

Maxwell moved and Hay seconded that BRIAN E. DAVIES, DAVID B. MACKENZIE, and A. J. HORN be accepted as new members of the JOIDES Safety Panel. Passed unanimously.

The AAPG apparently has no record about how they nominated their member of the JOIDES Safety Panel. Maxwell agreed to contact AAPG and request an official representative.

### II. MICROPALAEOREFERENCE CENTERS

There is still confusion about this subject. According to NSF, a member of the Smithsonian Institution could write a proposal as long as salaries for the senior staff are not included and the project is for the general interest of the scientific community.

Before the EXCOM agreed to endorse the PCOM resolution, it wanted to have several matters clarified.

1. How would this resolution affect the work that Sanders at Basel had already done? Hay agreed to investigate this.
2. Is the SIO paleoreference center permanent or temporary?
3. What has been done to the samples that have been taken and how will people in the community be notified about what is available?
4. Will a catalog of the samples be prepared in addition to the availability announcements in geologic journals?

In addition to including a notice about the availability of the micropaleoreference centers in the JOIDES Journal, a

notice should also be included in the Journal of Paleontology, Micropaleontology, and the Gulf Coast Section of SEPM.

III. SOUTH ATLANTIC SCHEDULE

DSDP is investigating using a non-S. African port between the end of Leg 73 and beginning of Leg 75. Otherwise a boat transfer should be possible for a Soviet scientist.

IV. OCEAN CRUST PANEL

Helsley moved and Schilling seconded that J. HONNOREZ and R. STEPHEN be accepted as new members of the JOIDES Ocean Crust Panel. Passed unanimously.

V. OCEAN PALEOENVIRONMENT PANEL

Ewing moved and Hay seconded that W. RUDDIMAN and J. HAYS be accepted as new members of the JOIDES Ocean Paleoenvironment Panel. Passed unanimously.

The EXCOM was mystified at the OPP's endorsement of a long barrel, large diameter, punch core system and R. Larson's site survey proposal in the Mariana and Nauru Basins, and requested clarification.

VI. ORGANIC GEOCHEMISTRY PANEL

Ewing moved and Helsley seconded that P. MEYERS be accepted as a new member of the JOIDES Organic Geochemistry Panel. Passed unanimously.

Helseley moved and Debyser seconded that the EXCOM concur with the PCOM's motion to approve a change in the organic geochemistry sampling procedure for hydraulic piston corer samples. Passed unanimously.

The new method would remove 60 cm of half the core every 30 m for organic geochemistry samples. The organic geochemistry half would be frozen; half of the organic geochemistry sample (1/4 of the core) would be permanently archived as a frozen sample. The other half (1/4 of the core), also frozen, would be sampled for organic geochemical analysis.



Of the non-organic geochemistry half of the core, half (1/4 of the core) would be sampled, and the other half (1/4 of the core) would be archived.

#### VII. SYNTHESIS VOLUMES

The AMP plans to produce a synthesis volume compiling IPOD active margin data and requested JOIDES approval. The role of JOIDES in synthesis volumes was discussed. It wasn't clear what the role was or what it should be. This included both subject and regional synthesis volumes and support for these volumes. The PCOM was asked to explore the idea about what JOIDES should do about synthesis volumes and the timeliness of these volumes.

#### VIII. PCOM CHAIRMANSHIP

The EXCOM thanked Jim Heirtzler for his work as Planning Committee Chairman. Maxwell will write him a letter expressing their thanks.

#### 149 NSF REPORT/BUDGET REVIEW

Tables listing the expenditures for FY '79, a detailed estimate for FY '80, and a preliminary estimate for FY '81 were distributed (see Appendix 1). There is a decrease in the JOIDES travel budget because of the decreased number of JOIDES Panel meetings. Increased fuel costs have cut into the DSDP budget. NSF is trying to obtain supplemental funds. In reviewing the DSDP budgets, 1979 was a phase-down year and budget constraints forced the lay off of personnel. These positions have been included in the FY '80 budget. Most of the FY '80 legs are in the South Atlantic. These are further from the U.S. than the FY '79 legs, so higher transportation costs are incurred.

The IPOD co-mingled funds are not used for U.S. site surveys.

#### 150 STATUS OF EXPLORER PROGRAM

#### I. REVIEW HISTORY/CURRENT STATUS

The OMD program has been discussed since 1973. It was formally proposed in 1974 but was considered technically premature. It was proposed again, and since the FUSOD meeting

has undergone considerable review and reworking. In 1978 the revised program, including engineering costs and budget revisions, was estimated at \$560 M.

A Blue Ribbon Panel chaired by H. G. Stever met this spring (1979) to review the Ocean Drilling/EXPLORER program. This panel noted the expense of the program and the mutual science and resource interests. It suggested that funds be sought outside of the NSF and recommended that the Government explore the interest of major U.S. industries in participating in and helping to support such a project.

Industry was approached through the Office of Science and Technology. Since the early fall, several meetings have been held between industry, government, and academic science. These negotiations are reaching a semi-final stage. A draft agreement, expressing the interest of industry and government in participating in an Ocean Drilling/EXPLORER Program has been prepared. It is hoped that the agreement will be signed by 5 December, and be negotiated between NSF and OMB between 5-10 December. If the agreement is signed, money for the EXPLORER program will be included in the President's budget which is presented to Congress on 19 January. This agreement is preliminary; many of the actual details of the science program will be worked out between the signing of this agreement in December and a more final agreement that will be signed sometime next summer before the Systems Integration Contract (SIC) is let.

## II. PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT/BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

The oil industry has been asked to fund half of the program, and in return is expecting to have a considerable influence on the program. They expressed reservations about the estimated total cost of the program. They felt the costs were too low and could run three times the NSF estimates. In addition, the government estimates are only inflated by 7%, when off-shore drilling costs have been increasing at a rate of 15%.

The Santa Fe Engineering Services Company, which has been hired by the NSF as the Systems Support Contractor for the EXPLORER program, reviewed the costs of a hypothetical program, outlined at the 2-3 October Houston meeting. They found that at 7% inflation, the estimated cost of \$560 M was very close to their \$600 M estimate (both figures at 7% inflation). Even at these prices, the oil companies

considered the program to be too expensive. This was particularly viewed as a problem in 1981 when the NSF budget is still paying for the CHALLENGER program.

To cut costs, the 18-month riserless program was eliminated, saving an estimated \$55 M in ship's operations and \$20 M in science. In the shortened program, the ship will be converted on either coast, and begin operations in early (about January) 1984 with a riser. This program allows the conversion of the ship and commencement of operations to proceed at a slower rate. The amount of money needed during the initial phases is decreased.

The revised budget, which is accompanying the preliminary agreement was put on the board. This budget is based on the assumption that \$10 million of new U.S. Government appropriations for OMD in FY '81 will be matched by the participating petroleum companies. After step increases in FY '82, FY '83, and FY '84 of \$6 million, \$14 million, and \$6 million for both the Government and Industry, only inflationary increases are required from FY '84 on (inflation assumed to be 10% annually). The preliminary agreement has cost figures for the program that look approximately like the following:

	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
EXPLORER	.5	1.0	2.1	20	32	60	73	80	88	97	106	117	20
EXPLORER Science Budget				6	8	10	11	12.1	13.3	14.6	16.1	17.7	10
CHALLENGER Budget			20	21									

OCEAN DRILLING (MARGIN) PROGRAM  
1978-1990

\$696.10--Total Cost

One of the difficult aspects of the program is the FY '81 budget. During that year the NSF will be paying \$21 M (with IPOD co-mingled funds) for a CHALLENGER program, \$6 M

for an EXPLORER science program, and \$10 M of the \$20 M for EXPLORER conversion (the other \$10 M will be paid for by the oil companies). Assuming that no further funds are appropriated by Congress, the \$10 M may have to come out of the existing NSF budget during FY '81. Of this money, \$5 M may be taken from the overall budget, and the other \$5 M from earth and ocean science.

### III. PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT/PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Management in the shortened program would assign JOI Inc. a scientific advisory role similar to its present role. Industry could have up to 49% representation on any scientific advisory panels. There would also be an industrial oversight committee to make sure that the costs weren't getting out of hand. NSF would let the SIC contract, and that could consist of a situation somewhat similar to the current SIO/Global Marine/DSDP.

### IV. PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT/OTHER AREAS

Many aspects of the program are still to be determined. There is still the possibility of making some modifications in the program, possibly putting in other and/or shallower holes. Some specific areas that have not been agreed to include:

1. The percentage of coring vs. cutting.
2. The role of non-U.S. countries. There is a clause acknowledging the possibility of non-U.S. government and non-U.S. oil companies participating.

If the oil companies and academic scientists agree to the program, discussions with other countries will begin after 19 January when the President presents the budget to Congress, and they will have a year to respond. These are some of the factors that will be investigated and worked out this year and be included in the agreement that should be finalized by summer CY '80.

### V. EXPLORER PROGRAM DISCUSSION

Lengthy discussion developed concerning the shortened version of the EXPLORER program, and there were many objections. Central to most of the objections, was the criticism

that the academic scientists had little or no role in the government/industry negotiations. The academic scientists had developed a program, and a philosophy towards the program. They were among the strongest supporters of the program. Whatever the revisions, the directors of the oceanographic institutions would be the ones that would be expected to promote the program, particularly at their institutions. The program they would now be asked to promote was one with compromises that they had no part in making. Given the opportunity, they might have arrived at the same conclusions. For example, drilling deep forearc holes without a riser may not be wise, but the decision to drop them was done without consulting the academic community. JOIDES had been asked to develop a program in phases, which they did. Without consultation, the ground rules on the phase development changed.

NSF pointed out the short time span for most of the decisions, the legal nature of the agreement, and the fact that some members of the JOI/JOIDES community had been involved in aspects of the discussion. This was generally not thought to be an adequate enough excuse.

Many specific areas of concern were expressed. These included the spirit and practice of industry/academic science objectives, particularly regarding FUSOD objectives, financial aspects of the program, and management.

The EXPLORER program, which was developed by JOIDES based on FUSOD objectives, tried to balance scientific objectives and to maintain community support. It was felt that ignoring these objectives indicated fundamental differences in academic vs. industry approaches to science as well as eroding community support for the program. In attacking scientific questions, the industry approach is geared much more towards asking specific petroleum-related questions, rather than more general questions of geologic processes. In practice these differences could create problems.

In the scenario that Congress does not appropriate an additional \$10 M in FY '81, and the NSF is assessed the money, support for the program, especially the shortened program, would be very difficult to maintain. It wasn't clear though how much of a difference there was in some aspects of the funding, e.g. site surveys.

NSF assured the EXCOM that science was still in the "driver's seat" regarding the management of the program.

Several members suggested that the academic interests be argued more forcefully in negotiations with industry.

After more questioning and discussion, it was emphasized that the December agreement was preliminary. With this preliminary agreement, there would be 6 months to a year to work out many of the specific details before the program commenced in a more final way at the beginning of FY '81. These further negotiations could in theory reexamine the science program as well as engineering/technological and financial barriers. Without this preliminary agreement there was little chance that further negotiations would be held.

It was again stated that the JOIDES community would be strong supporters of a good EXPLORER program. Such a program should be possible. In this light,

Talwani moved, Twinn seconded, that EXCOM strongly supports the discussions at present being held between agencies of the U.S. Government and U.S. industry to find means to finance an EXPLORER drilling program. However, it is concerned to learn that the constraints imposed by the agreement could prejudice the development of a program aimed at achieving the scientific goals set forth in the FUSOD document. It reiterates its strong support of these goals and accordingly expresses its wish to participate closely in any discussions aimed at adopting a program which will ensure that these goals are not compromised. Passed unanimously.

151 1981-83  
PROPOSAL

CHALLENGER

I. NSF INTRODUCTION

Draft copies of the most recently revised 1981-83 CHALLENGER proposal were distributed at the beginning of the meeting. NSF emphasized how difficult it had been to get the 1979-81 CHALLENGER extension through the Office of Management and the Budget. The chances of any new proposal getting through OMB were considered even slimmer. The hope of getting them through NSF would depend upon very exciting new science, a very well-written proposal, and funds that are not being used for an EXPLORER Ocean Drilling Program.

## II. RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL

In general, the response to the science in the proposal was positive. However, in light of the NSF's position and very tight funding, it was felt that a considerably more polished proposal would be necessary. Specific suggestions included:

1. Combine objectives for legs and sites.
2. Decrease the steaming time.
3. Develop a more balanced program with less emphasis solely on hydraulic piston coring. This was considered important because the scientific capabilities of the HPC have not been proven, and no concrete science results can be pointed to as justification.
4. Place more emphasis on downhole instrumentation.
5. Make a careful assessment of the Active Margin Panel objectives that can be met with the CHALLENGER.
6. Aim the program more at preparing for EXPLORER objectives/Develop a program that is able to stand completely on its own.

## III. FUTURE OF THE PROPOSAL

### A. Timing

The proposal is already a year late. DSDP is in the same situation for the 1981-83 proposal that it was in for the 1979-81 proposal and is facing a phase-down budget in 1981. To have funding for FY '81, a final proposal to go out for review must reach NSF by March/April.

Before the proposal can be submitted as a legal document to NSF it has to be approved by the University of California regents. To get the proposal through the U.C. system and to the NSF by February, the proposal has to go to the printers by mid-late December.

At the time of the EXCOM meeting, DSDP was preparing a budget to accompany the draft proposal and Jerry Winterer was smoothing some of the rougher spots. It was decided to send the draft proposal and budget through the U.C. system.

The PCOM was asked to rewrite the proposal incorporating EXCOM's suggestions. The new proposal should be reviewed at the February PCOM meeting. If the PCOM approves the proposal it could be finalized and sent to NSF as the official 1981-83 CHALLENGER proposal. As long as the budgets in the current 1981-83 proposal and the next revision are similar, the amended revision would not have to pass through the U.C. system. By the February meeting the JOIDES community should have a better understanding of the status of an EXPLORER program. A 10-20 page summary/abstract of the proposed scientific program and a budget should be submitted to the NSF with a letter indicating the intent to submit a formal proposal.

The IPOD countries were asked to send their comments and revisions regarding the 1981-83 proposal to the JOIDES Office as soon as possible.

B. Funding

The possibility of obtaining substantial U.S. funds for the 1981-83 proposal are not good. Some funds might be available through both the NSF and other agencies for an abbreviated program. Several IPOD countries expressed their strong interest in the program. In light of this, they might be able to increase their financial support for a year or two. It may also be possible to get support from non-IPOD countries, but this has not been investigated.

With some sources of funding possible, an abbreviated 1981-83 CHALLENGER program might be run. DSDP was asked to initiate discussions with GMI about a partial style program. Currently SIO has an option with GMI that gives them favorable ship rates. The option is supposed to be renewed one year prior to the expiration date of the contract.

C. Other Discussions

Funding the CHALLENGER program on a two-year by two-year basis was not thought to be an effective way to



operate. There was some discussion suggesting that a three- or four-year program be proposed. Costing out such a program at this time would be difficult. It was decided to keep with the two-year proposal.

152 OTHER BUSINESS--SOUTH  
ATLANTIC DRILLING

L. Dmitriev gave a presentation describing areas in the Atlantic where basalts have relatively high  $TiO_2$  contents (higher latitude areas) and relatively low  $TiO_2$  contents (lower latitude areas), possibly suggesting different depths of partial melting. In the South Atlantic this boundary is somewhere N of  $28^\circ$  S. He asked that 4-6 holes, 1-2° apart be drilled in the South Atlantic, just N and S of this transition.

The lead time to get these holes into the current South Atlantic program is too short. The South Atlantic program has been carefully planned by the OPP and severely cut back in time. The EXCOM encouraged the PCOM and Panels, particularly the OCP and OPP, to consider the importance of these sites when more lead time is available. Both Leg 73 and 74 holes are planned to be drilled to basement.

WHOI/URI has a dredging cruise this spring that is planned from Tristan de Cuna North to  $30^\circ$ S. If time is available, Schilling, one of the co-chief scientists, will extend the dredging program further North to look at the geochemical boundary.

Further discussion developed concerning the appropriateness of changing the South Atlantic program to investigate the South Atlantic heterogeneity problem. The ship may never be in the South Atlantic again. The OPP, however, has been carefully planning their program for the last three years. There have already been problems in adjusting the CHALLENGER schedule. The program is funded to investigate specific problems; if it is continuously changed, the program will lose credibility. Making this sort of change was also considered by some to not be the province of the EXCOM.

Helsley moved, Gartner seconded, that two weeks from the 1979-1981 North Atlantic program be given to the South Atlantic to investigate the geochemical boundary at  $28^\circ$ S, and that the two weeks lost from the North Atlantic be returned to them during the 1981-1983 CHALLENGER extension or during the EXPLORER program.  
Vote: 2 for, 6 against, 3 abstain. Motion defeated.

153 FUTURE MEETINGS

25-26 March, 1980

New Orleans  
RSMAS will host this meeting

17-19 July, 1980

Paris  
This will be at the conclusion of the IGC in Paris

17-19 November, 1980

U.R.I.

154 CLOSING REMARKS

Nikita Bogdanov and the staff of the Institute of the Lithosphere were thanked for their hospitality and hosting the meeting.

U.S. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
OCEAN SEDIMENT CORING PROGRAM  
Deep Sea Drilling Project  
International Phase of Ocean Drilling  
Financial Status Report  
November 1, 1979

The attached tables contain actual expenditures for Fiscal Year (FY) 1979 from 1 October 1978 to 30 September 1979. A detailed estimate is provided for FY 1980 (1 October 1979 to 30 September 1980). A preliminary estimate is given for FY 1981 (1 October 1980 to 30 September 1981).

OSCP - DSDP - IPOD

Financial Status Report

November 1, 1979

The Deep Sea Drilling Project's International Phase of Ocean Drilling is carried out by the University of California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography under contract with the National Science Foundation.

Scripps issues a major subcontract for GLOMAR CHALLENGER drilling with Global Marine, Inc. Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Incorporated (JOI, Inc.) issues subcontracts for the JOIDES Office and the IPOD Data Bank. Site Survey Management and all JOIDES committee and panel travel are being funded through JOI, Inc.

The DSDP contract is administered through the Ocean Sediment Coring Program office (OSCP) at the National Science Foundation. Certain expenses are incurred in connection with the DSDP at NSF, especially printing of the Initial Reports.

U.S. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
 OCEAN SEDIMENT CORING PROGRAM  
 Deep Sea Drilling Project  
 International Phase of Ocean Drilling

NSF/OSCP	Actual FY 1979	Estimate FY 1980	Estimate FY 1981
NSF			
Personnel, Science Coordinator	\$ 40,813	\$ 42,000	\$ 45,000
JOIDES, Travel & Office (JOI, Inc.)*	490,000	372,559	398,600
Interagency Agreements:			
Meteorology for GLOMAR CHALLENGER	105,300	110,000	117,700
Printing of Initial Reports	310,000	550,000	550,000
SUBTOTAL NSF/OSCP	<u>\$ 946,113</u>	<u>\$ 1,102,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,140,700</u>
SCRIPPS			
DSDP/IPOD**	<u>\$16,728,523</u>	<u>\$18,500,000</u>	<u>\$19,795,000</u>
GRAND TOTAL. OSCP/DSDP/IPOD	<u>\$17,674,636</u>	<u>\$19,602,000</u>	<u>\$20,906,300</u>

\*In FY 1978, JOI, Inc., took over JOIDES funding (July 1978).

\*\*For details see following page.

<u>DSDP/IPOD</u>	<u>Actual FY 1979</u>	<u>Estimate FY 1980</u>	<u>Estimate FY 1981</u>
<b>PERSONNEL COST:</b>			
Headquarters	\$ 400,043	\$ 616,000	\$ ---
Operations	349,808	552,300	---
Engineering	141,171	208,600	---
Science Summary	917,932	1,204,900	---
Logistics Summary	547,442	880,800	---
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL</b>	<b>\$ 2,356,396</b>	<b>\$ 3,462,600</b>	<b>\$ 3,705,000</b>
<b>SUPPLIES &amp; EXPENSE (S&amp;E):</b>			
Headquarters	284,183	269,000	---
Operations Summary	2,040,406	2,078,000	---
Engineering	245,527	300,000	---
Science Summary	449,885	447,000	---
Logistics Summary	331,671	516,500	---
<b>TOTAL S&amp;E</b>	<b>\$ 3,315,672</b>	<b>\$ 3,610,500</b>	<b>\$ 3,900,000</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>			
Headquarters	15,467	23,700	---
Operations Summary	25,781	25,500	---
Engineering	6,224	7,000	---
Science Summary	150,052	183,900	---
Logistics Summary	41,780	156,800	---
<b>TOTAL TRAVEL</b>	<b>\$ 239,304</b>	<b>\$ 396,900</b>	<b>\$ 424,783</b>
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 5,911,372</b>	<b>\$ 7,470,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,992,900</b>
<b>OVERHEAD</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>214,000</b>
<b>EQUIPMENT &amp; FIXTURES (E&amp;F)</b>			
Headquarters	1,922	2,000	---
Operations Summary	480	---	---
Engineering	7,223	---	---
Science Summary	15,017	5,000	---
Logistics Summary	31,585	50,000	---
<b>TOTAL E&amp;F</b>	<b>\$ 56,227</b>	<b>\$ 57,000</b>	<b>\$ 6,990</b>
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 6,167,599</b>	<b>\$ 7,727,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,267,890</b>
<b>DRILLING SUBCONTRACT</b>	<b>\$ 9,929,142</b>	<b>\$10,808,000</b>	<b>\$11,564,560</b>
<b>JOIDES OFFICE &amp; TRAVEL</b>	<b>5,724</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>SITE SURVEY SUBCONTRACT</b>	<b>\$ 626,058</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>DSDP/IPOD TOTAL PROGRAM</b>	<b>\$16,728,523</b>	<b>\$18,535,000</b>	<b>\$19,815,033</b>