

JOIDES OFFICE
Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science
Miami, Florida 33149
(305) 361-4168

MINUTES

JOIDES Executive Committee Meeting
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
9-10 November 1983

Members Present

- G. Brass (Alternate for A. Berman, EXCOM Chairman, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science)
- B. Biju-Duval (Centre National pour l'Exploitation des Oceans - France)
- J. Bowman (Natural Environment Research Council - UK)
- H. Durbaum (Bundesanstalt fur Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe - FRG)
- R. Heath (Oregon State University)
- C. Helsley (Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, University of Hawaii)
- M. Keen (Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Canada)
- J. Knauss, University of Rhode Island)
- M. Langseth (for B. Raleigh, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory)
- B. Lewis (University of Washington)
- A. Maxwell (University of Texas at Austin)
- W. Merrell (Texas A & M University)
- M. Peterson (for W. Nierenberg, Scripps Institution of Oceanography)
- J. Steele (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution)

Liaison

- J. Baker (Joint Oceanographic Institutions Inc.)
- J. Clotworthy (Joint Oceanographic Institutions Inc.)
- J. Honnorez (JOIDES Planning Committee)
- P. Rabinowitz (ODP Science Operator, TAMU)
- S. Toye (National Science Foundation)

JOIDES Office

- D. Marszalek (JOIDES Science Coordinator)

Guests and Observers

- W. Bryant (Texas A & M University)
- T. Davies (University of Texas at Austin)
- M. Gorini (Laboratories de Geologia Marinha, Cidade Universitaria, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
- L. Garrison (ODP, Texas A & M University)
- S. Herrig (ODP, Texas A & M University)
- B. Simoneit (Oregon State University)

JOI Office

- D. Rucker (JOI)

**JOIDES Executive Committee Meeting
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
9-10 November 1983**

ACTION AND NOTA BENE ITEMS

<u>Page</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Subject</u>
6	Nota Bene	Motion 264A: Canada accepted as member of JOIDES
7	J. Honnorez	Inform PCOM of reactivation of ILP and explore possibility of publishing drilling proposals
12	Nota Bene	Motion 268A: Termination of DSDP/IPOD advisory structure
12	PCOM	Re. staffing of ODP panels
13	PCOM	Re. formation of Task Group to assist TAMU in securing drilling clearances
14	Nota Bene	Motion 268B: Re. PCOM member being drilling proposal proponent
14	J. Honnorez	Report to EXCOM what steps PCOM will take to ensure that all drilling proposals are treated equally
15	D. Marszalek	Will inventory old JOIDES panel files for future archiving
15	Nota Bene	Motion 270: Annex B adopted as EXCOM Terms of Reference

**JOIDES Executive Committee Meeting
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
9-10 November 1983**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Page</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>
4	262	OPENING REMARKS AND BUSINESS
4	263	DEEP SEA DRILLING PROJECT REPORT
5	264	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION REPORT
7	265	JOI REPORT
9	266	MEMBER COUNTRY REPORTS
11	267	SCIENCE OPERATOR REPORT - TAMU
12	268	PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT
15	269	DSDP/IPOD PANEL ARCHIVES
15	270	ANNEX B - EXCOM TERMS OF REFERENCE
15	271	OTHER BUSINESS
19	272	FUTURE MEETINGS

**JOIDES Executive Committee Meeting
9-10 November 1983
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas**

262 OPENING REMARKS & BUSINESS

G. Brass (RSMAS alternate for A. Berman, EXCOM Chairman) opened and chaired the meeting.

W. Merrell (TAMU) welcomed Executive Committee members and guests to Texas A & M University.

Adoption of Minutes

J. Bowman (UK) noted that the minutes of the previous meeting in Swindon, UK did not reflect the sense of the voting on core curating recommendations from the Planning Committee. In cases where a majority of members voted affirmatively, but the motion was not adopted because a 2/3 majority vote was not achieved, the minutes now read "Motion not adopted". He suggested that the votes should be followed by the statement "Motion failed to take a 2/3 majority and therefore was not adopted"

Most EXCOM members felt that it was not necessary to indicate that a rejected motion had achieved a majority (but not a 2/3) vote. Such information is apparent in the recorded vote, and the degree by which a motion is either adopted or rejected is ultimately of no consequence.

The statement on page 15 of the minutes which reads "PCOM recommendations 2, 3 and 5 were not adopted by the Executive Committee" is amended to read "PCOM recommendations 2 and 3 were not adopted by the EXCOM and recommendation 5 was referred back to the PCOM for consideration.

The minutes as amended were unanimously adopted by a motion introduced by A. Maxwell and seconded by R. Heath.

263 DEEP SEA DRILLING PROJECT REPORT

M. Peterson reported for DSDP.

The drilling phase of the Deep Sea Drilling Project officially ended at 09:52 hours on 8 November 1983 with the completion of Leg 96 (Mississippi Fan). The final leg was a success with 11 sites drilled and logged; the HPC performed very well in sands, but stopped in cherty gravels (channel fill). A total of 624 sites were drilled during the project. The Glomar Challenger is now being demobilized in Mobile, Alabama. DSDP staff is in Mobile to assist in demobilization. Challenger will be returned to Global Marine on 20 November. The dynamic positioning system will be left intact.

The Project Plan and Budget for FY 1984 is still under review by NSF:

Proposed Budget: \$7.323M New funding
.603M Carry over from FY 1983
\$7.926M Total

Discussion:

J. Knauss - What is the fate of Challenger? M. Peterson - Not sure, but it may have been bid to the new drilling program.

R. Heath - Will the dynamic positioning system affect the debt to Global Marine? M. Peterson - Yes, but the value of the system is not much because it is outdated.

S. Toye - What were the downhole losses on Leg 96? M. Peterson - As stated in a letter sent to the Foundation, the losses were: \$105K (bottom hole assembly) and \$35K (bent BHA).

(M. Peterson continued.)

The **Initial Core Descriptions** will be reinstated in the printed form.

A package has been assembled to show PCOM the resolution attainable by x-radiography of cores.

Initial Reports Schedule: A reasonable target for publication of the Initial Reports is 36 months. The Information Handling Panel agrees but suggests some flexibility in the schedule.

Discussion:

H. Durbaum - A request from D. Roberts to delay publication of the Leg 81 volume was made because the submission of a German contribution has been delayed for a few weeks. M. Peterson - A delay is difficult to accommodate because all related work is affected and must be rescheduled.

J. Knauss - To what stage in the publication of the Initial Reports does the 36 months target apply? M. Peterson - The 36 months target is to deliver to NSF - a few more months are then required for printing.

J. Honnorez - A delay of one volume affects the schedule of subsequent volumes. It is JOIDES/NSF policy that 36 months is ample time for receipt of the scientific contributions.

W. Merrell - The 36 month policy has been reaffirmed by EXCOM in the past.

Consensus:

The target for receipt of scientific contributions is 36 months after the cruise; some flexibility in the schedule is desirable.

S. Toye reported for the Foundation.

The NSF report for the past 3 months will be brief, reflecting the maturation of the Ocean Drilling Program.

Non-US Participation

The **United Kingdom** was the first country to sign a MOU; the signing took place at Swindon (NERC).

An agreement to join was recently signed by **Canada**. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources will be the official JOIDES entity.

W. Hutchison (with M. Keen as alternate) will be the EXCOM representative; J. Malpas (R. Riddihough, alternate) will be the PCOM representative.

Brazil has formed a committee to examine ODP membership and has asked for official observer status at EXCOM/PCOM meetings.

The **European Science Foundation** group has recently met in Zurich and will meet this week in Strasbourg. Five countries (Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands and Italy) are interested and the outlook is positive.

Japan has sent a letter of intent to become a candidate member in the spring; funding arrangements are already in place.

Australia and **New Zealand** are unable to join ODP at this time, but their scientists hope to continue to participate in ocean drilling as individuals.

Canada

The National Science Foundation is pleased to announce that a Memorandum of Understanding for candidate membership in ODP was signed between NSF and the Canadian Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. The signing took place in Canada in October 1983.

(Executive Committee members expressed their pleasure over Canada's participation in the Ocean Drilling Program and in JOIDES. J. Bowman (UK) spoke for the Executive Committee in welcoming Canada into the JOIDES community. Canadian membership in JOIDES was then enacted by the following motion introduced by J. Bowman (UK) and seconded by W. Merrell (TAMU).

MOTION 264A: Move that Canada be accepted as a member of JOIDES.

VOTE: 13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain.

NSF Reorganization and Budget

The planned reorganization of the Ocean Drilling Program became effective 1 October.

The FY 1985 budget is near completion and will be submitted in early January for Administration approval. The details cannot be discussed at this time.

JOI Proposal Review

The JOI proposal for management of ODP is in the final stages of review. IPOD participated in the review process on 21 September. The only significant question in the proposal is the role of JOIDES; some clarifications have been presented (see Appendix G). It is hoped the management structure will be in place by January 1984.

Discussion:

M. Keen (Canada) - Canada has been contacted by B. Munsch (ESF) regarding possible formation of a consortium. Canada is considering the offer. A Canadian advisory structure is being set up. A cabinet response to a request for full membership in ODP is expected in September 1984.

H. Durbaum (FRG) - The JOI management proposal indicates that close cooperation between the science operator and industry will be established. Such cooperation is important to the non-US JOIDES members. Reactivation of the JOIDES Industrial Liaison Panel would ensure international participation in the science operator-industry relationship.

Scientists from non-US JOIDES member countries should be part of the science operator staff, reflecting the international make-up of the project. International participation in running the project would also be enhanced if the minutes of the science operator meetings with the Interface Working Group were distributed to the Executive Committee. Who will oversee the performance of JOI and TAMU? The EXCOM should have input in this matter.

Drilling proposals should be published along with the reasons for acceptance or rejection. Publication of proposals will help to eliminate the "closed shop" image of JOIDES.

The FRG is concerned about JOI-TAMU procurement policy for drilling technology.

B. Biju-Duval (France) - France is also concerned with the procurement of drilling technology. The role of the Technology and Engineering Development Committee is not clear. JOIDES must ensure that U.S. industry does not have an unfair advantage in supplying drilling technology.

Consensus:

Non-US members should be appointed to the Technology and Engineering Development Committee. Nominations should be submitted to J. Honnorez.

J. Honnorez (PCOM Chairman) will inform PCOM to explore the possibility of publishing drilling proposals. **ACTION-J.Honnorez**

265 JOI REPORT

J. Baker (JOI President) and J. Clotworthy (JOI Vice President) reported.

J. Baker informed EXCOM that the JOI management proposal is under review by the National Science Board. J. Clotworthy is the principal JOI contact point for the drilling program and will be assisted by D. Hunt, former Deputy Assistant Director at NSF for AAEO.

J. Clotworthy reported that JOI, TAMU and LDGO have held numerous meetings concerning contractual relationships. All subcontracts have NSF approval. Assuming approval of the JOI management proposal, it is expected that the NSF-JOI contract will be in place by 1 January 1984. JOI is moving ahead with ocean drilling business in anticipation of the contract.

LDGO has requested funds from JOI to purchase long lead time items for logging.

JOI is investigating the clearance procedure for drilling vs. site surveys. Different lead times to secure clearances may be required. The responsibility for securing clearances rests with TAMU for drilling, and with the site survey contractor for site surveys.

Regarding issues raised by H. Durbaum: The Interface Working Group does not run the program. The IWG was established to compensate for the geographical separation of the JOIDES Office in Miami, the science operator in Texas, and the logging subcontractor in New York. The IWG is a coordinating body and is not involved in policy decisions. The suggestion from H. Durbaum that minutes of the IWG meeting be circulated will be enacted.

JOI is working with TAMU and LDGO to ensure that procurement will be international in scope.

JOI recognizes the importance of international coordination in the ocean drilling program (e.g. site surveys) and is attempting to establish a JOI staff position to be filled by a non-US JOIDES scientist. The position is separate from the non-US JOIDES staff position with the science operator.

JOI recognizes that review of JOI and TAMU performance is important to the success of the ocean drilling program. Membership of a review committee has been discussed, but JOI feels that it is under constant review by JOIDES through its panels. The entire drilling program would benefit from a review by outsiders (non-JOIDES reviewers).

Discussion:

C. Helsley - Are JOIDES members excluded from the review committee?
J. Clotworthy - JOIDES members may be part of the review committee.

J. Bowman - Reviews of the program by JOI and by NSF could lead to an undesirable situation where the program is under constant review. J. Clotworthy - The review process would be similar to other JOI-type program reviews; the JOI review would be forwarded to NSF. The Foundation would not initiate its own review unless it found the JOI review to be inadequate.

J. Baker (JOI) - JOI welcomes criticism and plans to establish good channels of communication with the JOIDES community. JOI and TAMU are already linked by word

processor and JOI hopes to establish an electronic mail link with all JOIDES members; OMNET is in use among US institutions and that link exists between JOI and NERC (UK).

J. Honnorez - Regarding clearances for territorial waters, PCOM noted at their last meeting that 60% of the identified drilling targets are in the territorial waters of non-JOIDES countries. A State Department representative, Bill Erb, has been invited to the next PCOM meeting (10-13 January 1984 at TAMU) to discuss these issues. He will also meet with TAMU.

J. Knauss - It is useful for Bill Erb to meet with PCOM and TAMU. The US plans to comply with that portion of the Law of the Sea Treaty dealing with scientific research so permission to conduct research at sea may not be a problem. A real problem, however, is that a drilling vessel is not a "normal" research vessel, so it may require more than routine clearance. The lack of an organization of structure in some countries may make it difficult to secure clearances for a drilling vessel.

M. Peterson - DSDP required 1.5 years to get clearance from Mexico for the Challenger.

J. Bowman - some states may apply pressure to place nationals on board; perhaps space should be routinely reserved for national scientists.

J. Honnorez - The PCOM has already considered J. Bowman's concern. For example, a Norwegian Sea Working Group was set up with a Norwegian as chairman. We expect to have nationals on board. It is good policy and good public relations.

266 MEMBER COUNTRY REPORTS

France - B. Biju-Duval reported.

The French IPOD community has held several meetings concerned with the Ocean Drilling Program. Meetings held on 9 September and 25 October recommended that France join ODP. A French IPOD/Executive Committee meeting earlier this month also resulted in an endorsement of French participation in the ODP. A final decision was not taken because CNEXO needs to have final approval from its governmental authorities (a meeting is scheduled at the beginning of December). It is hoped that the MOU with NSF will be signed in the near future. A visit by S. Toye of NSF helped to solidify support for ODP within the French community.

French scientists have already started to assemble drilling proposals. One unresolved issue is the amount of funds available for support science (site surveys, pre-cruise studies, post-cruise meetings, etc.). France intends to participate with technical as well as scientific proposals.

United Kingdom - J. Bowman reported.

The UK IPOD committee has not met since the last EXCOM meeting at Swindon in August. Considerable behind-the-scenes activity, however, has occurred.

Dr. Keyworth (US Presidential science advisor) wrote to the chief scientist of the UK cabinet in support of the drilling program. As a result of that contact, the chief scientist has requested to be kept informed of UK efforts in ocean drilling.

The FY 1985 budget will not be known until February/March of next year.

Federal Republic of Germany - H. Durbaum reported.

Germany is in the final stages of signing the MOU for candidate membership with NSF. The funds will be derived from two sources: the Ministry of Energy and Technology and the FRG National Science Foundation.

In January/February 1986 the German polar research vessel Polar Stern will be available for work in the Weddell Sea. It is important for Germany to know as soon as possible if the ship is required for site surveys in the area. If not, then the vessel will be released to do other studies.

Discussion:

J. Bowman (UK) - The UK vessel Discovery will be in the Weddell Sea in 1984.

J. Honnorez - The JOIDES Site Survey Panel will meet 28-29 November to determine site survey needs.

B. Biju-Duval - A meeting is being planned in France to determine the site survey needs for the Mediterranean Sea.

Canada - M. Keen reported.

Canada signed the MOU with the US National Science Foundation as a candidate member 18 October in Ottawa. An organizational structure is being established, which is designed first for the planning phase: an interim Canadian EXCOM and an interim Canadian PCOM. One or the other is in essence charged with: making the case for full membership; acquiring the funds; setting up an organizational structure for the operational phase, etc. The present adhering body, during planning, is the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. The adhering institution during the operational phase may be another institution (e.g. a university). Canada will talk with the European Science Foundation about a consortium.

A proposal for Labrador Sea drilling has been formulated. We envisage site surveys in 1984 (to back up existing data) and have asked a number of people for comment on specifications. Much work was done off the Canadian west coast in 1983 (i.e., a superb SEAMARC II survey in cooperation with Hawaii) and will be done in 84 and 85, which will eventually lead to proposals for drilling later in the ODP.

Discussion:

H. Durbaum - German data for the Labrador Sea are available. M. Keen - It is already being used in planning the Labrador Sea proposal.

R. Heath - Would an offer from Canada to join in a consortium help bring Australia and New Zealand into the drilling program? S. Toye - Australia and New

Zealand are already aware of the possibility of a consortium with Canada.

J. Honnorez - K. Crook (Australia) called before the August EXCOM meeting to say that Australia could not join in the near future. JOIDES will continue to extend invitations to Australia and New Zealand to attend meetings as observers.

J. Bowman - The UK considered the possibility of a consortium with Australia and New Zealand but concluded that geographic separation would pose problems.

M. Keen - Geographic separation is a consideration; but each country could be responsible for "local" waters.

267 SCIENCE OPERATOR REPORT-TAMU

P. Rabinowitz (ODP Director) reported. Details of the report are included in Appendix A in which the following items are covered:

- TAMU ODP activities.
- TAMU role as science operator.
- Drillship award time schedule.
- Proposal evaluation team.
- ODP facility summary.
- Project Organization and personnel.
- Tentative Drilling Schedule, 1984-87.
- Summary of project activities.

W. Merrell reported that six responses to the drillship RFP were received from US and non-US offshore drilling equipment suppliers.

A staff position is being created for an "International Project Specialist". The person will be from an IPOD country, will work with the headquarters group and will have a visiting professor appointment in the UT system. The position will be for 2 or more years. P. Rabinowitz or W. Merrell should be contacted by interested persons.

Discussion:

H. Durbaum - The ODP science operator staff is to be approximately 130 persons. Has an attempt been made to hire IPOD scientists? P. Rabinowitz - Of the 130 positions, only about 12 are staff scientists. Equal consideration is being given to all scientists (US and non-US) to fill these positions on a permanent basis. Advertisements will soon appear in the major journals, after the science operator contract has been awarded to TAMU.

M. Peterson - Has the question of vessel insurance been addressed in the proposal.
P. Rabinowitz - Yes.

J. Bowman - What action has been taken to secure drilling clearances?
P. Rabinowitz - L. Garrison is in charge of drilling clearances. Contacts with the US State Department have been made. We are awaiting more specific site information from the PCOM. L. Garrison is the contact for clearances.

268 PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Honnorez (PCOM Chairman) reported.

ODP Advisory Structure

The ODP science advisory structure was established at the last PCOM meeting 13-15 September 1983 at Seattle, WA. The intent is for panels to retain 50% old membership for continuity. PCOM tried to maintain a balance among US JOIDES/non-US JOIDES/outside membership. Initial ODP panel membership is indicated in the handout (Appendix B).

The Planning Committee requests a directive from EXCOM concerning the fate of the DSDP/IPOD advisory structure.

Motion introduced by A. Maxwell and seconded by C. Helsley.

MOTION 268A: The DSDP/IPOD advisory structure will be terminated 1 January 1984 and will be replaced by the ODP advisory structure.

VOTE: 13 for; 0 against; 0 abstain.

Discussion:

H. Durbaum - R. Anderson (LDGO) at the last EXCOM meeting requested the formation of a logging advisory panel; what action did PCOM take? J. Honnorez - The expertise requested by R. Anderson was included in the Downhole Measurements Panel.

H. Durbaum - How will TAMU get technical advise? W. Merrell - TAMU will not have a technical and engineering advisory panel distinct from the JOIDES panel; TAMU will work with industry on an ad hoc basis.

Several Executive Committee members expressed concern that technological advice to the science operator be broadly based and that non-US industry be included, especially since advice to TAMU may influence the purchase of technology. Reactivation of the JOIDES Industrial Liaison Panel was considered by EXCOM.

Consensus:

An ODP project panel (not a JOIDES panel) informally known as an Industry Review Group will provide TAMU with technological advice on an ad hoc basis. EXCOM members will submit the names of industrial contacts to TAMU.

J. Honnorez requested that EXCOM members also submit to the PCOM, the names of candidates for the JOIDES Technology and Engineering Development Committee.

C. Helsley - Although the panel membership (Appendix B) is incomplete, it reflects inadequate staffing with scientists from JOIDES institutions. PCOM should make the membership worldwide, but should also maintain a substantial representation of JOIDES institutions.

ACTION - PCOM

J. Knauss - The advisory structure would benefit by the addition of another panel, with a limited term. The new panel should focus on problems of securing drilling clearances. Typical problems are: 1) the Ocean Drilling Program is international but the vessel is national (US); 2) the research involves drilling; and 3) jurisdiction in drilling areas is sometimes unclear, and may involve clearances from more than one country. Suggested members are T. Clingan (U. Miami, Ocean Law), L. Alexander (URI), W. Erb (US State Department).

Consensus:

A JOIDES Task Group should be formed to assist L. Garrison (TAMU) in securing drilling clearances. Formal (political) contacts should be paralleled by contacts at the scientific level.

ACTION - PCOM

PCOM Membership Rotation

B. Biju-Duval (France) reported that the Planning Committee had adopted the Executive Committee's recommendation regarding PCOM terms of office (Minutes 30 Aug.-1 Sept. EXCOM meeting, p. 10) which included the statement that "Commencing 1 January 1984, one quarter of the PCOM members shall rotate off the Committee annually, so that its membership is replaced very four years." The Executive Committee, therefore, should initiate the rotation.

J. Honnorez provided the EXCOM with the data (length of service on the PCOM and area of expertise) for each PCOM member (Appendix C). He noted that J. Kennett (URI) has resigned and that J. Aubouin (France) will resign at the end of 1984.

The EXCOM established the following schedule of rotation (terms to end 1 January):

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| 1984 | J. Creager (UW) | |
| 1985 | *J. Aubouin (France)
*H. Beiersdorf (FRG)
*W. Bryant (TAMU)
E. Winterer (SIO) | *Non-US members serve at the pleasure of their governments and rotation dates for them are only suggestions. |
| 1986 | *J. Cann (UK)
R. Moberly (HIG)
D. Hayes (LDGO) | |
| 1987 | R. von Herzen (WHOI)
H. Schrader (Oregon S.U.)
J. Honnorez (U.Miami)
R. Buffler (UT) | |
| 1988 | *J. Malpas (Canada)
To be announced (URI)
To be announced (UW)
*To be announced (Japan) | |

(J. Honnorez continued with the Planning Committee report.)

PCOM Conflict of Interest

The Planning Committee requests guidance on the issue of PCOM members as drilling proposal proponents.

Discussion:

C. Helsley - An active scientist may be a panel member and proposal proponent even if no conflict of interest is intended. Much of the potential for conflict of interest would be eliminated if the rotation of panel members were enforced and if all proposals were reviewed at the thematic/regional panel level.

R. Heath - PCOM proposal proponents should not participate in discussions relating to their proposals.

A. Maxwell - A main criticism of the drilling program is that it is perceived as a "closed shop". Rotation would be encouraged if PCOM members were not allowed to be proposal proponents.

J. Knauss - Are data available on the frequency of PCOM members as proposal proponents? J. Honnorez - No, such data have not been assembled.

Continued discussion resulted in a motion introduced by C. Helsley and seconded by R. Heath:

MOTION 268B: If a Planning Committee member is a proponent of drilling sites, the proposal must be reviewed independently by thematic or regional panels and the PCOM member is not to be involved in any substantive advisory role or in any final voting on the proposal at PCOM meetings.

VOTE: 12 for; 1 against; 0 abstain.

Ocean Drilling Program Announcement

J. Honnorez distributed copies of an announcement (Appendix D) of the new drilling program to be published in several international scientific journals.

EXCOM Consensus:

The announcement is approved in concept but requires some changes. The word "proposals" should be replaced by "letter of intent" or "ideas for drilling", etc. The proposal review process should be mentioned.

To ensure that all proposals are treated fairly, the list of drill sites and the reasons for acceptance or rejection should be published. J. Honnorez should report to EXCOM at the next meeting on steps taken by PCOM to ensure that all proposals are treated equally.

ACTION - PCOM

Name of the New Drilling Project

J. Honnorez reported on the PCOM resolution. (PCOM minutes, 13-15 Sep. 83, p. 33): "The Executive Committee is requested to restore an international character to the name of the new drilling program/project."

EXCOM Consensus:

Any change of the project name would result in confusion; the name "Ocean Drilling Program" will be retained.

269 DSDP/IPOD PANEL ARCHIVES

(During the last meeting, 30 Aug.-1 Sept. 1983, the Executive Committee instructed a subcommittee consisting of J. Clotworthy, M. Peterson and J. Honnorez to determine a policy for archiving panel records.)

J. Clotworthy read a report of the subcommittee (included here as Appendix E). The subcommittee feels that the records should be sent to the JOIDES office at Miami. D. Marszalek, with the assistance of a graduate student, will eliminate extraneous materials and inventory the documents. The assembled materials will then be offered to SIO for archiving along with DSDP files, or will be temporarily stored at the JOI offices in Washington, DC until such time as a permanent repository can be found.

ACTION

EXCOM Consensus:

The above plan for archiving should be initiated. Funds for historical analysis of the files may be available within NSF Directorates for such studies; interested historians may submit unsolicited proposals to NSF.

270 ANNEX B - EXCOM TERMS OF REFERENCE

J. Clotworthy (JOI) distributed copies of Annex B which replaces Annex A as the Executive Committee Terms of Reference (Appendix F).

Discussion resulted in the following changes:

Item 5. "The Executive Committee shall reach all its decisions by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all members." Change to read: "The Executive Committee shall reach all decisions by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all members including members from at least two countries."

Motion introduced by A. Maxwell and seconded by B. Lewis.

MOTION 270: Annex B is adopted as amended.

VOTE: 13 for; 0 against; 0 abstain.

271 OTHER BUSINESS

Letter from R. Heath (JOI-BOG Chairman) to S. Toye (NSF) concerning JOI role as ODP manager (Appendix G), and J. Honnorez (PCOM Chairman) remarks concerning the letter (Appendix H).

(Copies of both letters were sent to EXCOM for comment.)

EXCOM Consensus:

The R. Heath letter is for information purposes and is not a binding document, therefore J. Honnorez remarks do not require action.

Post-graduate Students on Drillship

J. Bowman (UK) noting that the new drillship will have more berths than Challenger, suggested that post-graduate students should be part of the scientific crew when space is available.

W. Merrell (ODP Project Director) replied that the inclusion of students is already part of the plan for staffing, but that whether or not students are to be included will be known only after a drillship has been selected and the available space is known.

Developing Countries as JOIDES Members

M. Keen (Canada) informed EXCOM that the Canadian AID (foreign assistance) program may be able to pay the JOIDES Membership fee for certain developing countries as part of a consortium with Canada. The question is, would such membership be approved by the Executive Committee.

Discussion:

C. Helsely - The participation of developing countries should be encouraged if they have a national scientific community.

J. Bowman - Many developing countries will insist that they are represented in the scientific crew when the drillship is in their territorial waters even if they are not JOIDES members.

J. Knauss - Scientists from developing countries should be invited to participate on legs prior to the ship being in their territorial waters. In this way the international character of the ODP will be promoted and good relations will be built up with states from which drilling clearances may be required in the future.

EXCOM Consensus:

EXCOM generally supports the inclusion of developing states in the drilling program.

Press Release, DARPA II Leg

J. Honnorez noted that a press release in the October issue of Geotimes (Appendix I) concerning the success of the Tonga Trench leg mentioned the following entities:

NORDA (3 times), DARPA (2 times), SIO (3 times), DSDP (1 time), while JOIDES and JOI were not mentioned at all. The press release was obviously not cleared by DSDP as required (this was confirmed by M. Peterson of DSDP).

EXCOM Consensus:

Unauthorized press releases are unfortunate but probably impossible to prevent. J. Honnorez is free to criticize the press release via a letter to Geotimes if he so desires.

R. Heath Speech at EXCOM Dinner

At a dinner hosted by TAMU on the evening of 9 November, R. Heath commended the Deep Sea Drilling Program. A synopsis of his speech follows:

"Ladies and Gentlemen:

At 9:52 a.m. on the 8th of November 1983, yesterday, the earth sciences, and particularly the marine earth sciences, saw a historic era come to an end. The D/V GLOMAR CHALLENGER was tied up after 15 years of work. The field part of the Deep Sea Drilling Project and International Phase of Ocean Drilling had come to a end. The results of the project are well known, but I think that both the statistical and, perhaps more importantly, the scientific accomplishments, of CHALLENGER and of the DSDP are worth repeating. At the end of Leg 96, 624 sites had been drilled over a period of 15 years. This is a remarkable accomplishment, particularly in light of the rather modest plans of the first year or two. To complete this program, CHALLENGER steamed close to three quarters of a million kilometers, roughly equivalent to circumnavigating the globe 15 times. Some of the statistics through the end of Leg 95, the latest I have, show that the ship drilled about 315 kilometers or roughly 196 miles, it cored about 167 kilometers, or almost 60 miles. The deepest penetration exceeded 1700 meters and the deepest penetration into basement exceeded a kilometer. I suspect that all of these accomplishments would have amazed even the optimists in the group who, in the mid-60's planned the first phase of the drilling program.

As far as scientific accomplishments are concerned, we tend to focus on the most recent happenings. At a moment like this, though, it is worth standing back and remembering what marine geology and geophysics were like in the late 1960's. We had a great deal of single channel seismic reflection data, but the arguments as to the nature of the multitude of sub-bottom reflectors were still heated. Today, in contrast, our understanding of the morphology of the sea floor and the layers beneath has rendered obsolete the debate as to whether Horizon A is chert or volcanic ash or an unconformity. We accept, almost as a matter of course, the calibration of our seismic records by DSDP sections. At the start of Leg 1, the age of the oceanic crust was still a subject of considerable controversy. When the drill ship proved that the crust of today's ocean basins is less than a couple of hundred million years old, the reality of sea floor spreading and plate tectonics became evident. A concept that had been viewed by many geologists (perhaps the most conservative of all scientists!) as a pretty far-out hypothesis, soon was accepted as solid theory that has underpinned most of the geology of the last 15 years. The continued vitality of the theory is demonstrated by the recent work on exotic terrains. We should remember that its widely-accepted validity depends to a considerable extent on DSDP's dating of magnetic anomalies.

Today, we accept the utility of the oceanic sedimentary record in unraveling the effects of changing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, or the history of ice ages. Yet the field of paleoceanography as we know it did not exist prior to the Deep Sea Drilling Project; a few people trying to extract results from patchy outcrops of ancient oceanic sediments have given way to sophisticated and, in many cases, quantitative studies of paleo-climates, studies which can be tested against the cores that have been recovered by the CHALLENGER. The temporal evolution of the ocean circulation, and of the major oceanic water masses has been documented by the drilling program. The effects of plate tectonics on oceanic sediments; the subsidence of the sea floor away from mid-ocean ridges and its drift across climatic zones have been recognized and used to "backtrack" the geologic records only because we have had the sedimentary cores to work with. Similarly, the demonstrated occurrence of deep-sea petroleum deposits and the acceptance that the conditions required for the maturation and migration of hydrocarbons occur in the deep sea, are products of the drilling project.

Each of us can look at his or her science, be it sedimentary petrology, paleontology, biostratigraphy, igneous petrology, or structural geology, and find key ideas or results that draw very heavily on the results of the Deep Sea Drilling Project. Likewise, in a purely technical sense, we have tools and skills that are now taken so much for granted that we forget the contribution of the Project in developing them. Dynamic positioning and the ability to re-enter holes in very deep water are now routine. No one is amazed that the CHALLENGER can stay on site for weeks at a time and repeatedly re-enter holes. Yet this technology was very largely developed for and first used by CHALLENGER.

It is clear that we owe an enormous debt to many people--to the many, many scientists who have helped plan the drilling project and have taken part in the 96 legs, to the staff of the Deep Sea Drilling Project, both present and past, who have run this marvelous operation for a decade and a half, and to the people from Global Marine who have operated the ship so effectively and professionally for so many years.

Today, though, it is fitting that we honor an amazing piece of machinery that was the first of its kind, but that has proven adaptable enough and sophisticated enough to accept the improvements in equipment and techniques of the last 15 years. Please join in a toast to that remarkable vessel--to the GLOMAR CHALLENGER."

Motion introduced by W. Merrell and seconded by M. Langseth.

MOTION 271: Move that R. Heath remarks be part of the EXCOM meeting minutes.

VOTE: 13 for; 0 against; 0 abstain.

Bird Mortality

M. Peterson informed EXCOM that a large number (tens of thousands) of several species of land birds had landed on the Challenger during bad weather encountered on Leg 96 (Mississippi Fan) in the Gulf of Mexico. The ship was several hundred miles offshore. Most of the birds died, presumably from exhaustion. As the incident may be of scientific value to ornithologists, a contact is requested.

J. Knauss - The Audubon Society should be informed; it maintains a network of ornithologists worldwide.

272 FUTURE MEETINGS

6-8 March 1984 EXCOM and IPOD, Baltimore MD

19-21 June 1984 EXCOM and JOI/BOG, France

The meeting adjourned at noon, 10 November 1983.