

ODP Council - JOIDES Executive Committee

Joint Meeting Participants

Oslo, Norway 25 June, 1996

ODP Council

Suzanne Egelund	Geological Survey of Denmark & Greenland, Copenhagen, Denmark
Peter Fricker	European Science Foundation, Strasbourg
Naci Gorur	TÜBITAK, Ankara, Turkey
Don Heinrichs(Chair)	National Science Foundation, Arlington, U.S.A.
John Krebs	Natural Environment Research Council, Swindon, U.K.
Kristjan Kristjansson	Icelandic Research Council, Reykjavik, Iceland
Tom Loutit	Australian Geological Survey Organization, Canberra, Australia
François Madelain	IFREMER, Issy-les-Moulieaux, France
Dietrich Maronde	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Germany
Torstein Pedersen	Research Council of Norway, Oslo, Norway
Robin Riddihough	Geological Survey of Canada, Ontario, Canada
Renzo Sartori	University of Bologna, Italy

Executive Committee - EXCOM

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

EXCOM Liaisons

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

Guests and Observers

Pamela Baker-Masson	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
J Paul Dauphin	US National Science Foundation
Ross Heath	Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, California
Hajimu Kinoshita	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Kazuhiro Kitazawa	JAMSTEC (Japan)
Shigeo Kuriki	MONBUSHO (Japan)
Bruce Malfait	US National Science Foundation

Julian Pearce
Takeo Tanaka
Akira Ueda

University of Durham, U.K., (PCOM Chair)
JAMSTEC (Japan)
STA (Japan)

JOIDES Office

Kathy Ellins
Colin Jacobs

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

Heinrichs opened the meeting by welcoming all participants and reminded the meeting that its purpose was for interaction between ODP Council members and the JOIDES representatives. Briden then welcomed all participants and said that he looked forward to reporting on JOIDES activities. Heinrichs then briefly reviewed the agenda.

J1 JOIDES REPORT TO COUNCIL

A. CURRENT ISSUES AND SHORT-TERM PLANNING (INCLUDING THE FY97 PROGRAM PLAN).

Briden opened this report and referred the meeting to the agenda papers, saying that certain points would be concentrated upon that came to the fore during the last two days of EXCOM. He called upon Mix to report the science plan.

Mix referred the meeting to the Program Plan and said that he would try and put the legs into context. He said that the ODP is already focusing its planning into the themes of the LRP, and this is manifest in the FY97 legs that have been scheduled.

Leg 171B Barbados LWD - second use of a new tool for the ODP, it allows the capture of data without coring or risking losing the hole through instability. This will build upon the success of Leg 156. Leg 171C is the Blake Plateau and Blake Nose, which will drill a very high resolution section of ancient sediments in an anomalously warm period of the past. This is to test the hypothesis of warm, salty bottom-waters. This leg will build on the efforts of Leg 165. Leg 172 looks at very rapid jumps of climate change in the last ca. 2 Ma. The key element is a full depth transect that will be of similar resolution to that gained from ice cores. It is linked to the results of Leg 162. Leg 173 builds on Legs 103 and 149, and examines the mechanisms of the formation of non-volcanic margins. Leg 174A is the New Jersey mid-Atlantic transect, and is planned to look at the timing of sea level changes and test the models of oil companies. This also is a multi-leg experiment that is here focused on the continental shelf. This complements Leg 166 which studied the same sea-level changes but in a different setting. This experimental program will require multi-platform operations - jack-up rigs. Leg 174B is a two-piece leg. Site 395A was drilled about 20 years ago and is still drawing-down sea water. This experiment will plug that flow and then follow up with downhole experiments to test hydrological circulation away from ridge crests. The second part of the leg is to test a new hammer drill-in casing system to replace sea floor assemblies. Leg 175 is a transect along the African margin, and will be a high resolution climate study to look at how heat is transported between the hemispheres. Leg 176 will return to the SW Indian ridge (Site 735B), and it will extend the existing site deep into the lower crust to look at the structure and chemistry of the oceanic crust. He said that there are several short legs that allow the science to be planned in a more focused manner.

Falvey then reported on the resources available to meet this science plan. He said that the BCOM took a radically different approach to this year's budget to allow for greater innovation in the Program. There were three envelopes defined, fixed costs, the innovation or X-base (the old Special Operating expenses), and the A-base that provides the services of the core Program delivery. He said that the X-base was set at \$3.5M and the A-base was then defined. He said the operators were then asked how they could allocate that X-base in the Program requirements. On the basis of the proposals submitted, a priority list was defined in conjunction with the BCOM and PCOM. The new allocation means that all projects now have sunset clauses. Falvey then reviewed the final allocations that will go to NSF for approval.

Briden said the first imperative is fixed costs, followed closely by innovation and only then the "normal" programmatic running costs. Krebs asked the target for efficiency gains. Falvey replied that it will effectively be the \$700K that was moved from the A-base to the X-base, and he outlined some examples from the BCOM priority list. He said that the target is to increase the X-

base to \$5M next year and then to \$6.5M, depending upon the level of savings that can be found in the A-base.

Briden then asked Falvey to present the new publications strategy. Falvey said that the new publications strategy has now been approved for implementation, and he reviewed the major points of this new strategy. He also outlined the major points of the NSF Inspector General's report and the response by ODP. He said the new strategy will improve the information availability by electronic means at a sustainable rate. Falvey then outlined the major elements of the current and new publications strategy along with a 5 year timetable for full implementation. Falvey reported cost savings of about \$750K per year at full implementation. Maronde asked if this was not a transfer of costs to the user? Krebs asked that publication in ODP literature vs. publication in "white literature"? Briden replied that there has been a change of policy on this to allow publication in the open literature at 12 months post cruise.

Briden then moved to the PEC IV report, saying that out of 42 items that needed to be addressed, only 5 came to this meeting, and only 2 of those are still outstanding that will be addressed in the next few months of organisational change. Briden also pointed out that the Executive Summaries of the operators are in the Council papers.

B. LONG-TERM PLANNING: RESPONSE TO MID-TERM REVIEW AND ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Briden referred the meeting to the agenda papers. He said that JOIDES is on track to addressing all of the points raised by the Greve report. He said that JOIDES are only half-way through the period designed for a response and this interim report is for information and possibly for Council to provide guidance. Briden said that JOIDES has determined that in order to address the issues raised by the Greve report, JOIDES has determined that it needs to restructure itself. He called upon Leinen to outline the JOIDES plans.

Leinen then reviewed the Greve recommendations as pertaining to the need to modify the JOIDES structure. She said that EXCOM had requested the Planning Committee to develop a strategy that would address many of the issues raised by Greve. EXCOM have endorsed a 3-tier science advisory system of planning, review, operation and evaluation. At the top level there will be a long term planning committee that will have an emphasis on long term planning, increases the power of the scientific leadership to focus on the LRP, and identifies this top level group as being responsible for regular evaluation of the Program in terms of the LRP. Another top-level committee will be established tasked with short-term issues as its priorities.

There will be a thematic review level panel that will be responsible for interior review and external peer review of proposals. The third component is the development of a flexible number of groups that can address detailed planning for themes, initiatives, and interaction with other Programs as requested by the top-level science committee.

She said that EXCOM believe that this is an appropriate structure to make the ODP much more responsive to the global community and it will allow proper focus of science priorities. Briden commented that technical developments will be dealt with by cross membership of the committees.

Fricker asked for clarification of the scientific leadership issue as he sees very many tasks. Briden said that this is an issue that EXCOM has been trying to grasp. Brown responded by saying that the internal scientific leadership is the PCOM and the Chair of that committee, and the new structure will unload the day-to-day issues and allow more time for longer term planning. He said that some things are still to be resolved such as the period of office, the amount of time required for the post, and the advocacy of the Program. He said the advocacy of the Program will have to be done on a national basis, but that JOI has been tasked to come up with a strategy for additional funding for Phase IV of the Program. In answer to Krebs, Briden said that the total number of committees will reduce. Mix then outlined the details of the proposed new committees. Madelain asked the timetable? Briden said that it will be very quick, there will be a transition

during calendar year 1997. Sartori asked what will happen to the service panels such as Site Survey? Mix replied that the essential panels (SSP, PPSP and TEDCOM) will remain. Pedersen asked about the reporting lines. Briden replied that this had yet to be finalised but that the Science Committee will report to the Executive Committee. He said that EXCOM were concerned that the reporting and proposed accountability lines were in good shape.

Briden then moved on to say that EXCOM have discussed future funding and the strategy alluded to by Brown addresses that issue. Loutit asked about the implications of the budget for the members for Phase III. Heinrichs said that EXCOM and JOI are using the planning numbers alluded to in the Greve report, and looking at additional partners. He said that JOI has been requested for a 5-year implementation plan, due in spring 1997. Falvey said that formally he is planning on a flat budget through FY97. Taylor said that the LRP will cost money to implement and that fact must be addressed.

Heinrichs then moved to Phase IV planning, and asked Briden to continue. Briden said that the meeting papers accurately predicts the present status and where the Program is going next. A major component of the vision for the future is riser drilling and there is a small divergence between ODP and OD21, but this is closing. He said that a full science conference has been proposed for 1997 to bring all the parties together.

In terms of technology, there will be a significant meeting in the autumn of 1996 of STA/JAMSTEC and the JOIDES TEDCOM (Technology and Engineering Development) to discuss in detail what will actually be built by the Japanese.

Coffee..... 16:15 - 16:30

Loutit commented that the progress on the presentation of the Program Plan was excellent and the group should be commended. He said that the ODP science community should push even harder on getting their results out to the wider world and that it is a good opportunity to get the funding agencies more involved with the Program. Briden said that JOIDES was waiting for Council to specify what it actually wants JOIDES to present to them, perhaps an open session with the expertise around the table could then be called upon. Fricker asked if the LRP would be elaborated upon. Briden said that JOI would be required to produce a 5-year plan and that would provide the answers Fricker was looking for.

Heinrichs asked Falvey to present his financial projection table. Falvey said that the financial projections were actually put into the LRP, but the Greve committee recommended that the details be removed. He was then asked to produce the detail which was now in the EXCOM papers. He said that it was not an authorised set of assumptions and he reviewed the table for the meeting. He said that, according to the figures presented here, he was asking for a growth of about 1% from the current members. Loutit said that EXCOM have now asked JOI to produce a funding scenario to fulfil this plan. Falvey said that this was so, and it would include consultation with member committees to achieve consensus, even if that meant a number of options.

J2 COUNCIL REPORT

Heinrichs said that the Council has not yet met, but that an agenda has been presented. It will meet in open session with the EXCOM Chair and the Chair of the JOI Board of Governor, and then a closed session looking at fiscal and structural issues.

J3 MEMBER REPORTS

Australia - Canada Consortia

Mayer reported for Aus-Can. He said that the reports were in the agenda book and updated the meeting on discussions with additional partners. Loutit reported that Taiwan had indicated the permission to join has been given and they will join within a couple of months. Mayer said that Korea has committed to membership later this year. Riddihough commented that for the first year it will be a 1/12 membership, with a 1/6 membership in the second year.

European Consortia for Ocean Drilling

Eldholm tabled an update at this meeting that encompasses the ECOD meeting held in early June. ESF wants to continue the consortia and the Nordic Group wants to maintain a 50% membership. There may be some reorganization of the rest of the consortia.

Fox said that the ship may officially be re-named to the JOIDES Resolution.

France

Ludden reported that France has two committees to look at its participation in the Program that will report later this year. He said that in addition to Lancelot's report, France was happy with a change to the publications policy, but it wanted a strong scientific committee that was as independent as possible, and France also wanted to see non-ODP scientists included on that committee. Madelain said that this evolution is seen as a positive signal in France, but the scientific committee must be independent of the Program and its composition will be very important.

Briden said that the membership is in response to the nominations of its members, so any country can nominate whomever it wishes, and he asked the definition of a non-ODP scientist? Madelain said that the committee must be opened to people involved in other geosciences Programs. Briden said that France could nominate visionary people if it wished. Ludden said that the science committee must not be saddled with operational matters.

Germany

Maronde reported a 5% budget increase overall for ODP science. He said that Germany is waiting for a decision from the grants committee on 49 proposals for ODP work. He then reported on the work of the KTB experiment and said that ODP could work with this Program and benefit from its results. He said the holes could be used for logging tests and experiments. Maronde then reviewed the holes of the KTB project. He said the Coring for Global Change workshop volume has now been published and volumes were available. Maronde said that there was also a workshop in Bremen about drilling for stratigraphic targets and the report would be available soon.

Japan

Taira reported that all partners within Japan have agreed high level talks for negotiation between ODP and OD21, which is a major step forward to solve some domestic issues.

United Kingdom

Briden reported the loss of Prof. Rob Kidd from the Program. He said that the JOIDES Office will continue to fulfil its function and Julian Pearce has agreed to assume the headship of the office and the PCOM Chairmanship. Briden said the ODP grants committee met last week and made one recommendation which will go forward to the NERC. Pearce said that the committee will recommend a named "Rob Kidd ODP Fellowship" be available from NERC. Briden then asked Krebs to take matters further on the national review of the ODP.

Krebs reported that the UK review of ODP came to NERC a few months ago and was strongly supportive of the ODP and the UK involvement. NERC Council was asked to consider the review in two areas - should it be a top-slice project or should it be placed along with the other earth science projects. The NERC decided that it should be prioritised alongside other earth sciences projects.

Regarding the projected increase in subscriptions, he said the UK view was that its subscription should be cash-limited at the 1996 level. Briden asked if the NERC decision was taken in the context of the funding profile in the LRP (6%). Krebs commented that it was, and he also commented that the projected overall budget of NERC shows a decrease in real terms.

United States

The 1996 budget would now increase slightly. There were no changes to report from USSAC.

NEXT MEETING

Briden said that in terms of the next joint meeting of EXCOM and ODP Council, it would be hosted by France at IFREMER, Brest at the end of June (23-29th) 1997. EXCOM note the possible difficulty for one member and will explore possible alternatives with a couple of weeks.

OTHER BUSINESS

EXCOM thanked Olav Eldholm and his staff for setting up this meeting in such excellent facilities.

Adjourn..... 17:25